



**Skanska USA Building Inc.**  
221 Yale Ave N. Suite 400  
Seattle, WA 98109  
Phone 206-726-8000  
Fax 206-328-9235  
Web www.skanskausa.com

February 20, 2015

University of Washington

Project: ASC 2015- Sustainable Building & LEED Problem Statement

Subject: Final Scoring Detail

Dear Ryan,

Congratulations on competing in the ASC 2015 Sustainable Building & LEED Problem Statement, I hope you found the experience both educational and enjoyable. We understand how much effort goes into preparing for the competition every year and to your credit the level of preparation showed, the judges were extremely impressed with the level of competition this year:

<u>Team</u>	<u>Score</u>
University of Florida	78.08
Colorado State University	76.40
University of Washington	71.80
University of New Mexico	63.51

Attached is a scoring summary sheet detailing how well your team performed on: the prequalification, each of the five problems and the addendum. The median and average scores of each problem are given for comparison. The total median and average scores for the written portion of the problem statement are shown at the top of the sheet along with your team's total score. In the upper right of the sheet your team's rank against the other competitors is shown for both the written and oral portions of the competition. The last pages detail a breakdown of how the judges scored your team on each written problem.

The Skanska problem statement team enjoyed the competition this year and we hope to see you all back for next year's event. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at [Anthony.spinelli@skanska.com](mailto:Anthony.spinelli@skanska.com).

Very Truly,

*Anthony J. Spinelli*

Anthony J. Spinelli  
Project Manager

Skanska USA Building  
[www.skanska.com](http://www.skanska.com)  
Phone +1 206 726 8000  
Mobile +1 206 406 2361  
Fax +1 866 457 5286

cc: ASC 2015 Problem Scoring

	Median Score	Average Score	UW
<b>83 Totals</b>	<b>50.95</b>	<b>48.30</b>	<b>58.24</b>

### Prequalification

5

- Number of AP on Team
- Format
- Sustainable Thoughts
- Green Achievements
- Page Count

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
1			0.25
1			1.00
1			0.75
1			0.25
1			1.00
<b>Prequalification Totals</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.25</b>

#### Rank Against Other Teams

Written Response:	Top Third
Oral Presentation:	Middle Third
Overall Score:	Top Third

### LEED Credit Comparison

10

- Overall Project Review
- Materials Category
- Recommendation of Rating System

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
3			1.74
2			1.25
5			-
<b>LEED Credit Comparison</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>2.99</b>

### On-Site Renewable

20

- Solar Panel Design
- Additional Renewable
- Alternate Energy Sources

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
12			11.25
6			6.00
2			2.00
<b>On-Site Renewable</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>13.03</b>	<b>19.25</b>

### Life Cycle Analysis

15

- Annual Energy Use
- Life Cycle Analysis
- Subcontractor Selection
- Incentives & Rebates
- Fixture Recommendation

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
2			2.50
6.5			3.50
2			2.00
3.5			2.00
1			1.00
<b>Life Cycle Analysis</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>9.50</b>	<b>11.00</b>

### Carbon Footprint

15

- Bid Comparison
- Local vs. Out of Town

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
10			8.50
5			5.00
<b>Carbon Footprint</b>	<b>10.50</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>13.50</b>

### Water Collection and Use

15

- Irrigation Consumption
- Rain Water Collection
- Cistern

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
6			2.25
6			2.50
3			1.25
<b>Water Collection and Use</b>	<b>6.75</b>	<b>7.08</b>	<b>6.00</b>

### Addendum

3

- Bonus Questions - Estimated Ridership 64000
- Bonus Questions - Gallons Saved 11000 (27000)
- Bonus Questions - Improve Ridership
- Formatting
- Exceeded Page Count

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	UW
1			1.00
1			0.25
1			1.00
-5			-
-10			-
<b>Addendum Totals</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>2.25</b>

Problem #1 - LEED 2009 vs. LEED v4 Assessment

10 Total Points Possible

10 Total Points Possible		
<b>PART 1: Overall Project Review</b>	<b>3 Pts Possible</b>	<b>1.74</b>
SS - 2009	0.2	0.1
WE - 2009	0.2	0.15
EA - 2009	0.2	0.05
MR - 2009	0.2	0.15
IEQ - 2009	0.2	0.15
IDP - 2009	0.2	0.2
RPC - 2009	0.2	0.2
LT - v4	0.2	0.05
SS - v4	0.2	0.1
WE - v4	0.2	0.1
EA - v4	0.2	0.02
MR - v4	0.2	0.02
IEQ - v4	0.2	0.05
Innovation - v4	0.2	0.2
RP - v4	0.2	0.2
Comments		
<b>PART 2: Materials Category</b>	<b>2 Pts Possible</b>	<b>1.25</b>
Credits of the future: do they mention all 3 credits and fully describe what each entails?	1	0.5
Did they research what needs to happen to accomplish credits of the future (EPDs, 3rd party certified products, "USGBC approved program")	0.25	0
Mention of MR credits being combined	0.75	0.75
Comments		
<b>PART 3: Recommendation of Rating System</b>	<b>5 Pts Possible</b>	<b>0</b>
Two or More Innovative Ideas	2	0
Are the innovative ideas realistic/attainable?	1	0
Were the innovative ideas explained well, easily understood?	1	0
Convincing	1	0
Comments		

15 Total Points Possible

University of  
Washington

Problem # 2 - Life Cycle Sustainability Analysis - Lighting		
#1.a Correct light fixture take-off QTY	1	1
#1.b Use correct LA County power/cost formula (22.3)	0.5	1
#1.c Answer	0.5	0.5
#2.a Complete detailed life cycle analysis	3	1
#2.b Identify criteria and formula used	3	2
#2.c Organization of answer/data	0.5	0.5
#3.a Select correct subcontractor	2	2
#4.a Quality of incentives/rebates (1 pt ea. - max of 3)	3	1.5
#4.b Organization of answer/findings	0.5	0.5
#5.a Correct selection of light fixture	1	1
	15	11

They missed the LED vs Flor life cycle difference and assumed both were replaced one after 10 years

15 Total  
Points  
Possible

Univ  
Washington

Problem #3 - 4th St. Station Carbon Footprint			
Part I #1	Takeoff of Concrete CY	1.5	1.5
Part I #2	Bid comparison / least expensive	2.5	2
Part I #3	Carbon Footprint of each supplier / lowest	4	3
Part I #4	Best value supplier	2	2
Part II #1	Carbon footprint of crew	2	2
Part II #2	Carbon footprint of crew - local	1.5	1.5
Part II #3	Carbon footprint of crew - carpool	1.5	1.5
Total		15	13.5

Notes

Pt I # 2 - did not include tax

Pt I # 3 - did not include total quantity of materials

15 Total Points Possible

University of Washington

Problem #4 - Water Usage and Collection		
#1. a) Forumula	2	0
#1 b) $ET_o$	1	0.5
#1.c) Landscaped Areas	1	0.75
#1.d) Answer	1	0.5
#1.e) Organization	1	0.5
#2.a) Rainfall data by month	1	0
#2.b) Rainwater Collection Formula	1.5	0.5
#2.c) Collection Area	1.5	1
#2.d ) Answer - Size of Cistern	1	0.5
#2.e) Organization	1	0.5
#3.a) Volume Calculation	0.5	0.25
#3.c) Graph/Method	1.5	0.5
#3.a) Answer & Organization	1	0.5

15

6

Don't know how they got  
landscape area

collection area is incorrect

didn't list values for assumptions

20 Total Points Possible

UW

Problem #5 - Onsite Renewable Energy			
#1.a	Correct quantities	2	2
	Work is shown, correct equation is used	2	2
	Marked up drawing is accurate and realistic	1	0.5
#1.b	Work is shown and is correct	1	1
	Acknowledged factors other than initial cost	1	1
	Narrative is clear and illustrates the rationale	2	2
#1.c	i. Correct direction	1	1
	ii. Correct angle	1	0.75
	iii. Correct dates	0.5	0.5
	iii. Correct angles	0.5	0.5
#2a.	Product chosen, with cost and quantity	2	2
#2.b.	cost of panel support structure	1	1
#2.c	payback period, and cost assumptions	2	2
#2.d	Projected cost of maintenance	1	1
#3.a	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.b	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.c	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.d	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5

Didn't account for mechanical equipment on C/S roof

Good detail

20

19.25