

GVR Planning & Evaluation Committee
Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

Draft Outline 8-5-18

- A. Background (Why we need an SOP)
1. Lack of continuity/director turnover/committee turnover
 2. Capital projects – more than before, more complex, and involve large sums
 3. Need to pinpoint when, FAC, and GVR staff coordinate their input
 4. Too much like “herding cats” without a good system in place
 5. Document “best practices” in a handbook to be passed on to next year’s committee
- B. Capital Project Request Summary (Form)
1. Document in one place all the information captured on the capital project – evaluation, budgeting, approvals, etc.
 2. Create a “steering committee” consisting of P&E Chair, FAC Chair, & GVR Facilities Director
 3. A place to document changes as the project progresses through the system
 4. Should there be only one “window” each year when major capital projects can be put forth?
 5. Do capital projects only get final approval when the annual budget is approved?
- C. Capital Project Definition
1. Capital projects must meet the following definition:
 - An monetary value of at least \$5,000 (per CPM Section V, sub-section A #4)
 - A life cycle of at least 3 years
 - Results in the creation of a fixed asset
 - Results in the revitalization/extension of a fixed asset
- D. Project Origination
1. New projects are either identified externally by input (e.g. member feedback, surveys, forums, etc.) or internally (e.g. GVR staff, WSM, etc.)
- E. CP Evaluation (Criteria & Evaluation)
1. What’s in the CPM ? Does the project fit with the GVR mission?
 2. Important to prioritize projects that compete for capital
 3. Pros and cons of existing methods:
 - a. DL’s 28 pt. criteria & impacts assessment XYZ criteria
 - b. Cost/benefit
 - c. 5 Tier model (Agree on values for each)
 4. “Program approach”, i.e. substantiate real need based on “comps”
 5. New method should perhaps combine both program approach and criteria/analysis
 6. Goal of new system should be – simple, but effective and reflective of members’ needs
 7. Identify & evaluate the “opportunity cost”, i.e. if this project is completed, what other project won’t be done as a result?
 8. Do we need a different system for:
 - a) Large capital projects (Over \$5,000?)
 - b) Under \$5,000?

- c) Health/safety/ADA requests
- d) Club Requests
- e) Staff Facilities/Services
- f) Membership requests i.e. from the survey
- g) Reserve study projects
- h) Center Assessment Projects

F. CP Process

1. Document the CP as it moves through FAC capital budgeting, WSM, Facilities staff and P&E
2. How often and when do we involve membership?
3. Estimate Vs. hard quote
4. Suggest we follow the path of the existing PB project as an example
5. Have adjoining HOA's been consulted?
6. When and how should the "repurposing" of facilities be used?

G. Clubs

1. Evaluation of annual requests – due end of March for following year.
2. Club contribution – yes or no – if yes how much?
3. Document the process through the system
4. Identify & document with a list – unmet club needs
5. Club award history
6. Club membership & usage history

H. Staff Funding Requests

1. Should these requests be out-boarded from the above process?
2. What is P&E's role in these projects?
3. Should we be using a different evaluation process?

I. GVR Facility Assessment

1. Browning Reserve study is cumulative and evaluates & tracks life cycle of large assets
2. Excludes things like bringing things up to code
3. Facilities dept reviews complement Browning's work for routine projects e.g. lighting upgrade, etc.)
4. Facilities dept. working toward "predictable maintenance"
5. Funding is from non-reserve capital budget
6. Timing: Conducted in winter months & work done in summer

J. Project Cost Estimates

1. Provided by GVR Facilities dept.
2. Can be estimates where GVR acts as contractor and consults with their known sub-contractors, or
3. Facility dept can get hard quotes from 3 suppliers.

K. Calendar

- P&E
- Club Requests
- Capital Budgeting