



City of Lawrence Capital Improvement Plan Prioritization Summary

City of Lawrence

Introduction

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is a tool to help the City look beyond year-to-year budgeting to determine what, when, where and how future public improvements will take place over the next five years. The Capital Improvement Budget is made up of capital projects contained in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Capital Project Defined

A capital project is defined as a project with a minimum total cost of \$100,000 resulting in either the creation of a new fixed asset or results in the enhancement to an existing fixed asset with a life expectancy of at least 2 years. Some examples include construction or expansion of public buildings, new storm and sanitary sewers, water line upgrades and extensions, the acquisition of land for public use, planning and engineering costs, and street construction.

Goals

The goal of a 5-year CIP is to establish a plan that outlines the projected infrastructure improvement needs of the City to assist in the planning and budgeting process. This plan will include a summary of the improvements, an estimated cost, a schedule for the improvements, and the source of funding for the project as outlined in the CIP Policy. The CIP will prioritize the identified projects into yearly plans based on areas of emphasis and project rankings. The annual prioritization process will be guided by the City's strategic plan. Projects will be re-prioritized if the project has changed in scope or one there has been a shift in one of the variables (i.e., received a grant for the project, change in regulations, etc.). If no changes from the prior year have been made to a project, it will retain the same score from the prior year.

Prioritization

The prioritization of the eligible projects is completed by staff through use of a CIP Ranking Criteria outlined below. Each potential project must first be classified as a CIP project according to the definition above. If the above criteria are met, the project will be given a CIP score and project ranking. Based on this CIP score and project ranking, the recommended CIP will be established and presented to the City Commission for consideration as outlined in the CIP Policy.

Funding Limits

On an annual basis, funds for CIP projects will be limited based on the City's fund balances and bonding capabilities. A level of funding for the different project types will be developed to determine the annual scope of the CIP. Projects identified in the CIP may be funded by different sources. General obligation (GO) bonds, revenue bonds, direct funding out of existing fund balances, joint cooperative efforts with outside entities, grants and donations are a few of the different options for funding CIP projects. During the City's annual budget process, the projects will be fully analyzed for the source or sources of funding available.

Scheduling of Projects

Project schedules will be developed based on the available funding and project ranking. The schedules will determine where each project fits in the 5-year plan. This will be based on the priority of the project, funding availability and how it correlates with other projects included in and out of the CIP.

Production of CIP Plan

The final plan will be produced based on the evaluation of the CIP score, project type, funding, and schedule. The CIP will be re-evaluated on an annual basis to align growth, needs and budgeting.

Categories	Categories Score	Categories Weight	Weighted Score	
Strategic Plan Alignment (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	2	<input type="text"/>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-right: 10px;">Total Score</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 30px; margin-left: 10px;"></div> </div>
Regulatory Compliance (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	3	<input type="text"/>	
Sound Fiscal Stewardship (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Efficient & Effective Processes (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Equity & Inclusion (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Environmental Sustainability (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Engaged & Empowered Teams (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Community Engagement (0-3)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
Asset Management (0-6)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	
External Funding (0-6)	<input type="text"/>	1	<input type="text"/>	

CIP Ranking Criteria

1. **Strategic Plan Outcome Alignment** – The strategic plan and other plans such as Plan 2040, various master plans, departmental strategic plans, and asset management plans are prepared to provide the City of Lawrence with a valuable aid for continuing efforts to meet and exceed goals set forth by City departments, advisory boards and commissions, and the community at-large. Plans include those documents that have been prepared internally to assure consistent adherence to industry best practices, as well as those documents that have been created with the assistance of outside consultants. The score will be based on answers to the following question:
 - a. How many progress indicator(s)/strategy(ies) outlined in the strategic plan does this project align with?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project does not align with any progress indicators or strategies outlined in the strategic plan	The project aligns with one (1) progress indicator or strategy outlined in the strategic plan	The project aligns with two (2) progress indicators or strategies outlined in the strategic plan	The project aligns with three (3) progress indicators or strategies outlined in the strategic plan

2. **Regulatory Compliance** – This includes compliance with regulatory mandates such as Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) directives, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and other County, State and Federal laws. This also includes compliance with self-imposed City ordinances, such as achieving 100% renewable energy within municipal operations. The score will be based on answers to the following questions:
 - a. Does the proposed project address a current regulatory mandate? If yes, which one(s)?
 - i. If the project addresses Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, does it implement the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design for newly constructed or altered State and Local Government facilities?
 - b. Will the proposed project proactively address a foreseeable (within the next 5 years) regulatory mandate? If yes, which one(s)?
 - c. Does the proposed project have a lasting impact on promoting regulatory compliance over the long term (more than 10 years)?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project does not address a regulatory compliance issue	The project provides a short-term fix for an existing regulatory compliance issue or for one anticipated in the near future	The project provides a moderate-term fix for an existing regulatory compliance issue (maximum score for self-mandated projects)	The project resolves a pressing or long-term regulatory compliance issue and at least half of the project budget is tied to meeting a regulatory compliance standard

3. **Sound Fiscal Stewardship** – Some projects may impact the operating budget for the next few years or for the life of the facility. A new facility will need to be staffed and supplied, therefore having an impact on the operational budget for the life of the facility. Replacing a streetlight with a more energy efficient model may decrease operational costs. The score will be based on answers to the following questions:

- a. Will the proposed project require additional funding (i.e., personnel, annual maintenance, equipment outside of what is included in the project)?
- b. Will the proposed project reduce staff time and City resources currently being devoted, and thus have a positive impact on the operational budget over the lifetime of the project (i.e., the return on investment is a net positive)?
- c. Will the proposed project present a revenue generating opportunity?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project will have a negative impact of more than \$10,000 on the budget.	The project will have a minimal (+/- \$10,000) impact the operating budget as it is cost/revenue neutral	The project will have a moderate positive impact on the budget (generate revenues or create savings) of \$10,000 to \$25,000.	The project will have a significant positive impact on the budget (generate revenues or create savings) of more than \$25,000.

4. **Efficient & Effective Processes** – Moving forward capital projects in a manner that allows for intentional and consistent delivery of city services is incredibly important. Projects will score higher in this category if they eliminate frustration and help streamline processes, have a critical timing/location component, or help us meet our reliability goals. The score will be based on the answers to the following questions:
- a. How does the proposed project enhance timely, accurate, accessible, and transparent information, processes, and services?
 - i. Will this project help streamline operations?
 - b. When is the proposed project needed (location/timing)?
 - i. Do other projects require this one to be completed first? Or vice versa?
 - ii. Can the proposed project be done in conjunction with other projects? (i.e., installation of sidewalks and street lighting within the same block)
 - c. How does this project align with the reliability goals of the city?
 - i. What reliability issue is this project going to solve?
 - 1. Percent of goals met for reliability for water, wastewater, stormwater, transportation network, transit, fleet, or information technology systems (CC-4)
 - 2. Percent of fires contained to their room of origin (SaS-3)
 - 3. Percent of cardiac arrest patients with pulsatile rhythms upon arrival to a hospital (SaS-4)

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project will not help achieve any of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 1 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 2 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve all 3 of the 3 outlined criteria

5. **Equity & Inclusion**—Projects will score higher in this category if it moves the City towards fair and equitable delivery of services so that no group is disadvantaged or burdened. The score will be based on the answers to the following questions:
- a. Does the proposed project apply an equity lens in the allocation of funds? If yes, please answer the following:

- i. How will this project display inclusive representation and participation for all (different incomes, races, education levels, language skills, ages, physical or mental abilities, or other vulnerable populations) to advance equity?
 - 1. Percent of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) residents rating the community as welcoming (UI-5)
 - 2. Percent of households that are experiencing housing stress (spending more than 30% of their income on housing) (SWN-5)
 - 3. Point-in-time count of people experiencing homelessness (SWN-6)
 - 4. Variance of satisfaction with perceptions of safety by race, gender, education, and income (SaS-6)
 - 5. Women/Minority business ownership rate (PES-5)
 - 6. Variance of median income by race (PES-6)
- b. How does the proposed project improve residential connectivity (i.e., increase the number of residential units within a half mile of amenities, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements)?
 - i. Percent of residential units within a half mile of City green space (SWN-2)
 - ii. Percent of residential units within a half mile of a walking/biking trail (SWN-3)
 - iii. Percent of residential units within a half mile of a school or library (SWN-4)
 - iv. Connectivity of healthy food providers by transit, bike routes or sidewalks (SWN-13)
 - v. Percent of sidewalks and shared use paths in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and deflection minimum standards (CC-5)
 - vi. Percent of residential units in the Environmental Justice Zone within a quarter mile of a transit stop or on-demand transit zone (CC-6)
- c. How does the proposed project help improve service delivery or ensure that destinations are more equitable?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project will not help achieve any of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 1 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 2 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve all 3 of the 3 outlined criteria

6. **Environmental Sustainability** –Projects that consider the long-term environmental consequences, big and small, acknowledging the impacts may extend beyond our boundaries will score higher in this section. The score will be based on the answers to the following questions:
- a. Does the proposed project help meet the sustainability goals of the city? If yes, which one(s)?
 - i. Improve energy efficiency (SWN-14)
 - ii. Infill development (PES-10)
 - iii. Reduction of singular occupancy vehicle trip (CC-11)
 - iv. 100% renewable energy (CC-12)
 - i. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
 - b. Does the proposed project improve green space or access to residential use of public land for environmentally sustainable uses? If yes, which one(s)?
 - i. Acres of park green space per resident (UI-12)
 - ii. Acres of public land used for environmentally sustainable uses (food production, native landscaping, monarch waystations, green infrastructure, etc.) (SWN-12)
 - iii. Connectivity of healthy food providers by transit, bike routes or sidewalks (SWN-13)
 - iv. Miles of trails (CC-13)

- c. Does the proposed project account for climate adaptation (increasing severity of flooding and extreme temperatures), including the necessary budget (CC-14)?
 - i. Does the project incorporate standards outlined in green rating systems (i.e., LEED, Envision, etc.)? If yes, which one?
 - ii. How does the project improve our ability to address extreme weather conditions?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project will not help achieve any of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 1 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 2 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve all 3 of the 3 outlined criteria

7. **Engaged & Empowered Teams** –Projects that support employees throughout the organization as we invest in and cultivate service to our community will score higher in this category. The score will be based on the answers to the following questions:

- a. How does the proposed project help train and equip staff to meet the goals established in the strategic plan?
 - i. Percent of Law Enforcement Officers meeting or exceeding 80 hours of annual training (SaS-13)
 - ii. Percent of Firefighters meeting or exceeding 228 hours of firefighter training (SaS-14)
 - iii. Other
- b. How does the proposed project help create a safe and welcoming environment with space for autonomy, innovation, and continuous improvement (CW-8)?
- c. Is the proposed project anticipated to increase employee satisfaction? If yes, which one(s)?
 - i. Employee Engagement Index for Parks & Recreation (UI-11)
 - ii. Employee Engagement Index for Planning & Development Services (SWN-10)
 - iii. Employee Engagement Index for Solid Waste (SWN-11)
 - iv. Employee Engagement Index for Police (SaS-11)
 - v. Employee Engagement Index for Fire Medical (SaS-12)
 - vi. Employee Engagement Index for Municipal Services & Operations (except Solid Waste) (CC-10)
 - vii. Overall Employee Engagement Index (CW-6)
 - viii. Employee Engagement Index for internal service departments (CW-7)

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project will not help achieve any of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 1 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve 2 of the 3 outlined criteria	The project will help achieve all 3 of the 3 outlined criteria

8. **Community Engagement** –Projects that invite and welcome all community members to collaborate and innovate with us will score better in this area. The score will be based on the answers to the following questions:

- a. Is it likely this project will improve community satisfaction within one of the outcome areas If yes, which one(s)?
 - i. Percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with Parks & Recreation system (UI-1)
 - ii. Percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with the amount of arts, diverse culture and events (UI-2)

- iii. Percent of residents who perceive the City as a good or very good place to live (SWN-1)
 - iv. Percent of residents who perceive Lawrence as safe or very safe (SaS-1)
 - v. Percent of businesses rating Lawrence as a good or excellent place to do business (PES-1)
 - vi. Percent of residents rating Lawrence as a good or excellent place to work (PES-2)
 - vii. Percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with the condition of major city streets (CC-1)
 - viii. Percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with their transportation experiences (driving, walking/wheeling, biking, riding the bus, etc.) (CC-2)
 - ix. Percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with the access, availability, and timeliness of information (CW-1)
 - x. Of residents who have engaged with a City department in the past year, the percent who were satisfied with the overall quality of service provided (CW-2)
- b. Does the project budget include the appropriate funding/resources for the desired level of public participation? What level of public participation is anticipated (i.e., inform, consult, involve, collaborate, empower as [outlined by IAP2](#)) (CW-3)?

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3
The project is not anticipated to impact community satisfaction nor has funding been identified for public participation	The project is anticipated to impact one (1) or more community satisfaction criteria OR has funding identified for public participation	The project is anticipated to impact one (1) community satisfaction criteria AND has funding identified for public participation	The project is anticipated to impact two (2) or more community satisfaction criteria AND has funding identified for public participation

* All publicly submitted projects, should include funding for public participation

9. **Asset Management** – Projects that implement asset management strategies will score higher in this area. This area has 2 scoring sections. The first potential 3 points are based on the below score matrix. The final 3 points are based on the questions in section b :

Business Risk Exposure Matrix (BRE)

Consequence of Failure	5	0	5	10	15	20	25		
	4	0	4	8	12	16	20	Very Low Risk	Category 0
	3	0	3	6	9	12	15	Low Risk	Category 1
	2	0	2	4	6	8	10	Moderate Risk	Category 2
	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk	Category 3
		0	1	2	3	4	5	Extreme Risk	
	Probability of Failure								

- a. Has the criticality of the asset/s been identified as well as the condition to determine BRE (Business Risk Exposure)?
- i. Consequence of failure (COF) has been identified. This is related to asset criticality and can be applied to multiple consequence factors with examples below
 - 1. High cost to the community
 - 2. Loss of health and safety within the community or staff
 - 3. High cost to repair
 - 4. Poor public relations
 - 5. Regulatory noncompliance

- ii. The condition state of the asset/s - Probability of Failure (POF) - has been determined according to the 3 categories of failure below.
 - 1. Physical Failure – The physical condition of the asset and its ability to operate in the current condition.
 - 2. Performance Failure – The asset is in working order but no longer provides the level of service desired or needed.
 - 3. Economic Failure – The asset and/or treatment is no longer cost effective.
- b. The following questions are to determine scoring based on asset management principles. 1 point is added to the asset management score for each question that is true for this project.
 - i. Are we maintaining or restoring an existing asset/s and does the treatment align with the treatment/s identified in asset management plans to work towards lowest cost of ownership?
 - ii. Have potentially affected infrastructure groups reviewed the project and accounted for future staff workload and resource requirements?
 - iii. Does the project address the mitigation of short-term and long-term risks?

Scoring Scale

Section a Scoring

0	1	2	3
The assets directly or indirectly affected in this project are either already new or have not had any analysis done on criticality and condition.	The assets directly or indirectly affected in this project have criticality and condition and score in the low risk category	The assets directly or indirectly affected in this project have criticality and condition and score in the moderate risk category	The assets directly or indirectly affected in this project have criticality and condition and score in the high or extreme risk category

Bonus Section

- 1. **External Funding** – Capital improvement projects may be funded through sources other than City funds. Grants through various agencies, public private partnerships, and donations can all be sources of external funding for a project. The percentage of total cost funded by an outside source will determine the score in this category.

Scoring Scale

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0% to 14% External Funding	15% to 28% External Funding	29% to 43% External Funding	44% to 57% External Funding	58% to 71% External Funding	72% to 85% External Funding	86% to 100% External Funding

CIP Asset Management Prioritization Examples

MS1-00011 (Formerly MS-23-0037)

City of Lawrence, Kansas

Project #	MS-23-0037			
Project Name	Wakarusa Dr. Reconstruction - Harvard Rd to 6th Street			
Type	Improvement	Department	Municipal Services & Operation	
Useful Life	50 years	Category		

Prioritization Guidelines Score				
Regulatory Compliance Score: 0	Strategic Plan Outcome Alignment Score: 6	Sound Fiscal Stewardship Score: 1	Efficient & Effective Processes Score: 1	Equity & Inclusion Score: 1
Environmental Sustainability Score: 0	Engaged & Empowered Teams Score: 0	Community Engagement Score: 3	External Funding Score: 2	Total Score: 14

Description	Total Project Cost: 3,250,000
Reconstruct Wakarusa from north of Inverness to 6th Street including, concrete pavement, storm sewer, bike facility, and sidewalks. Private drive intersection to commercial area east & west of Wakarusa will be evaluated for traffic control improvements (traffic signal or roundabout).	

Justification	
Wakarusa has unsuitable subgrade conditions that cause pavement failures and requires street maintenance to maintain. An emergency mill/overlay was completed in 2019 due to condition. Average PCI was 51 before mill/overlay.	

Asset Management Review

Upon review of this project, we determined the COF for a high traffic arterial street to be a level 4 with a probability of failure at level 4. This puts the road segments in Category 3 of the BRE Matrix earning the project **(3 points)** for section **A** of the asset management score.

For section **B**, question **I**, the proposed work of reconstructing the road segments aligns with the life-cycle model we have developed. Delay of the project would incur more costs for maintenance and major rehab at this stage of its life. **(1 Point)**

For section **B**, question **II**, street crews would have been consulted on future maintenance and the workload would likely decrease in the short term. However, there doesn't appear to be evidence that Parks and Recreation staff have reviewed the potential roundabout control improvements and how that affects their staffing and resources for maintenance. The bike facility was mentioned as needing additional resources. **(0 Point)**

For section **B**, question **III**, the major risks associated with this project are escalating maintenance and major rehabilitation costs in the short to long term. With a deteriorated base, any work on these road segments that is not reconstruction can be considered a stop-gap measure. Other risks that would be mitigated are traffic flow, and driver safety. As roads deteriorate, more and more drivers find alternate routes that may not be designed for the extra traffic volume. This includes design as well as safety

features such as crosswalks and signage. Private lots also become a mode of travel between destinations. If a roundabout is part of the design, risks associated with parks and recreation resources need to be addressed and mitigated. **(1 Point)**

Asset Management Score **(5 Points)**

Total Score **(19 Points)**

MS1-00013 (Formerly MS-24-0045)

City of Lawrence, Kansas

Project #	MS-24-0045			
Project Name	West of K-10 Water Pressure Zone			
Type	Improvement	Department	MSO - Utilities	
Useful Life	50 years	Category		

Prioritization Guidelines Score				
Regulatory Compliance Score: 6	Strategic Plan Outcome Alignment Score: 2	Sound Fiscal Stewardship Score: 3	Efficient & Effective Processes Score: 2	Equity & Inclusion Score: 0
Environmental Sustainability Score: 0	Engaged & Empowered Teams Score: 0	Community Engagement Score: 1	External Funding Score: 0	Total Score: 14

Description	Total Project Cost: 11,500,000
The West of K-10 Water Pressure Zone project includes a new water tower, water transmission main, and booster pumping station in the future growth area west of Highway K-10. This project was identified in the 2012 Integrated Water Utilities Plan as West Hills Future.	

Justification
Justification for this project will be growth related.

Asset Management Review

Upon review of this project, we determined this is the development of new assets and thus does not have a COF or POF rating. This puts the road segments in Category 0 of the BRE Matrix earning the project **(0 points)** for section **A** of the asset management score.

For section **B**, question **I**, the proposed work is of a new asset and does not receive a point. **(0 Point)**

For section **B**, question **II**, knowledge of future O&M impacts for operation and maintenance are known, but have not been reviewed by operational staff for potential future staffing and resource impacts. **(0 Point)**

For section **B**, question **III**, the major risks associated with this project are issues with pressure in an area likely to be developed. This impacts several levels of service and our ability to provide adequate water resources and fire protection to the area west of K-10. Staffing and resource risks will need to be addressed as well. **(1 Point)**

Asset Management Score **(1 Points)**

Total Score **(15 Points)**

PR1-00011 (Formerly PR-225-8000)

City of Lawrence, Kansas

Project #	PR-25-8000			
Project Name	Community Building - Security / ADA Improvements			
Type	Improvement	Department	Parks & Recreation	
Useful Life	20 years	Category		

Prioritization Guidelines Score				
Regulatory Compliance Score: 9	Strategic Plan Outcome Alignment Score: 2	Sound Fiscal Stewardship Score: 1	Efficient & Effective Processes Score: 0	Equity & Inclusion Score: 2
Environmental Sustainability Score: 0	Engaged & Empowered Teams Score: 2	Community Engagement Score: 3	External Funding Score: 0	Total Score: 19

Description	Total Project Cost: 1,040,000
<p>The Community Building is a multi-use recreation facility in Downtown Lawrence. This Historic Structure was originally constructed in the 1940's as a National Guard Armory. It has seen a number of significant renovations bringing it to its current level of functionality. However the one item never addressed is security of the facility. At the present time, there is an elevator entrance at the back of the building, providing unrestricted access to the lower level of the building and the gym. Building staff are located at the north entrance of the building and have no control of who enters the building from the elevator at the back of the building. This layout also limits facility use tracking. There are also ADA access concerns for the cardio area and the upper level dance studio. Modern recreation centers provide one secured access point that can be monitored by building staff for control of who enters the building. This renovation project would provide this type of building control.</p>	

Justification
Areas of the building are not ADA compliant Critical Success Factors: Equity and Inclusion Safe and Secure Strong, Welcoming Neighborhoods Infrastructure and Asset Management and Connectivity

Asset Management Review

Upon review of this project, the COF can be determined when understanding the use of the building and the issues of accessibility and safety from examples 1, 2, 4 and 5 from the initial guidelines for COF. This is coupled with the facility's dual usage as an emergency shelter. From this, we estimate a failure of these criteria puts the COF at a level 3. The lack of single point entry into the building and inadequate ADA accommodations for entry put the POF at level 3. The resulting BRE subsequently lands in Category 2 of the BRE Matrix **(2 points)** for section **A** of the asset management score.

For section **B**, question **I**, the proposed work of addressing the access and ADA issues does involve replacing assets with a singular point of entry and access. The final design has not been determined, but centralizing access should reduce or keep operating costs static. **(1 Point)**

For section **B**, question **II**, parks and rec staff have reviewed the project as well as the ADA coordinator. It is unclear if facility staff has reviewed potential workload and resource changes for the facility. It is likely it would add very little extra O&M for the facility, but that depends on the final design. **(0 Point)**

For section **B**, question **III**, the major risks associated with this project are security and accessibility. A single point of entry allows staff to know who is entering and exiting the building. This aides in providing a safer environment for staff and patrons. This is also important in emergency situations at the facility to ensure all patrons and staff can easily exit the facility if needed. Depending on the final design, other workgroups may need to review their resource impacts. **(1 Point)**

Asset Management Score **(4 Points)**

Total Score **(23 Points)**