

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

December 3, 2013 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

December 4, 2013 8:30 am to 3:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3rd Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

Chair:	Elizabeth Nudelman
Tuesday, December 3rd	
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Committee Preparation Arrival, Packet Review Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Business, Additions to the Agenda
8:45 – 9:00 AM	Public Comment (5 minutes maximum, time will be prorated if more than three people wish to comment)
9:00 – 10:15 AM	Staff Briefing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY2015 CIP Report • Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB 237 Report)
10:15 – 10:30 AM	BREAK
10:30 – 12:00 PM	Staff Briefing (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventative Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)
12:00 – 1:00 PM	LUNCH
1:00 – 2:30 PM	CIP Application Worksession: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project overview and summary of work to date Walkthrough work to be presented during this meeting
2:30 – 2:45 PM	Public Comment
2:45 – 3:00 PM	BREAK
3:00 – 4:30 PM	Planning: CIP draft application, instructions, rating
4:30 PM	Recess

The department will provide teleconference access to this meeting in its entirety. This is not standard for BRGR meetings and is offered to solicit additional responses to these aspects of the CIP application review process. To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 6470 and the # key.

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

December 3, 2013 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

December 4, 2013 8:30 am to 3:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3rd Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

Chair: Elizabeth Nudelman

Wednesday, December 4th

8:30 AM	Call to order
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Public Comment
8:45 – 10:15 AM	Inadaquacies of Space: CIP draft application, instructions, rating
10:15 – 10:30 AM	BREAK
10:30 AM – 12:00 PM	Alternates and Options: CIP draft application, instructions, rating
12:00 – 1:00 PM	LUNCH
1:00 – 1:15 PM	Public Comment
1:15 – 2:15 PM	Alternates and Options: CIP draft application, instructions, rating
2:15 – 2:30 PM	Public Comment
2:30 – 3:00 PM	Summary to date: CIP draft application and materials
3:00 PM	Adjourn Meeting

The department will provide teleconference access to this meeting in its entirety. This is not standard for BRGR meetings and is offered to solicit additional responses to these aspects of the CIP application review process. To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 6470 and the # key.

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee
August 1 and 2, 2013
Anchorage – Talking Book Library
MEETING MINUTES – FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Committee Members Present

Elizabeth Nudelman
Doug Crevensten
Mary Cary
Mark Langberg
Robert “Bob” Tucker

Staff

Stuart Gerger
Elwin Blackwell

Additional Participants

Dave Herbert (St. Mary’s) telephone
Don Hiley (SERRC) telephone
Rachel Molina Lodoen (ASD) telephone
Don Carney (Mat Su)
Kevin Lyon (Kenai)
Dave Norum (FBNS)
David Tressler (KPBSD)

August 1

Call to Order and Roll Call at 9:05am

Elizabeth Nudelman, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 and a roll call was completed. *Senator Dunleavy*, *Dean Henrick*, and *Carl John* were not present. A quorum was established.

Review and Approval of Minutes

The May 8 - 9, 2013 minutes were reviewed. *Mark* clarified that he was in attendance at the meeting and requested the minutes be revised accordingly. The following corrections were also noted:

First paragraph: all members were not present. *Elizabeth* stated that each Legislative Session a letter is sent to the Senate and the House. A member has not been appointed from the House and that seat is vacant. It was agreed that it will be noted in the minutes.

A header and footer is needed on all pages of the minutes.

Page 50 - change “ineffective” to “in effect”.

Page 51 - last paragraph, second sentence is not a complete sentence. Staff will research and make correction.

Page 56 - change “for just” to “just for”.

Mark wanted to clarify whether the action items mentioned in the minutes were taken care of.

Mark made a motion to approve the minutes of May 8 - 9, 2013, as amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Agenda Addition

Elizabeth made a motion to add a discussion of items from the previous minutes to the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion of Previous Minutes' Action Items

Mark referenced page 52 of previous minutes, where *Kimberly Andrews* mentioned that it was a confidentiality issue to use school districts' actual CIP applications as examples. *Mark* suggested that the Department mark up some examples from an actual application, alter it so it is not known whose district it is, and use them at the CIP workshop. There can be good examples and bad examples as far as what is effective and less effective. *Elizabeth* wants to double check the use of the phrase "confidentiality" in light of the public information. Acknowledges desire for examples both good and those less successful or effective.

Mark referenced page 54 of 56, where the Department was going to look into the language of the debt program and get back with an answer. *Elizabeth* noted that she will go back and look and see what research was done and if there was a definitive answer and what the language says in the statute and regulations – many places in statutes say "district owned" buildings.

Mark referenced page 56, request that finalized list of action items be emailed, was that done? *Stuart* noted letter of June 7th, included in back of the committee packet.

Introduction of Work Session Goals

Stuart presented the work session goals. He noted that changes to the CIP application are an ongoing process and that there is a goal of April 2014 to bring something to the table. *Elizabeth* clarified that, although there will be discussions of specific questions along the way, there won't be any ratifications or decisions until April and seeing where the BRGR Committee is at.

Bob asked whether the draft reorganization of the CIP application had gone out to the districts for review. *Stuart* stated that what went out to the Superintendents included an acknowledgement that the process was occurring, the call-in information, the agenda, and a link to the website to find the information. *Bob* expressed concern that there wasn't enough time to look at it, but mentioned it was good that the Superintendents at least got that email. *Stuart* acknowledged that it is a lot of information and that after public comment he will walk through the structure of what is in front of the committee.

Public Comment

Don Carney stated that when he approached the Superintendent of his school district, she had not had an opportunity to review the email that went out from *Stuart*. *Don* expressed concern that most Superintendents probably didn't even get a chance to read that email and forward it to the respective person. He stated that it was extremely short notice with a high volume of material. *Don* asked that in the future people get more notice so that there is time for people to review and to buy an affordable ticket to send a representative. He appreciates the opportunity to be able to phone in, but it is not the same as having a person present.

Bob appreciated removing the ratification of items at the end of each meeting, and asked that for the next agenda we had a period of time for people to discuss the previous meeting for those that were not in attendance or have had time to think about what had been covered and have something to say. *Elizabeth* agreed and stated that there will be several meetings discussing the application so there will be multiple opportunities for people to comment.

Don Carney asked whether CIP questions can be directed towards Department employees or whether everything needs to be discussed in front of the committee. *Elizabeth* clarified that if people have facility-specific questions they may direct them to Department employees but any discussion regarding the application changes would be in front of the committee.

Dave Norum stated that he is glad to hear that there are not going to be any changes and that this is an ongoing process and will be looked at as a whole at the end. He thanked the committee for that clarification.

Don Hiley agreed with the previous comments about the short notice and magnitude of the material. He stated that he would like to make an intelligent analysis and that would require a little more time. He would have made every effort to attend in person if he had more notice to make arrangements. *Don* commented that everything being talked about has not been put online.

Stuart responded that the Meeting Packet was posted online Tuesday, July 30, 2013: “work session materials” and “agenda” were posted at that time as well. *Don* clarified that the full BRGR packet is not on the website and asked if the people in the room had access to the packet. *Stuart* responded that only the committee members had the full packet, including the draft minutes and inter-committee memo.

Work Session Discussion: Walk Through

Elizabeth clarified that what the committee has in their packet is the first efforts to make the application simple and easy for school districts to use. The current application contains a lot of quality information that shouldn't be lost, but efforts can be done to make the administrative process as easy as possible for the districts; the reorganization is just housekeeping to make that happen. *Elizabeth* stated that no decisions or votes will be made but rather that will occur in the December 2013 or Spring 2014 meeting.

Stuart noted there are three kinds of changes that are being made: moving a question within the application, reorganizing the way a question is presented, and tweaks to the language of a question without changing the intent. There are no wholesale changes being presented. Goal was to organize it in a way to make sense to an applicant and to align the flow of the Application, Instructions, and Rater's Guide. Realize that it is the content of the question that is important, and that it needs to be aligned with the statutes and that it be clear and transparent how the Department reviews and scores the application.

Stuart referenced page 4 of 56, which was an outline of the reorganization strategy used in the Application and Instructions. *Elizabeth* clarified that Section 6 and 7 headers will not stay the same. She explained that it was just a way to break things up and make sure that we are aligned

with Statute and Regulation. *Stuart* noted that an appendix was added to the application to put all the statute and regulation references for the factors for rating in one place.

Stuart began to walk through the Application for Funding. *Bob* noted he appreciated that all the changes were laid out now, even the ones to be discussed later, so that people can see the entirety.

Bob questioned if there will be a time to discuss the primary purposes in the future, to decide whether to take changes to the Board. *Elizabeth* stated that Statute and Regulation directs us on the major components on the process and projects, like primary purpose, and any changes to Statute or Regulation needs to be brought to the Legislature. *Bob* would rather know now if there are changes that need to go into statute, so we can get them in instead of waiting and it being too late. *Stuart* reiterated that the direction from the committee and commissioner was to reorganize the application, and to leave room for other changes.

Doug stated his thought that this is an okay time to discuss the purposes and asked that we not exclude any changes that the committee feels might require a Statute or Regulation change. *Bob* agreed that the committee needs to try to tell the Legislature where and how it could be done better, but when to do that is the question.

Mary said that, so as not to distract from this process, the committee should note any wanted changes and set a date as to when it will be addressed. *Elizabeth* stated we should note adjustments to regulations and discuss those as we move through this process. She reiterated that Statute change is complex and that maybe an hour or two discussion can be added to a future meeting. *Bob* asked to continue to pursue the change to the primary purposes statute and that the committee keep a task list. *Mary* noted that statute and regulation review and recommendations would be on the task list; *Bob* agreed. *Doug* suggested the ongoing task list be public so people can comment for future meetings.

Elizabeth clarified that the committee set a task list to go through the application by question and topic and engage the public. The Department made a tight schedule to get that done.

Bob suggested that people send information and comments on the task list and then that information can be compiled by the Department for presentation when the topic comes up at a future meeting.

Stuart sought clarification that this collected information would not be for changes for this application reorganization process, but for a future discussion and process. There was general agreement from members.

Doug suggested parsing out what the main issues are and put it out on the webpage and gathering information as people give it.

Elizabeth noted all comments and questions should be emailed to *Stuart's* email address.

Task list to be “Future Discussion Topics and Possibilities” – add “Primary Purpose” and playgrounds. *Mary* stated that we have a huge list out there and that the list needs to be compiled. *Bob* suggested identifying the top 10 items on the list at the last BRGR meeting of this application process.

Mary noted that this application process was given to the committee as a priority to be done in lieu of everything else at this time.

Stuart continued to walk through the CIP draft application discussion. *Elizabeth* noted that we want the application to be a tool for the districts, to make for efficient and good projects.

Elizabeth explained that making Scope and Life Safety separate categories is a change, although it doesn't change the points. She asked that people give that change some thought and that it be recognized as one of the proposed changes.

Bob commented that it seems like the separation gives districts more areas to give raters more information than before, especially with more specific information; it prompts applicants to give more information to enable better rating.

Stuart explained that scope isn't a scored category, though it's a very important piece of information. Currently it is coupled with a scored category as one question, which may have led to point-slanted descriptions.

Stuart continued with the CIP draft application discussion. *Stuart* explained that the facility appraisal (in 4b, project description attachments) is on the list of items to reevaluate. *Elizabeth* asked that if there are comments on the facility appraisal, people please comment for future discussions.

Stuart continued with 4c, which is slightly redundant with the scope of work but is noted because there is a different requirement for already completed work.

Bob asked whether the description in 4c was written exactly as it is in 4 AAC 31.023(c)(2). *Stuart* answered no. *Elizabeth* explained that the Statue and Regulation really does not address completed projects. *Elizabeth* referenced how expenditures less than 3 years can be submitted for reimbursement, although if that project is funded, it is treated as if it is a project that is not completed; the Department is required to review all necessary documents. She noted that the draft language was to strike a balance between completed projects and not. She referred to a comment by *Carl John* that completed projects get more points due to being complete. *Bob* clarified that completed projects are not given a reward or extra points because the project is done, but they may score better because the application is complete and has good information. *Doug* asked if the question should be phrased as “The department allows for reimbursement of already completed work within the parameters set out in 4 AAC”.

Stuart used an example of a district project that may not have been a thoroughly-planned decision yet it was rewarded because it was an already completed project. Those are the type of dilemmas *Stuart* believes the Department faces.

Bob stated that situations where school districts will use a completed project to move up the priority list have been happening for a while. *Doug* stated that if it's in Statute, then maybe that is a statutory change that should be put on the list of items to bring to the Legislature. *Elizabeth* interjected that it's not clear in the Statute, beyond that you can place expenditures from up to three years prior. One interpretation is that if the Department has to approve things along the way, then there is no way to bring a completed project into CIP, but many people across the state feel that this is a necessary avenue.

Bob recognized that the real problem is that there is not enough funding for all the projects. *Doug* commented about whom the interpretation benefits: the districts with the larger tax base.

Elizabeth noted that Legislators asked about project ranking and it needs to be clear that completed projects go through the CIP process with the uncompleted projects. This can be a discussion for a future meeting.

Stuart stated that the Department recognizes value of districts that are proactive and complete projects that need to be completed.

Doug recommends keeping the first sentence of 4c and moving the second sentence to the Instructions with additional information.

Stuart continued to questions 4d and 4e. *Mary* asked about whether the words "on site" literally mean within the property line. *Stuart* responded that sometimes it can include a related site and that the Department has the authority to modify the application or scope of work. *Mary* noted that maybe the Instructions could clarify.

Bob asked that for the next meeting all the noted changes that were made could be highlighted so it is known what was changed from the original application; even one word can change meaning.

Doug asked whether 4e should have the words "on site" in the question. *Mary* proposed a hypothetical where a project may have districtwide impacts. *Stuart* suggested "facilities related to the project." *Elizabeth* further suggested "facilities within in the project scope". *Stuart* stated that what they're trying to do is have a reminder that a transition plan is useful and necessary. *Elizabeth* noted that it is important to take care of an old building that is being left behind and not leave them scattered across the state. *Bob* noted that he liked having it separate and not muddying the scope. The committee largely agreed that this question was important and that it may just require a wording change.

Public Comment

Don Carney asked whether input will be allowed on the CIP application changes during the discussion periods, as the public comment time is not an efficient amount of time to contribute.

Elizabeth stated that there is flexibility and the committee may be able to take a few comments along the way. Additional public comment times can be added and any comments and/or questions can be emailed to *Stuart*.

Don Carney added that whatever is put in the application becomes a part of the project agreement and that school districts need to know that.

Dave Norum asked if there is an opportunity to comment when a certain question is brought up instead of commenting afterwards, as a comment or question may not make as much sense after the context of the discussion.

Bob agreed that as a committee member he would be okay with that as long as it doesn't get out of hand, that way people can comment by section, not by question. *Elizabeth* said there can be room for flexibility, but we cannot steer away from the committee rules.

Dave Norum questioned whether 4c should be in "Project Planning" instead of "Project Information". He also pointed out that his school district, Fairbanks North Star, does not do planning before funding is awarded. The reasoning is that sometimes by the time funding is awarded, planning has already changed. The district's lack of project planning prohibits them from being awarded those points.

Don Hiley stated that the example given for 4c was not an entirely accurate statement. Also, he noted that most of the time already completed projects are generally small projects and don't have a significant impact on budget funding. Maybe for the December meeting there would be a time set when more stakeholders would be available for interaction and questions.

Kevin Lyon worried that if a project won't score in Life Safety, then taking all the points from the project description (4a) gives a project zero points and is not balanced. Life Safety too is narrow in that it doesn't address security-type issues. 4e used to be required only for a state-owned or -leased facility; state entities have other processes for disposal of assets.

Elizabeth noted that we're still going through the run through and that Scope, Life Safety and Emergency will be delved into later in the meeting. Regarding Transition Planning, it is a good suggestion to note if a building is borough-owned; this is will be good thing to revisit in December. Department has good direction regarding state-owned buildings, but not for borough-owned buildings.

Mary said that maybe it should be fundamental information to note who owns it with building information.

Bob wanted to clarify whether *Kevin Lyon's* comment about taking points away from scope was accurate. *Stuart* noted that rater's gave points for life safety but they didn't rate the scope, and the separation was to clarify that.

Continued Work Session Discussion: Walk-Through

Stuart continued introducing the CIP draft application with Section 5 "Project Planning". It is an extremely important part of a project, with a definite place according to statute and regulation as a scoring criterion. *Elizabeth* stated that Section 5 is a section the committee is really soliciting input on; it is a difficult place for the Department to assign points and we want it to be

transparent. *Bob* asked that total points be put on the top of each section. *Stuart* noted that, officially, “planning” gets no points; the information gets points in other places of the application.

Last two sections, Sections 6 and 7, are about scoring and points and have the points identified.

This draft focuses mostly on code-related life safety conditions and is broken into different levels to help applicants and raters use as a guideline.

Section 7 introduced. *Bob* asked if potential points should be identified the earlier section and referred back to. *Elizabeth* stated that it is a good discussion to have; she liked breaking out the information for scope and eligibility, but once the planning information was asked for then she was looking for points. *Bob* reiterated that noting at the top of the information section that the information was going to be used for points in a later section is important so the applicant could focus on it. *Elwin* agreed that without a notation, maybe an applicant would be inclined to gloss or skip over a section thinking it would not gain them an advantage point-wise.

Elizabeth asked that all return at 1:00p. The committee recessed for lunch.

BREAK - Lunch

Work Session Discussion: Emergency

Stuart turned the focus to the CIP draft application starting with question 6a, Emergency Conditions. In the current application this is a one sentence question with a yes/no checkbox. Draft application seeks more specific information. *Mark* commented that he likes the breakdown of instructions and that it will help districts better achieve points. *Elizabeth* added that she likes the “yes” or “no” answers for this question, although it is important to convey the need for the districts to provide narrative into their answers. *Doug* suggested removing “please” and just state “describe in more detail the nature of the life safety conditions”. *Mark* agreed that “use this area to describe” may be preferred.

Stuart emphasized the note above 6a, which states that verifying documentation must be provided. *Bob* suggested bolding the language, *Mark* concurred. *Mary* recommended removing “please” throughout the document and direct applicants to “provide” in order to make it a directive and not optional. *Elizabeth* noted that sometimes raters can intuit that a situation is an emergency, but without substantiation it puts the raters in a difficult situation. *Elwin* added that when districts just check the box, in the past, it hasn’t automatically given the district points for that question, as per the Rater’s Guide. *Doug* asked clarification about how much narrative instruction is put in the upfront part, and how much is put into the Instructions.

Mary asked that the check box questions have line items so each can be referenced pretty easily.

Stuart stated that the list came from a matrix from an earlier BRGR meeting and then tried to be consistent in the breakdown between the Application, Instructions, and Rater’s Guide.

Elizabeth noted that previously there had not been a lot of points given on the Emergency question, and that that may still hold. There should still be room left for true emergencies, and not use up all the points on non-emergency conditions – leave points for those things that rarely, if ever, happen.

Bob noted that just by reading the Rater's Guide, districts could know going in about how they would score and that it was important to leave in the point spread for when it was really needed. Really likes how up front it is about how you can get points for potential failures and for complete failures.

Doug appreciated that the list read from worst case to less worst cases and thinks it helps establish the point range also.

Bob noted that something to look at was tying in the questions to the point categories. *Mary* stated that what was tough with the items on the list is that some are complete emergencies and some are component failures or building systems renewals; testing this model will be important.

Mary noted that “critical structural weakness” could be an overstressed roof with heavy snow loads or a code change. Discussion followed about “potential risk”.

Discussion continued regarding potential scenarios and the order of items on the list. It was noted that the written description would flesh out the specific scenario, to justify more or less points.

Elizabeth asked if the questions in 6a directly relate to the point categories in the Instructions. *Mary* noted that numerous boxes could be checked depending on the projects and it should be in the narrative. *Mary* asked if points were cumulative. *Stuart* noted that projects could accumulate more than 50 if that was the case, but it is a point for discussion. *Mark* noted that at some point raters would have to make a subjective decision about how many point to assign, so trying to objectively assign points to each question wouldn't work.

Bob asked that there be an additional box to describe anything beyond what was checked in 6a and 6b: add an “Other” box, and emphasize that the text box is to provide documentation and to describe in depth the checkbox conditions. *Mark* asked whether districts were able to check more than one box if it applied, if so, change the question to allow more than one check box. The committee agreed that all boxes that apply should be checked and be described. *Stuart* asked how that would be scored. *Mary* noted that there is already a breakdown in place (actual, potential, etc.). *Elizabeth* expressed concern that this question is too inclusive and that this also contains some life safety concerns.

Mark asked if the goal of the question was to be subjectively or objectively scored. *Elizabeth* responded that she thought the goal was it was to be subjectively scored, but with strong guidelines so districts know what to expect. *Doug* observed that it will never be completely objective, but it is crafted in such a way that people can reach similar conclusions as to how bad the emergency is or isn't. Asked if 6a and 6b could be combined, listing the failing critical component portions under the building failure portion. *Stuart* responded that the draft's intent was to separate whole building failure from failing critical components; sometimes a critical

component can fail in such a way to make a building not functional. *Stuart's* concern is that merging the lists would get confusing: going between building scoring and component scoring.

Bob asked whether it was possible to rate Emergency and Life Safety points for each application before ranking the rest of the applications so there is a clear idea where projects stand as far as points. *Mark* added that it may be an idea to have each rater go through Emergency and Life Safety questions to determine the top ten projects. *Elizabeth* interjected that projects should get the same points if they are rated all the way through the application. What we are trying to do is establish a priority list using the different factors, without establishing an absolute priority for one factor.

Prompted by questions from *Doug*, *Elwin* explained the Department's process of rating applications.

Bob asked the committee to consider sending the draft back to the raters to look at the section and point values (and where they stop and start), and whether there are multiple boxes or a single box, and how this aligns with what has been done in the past. *Stuart* noted that historically few points are awarded in the Emergency question; some of the changes were to rebalance the question, so point awards were not going to be the same. *Elizabeth* commented that you should know an emergency if you see it and that a lot of projects are not emergencies and won't get points.

Doug asked that raters think about and discuss whether this draft would make the rating process easier or do they see some problems with it. *Bob* asked that that feedback be brought back to a future meeting. *Elizabeth* asked that the raters also consider whether all items belong in the question, are they clear and differentiated enough, are some items missing, and if the instructions and points are laid out in a workable way.

Bob encouraged the districts to run some of their projects through this and bring in comments for next meeting.

Public Comment

Dave Norum expressed concern regarding changing point values for questions and how points are awarded. He referenced projects from last year's applications and how their Life Safety points were all the same across the board for the top projects, and down the list the points are close. Project priority on the list is primarily driven by planning, design, and cost points.

Don Carney expressed that current award of points for Emergency and Life Safety is too conservative.

Kevin Lyon would like to see Emergency points based on the size and need of the districts. For example, a small district's expense to replace a boiler is far greater than the effect it has on a larger district. Maybe add a point category for length of time on a project is unfunded on the list. Agrees there shouldn't be a lot of Emergency points.

Don Hiley stated that the matrix for Emergency and Life Safety looks a little busy. He would like for the check boxes (categories) to be more straight-forward.

BREAK

Continued Work Session Discussion: Emergency

Bob suggested that maybe there be an alignment of 10 questions with 10 point categories. *Bob* feels that projects that are already completed are no longer considered an emergency. Proposed that a completed project that had been an emergency received half the emergency points it would have otherwise received.

Discussion continued regarding assignment of points, alignment to categories, and presentation of description questions.

Members directed *Stuart* to review the draft's 6a and 6b to ensure that the questions correlate to the point categories.

Mary asked that there be more clarity on the application as to what would constitute an emergency (inability to use facility for education) or a life safety (potential risk to a user) situation.

Discussion followed regarding cross-over between emergency and life safety situations and historical background of split. Touched on where security safety could be incorporated.

Elizabeth stated that any question that is not in Statute or Regulation can be taken to the State Board of Education to be made a Statute or Regulation so districts can easily reference these while submitting an application. *Elizabeth* set a goal of June 2014 to bring any changes necessary to the State Board of Education.

Mark asked that in question 6b, the word "emergency" be replaced with the word "urgency".

Elizabeth asked whether question 6b had "code conditions" omitted intentionally. *Stuart* answered that "code conditions" had not been completed.

Discussion continued regarding definition of emergency and differentiating between Emergency and Life Safety conditions and points.

Mary noted that it may be something to take to the Legislature to change statute to allow for different pots of money, allowing for a "mini major maintenance" list as well. *Elizabeth* said that the Department is careful not to differentiate between districts or scale of projects. *Mary* asked that the districts weigh in on the topic.

Mary asked for clarification on, in situations like seismic code, how to balance when a building is not in code violation, but is substandard to current code. Major maintenance will trigger the need for compliance with current code.

Bob asked that more content and guidance be added in the Rater's Guide for Life Safety.

Public Comment

Don Hiley reiterated that he prefers keeping it as simple as possible and to whittle it down to the essences.

Don Carney stated he was in favor of narrower ranges of points for each question. He believes that makes a rater more comfortable and allows for flexibility. This would allow for the elimination of that "conservative" mindset.

Dave Norum said he believes the committee is heading in the right direction. He believes that if a completed project is no longer an emergency, it discourages a district to be proactive. He stated his district has submitted projects as "design build", this gets a good price but doesn't get points for a district.

Dave Herbert commended the committee on streamlining the process. He believes the system in place does work, but encourages the committee to take public testimony from districts that have written applications and overseen projects in both rural and urban Alaska. He stated that many Superintendents he has spoken to were a little taken aback that this process was going on. He believes Superintendents need to be more involved.

Kevin Lyon would like to see emergency points pinned down more specifically since Life Safety is, and should remain, a very broad spectrum.

Elizabeth recessed the committee meeting at 4:30p and noted the next day's start time to be 9:00am on the 2nd.

August 2

Call to Order

Elizabeth called the meeting to order. She stated that after every question presented there will be time for public comment, in addition to the set public comment times throughout the meeting.

Public Comment

David Tressler asked if security and building configuration will be part of the life safety discussion.

Work Session Discussion: Life Safety

Stuart began the day's discussion with a continuation from the previous day's meeting on the CIP draft application changes. *Elizabeth* stated the goal of evaluating the Life Safety is that we have to determine the severity of the life safety or code issue.

The topic of security was brought up and where it might be added into the application.

Task item was offered up to figure out how to integrate building security into the scoring procedure and also to see if it should be added to Statute or Regulation.

Bob noted that it appears security is currently being considered in Life Safety. *Mark* mentioned that 6e could include how space inadequacies affect security. The committee agreed that if and when security is added to the application, it needs to be clear to districts that it has been included and what verification or documentation should be provided.

Department needs to review whether a security program could be included as a new program under 6e.

Elwin added that, prior to two years ago, he hasn't seen any projects that include increased security in a consistent manner.

Public Comment

Don Carney stated that he believes security belongs in the Life Safety question. He also discussed his district's situation where the security recommendation was to build a new entrance and they were forced to take from educational space because they were not eligible for anything additional.

Bob stated that if security was left in Life Safety question instead of creating a whole new question, there would be no reason to have to bring the topic of security to the Legislature. *Mark* added that it would be a good idea to have an adjustment made to have added square footage approved for security reasons so those projects can stay on the Major Maintenance list. *Mark* suggested that a sentence be added to the question clarifying that security is included and that a range of points be added as well.

Discussion followed regarding what the effect of allowing additional space for security could have on district allowable square footage.

Public Comment

Kevin Lyon referenced his district, and how a project was submitted and received 14.33. He said that .33 points were awarded for space inadequacy, therefore, there are no points currently in Life Safety for security.

Dave Norum expressed his concern that districts will submit security issue projects during the CIP process, despite districts just received a portion of the \$25 million for security upgrades.

Elizabeth stated that the Department needs to go back and look at how it is currently being applied and look at what kind of priority districts have put on security projects.

Continued Work Session Discussion: Life Safety

Bob likes what the draft currently has, but wants Department to vet and come up with something for security in Life Safety or wherever it should go after reviewing regulations, and also put point values to security and codes in Life Safety, per the Emergency section. Maybe add two sections for physical security for building configuration and physical security for infrastructure with points assigned to them.

Department needs to emphasize in the CIP workshop the importance of providing the information, descriptions, and narratives requested so that the raters can give districts full points.

Mark requested that the “Other” box be added to Life Safety, as it was under Emergency. Per previous discussion on Emergency Conditions, remove “please” and rewrite lead-in of descriptive box “Use this area for explanation of the impact and severity of the life safety condition”. *Mary* stated that the Instructions should note that this expands upon what is initially described in the Scope. The committee agreed that the word “cause” should be removed from the question.

The committee continued with the CIP application changes.

Future Discussion Items

Elizabeth noted that as per the agenda the plan was to discuss Emergency, Life Safety, and Planning. Since the committee was ahead of schedule, it was decided that a list of pertinent topics to discuss in the future would be made:

Mary asked that square foot allotment, particularly as it applies to net vs. gross square footage, should be added to the list.

Bob added that gross square footage for mechanical, electrical, and maybe security – “operational” space, would need to be discussed. Previously he had desired to review vocational education space, resource rooms, and special education rooms.

Doug wanted to discuss primary purpose for playgrounds and parking lots under the school construction and major maintenance lists.

Mary also added that on her list was a discussion of major maintenance that permits education improvements and that if money is spent on a facility you can reconfigure or expand. Should there be a certain percentage you can add if it falls under mechanical or security, etc., that wouldn't take away from educational space, unless school is under capacity.

Don Hiley asked if we could add the discussion of lengthening the amount of time a condition survey is eligible.

BREAK

Work Session Discussion: Project Planning

Stuart focused the discussion of the CIP draft application starting on Section 5 "Project Planning". *Stuart* referenced Appendix D, which depicts changes in points for planning. Department is seeking to shift emphasis to the earlier stages of planning and points slightly shifted accordingly. Discussion of whether the information in the appendix should be moved in to the body of the Instructions and to shift the points information to the Rater's Guide as well. Change Appendix D to remove the requirements and points information and add construction document phase; make it into a big picture of capital improvement project phases. Further discussion of whether point values should be listed next to each question throughout the application. The committee suggested that the word "phase" be taken off the questions as it can be confusing to the reader. *Mary* stated that planning is a pretty sizeable expense to invest in without knowing whether that project will be funded. *Stuart* responded that the Department supports thorough, conceptual planning for a project they are looking to get funded. Discussion regarding hired consultant versus in-house work done and desire to reward good planning that will provide for good projects.

Public Comment

Don Carney explained that some projects, a boiler replacement for example, require minimal planning, if any. It's hard for a district to get points for planning when there isn't much needed in the first place. He explained that sometimes when an application states that zero thru ten points can be awarded there is room for argument, whereas a zero or ten point question is easier to explain to the reader.

Dave Norum asked what the committee wants to drive the priority list: Life Safety and Emergency or Planning and Cost Estimate. Currently, top projects have high Planning and Cost Estimate points. Proposed that districts have learned what to focus on to make up or get more points.

Rachel was wondering if the Life Safety points could be weighted more heavily. She agreed that the Department is headed in the right direction.

Don Hiley said it would be a real mistake for the Department to devalue the design of a project. He also disagrees with the idea that an already completed project can't be considered an emergency anymore.

The committee recessed for lunch. *Elizabeth* asked that all return at 1:00p.

BREAK - Lunch

Work Session Discussion: Project Planning

Mark suggested that the application break out the points for not just the raters but the applicants as well. Discussion regarding how to incrementally score required planning documents, particularly in areas where not all documents are required. *Elwin* added that in the past, there has had to be some subjectivity in an objective question. He explained that awarding a range of points instead of a set certain points or no points, can be where some of the problem has arisen because there is a subjective call. *Elwin* explained that if any of the required items are missing, as of right now, they are not awarded any points. *Mary* asked that the condition survey be re-labeled as “pre-planning”. She also said that many line items in planning can be added to “pre-planning”. Discussion on whether points should be awarded if documents are not really needed for a project, even if submitting the documents is required.

Elizabeth pointed out that a drafted change is that there are 30 Planning points instead of the 40 points in the current application. The drafted change is the facility appraisal point value has been taken out. *Mark* pointed out that currently Appendix A is inaccurate. *Elizabeth* stated that the Department is suggesting as a draft that the condition survey is 10 points; conceptual pre-construction, ed-specs, and planning are 10 points; schematic design is 5 points; and design development is 5 points. *Stuart* noted that the Department was aiming for a scale-appropriate evaluation of the project.

Elizabeth asked *Elwin* to explain the value he sees in a condition survey while rating. *Elwin* explained that his thoughts are that the condition survey is a way to more fully grasp what the conditions in the building are as well as its severity. *Elwin* categorized the condition survey as a “pre-planning” element to a project, agreeing to what *Mary* had mentioned previously. *Elwin* stated that the condition survey is a great tool to go back and check to make sure the scope is in accordance to what the condition survey said needs to be fixed. *Bob* asked if *Elwin* had noted the age of the condition survey being an issue. *Elizabeth* clarified that although the condition survey should help the rater know what the scope is, the application should also have this in it as well; the condition survey should help the district plan.

Public Comment

Don Hiley explained that a lot of smaller districts that do not have the qualified staff rely on contracting for services that they need.

Dave Norum is concerned that the matrix that is being used only allows for 33% for Emergency and Life Safety, that some of the scoring would be evened out.

Kevin Lyon likes how the points are being shifted to the early design. He believes that planning should be applicable for the size of the project.

Continued Work Session Discussion: Project Planning

Mary stated that districts don't want to risk going past schematic design until there is assurance of or there is a secure funding stream. She believes that districts that go past schematic design before being funded seem to be penalized. *Bob* interjected that this is where the loop hole is for completed projects. He believes that more points should be awarded for pre-planning because that is the most fiscally responsible way of doing it. *Elizabeth* stated that completed projects on last year's CIP list that received high points were very low dollar amount projects. *Bob* proposed that more points be assigned to pre-planning and planning, beyond what is proposed in the draft. Discussion followed of whether to shift points out of design development and schematic design to pre-planning and planning stages.

Public Comment

Don Hiley thinks that the completed project issue is a red herring and it doesn't seem to be a meaningful problem.

Don Carney agrees that planning should get the points, but at the same time he knows what that costs to do the pre-planning. He feels that the amount of money that is spent on 95% documents isn't worth it if you don't have secure funding and sometimes it takes years to get funded and by that time the drawings aren't useful. *Don* stated that he doesn't feel condition surveys need to be done by a licensed professional. He feels that a district's mechanic would know the building more than a person who does a walk through. He agrees with partial point awards.

Bob proposed that if the Department has a six-year CIP list, then condition surveys should be eligible for six years. Six years would give the districts a little more flexibility. He agrees with *Don* that condition surveys shouldn't have to be done by a licensed professional.

Mark proposed that what is currently called the "Condition Survey" phase be renamed to "pre-planning" or "project evaluation" and to state that an A/E is not required to do this phase but rather a qualified individual would be sufficient to do the survey. Perhaps move items 2 and 3 from "planning" up to "pre-planning". He proposed that Design Development be zero points, schematic design remain as 5 points, planning go up to 20 points, pre-planning go up to 15 points.

Continued Work Session Discussion: Project Planning

Mary asked whether we would prorate those points and have them add up to 30, as previously discussed. *Mary* added that the purpose of this isn't to equalize the points, rather it's for the raters to have good numbers to know that the project is feasible.

The committee discussed the distribution of points. *Doug* asked why *Mark* valued pre-planning less than planning. *Mark* explained that dependent on the scope of the project, pre-planning could be as simple as a one page report. He explained that he did not want to give high points for something that simple. Mention of "double dipping" potential with cost estimate.

Elizabeth clarified that the BRGR Committee agrees that pre-planning should be weighted more heavily than design development. *Elizabeth* clarified that the consensus is to minimize the 95% construction document points.

Bob proposed pre-planning 15 points, planning 10 points, and schematic design 5 points, to remain at 30 points total. *Mary* clarified that purpose should be to give clarity to raters and districts, not provide a potential advantage to any district.

Public Comment

Don Carney added that the Department spends money on updating the cost model each year and that this is a pretty accurate tool and also rather simple. The cost model is within 3% while the professional estimates are within 15%. He feels that if a couple more things were put into the cost model, it could be even more accurate and that the professional tool wouldn't be worth 30 points.

Don Hiley feels there is still value in professional estimates.

Elizabeth added that a cost estimate discussion will come up at a later meeting.

Future Meeting Date

The committee discussed a meeting date. A tentative date is December 3 & 4, 2013, to be confirmed within 15 days.

Elizabeth explained that December will be when the Department brings back the re-drafted CIP application. At the December meeting, to assist with member review, *Stuart* will provide an initial briefing of the changes to the draft he made as a result of the current meeting, with no committee discussion at that time.

Final Notes

Mary asked to add items to the task list: review Appendix C, discuss facility condition survey standard, and review past meeting minutes to add previous items to task list.

Doug asked to add a task of looking at the possibility of different processes/applications/funding streams for funding rural and urban projects. *Elizabeth* noted that funding is not what the BRGR Committee is charged with doing, but the concern can be noted.

Meeting Adjourned

By: Stuart Gerger, Facilities Architect**Date:** December 3, 2013**Phone:** 465-6906**File:** 2013-12-03 Staff Briefing**For:** Bond Reimbursement and Grant
Review Committee**Subject:** EED Facilities Overview

S T A F F B R I E F I N G

Staff Briefing

Initial CIP Lists

The initial CIP lists are included in the packet. The department provided a memo to the School Superintendents that announced the availability of the lists. The department also transmitted the initial lists to the Governor's office for their use in developing the FY2015 capital budget in accordance with AS 14.11.013(a)(3).

For FY2015, 34 of 53 school districts submitted a total of 121 applications for the first year of the districts' revised six-year plans; 98 of the applications were scored, and the districts requested that 23 application scores be re-used for the FY 2015 list. The department determined that 2 applications were ineligible, modified the category of 2 projects that resulted in a change of list, and adjusted the budget of 11 projects under provisions of AS 14.11.

Following are some year-to-year statistics. Amounts requested are totals for state share and do not include participating share amounts that would be provided by the districts. Previous years are final list totals, and FY2015 is based on the initial list, subject to adjustment before finalization:

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
Districts Submitting Applications	34	35	34
Number of Applications Submitted	158	137	121
Number of Applications Scored	138	85	98
Number of Applications Reused	20	52	23
Number of Applications Ineligible	11	2	2
Number of Applications with a Change in List	4	2	2
Number of Applications with Budget Adjustment	18	5	11
Number of Projects on Major Maintenance List	120	111	102
Number of Projects on School Construction List	27	24	17
Amount Requested on Major Maintenance List	\$265,889,455	\$253,682,082	\$183,116,162
Amount Requested on School Construction List	\$273,634,749	\$284,133,432	\$267,163,334

Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB 237)

The updated debt tracking report under SB237 starting July 1, 2010 is attached to the committee packet. The total amount of bond authorization requested under SB 237 is \$769,919,670. The total amount approved by the department is \$767,573,734. The total voter approved amount is \$657,713,734. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$657,713,734.

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 70% - \$518,124,855

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 60% - \$139,588,879

Preventative Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report (attached) was updated on May 31, 2013. To date, 51 of 53 school districts have certified preventive maintenance programs. The Aleutian Region and Pribilof Islands are not currently certified.

During FY13, site visits were conducted in the following school districts:

- Anchorage
- Chugach
- Fairbanks
- Galena
- Kenai Peninsula
- North Slope Borough
- Pelican City
- Tanana City
- Valdez City

In FY14, DEED anticipates conducting site visits in the following school districts:

- Bering Strait
- Bristol Bay Borough
- Iditarod Area
- Lake & Peninsula
- Lower Kuskokwim
- Lower Yukon
- Skagway City
- St Mary's
- Yukon Flats
- Yukon Koyukuk

By June 1, 2014, visited school districts will receive a preliminary notice to establish preventive maintenance certification. School districts which cannot demonstrate full compliance by August 1, 2014, will not be eligible to apply for FY16 CIP grant funding.

CIP Application Review

The review process continues with materials that will be presented for review and discussion at this meeting. The goal of the CIP application review is to look for areas to improve the clarity and transparency of the CIP application and scoring process. Based on an outline of goals provided to the Committee in June, the department prepared and presented initial materials at the work session last August.

Integrating discussion and feedback from that work session, the department has updated the previously presented materials, and will present those updates along with new material. To clarify a point from August, no final decisions or approval of application changes will be requested by the department during the presentations at this meeting. The BRGR committee will review and approve changes, if any annually in keeping with past process.

The department has sought participation in this process from the districts and interested parties. Districts have been notified for each BRGR committee and agendas and materials are on line. The goal for this meeting is to have a complete BRGR packet on line two weeks in advance and notify districts and interested parties. The department will also notify and supply a call in line for listeners outside of Anchorage.

Publications Update

Following is a list of publications currently managed by the department and the year of publication or latest draft. Because efforts have been directed towards the application review and other facilities section workload there is no update on this item.

1. Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Guide (Preventative Maintenance Handbook (1999).
2. A/E Services handbook (1999-Draft)
3. Swimming Pool Guidelines (1997)
4. Outdoor Facility Guidelines (new)
5. Space Guidelines Handbook (1996)
6. Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook (1999)
7. Renewal & Replacement Guideline (2001)
8. Facility Appraisal Guide (1997)
9. Condition Survey (1997)
10. Project Delivery Handbook (2004)
11. Equipment Purchase Guideline (2005)
12. Educational Specification Handbook (2005); and Educational Specifications Supplement (2009)
13. Capital Project Administration Handbook (2007)
14. Site Selection Criteria Handbook (Updated December 2011)

Staffing Update

Staffing Update- As of December 3rd, the Facilities Section is fully staffed. The department recently hired Lori Weed as the Facilities Section School Finance Specialist II. She assumes the role as lands management staff in the section. Lori is an excellent addition to the section and we are glad to have her. The department also recently re-hired Wayne Marquis as the Building Management Specialist. Wayne held this position in 2009-2011. Welcome back Wayne.

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 School Construction Grant Fund
 Initial List

Nov. 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwethluk K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	\$57,678,571	\$57,678,571	\$25,518,469	\$32,160,102	\$643,202	\$31,516,900	\$31,516,900
2	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	\$100,065,442	\$54,046,749	\$0	\$54,046,749	\$10,809,350	\$43,237,399	\$74,754,299
3	Saint Marys	Andreafski High School Gym Construction	\$12,381,990	\$12,290,231	\$0	\$12,290,231	\$614,512	\$11,675,719	\$86,430,018
4	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Tuntutuliak	\$55,462,324	\$55,462,324	\$0	\$55,462,324	\$1,109,246	\$54,353,078	\$140,783,096
5	Yukon-Koyukuk	Jimmy Huntington K-12 Addition/Renovation, Huslia	\$19,159,236	\$18,554,216	\$0	\$18,554,216	\$371,084	\$18,183,132	\$158,966,228
6	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Atmautluak	\$45,188,824	\$45,188,824	\$0	\$45,188,824	\$903,776	\$44,285,048	\$203,251,276
7	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$18,594,511	\$18,299,390	\$0	\$18,299,390	\$365,988	\$17,933,402	\$221,184,678
8	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional High School Cafeteria Addition	\$9,157,375	\$9,091,605	\$0	\$9,091,605	\$181,832	\$8,909,773	\$230,094,451
9	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	\$13,799,174	\$13,799,174	\$0	\$13,799,174	\$275,983	\$13,523,191	\$243,617,642
10	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	\$451,346	\$451,346	\$0	\$451,346	\$157,971	\$293,375	\$243,911,017
11	Kuspuk	Johnnie John Sr. K-12 Replacement School, Crooked Creek	\$10,034,721	\$10,034,721	\$0	\$10,034,721	\$200,694	\$9,834,027	\$253,745,044
12	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area	\$430,601	\$430,601	\$0	\$430,601	\$8,612	\$421,989	\$254,167,033
13	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	\$109,374	\$109,374	\$0	\$109,374	\$38,281	\$71,093	\$254,238,126
14	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	\$6,173,568	\$5,936,205	\$0	\$5,936,205	\$118,724	\$5,817,481	\$260,055,607
15	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track & Field Improvements	\$5,398,431	\$5,398,431	\$0	\$5,398,431	\$107,969	\$5,290,462	\$265,346,069
16	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Drainage and Traffic Upgrades	\$1,062,398	\$1,062,398	\$0	\$1,062,398	\$21,248	\$1,041,150	\$266,387,219
17	Yupiit	Parking & Drive Resurfacing, 3 Schools	\$791,954	\$791,954	\$0	\$791,954	\$15,839	\$776,115	\$267,163,334
Totals:			\$355,939,840	\$308,626,114	\$25,518,469	\$283,107,645	\$15,944,311	\$267,163,334	

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial Agency Decision

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler Rehabilitation	\$36,657	\$36,657	\$0	\$36,657	\$10,997	\$25,660	\$25,660
2	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K Demoski K-12 School Renovation, Nulato	\$10,528,383	\$10,312,600	\$0	\$10,312,600	\$206,252	\$10,106,348	\$10,132,008
3	Nome City	Districtwide Lighting Replacement	\$267,165	\$267,165	\$0	\$267,165	\$80,149	\$187,016	\$10,319,024
4	Fairbanks	Barnette K-8 Magnet School Renovation, Phase 4	\$10,168,215	\$10,069,868	\$0	\$10,069,868	\$3,020,960	\$7,048,908	\$17,367,932
5	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Boiler Replacement	\$2,646,326	\$2,646,326	\$0	\$2,646,326	\$52,927	\$2,593,399	\$19,961,331
6	Kake City	Kake High School Boiler Replacement, Phase 2	\$250,924	\$250,924	\$0	\$250,924	\$25,092	\$225,832	\$20,187,163
7	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary HVAC System Upgrades	\$1,454,370	\$1,454,370	\$0	\$1,454,370	\$509,029	\$945,341	\$21,132,504
8	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	\$1,594,652	\$1,580,276	\$0	\$1,580,276	\$474,083	\$1,106,193	\$22,238,697
9	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	\$1,015,715	\$1,015,715	\$0	\$1,015,715	\$20,314	\$995,401	\$23,234,098
10	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	\$242,304	\$242,304	\$0	\$242,304	\$48,461	\$193,843	\$23,427,941
11	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	\$290,724	\$290,724	\$0	\$290,724	\$101,753	\$188,971	\$23,616,912
12	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	\$57,225	\$57,225	\$0	\$57,225	\$1,144	\$56,081	\$23,672,993
13	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Sprinkler Upgrades	\$91,103	\$91,103	\$0	\$91,103	\$31,886	\$59,217	\$23,732,210
14	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Headquarters Classroom Building Renovation	\$7,708,674	\$7,666,562	\$0	\$7,666,562	\$383,328	\$7,283,234	\$31,015,444
15	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	\$3,717,328	\$3,655,602	\$0	\$3,655,602	\$182,780	\$3,472,822	\$34,488,266
16	Haines	Haines Vocational Education Building Mechanical Upgrades	\$1,697,626	\$1,697,626	\$0	\$1,697,626	\$594,169	\$1,103,457	\$35,591,723
17	Northwest Arctic	Buckland K-12 Heating System Improvements	\$736,786	\$736,786	\$0	\$736,786	\$147,357	\$589,429	\$36,181,152
18	Galena	Sidney Huntington High School Floor Renovation	\$560,297	\$560,297	\$0	\$560,297	\$28,015	\$532,282	\$36,713,434
19	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, And Intercom Replacement	\$539,621	\$539,621	\$0	\$539,621	\$188,867	\$350,754	\$37,064,188
20	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Multipurpose Building Roof Replacement	\$233,431	\$233,431	\$0	\$233,431	\$4,669	\$228,762	\$37,292,950
21	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door & Flooring Replacement	\$138,462	\$138,462	\$0	\$138,462	\$13,846	\$124,616	\$37,417,566
22	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	\$1,258,584	\$1,258,584	\$0	\$1,258,584	\$25,172	\$1,233,412	\$38,650,978

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial Agency Decision

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
23	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Sound & Acoustic Renovation	\$303,487	\$303,487	\$0	\$303,487	\$6,070	\$297,417	\$38,948,395
24	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	\$119,149	\$119,149	\$0	\$119,149	\$35,745	\$83,404	\$39,031,799
25	Craig City	Craig Middle School Renovation	\$11,176,539	\$11,176,539	\$0	\$11,176,539	\$1,117,654	\$10,058,885	\$49,090,684
26	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$578,960	\$578,960	\$0	\$578,960	\$11,579	\$567,381	\$49,658,065
27	Hoonah City	Hoonah Campus Boiler Replacement	\$246,757	\$246,757	\$0	\$246,757	\$74,027	\$172,730	\$49,830,795
28	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary East Wing Flooring Replacement	\$313,604	\$313,604	\$0	\$313,604	\$109,761	\$203,843	\$50,034,638
29	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$3,674,171	\$3,674,171	\$0	\$3,674,171	\$183,709	\$3,490,462	\$53,525,100
30	Yupit	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Removal/Replacement	\$6,165,858	\$6,165,858	\$0	\$6,165,858	\$123,317	\$6,042,541	\$59,567,641
31	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Biomass Boiler	\$2,083,615	\$2,083,615	\$0	\$2,083,615	\$625,084	\$1,458,531	\$61,026,172
32	Copper River	District Office Renovation	\$1,042,043	\$1,042,043	\$0	\$1,042,043	\$20,841	\$1,021,202	\$62,047,374
33	Kenai Peninsula	Kenai Middle School Asbestos Removal/Security Upgrade	\$7,458,445	\$7,458,445	\$0	\$7,458,445	\$2,610,456	\$4,847,989	\$66,895,363
34	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	\$2,838,677	\$2,838,677	\$0	\$2,838,677	\$56,774	\$2,781,903	\$69,677,266
35	Haines	Haines High School Air Handlers Replacement	\$500,911	\$500,911	\$0	\$500,911	\$175,319	\$325,592	\$70,002,858
36	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$440,959	\$440,959	\$0	\$440,959	\$8,819	\$432,140	\$70,434,998
37	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	\$903,644	\$903,644	\$0	\$903,644	\$180,729	\$722,915	\$71,157,913
38	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	\$581,315	\$581,315	\$0	\$581,315	\$11,626	\$569,689	\$71,727,602
39	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniarmiut K-12 School Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	\$1,037,460	\$1,037,460	\$0	\$1,037,460	\$20,749	\$1,016,711	\$72,744,313
40	Yukon Flats	Boiler & Control Upgrades, 4 Schools (Fort Yukon, Beaver, Chalkyitsik, Stevens Village K-12 Schools)	\$2,768,223	\$2,768,223	\$0	\$2,768,223	\$55,364	\$2,712,859	\$75,457,172
41	Fairbanks	Woodriver Elementary Renovation, Phase 3	\$9,952,322	\$9,952,322	\$0	\$9,952,322	\$2,985,697	\$6,966,625	\$82,423,797
42	Bristol Bay Borough	Bristol Bay School Boiler Installation	\$637,626	\$637,626	\$0	\$637,626	\$223,169	\$414,457	\$82,838,254
43	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Roof & Siding Replacement, Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$2,062,100	\$2,062,100	\$0	\$2,062,100	\$412,420	\$1,649,680	\$84,487,934
44	Kenai Peninsula	Homer High School Roofing Replacement	\$5,616,930	\$5,616,930	\$0	\$5,616,930	\$1,965,925	\$3,651,005	\$88,138,939
45	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Security Upgrades	\$1,029,688	\$1,029,688	\$0	\$1,029,688	\$308,906	\$720,782	\$88,859,721

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial Agency Decision

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
46	Denali Borough	Districtwide Security Upgrades	\$2,249,662	\$2,249,662	\$0	\$2,249,662	\$449,932	\$1,799,730	\$90,659,451
47	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Air Handler Replacement	\$149,245	\$149,245	\$0	\$149,245	\$52,236	\$97,009	\$90,756,460
48	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$885,683	\$885,683	\$0	\$885,683	\$265,705	\$619,978	\$91,376,438
49	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School/Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrades	\$501,011	\$501,011	\$0	\$501,011	\$150,303	\$350,708	\$91,727,146
50	Valdez City	Valdez High School/Hermon Hutchens Elementary Gym Lighting Upgrades	\$865,814	\$865,814	\$0	\$865,814	\$303,035	\$562,779	\$92,289,925
51	Fairbanks	Tanana Middle School Mechanical Upgrades	\$9,663,174	\$9,663,174	\$0	\$9,663,174	\$2,898,952	\$6,764,222	\$99,054,147
52	Copper River	Slana K-12 School Renovation	\$1,375,840	\$1,375,840	\$0	\$1,375,840	\$27,517	\$1,348,323	\$100,402,470
53	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	\$2,613,670	\$2,613,670	\$0	\$2,613,670	\$52,273	\$2,561,397	\$102,963,867
54	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	\$3,935,200	\$3,935,200	\$0	\$3,935,200	\$78,704	\$3,856,496	\$106,820,363
55	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting System Installation	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$106,862,121
56	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	\$605,696	\$605,696	\$0	\$605,696	\$60,570	\$545,126	\$107,407,247
57	Haines	Haines High School & Pool Locker Room Renovation	\$1,979,264	\$1,979,264	\$0	\$1,979,264	\$692,742	\$1,286,522	\$108,693,769
58	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$651,236	\$651,236	\$0	\$651,236	\$13,025	\$638,211	\$109,331,980
59	Lower Yukon	Fuel Tank & Soil Remediation, 4 Sites (Pilot Station, Ignatius Beans, Pitka's Pt., Scammon Bay K-12 Schools)	\$5,230,620	\$5,230,620	\$0	\$5,230,620	\$104,612	\$5,126,008	\$114,457,988
60	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	\$1,351,847	\$1,351,847	\$0	\$1,351,847	\$27,037	\$1,324,810	\$115,782,798
61	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$1,347,878	\$1,347,878	\$0	\$1,347,878	\$26,958	\$1,320,920	\$117,103,718
62	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Emergency Generator	\$2,384,470	\$2,384,470	\$0	\$2,384,470	\$715,341	\$1,669,129	\$118,772,847
63	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	\$88,806	\$88,806	\$0	\$88,806	\$1,776	\$87,030	\$118,859,877
64	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation, Bethel	\$302,720	\$302,720	\$0	\$302,720	\$6,054	\$296,666	\$119,156,543
65	Kodiak Island	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,199,100	\$1,199,100	\$0	\$1,199,100	\$359,730	\$839,370	\$119,995,913
66	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Plumbing Renovations	\$456,876	\$456,876	\$0	\$456,876	\$137,063	\$319,813	\$120,315,726
67	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Provisions Installation	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$120,357,484

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial Agency Decision

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
68	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	\$176,649	\$176,649	\$0	\$176,649	\$17,665	\$158,984	\$120,516,468
69	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium DDC Controls Upgrade	\$337,956	\$337,956	\$0	\$337,956	\$101,387	\$236,569	\$120,753,037
70	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Locker Room Renovation	\$499,879	\$499,879	\$0	\$499,879	\$149,964	\$349,915	\$121,102,952
71	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades	\$6,159,526	\$6,159,526	\$0	\$6,159,526	\$1,847,858	\$4,311,668	\$125,414,620
72	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$298,329	\$298,329	\$0	\$298,329	\$5,967	\$292,362	\$125,706,982
73	Fairbanks	Joy Elementary Roof Replacement	\$1,102,435	\$1,102,435	\$0	\$1,102,435	\$330,730	\$771,705	\$126,478,687
74	Kodiak Island	East Elementary & Karluk K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacements	\$1,241,679	\$1,241,679	\$0	\$1,241,679	\$372,504	\$869,175	\$127,347,862
75	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	\$1,838,495	\$1,838,495	\$0	\$1,838,495	\$551,548	\$1,286,947	\$128,634,809
76	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon K-12 School Soil Remediation & Tank Farm Replacement	\$8,889,258	\$8,889,258	\$0	\$8,889,258	\$177,785	\$8,711,473	\$137,346,282
77	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 School Renovation	\$2,621,463	\$2,621,463	\$0	\$2,621,463	\$52,429	\$2,569,034	\$139,915,316
78	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$1,182,262	\$1,182,262	\$0	\$1,182,262	\$23,645	\$1,158,617	\$141,073,933
79	Kuspuk	Districtwide Heating & Sprinkler Upgrades	\$5,706,032	\$5,706,032	\$0	\$5,706,032	\$114,121	\$5,591,911	\$146,665,844
80	Copper River	Glennallen K-12 School & Kenny Lake K-12 School Energy Upgrade	\$2,510,322	\$2,510,322	\$0	\$2,510,322	\$50,206	\$2,460,116	\$149,125,960
81	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Upgrade	\$738,248	\$738,248	\$0	\$738,248	\$14,765	\$723,483	\$149,849,443
82	Bering Strait	Districtwide Fuel Tank Demolition	\$937,600	\$937,600	\$0	\$937,600	\$18,752	\$918,848	\$150,768,291
83	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$264,405	\$264,405	\$0	\$264,405	\$79,321	\$185,084	\$150,953,375
84	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrades	\$264,549	\$264,549	\$0	\$264,549	\$5,291	\$259,258	\$151,212,633
85	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Mechanical Control Upgrades	\$1,333,881	\$1,333,881	\$0	\$1,333,881	\$26,678	\$1,307,203	\$152,519,836
86	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,601,895	\$1,601,895	\$0	\$1,601,895	\$32,038	\$1,569,857	\$154,089,693
87	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	\$3,056,476	\$3,056,476	\$0	\$3,056,476	\$61,130	\$2,995,346	\$157,085,039
88	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 School Gymnasium Relocation & Foundation	\$175,163	\$175,163	\$0	\$175,163	\$3,503	\$171,660	\$157,256,699
89	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline, 2 Sites (Pilot Station & Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	\$1,843,507	\$1,843,507	\$0	\$1,843,507	\$36,870	\$1,806,637	\$159,063,336
90	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	\$3,894,017	\$3,894,017	\$0	\$3,894,017	\$77,880	\$3,816,137	\$162,879,473

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2015)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial Agency Decision

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
91	Kodiak Island	East Elementary, Peterson Elementary & Ouzinkie K-12 School Flooring Replacements	\$2,361,982	\$2,361,982	\$0	\$2,361,982	\$708,595	\$1,653,387	\$164,532,860
92	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-8 School Renovation	\$4,977,122	\$4,977,122	\$0	\$4,977,122	\$99,542	\$4,877,580	\$169,410,440
93	Yupit	Akiak K-12 School Power Generation	\$903,926	\$903,926	\$0	\$903,926	\$18,079	\$885,847	\$170,296,287
94	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 School Renovation	\$4,731,834	\$4,731,834	\$0	\$4,731,834	\$94,637	\$4,637,197	\$174,933,484
95	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School Fire Panel Replacement	\$449,422	\$449,422	\$0	\$449,422	\$134,827	\$314,595	\$175,248,079
96	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School & Peterson Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement	\$2,861,862	\$2,861,862	\$0	\$2,861,862	\$858,559	\$2,003,303	\$177,251,382
97	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	\$681,636	\$681,636	\$0	\$681,636	\$13,633	\$668,003	\$177,919,385
98	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,069,876	\$1,069,876	\$0	\$1,069,876	\$21,398	\$1,048,478	\$178,967,863
99	Kodiak Island	East Elementary Interior Renovation	\$2,582,623	\$2,582,623	\$0	\$2,582,623	\$774,787	\$1,807,836	\$180,775,699
100	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	\$293,640	\$293,640	\$0	\$293,640	\$5,873	\$287,767	\$181,063,466
101	Lower Yukon	Security Access System Upgrades - 6 Sites	\$1,519,482	\$1,519,482	\$0	\$1,519,482	\$30,390	\$1,489,092	\$182,552,558
102	Kodiak Island	Underground Storage Tank Replacements, 4 Sites (Chiniak, Port Lions, Old Harbor, Larsen Bay K-12 Schools)	\$805,148	\$805,148	\$0	\$805,148	\$241,544	\$563,604	\$183,116,162
TOTALS:			\$214,602,666	\$214,170,322	\$0	\$214,170,322	\$31,054,160	\$183,116,162	

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
1	3	Alaska Gateway	Tok Sprinkler Renovation	C	\$ 581,315						
2	3	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	C	\$ 3,935,200						
3	3	Alaska Gateway	Eagle School Building Upgrade	C	\$ 3,932,126						
4	3	Alaska Gateway	Northway School Building Upgrade	C	\$ 3,023,841						
5	3	Alaska Gateway	Tok School Roof and Insulation Replacement Project	C	\$ 2,000,000						
6	3	Alaska Gateway	Training and Administration Center	C		\$ 4,114,566					
1	56	Aleutians East Borough	Sand Point K-12 Heating System Renovation	C	\$ 290,724						
2	56	Aleutians East Borough	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	F	\$ 441,630						Y
3	56	Aleutians East Borough	King Cove K-12 School Paving	F	\$ 107,020						Y
1	5	Anchorage	4 School Component Renewal, Parking & Site Circulation Design & Construction Projects	B	\$ 19,910,000						
2	5	Anchorage	4 School Planning & Design Projects	D	\$ 6,325,000						
3	5	Anchorage	Airport Heights Elementary School Addition & Renovation	D	\$ 24,000,000						
4	5	Anchorage	3 School Parking & Site Improvements	D	\$ 5,640,000						
5	5	Anchorage	Districtwide Emergent Projects	B	\$ TBD						
6	5	Anchorage	Eagle River Elementary School Component Renewal 2	B	\$ 5,434,000						
7	5	Anchorage	Gladys Wood Elementary School Addition / Renovation Design	D	\$ 1,045,000						
8	5	Anchorage	Turnagain Elementary School Major Renovation Design	D	\$ 1,568,000						
9	5	Anchorage	Airport Heights Elementary School Addition / Renovation Design & Construction	D	\$ 20,900,000						
10	5	Anchorage	Bayshore Elementary School Component Renewal	B	\$ 4,076,000						
11	5	Anchorage	O'Malley Elementary School Major Renovation Design	D	\$ 1,045,000						
12	5	Anchorage	Huffman Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B	\$ 5,330,000						
13	5	Anchorage	Susitna Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B	\$ 4,076,000						
14	5	Anchorage	Gruening Middle School Addition / Renovation Design	D	\$ 2,613,000						
15	5	Anchorage	West High (60%) and Romig Middle (40%) School Design	D	\$ 2,718,000						
16	5	Anchorage	Districtwide BLE 2	B	\$ 5,225,000						
17	5	Anchorage	Districtwide CTE	D	\$ 5,225,000						
18	5	Anchorage	Rabbit Creek Elementary School Major Renovation Construction	D		\$ 9,829,000					
19	5	Anchorage	Mountain View Elementary School Major Renovation Construction	D		\$ 10,921,000					
20	5	Anchorage	Central Middle School Addition/ Renovation Construction	D		\$ 43,681,000					
21	5	Anchorage	Romig Middle School Renovation	D		\$ 14,707,000					
22	5	Anchorage	Steller Secondary School Addition / Renovation Design	D		\$ 1,639,000					
23	5	Anchorage	Mount Iliamna (50%)/Whaley School (50%) Replacement Design	D		\$ 3,278,000					
24	5	Anchorage	Districtwide BLE 3	B		\$ 5,461,000					
25	5	Anchorage	Inlet View Elementary School Constuction	D			\$ 3,995,000				
26	5	Anchorage	Gladys Wood Elementary School Addition / Renovation Construction	D			\$ 10,271,000				
27	5	Anchorage	Turnagain Elementary School Major Renovation Construction	D			\$ 10,271,000				
28	5	Anchorage	O'Malley Elementary School Major Renovation Construction	D			\$ 10,271,000				
29	5	Anchorage	Chugiak Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B			\$ 3,709,000				
30	5	Anchorage	Chinook Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B			\$ 4,154,000				
31	5	Anchorage	Gruening Middle School Addition / Renovation Construction	D			\$ 34,235,000				
32	5	Anchorage	Bartlett High School West Academic Wing Renovation Design	D			\$ 2,283,000				
33	5	Anchorage	East High School Benson Building Renovation Design	D			\$ 2,283,000				
34	5	Anchorage	Districtwide BLE 4	B			\$ 5,706,000				
35	5	Anchorage	Northwood ABC School Upgrade Component Renewal	B				\$ 5,039,000			
36	5	Anchorage	Willow Crest Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B				\$ 2,803,000			
37	5	Anchorage	Wonder Park Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B				\$ 4,771,000			
38	5	Anchorage	West High School Constuction 1	D				\$ 23,255,000			
39	5	Anchorage	Steller Secondary School Addition/ Renovation Construction	D				\$ 13,714,000			
40	5	Anchorage	Mount Iliamna (50%)/Whaley School (50%) Replacement Construction	D				\$ 32,200,000			
41	5	Anchorage	Districtwide BLE 5	B				\$ 5,963,000			
42	5	Anchorage	Orion Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B					\$ 5,185,000		

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
43	5	Anchorage	Abbott Loop Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B					\$ 624,000		
44	5	Anchorage	College Gate Elementary School Upgrade Component Renewal	B					\$ 2,804,000		
45	5	Anchorage	West High School Construction 2	D					\$ 14,581,000		
46	5	Anchorage	Bartlett High School West Academic Wing Renovation Construction	D					\$ 22,432,000		
47	5	Anchorage	East High School Benson Bldg Renovation Construction	D					\$ 22,432,000		
48	5	Anchorage	Districtwide BLE 6	B					\$ 6,231,000		
1	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	D	\$ 1,015,715						
2	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Sound and Acoustic Renovation	C	\$ 296,954						Y
3	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track and Field Construction	F	\$ 5,398,431						
4	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla Music Building Remodel	C		\$ 300,000					
5	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla Auto Shop Remodel	C			\$ 750,000				
6	6	Annette Island	Metlakatla District Office Remodel	C				\$ 250,000			
1	7	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Addition	C	\$ TBD						
2	7	Bering Strait	Districtwide Digital Control Upgrade M/M	C	\$ TBD						
3	7	Bering Strait	Districtwide Fuel Tank Demolition	C	\$ TBD						Y
4	7	Bering Strait	Stebbins K-12 School Addition	B		\$ TBD					
1	8	Bristol Bay	Bristol Bay School Boiler Installation	C	\$ 637,626						
1	9	Chatham	Klukwan School Boiler Replacement	C	\$ 57,225						
2	9	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	C	\$ 566,497						Y
3	9	Chatham	Klukwan School Major Maintenance Roof Replacement	C	\$ 1,347,878						
1	10	Chugach	Whittier School Heating/Power System Upgrade	D	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.						
2	10	Chugach	Tatitlek School Upgrade	D							
3	10	Chugach	Chenega Bay School Upgrade	D	\$ 1,218,000						
1	11	Copper River	District Office Roof Renovation & Energy Upgrade	C	\$ 1,042,043						
2	11	Copper River	Slana School Upgrade	D	\$ 1,375,840						
3	11	Copper River	Glennallen Vocational Education Facility Upgrade	D	\$ 738,248						
4	11	Copper River	Glennallen School & Kenny Lake School Energy Upgrade	E	\$ 2,510,322						
5	11	Copper River	District Maintenance Shop Upgrade	D		\$ 500,000					
6	11	Copper River	District Office Upgrade	D			\$ 2,000,000				
7	11	Copper River	Kenny Lake School Upgrade	D				\$ 9,000,000			
8	11	Copper River	Glennallen School Upgrade	D					\$ 14,000,000		
9	11	Copper River	Districtwide Site Upgrades	F						\$ 3,000,000	
1	13	Craig	Craig Elementary School Door and Flooring Replacement	C	\$ 138,462						
2	13	Craig	Craig Middle School Renovation	C	\$ 10,935,948						Y
1	2	Denali Borough	Anderson School Water Line Replacement	D	\$ 242,304						
2	2	Denali Borough	Districtwide Security Upgrades	C	\$ 2,249,662						
3	2	Denali Borough	Roof Replacement - 2 Schools	C	\$ 2,062,100						
4	2	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley / Replace Coal & Oil Fired Boilers	C		\$ TBD					
5	2	Denali Borough	Cantwell Electrical System Upgrade, Generator Building Remodel to Accommodate Boiler System Replacement, Heating & Ventilation System Replacement, Bathroom Remodel for ADA Compliance	D		\$ TBD					
6	2	Denali Borough	Anderson / Replace Boilers & Relocate Boiler Room	C		\$ 2,000,000					
7	2	Denali Borough	Anderson/ Replace Deteriorated, Ice Damaged, and Leaking Roof Over Shop and High School	C			\$ TBD				
8	2	Denali Borough	Cantwell / Replace Original Section of School	F			\$ TBD				
9	2	Denali Borough	All Schools / Refurbish Commercial Kitchens	C			\$ TBD				
10	2	Denali Borough	Anderson / Second Egress for Office and Music, Locker Rooms, Bathrooms not ADA, Gym Seating	D				\$ TBD			
11	2	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley / Septic System Leach Field Re-Grade, Foam, and Heat Trace	C				\$ TBD			
12	2	Denali Borough	Cantwell / Septic System Leach Field Re-Grade, Foam, and Heat Trace	C				\$ TBD			
13	2	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley / Replace Difficult to Operate Main Switch Gear	D				\$ TBD			
14	2	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley / Refurbish Library Bathrooms	D					\$ TBD		
1	16	Fairbanks	Barnette Magnet School - Renovation Phase IV	D	\$ 8,826,047						

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
2	16	Fairbanks	Woodriver - Renovation Phase III	E	\$ 9,952,321						
3	16	Fairbanks	Tanana - Mechanical Upgrades & Energy Efficiencies	E	\$ 9,663,173						
4	16	Fairbanks	Joy Elementary - Roof Replacement	C	\$ 1,102,435						
5	16	Fairbanks	North Pole Middle - Interior and Exterior Renovations	E	\$ 9,916,445						
6	16	Fairbanks	Arctic Light Elementary - Lighting & Energy Efficiency Upgrades	E	\$ 1,809,987						
7	16	Fairbanks	Pearl Creek - Flooring & Classroom	E		\$ 4,746,852					
8	16	Fairbanks	Weller - Flooring & Classroom Upgrades	E		\$ 4,247,925					
9	16	Fairbanks	West Valley - Gym Renovation	E		\$ 4,500,000					
10	16	Fairbanks	University Park - Traffic Safety Improvements	E		\$ 750,000					
11	16	Fairbanks	Administrative Center - Site Upgrade	C		\$ 1,500,000					
12	16	Fairbanks	Lathrop - Kitchen Upgrade	E		\$ 2,585,194					
13	16	Fairbanks	Pearl Creek - Traffic Safety Upgrades	E		\$ 1,700,000					
14	16	Fairbanks	Ladd - Roof and Exterior Upgrades	C		\$ 3,500,000					
15	16	Fairbanks	North Pole High - Replace Widows and Clearstory	E		\$ 800,000					
16	16	Fairbanks	Joy - Flooring, Lighting & Interior Upgrades	E			\$ 4,500,000				
17	16	Fairbanks	West Valley - Auditorium Upgrade	F			\$ 1,000,000				
18	16	Fairbanks	Tanana - Renovation Phase I	C			\$ 9,750,000				
19	16	Fairbanks	Lathrop - Replace Roof Gym Area	C			\$ 500,000				
20	16	Fairbanks	DistrictWide - Replace Hallway Lockers	C			\$ 1,389,685				
21	16	Fairbanks	Ben Eielson Jr/Sr - Roof Replacement	C				\$ 3,900,000			
22	16	Fairbanks	Salcha - Renovation	C				\$ 2,500,000			
23	16	Fairbanks	North Pole High - Complete HVAC Controls	C				\$ 650,000			
24	16	Fairbanks	Universty Park - Lighting & Energy Efficiency Upgrades	C				\$ 1,250,000			
25	16	Fairbanks	Administrative Center - Flooring Replacement	C				\$ 750,000			
26	16	Fairbanks	North Pole High - Site Upgrades	C				\$ 2,500,000			
27	16	Fairbanks	DistrictWide - Emergency Electrical System Upgrades	C				\$ 2,600,000			
28	16	Fairbanks	Joy - Site Improvements	C					\$ 1,250,000		
29	16	Fairbanks	Crawford - Flooring & Classroom Upgrades	C					\$ 6,500,000		
30	16	Fairbanks	Randy Smith - Security & Control Systems	C					\$ 500,000		
31	16	Fairbanks	Howard Lake - Traffic Safety Improvements	C					\$ 550,000		
32	16	Fairbanks	Arctic Light - Site Improvements	C					\$ 750,000		
33	16	Fairbanks	Admin Center - Roof Replacement	C					\$ 600,000		
34	16	Fairbanks	Badger Road Elementary - Site Upgrades & Safety Improvements	C					\$ 500,000		
35	16	Fairbanks	Ticasuk Brown - Flooring Replacement	C					\$ 3,500,000		
36	16	Fairbanks	University Park - Renovation Phase I	C						\$ 4,700,000	
37	16	Fairbanks	Badger Rd. - Renovation Phase II	C						\$ 4,500,000	
38	16	Fairbanks	Anderson - Roofing Replacement	C						\$ 9,500,000	
39	16	Fairbanks	Ladd - Site Improvements	C						\$ 750,000	
40	16	Fairbanks	Ann Wien - Replace Flooring	C						\$ 750,000	
1	17	Galena	GILA Headquarters Classroom Building Upgrade	D	\$ 7,708,674						
2	17	Galena	Sidney Huntington High School Floor Renovation	C	\$ 560,297						
3	17	Galena	Sidney Huntington High School Gym Floor Upgrade	E		\$ 100,000					
4	17	Galena	GILA Composite Building Energy Efficiency Upgrade	E			\$ 150,000				
5	17	Galena	Sidney Huntington School Energy Efficiency & Door Upgrades	E				\$ 100,000			
6	17	Galena	GILA Automotive Lab Energy Upgrades	E					\$ 50,000		
7	17	Galena	Sidney Huntington School Boiler Upgrade	E						\$ 175,000	
1	18	Haines	Haines High School Air Handler Replacement	D	\$ 500,911						
2	18	Haines	Haines Voc Ed Building Mechanical Upgrades	C	\$ 1,697,626						
3	18	Haines	Mosquito Lake School Sprinkler Upgrades	D	\$ 91,103						
4	18	Haines	Mosquito Lake Air Handler Replacement	D	\$ 149,245						
5	18	Haines	Haines High School and Pool Locker Room Renovation	B	\$ 1,926,658						Y
6	18	Haines	Mosquito Lake School Exterior, Interior, Electrical Upgrades	C		\$ 750,000					
7	18	Haines	Mosquito Lake Utility Building Upgrades	C		\$ 175,000					

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
8	18	Haines	Haines High School Track and Soccer Field Renovations & Upgrades	F			\$ 1,000,000				
9	18	Haines	Haines High School Roof Replacement	C						\$ 1,500,000	
1	19	Hoonah	Hoonah Central Boiler Replacement	C	\$ 246,757						
2	19	Hoonah	Hoonah Natatorium Plumbing Renovations	C	\$ 456,876						
3	19	Hoonah	Hoonah Natatorium Fire Alarm Upgrade	D	\$ 264,405						
4	19	Hoonah	Hoonah Natatorium DDC Controls Upgrade	C	\$ 337,956						
1	20	Hydaburg	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	C	\$ 903,644						
2	20	Hydaburg	Hydaburg High School and Gym Roof Replacement	C			\$ 734,418				
1	21	Iditarod	Holy Cross K-12 School Roof Replacement	C	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.						
2	21	Iditarod	Shageluk & Anvik Kitchen Renovation	C	\$ TBD						
3	21	Iditarod	Shageluk Water System Renovation	C	\$ TBD						
4	21	Iditarod	McGrath Fire Alarm System Upgrade	C	\$ TBD						
5	21	Iditarod	Takotna School Roof Repair	C	\$ TBD						
6	21	Iditarod	Grayling School Roof Repair	C	\$ TBD						
7	21	Iditarod	Districtwide Security System Installation	C	\$ TBD						
8	21	Iditarod	Anvik School Roof Repair	C	\$ TBD						
1	22	Juneau	Mendenhall River Community School Renovation	C, D		\$ 6,235,000					
2	22	Juneau	Marie Drake Renovation	C, D		\$ 16,338,000					
3	22	Juneau	Juneau-Douglas High School Gymnasium Upgrade	C,D		\$ 849,000					
4	22	Juneau	Floyd Dryden Athletic Fields Construction & Renovation	F		\$ 6,983,000					
5	22	Juneau	Juneau School District Athletic Fields Renovation	F		\$ 1,687,000					
6	22	Juneau	Dzanitiki Heeni Middle School Roof Replacement	C			\$ 1,811,000				
1	23	Kake	Kake High School (Campus Wide) Boiler 2 Replacement	C	\$ 250,924						
2	23	Kake	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	C	\$ 605,696						
3	23	Kake	Districtwide Painting and Repairs	C	\$ 834,895						
4	23	Kake	Kake High School Cafeteria Flooring Replacement	C	\$ 176,649						
5	23	Kake	Bleachers & Gym Renovation	C		\$ 30,000					
6	23	Kake	Kake Elementary School Mechanical Controls	C		\$ 75,000					
7	23	Kake	Vocational Building Renovations	C		\$ 400,000					
8	23	Kake	Elementary Roof Replacement	C		\$ 1,500,000					
9	23	Kake	Parking Lot Resurface	F		\$ 200,000					
10	23	Kake	Covered Play Area	F			\$ 800,000				
11	23	Kake	Middle School and Library Renovation	C				\$ TBD			
12	23	Kake	High School HVAC	D					\$ TBD		
1	24	Kenai	South End Boiler Conersions (NG)	C	\$ 2,500,000						
2	24	Kenai	Kenai Middle School Asbestos Removal / Office Remodel	A	\$ 5,000,000						
3	24	Kenai	Districtwide Window Replacements	C	\$ 1,797,282						
4	24	Kenai	Districtwide Reroofs Phase II	C	\$ 16,866,500						
5	24	Kenai	Kachemak Selo New School Construction	B	\$ 16,000,000						
6	24	Kenai	Nanwalek Propane Storage Upgrade	D		\$ 330,000					
7	24	Kenai	Nanwalek Water Storage Upgrade	C		\$ 750,000					
8	24	Kenai	Homer Middle Drainage	C		\$ 250,000					
9	24	Kenai	Seward High Parking Lot Lighting Upgrade	C			\$ 500,000				
10	24	Kenai	Moose Pass School Water Treatment	D			\$ 75,000				
11	24	Kenai	Sterling Elementary Primary Wing Heat System Upgrade	C			\$ 170,000				
12	24	Kenai	Homer High Parking Lot Renovation	C			\$ 750,000				
13	24	Kenai	Tustumena Elementary Siding	C			\$ 150,000				
14	24	Kenai	Homer Middle School Field Rehabilitation	C			\$ 900,000				
15	24	Kenai	Ninilchik/Skyview/Seward Tracks	F			\$ 4,000,000				
16	24	Kenai	Districtwide Security Systems Phase II	A				\$ 1,000,000			
17	24	Kenai	Homer Flex Parking Reconfiguration	C				\$ 100,000			
18	24	Kenai	West Homer Elementary Wall Seal	C				\$ 450,000			
19	24	Kenai	Districtwide Artifical Turf Playing Fields	F					\$ 7,000,000		

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
20	24	Kenai	Districtwide Re-roof Phase III	C					\$ 16,452,780		
21	24	Kenai	Districtwide ADA Upgrades	C						\$ 1,000,000	
22	24	Kenai	Districtwide Portable/Outbuildings	C						\$ 1,000,000	
23	24	Kenai	Districtwide Asbestos Abatement	A						\$ 1,000,000	
24	24	Kenai	Districtwide Playground Upgrades	C						\$ 550,000	
25	24	Kenai	Districtwide Electrical Upgrades	C						\$ 200,000	
26	24	Kenai	Districtwide Carpet/Flooring Upgrades	C						\$ 1,000,000	
27	24	Kenai	Districtwide Locker Replacements	C						\$ 1,000,000	
28	24	Kenai	Districtwide Asphalt Repair	F						\$ 1,561,600	
1	25	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Security Upgrades	C	\$ 1,029,688						
2	25	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Biomass Boiler	E	\$ 2,083,615						
3	25	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Emergency Generator	C	\$ 2,384,470						
4	25	Ketchikan	Houghtaling Roof Replacement	C		\$ 2,000,000					
5	25	Ketchikan	High School & Maintenance Facility Roof & Exterior Door Replacement	C			\$ 1,836,000				
1	27	Klawock	Klawock K-12 UST Replacement	D	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.						
1	28	Kodiak	Larsen Bay School Roof Replacement	C	\$ 885,683						
2	28	Kodiak	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	C	\$ 1,199,100						
3	28	Kodiak	East Elementary and Karluk School - UST Replacement	D	\$ 1,241,679						
4	28	Kodiak	Main Elementary & Kodiak Middle School - UST Replacement	D		\$ 609,313					
5	28	Kodiak	Kodiak Rural Schools UST Replacement	D			\$ 805,151				
6	28	Kodiak	East Elementary, Peterson Elementary and Ouzinkie School - Flooring Replacement	D		\$ 2,361,982					
7	28	Kodiak	Kodiak Middle School & Peterson Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement	C		\$ 2,861,861					
8	28	Kodiak	Kodiak Middle School Fire Panel Replacement	C		\$ 449,427					
9	28	Kodiak	Kodiak High School Gym Floor Replacement	C			\$ 838,827				
10	28	Kodiak	East Elementary Interior Renovation	C				\$ 252,623			
11	28	Kodiak	Kodiak Middle School - Replace Elevator Controls	D			\$ 227,281				
12	28	Kodiak	Districtwide - Install/Enhance Security Video Surveillance	A				\$ 217,129			
13	28	Kodiak	Baranof Park - Renovation of Field and Track	F	\$ 500,000						
14	28	Kodiak	Peterson Elementary - Pave Parking Lot	C			\$ 1,404,098				
15	28	Kodiak	Main Elementary - Upgrade Crossing Lights	A				\$ 51,888			
16	28	Kodiak	Akhiok, Chiniak, and Karluk Schools - Earthquake Mitigation Plan - Remove Uphill Slopes	A				\$ 781,663			
17	28	Kodiak	Districtwide Earthquake Mitigation Plan - Suspended Ceiling Upgrade	A				\$ 526,372			
18	28	Kodiak	Middle School Earthquake Mitigation Plan - Replace Retaining Wall	A					\$ 125,935		
19	28	Kodiak	North Star & Peterson Elementary - Install Emergency Power	C					\$ 90,450		
20	28	Kodiak	Larsen Bay School - HVAC Equipment and Controls Replacement	C					\$ 1,306,425		
1	29	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	C	\$ 1,231,491						Y
2	29	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	A	\$ 13,502,127						Y
3	29	Kuspuk	Johnnie John Sr. K-12 School Replacement, Crooked Creek	A	\$ 9,818,709						Y
4	29	Kuspuk	Districtwide Heating & Sprinkler Upgrades	E	\$ 5,583,202						Y
1	30	Lake & Peninsula	Port Alsworth Classroom Expansion	B	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.						
2	30	Lake & Peninsula	Newhalen Kitchen Remodel/Expansion	A							Y
3	30	Lake & Peninsula	Chignik Bay School Roof Replacement	C							Y
4	30	Lake & Peninsula	Districtwide HVAC Upgrades	D	\$ TBD						
5	30	Lake & Peninsula	Districtwide Plumbing Upgrades	D	\$ TBD						
6	30	Lake & Peninsula	Districtwide Electrical Upgrades	D	\$ TBD						
1	31	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial School Replacement, Atmaultluak	B	\$ 45,188,824						
2	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak K-12 School Reno/Add, Tuntutuliak	B	\$ 54,268,419						Y
3	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Boiler Replacement	C	\$ 2,646,326						
4	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	D	\$ 6,173,568						
5	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwethluk K-12 School Replacement	B	\$ 57,678,571						Y
6	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Mekoryuk Wastewater Upgrades	D	\$ 1,015,127						Y

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
7	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	C	\$ 2,838,677						
8	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional HS Cafeteria Addition	F	\$ 9,157,375						
9	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Transportation and Drainage Upgrades	C	\$ 1,062,398						
10	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Bethel	D	\$ 302,720						
11	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Disposition, Districtwide	D		\$ 5,800,000					
12	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Uogrades, Districtwide	D		\$ 7,250,000					
13	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Akiuk Memorial School Deferred Maintenance, Kasigluk-Akiuk	C		\$ 1,100,000					
14	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School Deferred Maintenance, Nunapitchuk	B		\$ 43,400,000					
15	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Nelson Island School Deferred Maintenance, Toksook Bay	C			\$ 40,300,000				
16	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Eek School Deferred Maintenance	C			\$ 8,986,000				
17	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Roof Repairs, Districtwide	C			\$ 27,800,000				
18	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Wastewater Upgrades, Districtwide	D				\$ 14,200,000			
19	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Treatment & Storage Upgrades, Districtwide	D				\$ 8,400,000			
20	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Ayaprun School Replacement, Newtok/Metarvik	B				\$ 44,000,000			
21	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Arviq School Imrovement, Platinum	B					\$ 10,700,000		
22	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Fire Alarm & Sprinklers, Districtwide	D					\$ TBD		
23	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Akula Elitnavik School Renovation Addition, Kasigluk-Akula	B					\$ TBD		
24	31	Lower Kuskokwim	WM Miller Memorial School Replacement, Napakiak	B					\$ 23,300,000		
25	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Qugcuun Memorial School Renovation Addition, Oscarville	B						\$ 16,100,000	
26	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Paul T. Albert Memorial School Renovation Addition, Tununak	B						\$ 11,500,000	
1	32	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay Siding Replacement	C	\$ 651,236						
2	32	Lower Yukon	Fuel Tank and Soil Remediation Projects - 4 Sites (PQS, MOU, PIT, SCM)	D	\$ 5,230,620						
3	32	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline Projects - 2 Sites (PQS, MOU)	D	\$ 1,843,507						
4	32	Lower Yukon	Security Access System Upgrades - 6 Sites (HPB, SCM, SXP, RSM, KOT, PQS)	C	\$ 1,519,482						
5	32	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	C	\$ 3,056,476						
6	32	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay EM Lighting and Retrofit	C	\$ 293,640						
7	32	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay Installation of Electrical Provisions	D	\$ 42,610						
8	32	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay Emergency Lighting Project	D	\$ 115,367						
9	32	Lower Yukon	Kotlik School Finish Upgrades	C				\$ TBD			
10	32	Lower Yukon	Pilot Station Finish Upgrades	C				\$ TBD			
1	33	Mat-Su	New Knik Area High & Middle School	C	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.						
2	33	Mat-Su	New Vehicle Repair Shop	E							
3	33	Mat-Su	New Valley Pathways HS	A							
4	33	Mat-Su	Elem Flooring Replacement/Room	D							
5	33	Mat-Su	Admin Bldg - Replace Windows	C							
6	33	Mat-Su	Big Lake Elem Flooring Replacement	D							
7	33	Mat-Su	Colony HS Flooring Replacement	D							
8	33	Mat-Su	Palmer HS Paving and Sidewalk Improvements	B	\$ 57,000						
9	33	Mat-Su	New Elem School	A	\$ 30,253,000						
10	33	Mat-Su	Tanaina Elem - Add entrance canopies	A	\$ 28,000						
11	33	Mat-Su	Pioneer Peak Elem toilet Room Renovations	C	\$ 45,000						
12	33	Mat-Su	Wasilla Middle School - Renovate Dust Collection System	D	\$ 50,000						
13	33	Mat-Su	Wasilla MS - Renovate Boiler Room Pumps and Piping	D	\$ 145,000						
14	33	Mat-Su	Tanaina Elem - Flooring Replacement	B	\$ 40,000						
15	33	Mat-Su	Admin Bldg - replace Carpeting	B	\$ 170,000						
16	33	Mat-Su	Career & Tech HS Addition	A	\$ 19,536,000						
17	33	Mat-Su	DW ADA Upgrades	B		\$ 266,400					
18	33	Mat-Su	Iditarod Elem Window Replacement	B		\$ 40,000					
19	33	Mat-Su	New Mid-Valley HS	B		\$ 16,372,362					
20	33	Mat-Su	Palmer HS Replace Windows and Blinds	C		\$ 75,000					
21	33	Mat-Su	Houston HS Running Track and Athletic Facility Improvements	D		\$ 845,000					
22	33	Mat-Su	Palmer MS - Replace Flooring	B		\$ 120,000					
23	33	Mat-Su	Butte Elem School Renovation	F		\$ 18,563,254					

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
24	33	Mat-Su	Su-Valley HS Running Track	D		\$ 345,000					
25	33	Mat-Su	Big Lake Elem - Replace Moveable Walls	B		\$ 40,000					
26	33	Mat-Su	Admin Bldg - Renovate Toilet Rooms	B			\$ 48,000				
27	33	Mat-Su	Wasilla MS - Replace Student Lockers	B		\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000				
28	33	Mat-Su	Palmer MS Pave Running Track	B		\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000				
29	33	Mat-Su	Palmer MS Renovation	F			\$ 32,794,628				
30	33	Mat-Su	Reroof Colony MS and HS	C			\$ 9,663,586				
31	33	Mat-Su	Reroof Big Lake/Willow/Pioneer Peak Elem	C			\$ 8,989,653				
32	33	Mat-Su	New Academy Charter	A			\$ 18,653,025				
33	33	Mat-Su	New MS	A				\$ 66,568,456			
34	33	Mat-Su	New Elem School #2	A				\$ 32,253,487			
1	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Energy Savings & Safety Upgrades	E	\$ 3,674,171						
2	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Boiler Replacement Including New Breeching Stacks, Circulation Pumps and Control System	E		\$ 834,400					
3	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Eastside ADA Access and Other Concrete Repair and Grading Work	D		\$ 1,312,500					
4	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Electrical Upgrade, Fire Alarm Upgrade, Exterior Wall Insulation, Arctic Entryways, and Interior Building Systems	D			\$ 1,450,000				
5	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Roof Repair/Replacement	C				\$ 1,365,000			
6	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Vocational Education Classroom Update & Remodel	D				\$ 1,075,000			
7	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Alternative Energy Supplementary Boilers and Building Systems, Stack Replacements, Removal and Replacement of Underground Fuel Tanks	E					\$ 577,500		
8	34	Nenana	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance: Building and Grounds Safety and Security Systems; Keyless Entry, Fencing, Covered Playground Area, Playground Surfaces	A					\$ 650,000		
1	35	Nome	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	C	\$ 116,584						Y
2	35	Nome	Districtwide Lighting Replacement	E	\$ 267,165						
3	35	Nome	Building A Primary Electrical Service	D		\$ 250,000					
4	35	Nome	Nome Beltz Jr/Sr High Electrical Upgrades Design	C		\$ 25,000					
5	35	Nome	Maintenance Bldg Siding and Roof Replacement	C			\$ 225,000				
6	35	Nome	Quonset Hut Siding Replacement	C				\$ 120,000			
7	35	Nome	Exterior Lighting Upgrades (Both School Sites)	C				\$ 40,000			
8	35	Nome	Nome Beltz Jr/Sr High Generator Replacement	C					\$ 250,000		
1	36	North Slope Borough	Harold Kaveolook School Gymnasium Addition	F	\$ 7,959,499						
2	36	North Slope Borough	Harold Kaveolook Integrated Facility Security System Upgrades	F	\$ 705,600						
3	36	North Slope Borough	Eben Hopson Middle School Integrated Facility Security System Upgrades	F	\$ 825,800						
4	36	North Slope Borough	Nuiqsut Trapper School Integrated Facility Security System Upgrades	F	\$ 709,000						
5	36	North Slope Borough	Technology Infrastructure Upgrades	F	\$ 800,268	\$ 1,098,679	\$ 1,291,102	\$ 1,273,034	\$ 1,204,188	\$ 1,608,560	
6	36	North Slope Borough	Districtwide Miscellaneous Housing Renovations & Upgrades	C	\$ 651,600	\$ 459,600	\$ 189,600	\$ 270,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	
7	36	North Slope Borough	Districtwide FF&E	E	\$ 714,000	\$ 714,000	\$ 714,000	\$ 714,000	\$ 714,000	\$ 714,000	
8	36	North Slope Borough	Districtwide School Bus Replacement	E	\$ 698,700		\$ 316,200			\$ 459,000	
9	36	North Slope Borough	Districtwide Light Duty Vehicle Replacement	E	\$ 398,820	\$ 275,400		\$ 71,400	\$ 214,200		
10	36	North Slope Borough	Meade River School Major Facility Renovations	C	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 9,767,984					
11	36	North Slope Borough	Eben Hopson Middle School Major Facility Renovations (PAR)	C		\$ 50,000					
12	36	North Slope Borough	Fred Ipalook Elementary School Major Facility Renovations	C		\$ 1,800,000	\$ 13,420,880				
13	36	North Slope Borough	Alak School Mjaor Facility Renovations	C			\$ 1,200,000	\$ 9,256,432			
14	36	North Slope Borough	Barrow High School Major Facility Renovations	C				\$ 2,000,000	\$ 15,225,523		
15	36	North Slope Borough	Barrow High School Multipurpose Room Addition	F					\$ 3,000,000	\$ 23,132,075	
16	36	North Slope Borough	Tikigaq New High School Center (PAR)	F					\$ 50,000		
17	36	North Slope Borough	Point Lay Teacher Housing Development (PAR)	C						\$ 58,398	

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?		
18	36	North Slope Borough	Central Office Annex Major Facility Renovations - PAR	C	NSB Project Analysis In Progress					\$	100,000		
19	36	North Slope Borough	Barrow Telephone System Upgrade	F	NSB Project Analysis In Progress					\$	44,235		
1	37	Northwest Arctic	Buckland K-12 Heating System Improvement	E	\$	720,926					Y		
2	37	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School	B	\$	100,065,442							
3	37	Northwest Arctic	Northwest Magnet School Dorm Phase II	N/A	\$	6,000,000							
4	37	Northwest Arctic	Selawik Heating System Upgrade	E			\$	446,250					
5	37	Northwest Arctic	Kotzebue School Floor Replacement	C			\$	150,000					
1	38	Pelican	Pelican HS Mechanical Upgrades	C	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.								
2	38	Pelican	Pelican HS Window Replacement	C									
3	38	Pelican	Pelican MS Roof Replacement	C	\$	250,000							
4	38	Pelican	Pelican HS Plumbing Upgrade	C			\$	150,000					
5	38	Pelican	Pelican HS Lighting and Electrical Upgrades	C			\$	350,000					
6	38	Pelican	Pelican HS Roof Replacement	C			\$	600,000					
1	39	Petersburg	District Food Service Renovations	D	\$	1,594,652							
2	39	Petersburg	Petersburg Middle/High Boiler Retubing	C	\$	36,657							
3	39	Petersburg	Petersburg High School Library Renovation	C	\$	40,000							
4	39	Petersburg	Districtwide Boiler Replacement	C			\$	626,160					
5	39	Petersburg	Repair Auditorium Failing Floor System	C			\$	150,000					
6	39	Petersburg	Petersburg Middle/High School Underground Fuel Tank System	C				\$	100,000				
7	39	Petersburg	Districtwide Electrical Upgrades	C					\$	925,949			
8	39	Petersburg	Rae C. Stedman Elementary School Plumbing System Replacement	C					\$	736,401			
9	39	Petersburg	Districtwide Digital HVAC System	C						\$	125,000		
1	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Renovate Gym	D	* District did not submit applications or six-year plan. Left previous data as-is.								
2	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Replace Lighting System	C									
3	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Install Sprinkler System	C									
4	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Renovate Elem Bathrooms	C									
5	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Renovate Science Classroom	C									
6	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Renovate Home Economics Room	D									
7	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Replace UST	D									
8	40	Pribilof	St. Paul School - Direct Existing Drainage From Front of School	C	\$	500,000							
1	46	Saint Mary's	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	C	\$	3,717,328							
2	46	Saint Mary's	Andreafski High School Gym Construction	B	\$	12,381,990							
1	44	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Fire Suppression System	C	\$	440,959							
2	44	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Multipurpose Bldg Roof Replacement	C	\$	228,406					Y		
3	44	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School UST Replacement	C	\$	298,329							
4	44	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	D	\$	88,806							
5	44	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Mechanical Control Upgrades	C	\$	1,333,881							
6	44	Southeast Island	Gym Lighting Upgrade, 2 Schools (Thorne Bay, Port Protection)	D	\$	681,636							
7	44	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 Covered Physical Education Area	F	\$	430,601							
8	44	Southeast Island	Roof Replacement, 2 Schools (Thorne Bay, Port Protection)	C	\$	3,894,017							
9	44	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 Gymnasium Relocation & Foundation	C	\$	175,163							
1	45	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 Renovations	C	\$	2,825,257							
2	45	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 School Renovations	C	\$	4,735,398							
3	45	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-8 School Renovations	C			\$	5,413,888					
4	45	Southwest Region	Manokotak School Sewer & Water Upgrades	C	\$	238,973							
5	45	Southwest Region	Manokotak School Interior Floor Finishes & Ceiling Replacement	C				\$	881,884				
6	45	Southwest Region	Togiak School Interior Floor Finishes	C					\$	1,533,070			
1	48	Valdez	Herman Hutchens Elementary HVAC System Upgrades	C	\$	1,454,370							
2	48	Valdez	Herman Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, & Intercom Replacement	C	\$	582,005					Y		
3	48	Valdez	HHES East Wing Flooring Replacement	C	\$	313,604							
4	48	Valdez	Valdez High School/Hermon Hutchens Elementary Lighting Upgrade	B	\$	865,814							
5	48	Valdez	Districtwide Electrical Wiring and Technology Upgrades	D			\$	250,000					
6	48	Valdez	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Sprinkler & Water Service Repair	D			\$	960,000					

Priority	District #	District Name	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Reused?
7	48	Valdez	Valdez High School HVAC System Upgrades	C		\$ 1,800,000					
8	48	Valdez	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Exterior Upgrades/ Building Envelope and Windows	C		\$ 2,000,000					
9	48	Valdez	Culinary Arts Classroom Remodel	C		\$ 350,000					
10	48	Valdez	Districtwide Waterline Replacement	C			\$ 1,903,405				
11	48	Valdez	Renovate Science Lab, VHS	C			\$ 100,000				
12	48	Valdez	Valdez High School Bathroom and Interior Plumbing Upgrades	C			\$ 750,000				
13	48	Valdez	Valdez High School Carpet Replacement	C			\$ 250,000				
14	48	Valdez	Exterior Door and Card Reader Locks at Valdez High School and Hermon Hutchens Elementary School	C			\$ 500,000				
15	48	Valdez	Valdez High School Gym Floor Replacement	C				\$ 850,000			
16	48	Valdez	Acoustical Upgrades in Valdez High School Gym	C				\$ 400,000			
17	48	Valdez	Districtwide Storm Drainage Upgrades	C					\$ 300,000		
1	49	Wrangell	Wrangell High School / Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrades	D	\$ 490,000						Y
1	50	Yakutat	Yakutat High School Locker Room Renovations	C	\$ 499,879						
2	50	Yakutat	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades	C	\$ 6,159,526						
3	50	Yakutat	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	C	\$ 1,838,495						
1	51	Yukon Flats	Boiler and Control Upgrades, 4 Schools	C	\$ 2,708,633						Y
2	51	Yukon Flats	Venetie Generator Building Renovation	D	\$ 2,613,670						
3	51	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik Water Tank Replacement	C	\$ 1,351,847						
4	51	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	D	\$ 8,889,258						
5	51	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	D	\$ 1,182,262						
6	51	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	D	\$ 1,069,876						
7	51	Yukon Flats	Venetie Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	D	\$ 1,601,895						
8	51	Yukon Flats	Beaver Major Maintenance to Include Zone Valve Replacement, Generator Overhaul, Replace Exterior Windows, HVAC Controls	C		\$ TBD					
9	51	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village Major Maintenance - Replace Windows, Zone Valves, Sewer Pumps	C		\$ TBD					
10	51	Yukon Flats	Venetie Major Maintenance - Utility Bldg Upgrade, Replace Plumbing Throughout, Replace Carpet and Paint	C		\$ TBD					
11	51	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon - Replace Boilers, Lock Upgrades and Window Replacement	C			\$ TBD				
1	52	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K Demoski K-12 School Renewal	D	\$ 10,528,383						
2	52	Yukon-Koyukuk	Jimmy Huntington K-12 Addition and Renovation	A	\$ 19,159,236						
3	52	Yukon-Koyukuk	Allakaket School Upgrade	D		\$ 10,000,000					
4	52	Yukon-Koyukuk	Minto K-12 School Renovation	C			\$ 8,500,000				
5	52	Yukon -Koyukuk	Districtwide Fuel Tank Removal	D			\$ 1,100,000				
6	52	Yukon -Koyukuk	Gladys Dart Manley Renovation and Upgrade	C				\$ 500,000			
1	54	Yupiiit	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Removal/Replacement	D	\$ 6,033,129						Y
2	54	Yupiiit	Akiak K-12 School Power Generation	C	\$ 884,468						Y
3	54	Yupiiit	Parking & Drive Resurfacing, 3 Schools	F	\$ 774,906						Y

Totals:	\$ 772,791,208	\$ 293,727,109	\$ 308,673,427	\$ 296,405,333	\$ 187,700,646	\$ 87,970,678	\$ 169,911,410
---------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------

Total Six-Year Plan Estimate: \$ 1,947,268,401

This page is intentionally blank

State of Alaska
Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects
SB237 Debt Reimbursement Program - Effective 7/1/2010

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Anchorage										
		4 School Component Renewal, Design and Construction (Bayshore, Eagle River, Huffman, Susitna Elementary Schools)	10/4/2013	\$19,910,000	\$0	\$19,910,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Awaiting Voter Approval
		4 School Planning and Design (Gladys Wood, O'Malley, Turnagain Elementary Schools and Gruening Middle School)	10/4/2013	\$6,325,000	\$0	\$6,325,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Awaiting Voter Approval
		Airport Heights Elementary School Addition and Renovation	10/4/2013	\$24,000,000	\$0	\$24,000,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Awaiting Voter Approval
		Districtwide Building Life Extension Projects	1/26/2011	\$11,765,000	\$0	\$11,225,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 4/5/11
		Districtwide Design Projects	1/26/2011	\$5,100,000	\$0	\$5,100,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 4/5/11

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		Service High School Addition and Renewal	2/1/2011	\$38,000,000	\$0	\$38,000,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		not approved by voters 4/5/11
		3 School Parking and Site Improvements Design and Construction (Wonder Park Elementary, Romig Middle School, West High School)	10/4/2013	\$5,300,000	\$0	\$5,300,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Awaiting Voter Approval
	DR-11-108	Career and Vocational Education Upgrades	1/26/2011	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-128	Building Life Extension Projects	3/23/2012	\$22,730,000	\$22,730,000	\$22,730,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-129	Career Technology Education Upgrades	3/23/2012	\$8,425,000	\$8,475,000	\$8,425,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-130	Career Technology Education Additions and Chugiak HS Control Room Replacement	3/23/2012	\$15,390,000	\$15,340,000	\$15,390,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-131	Design Projects; Girdwood K-8 Airport Hts Elem	3/23/2012	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-106	Districtwide Building Life Extension Projects	3/19/2013	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-107	Bartlett HS Cafeteria/Kitchen Renovations	3/19/2013	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-108	District wide Planning and Design Projects- 9 Schools (Anchorage and JBER)	3/19/2013	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-109	Aurora Elementary School Gym Addition	3/19/2013	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-110	Girdwood K-8 School Construction	3/19/2013	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Anchorage Totals:				\$231,670,000	\$121,270,000	\$231,130,000				

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Cordova										
	DR-11-107	Cordova Jr/Sr HS ILP Building Project	4/6/2011	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Cordova Totals:				\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000				
Fairbanks										
	DR-12-102	North Pole Middle School Roof Replacement	7/15/2011	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-103	North Pole Vocational Wing Renovation	7/15/2011	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-104	Ryan Renovation Phase II	7/15/2011	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	voters approved \$9,900,000 for Ryan Phase II
	DR-12-105	Salcha Roof and Envelope Upgrades	7/15/2011	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-106	Wood River Gym Upgrades	7/15/2011	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	voters approved \$10,390,000 for 4 projects
	DR-14-102	Ryan Middle School Replacement	7/15/2013	\$37,150,000	\$37,150,000	\$37,150,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-103	Tanana MS Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$4,751,747	\$4,751,747	\$4,751,747	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-104	University Park Elementary Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$3,912,133	\$3,912,133	\$3,912,133	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-105	Ticasuk Brown Elementary Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$3,905,246	\$3,905,246	\$3,905,246	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-106	North Pole MS Mechanical and Energy Efficiency Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$6,033,410	\$6,033,410	\$6,033,410	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-14-107	Two Rivers Elementary Classroom Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$797,464	\$797,464	\$797,464	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Fairbanks Totals:				\$76,840,000	\$76,840,000	\$76,840,000				
Juneau City Borough										
	DR-11-101	Auke Bay Elementary School Renovation Project	9/3/2010	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amended 12-17-11 for additional voter approved amount of \$1,400,000
	DR-11-200	Auke Bay Elementary Ground Source Heat Pump	12/17/2011	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	amends DR-11-101
	DR-12-101	Adair-Kennedy Synthetic Turf Replacement Project	8/2/2011	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Juneau City Borough Totals:				\$21,291,000	\$21,291,000	\$21,291,000				
Kenai Peninsula										

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-11-100	Districtwide Roofing Project	7/16/2010	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-14-100	Homer High School Turf Upgrade	7/8/2013	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-14-101	Roof Replacement - 10 Schools	7/8/2013	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Kenai Peninsula Totals:				\$39,853,500	\$39,853,500	\$39,853,500				
Ketchikan										
	DR-11-106	Ketchikan High School Roof Replacement	12/22/2010	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-13-100	Districtwide Major Maintenance	9/10/2012	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Voters approved \$5,500,000 for five projects.

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-13-101	Schoenbar Middle School Field Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$232,000	\$232,000	\$232,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-102	Fawn Mountain Elementary Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-103	Districtwide Site Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$228,728	\$228,728	\$228,728	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-104	Smithers Pool Demolition	9/10/2012	\$2,374,020	\$1,363,253	\$1,363,253	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Add'l \$221,759 of redirected funds from DR-10-100; Reduced \$10,767 b/c of voter apvl
	DR-13-105	Valley Park Bus Pullout	9/10/2012	\$314,775	\$0	\$0	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Funds are redirected from DR-10-100
Ketchikan Totals:				\$10,225,542	\$8,900,000	\$8,900,000				
Kodiak Island										

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-100	Kodiak High School Renovation/Addition	2/1/2012	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	project agreement uses \$68,679,814 of the approved amount
Kodiak Island Totals:				\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000				
Lake & Peninsula										
	DR-13-111	Tanalian School Addition and Renovation	4/18/2013	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-112	Newhalen Kitchen and Gym Remodel and Expansion	4/18/2013	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Lake & Peninsula Totals:				\$18,200,000	\$18,200,000	\$18,200,000				
Mat-Su Borough										
	DR-11-102	Fire Alarm System Replacement, 10 Schools	11/17/2010	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-11-103	Roof Replacement, 7 Schools and Administration Building	11/17/2010	\$26,956,050	\$26,956,050	\$26,956,050	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-11-104	Flooring Replacement, 8 Schools	11/17/2010	\$3,118,963	\$3,118,963	\$3,118,963	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-11-105	ADA Parking and Access, 3 Schools	11/17/2010	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-107	Big Lake Elementary School Renovation	2/29/2012	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-108	Palmer High School Renovation	2/29/2012	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-109	Palmer HS/Houston HS Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-110	Wasilla HS/Houston HS Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-111	Fire Alarm Replacement, 3 Schools	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-112	Restroom Renovation, 6 Schools	2/29/2012	\$863,000	\$863,000	\$863,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-113	Flooring Replacement, 7-Schools	2/29/2012	\$685,000	\$685,000	\$685,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-114	New Knik Area Middle/High School	2/29/2012	\$65,455,000	\$65,455,000	\$65,455,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-115	Valley Pathways School	2/29/2012	\$22,515,000	\$22,515,000	\$22,515,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-116	Mat-Su Day School	2/29/2012	\$12,426,000	\$12,426,000	\$12,426,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-117	Mat-Su Career & Tech HS Addition	2/29/2012	\$16,150,000	\$16,150,000	\$16,150,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-118	Iditarod Elementary School Replacement	2/29/2012	\$25,214,000	\$25,214,000	\$25,214,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-119	New Knik Area Elementary School	2/29/2012	\$26,529,000	\$26,529,000	\$26,529,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-120	Districtwide Energy Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$3,162,000	\$3,162,000	\$3,162,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-121	Districtwide Physical Education Improvements	2/29/2012	\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-122	Districtwide HVAC Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-123	Emergency Power Generators & Switch Gear, 9-Schools	2/29/2012	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-124	Houston HS Exterior Envelope Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-125	Houston MS/Palmer MS Locker Replacement	2/29/2012	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-126	Districtwide ADA Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-127	Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Mat-Su Borough Totals:				\$247,830,051	\$247,830,051	\$247,830,051				

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
North Slope Borough										
	DR-12-132	Nuiqsut Trapper School Renovation	6/28/2012	\$5,587,194	\$5,815,000	\$5,815,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	\$750,000 approved in 10/7/08 election; \$5,065,000 approved in 10/6/09 election
	DR-12-133	Tikigaq School Gym and Locker Room Renovation	6/28/2012	\$1,808,200	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
North Slope Borough Totals:				\$7,395,394	\$6,915,000	\$6,915,000				
Valdez City										
	DR-12-134	George H. Gilson Junior High School Replacement	6/28/2012	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Valdez City Totals:				\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183				
Grand Totals:				\$769,919,670	\$657,713,734	\$767,573,734				
Total of Projects Both Voter and EED Approved:				\$657,713,734						
<i>(This is a total of the EED Approved Amount.)</i>										



PM State-of-the-State

Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS OF 05/31/2013

District	Date of Last Visit	*Year of Next Visit	Approved FAIS	Maintenance Management	Energy	Custodial	Training	R&R Schedule	Maint. Program	Status	Program Name	CIP Eligible	Certification Pending
Alaska Gateway	4/4/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Aleutian Region	8/31/2005	2016	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	4 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
Aleutians East	10/8/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Anchorage	4/1/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
Annette Island	3/17/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Bering Strait	4/3/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	TMA	Yes	No
Bristol Bay Borough	2/27/2008	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chatham	2/16/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chugach	4/3/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Copper River	4/2/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Eduphoria	Yes	No
Cordova	11/16/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Craig City	2/28/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Delta/Greely	4/6/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Denali Borough	12/7/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Dillingham City	4/10/2006	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Fairbanks	5/7/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	JD Edwards	Yes	No
Galena	5/8/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Haines	11/3/2010	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Hoonah City	3/21/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Hydaburg City	3/1/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	MPulse	Yes	No*
Iditarod Area	4/14/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Juneau	11/10/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	TMA	Yes	No
Kake City	5/5/2010	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kashunamiut	8/27/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	4 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No*
Kenai Peninsula	2/26/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Ketchikan	3/15/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Klawock City	2/29/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kodiak Island	1/10/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Kuspuk	1/11/2010	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Lake & Peninsula	2/25/2008	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	QQest	Yes	No
Lower Kuskokwim	3/10/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	D	Yes	No
Lower Yukon	3/11/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Mat-Su Borough	4/25/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Nenana City	12/14/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Nome City	5/22/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No



PM State-of-the-State

Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS OF 05/31/2013

District	Date of Last Visit	*Year of Next Visit	Approved FAIS	Maintenance Management	Energy	Custodial	Training	R&R Schedule	Maint. Program	Status	Program Name	CIP Eligible	Certification Pending
North Slope Borough	5/21/2013	2018		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	WorkTracker	Yes	No
Northwest Arctic	12/7/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Pelican City	2/14/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Petersburg City	3/30/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Pribilof Island	4/5/2010	2015	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	S	3 of 5	Maximo*	No	Yes
Sitka City Borough	2/2/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Skagway City	5/28/2008	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	MC	Yes	No
Southeast Island	5/8/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	MPulse	Yes	No
Southwest Region	2/17/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
St Mary's	3/13/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Tanana City	5/9/2013	2018	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	S	4 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	Yes
Unalaska City	10/12/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Valdez City	3/14/2013	2018	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Wrangell City	3/31/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yakutat City	11/9/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yukon Flats	4/9/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yukon-Koyukuk	4/7/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yupiit	8/24/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No

In Compliance 48 51 52 53 52 53 49 51

Legend

- N = Not in compliance
- Y = In full compliance
- NP = Not participating
- U = Undecided
- S = SERRC supported
- FAIS = Fixed Asset Inventory System
- I = Commercial IMMS
- C = Commercial CMMS
- D = In-house District Program
- * = Use Maximo through SERCC Service Contract
- Bold** - Site visit pending

**"Year of Next Visit" dates are subject to change at the departments discretion. Scool Districts will be notified in a timely manner if scheduled visit dates listed on this report are altered.



To: Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

Thru: Elizabeth Nudelman, Director

From: School Facilities

Date: December 3, 2013

Subject: Dec. 3-4 CIP work session packet: general introduction

-
- At the BRGR meeting of August 1-2, the committee reviewed DRAFT 1 of proposed revisions to the CIP application and instructions. With discussion and feedback by the committee and public noted by the department, the draft has been further developed.
 - DRAFT 2 is provided for use at this work session and for public review and comment. Along with integrating comments received, it introduces some new material for review and comment.
 - Reviewing this material, there are four different degrees of change:
 - Relocation without content change of the same question or information to another part of the package. For example: question 28 in the FY15 application has been moved to become question 6i with no change to the text.
 - Limited content change to clarify or provide added information not intended to change the intent of the text. For example: FY15 application question 3 about providing a six-year plan has added text noting that providing a plan is BOTH a requirement for eligibility as well as a criteria for scoring per statute. This is noted to clarify for the applicant the significance of this submittal.
 - Proposed changes in content that add criteria but do not change available points. For example: question 6b (Life/Safety/Code) has a series of yes/no questions along with an area to add narrative support of those answers. This criteria was not present before, but the score for this question (#17 in the FY15 application) remains as-is, up to 50 points.
 - Proposed changes in content that adjust criteria and adjust available points: For example: DRAFT 2 questions 5a-d reconfigure the planning criteria to strengthen an emphasis on district planning. The planning points are also changed per sub-category as well as overall.
 - The Comparative Guide may be helpful for review of DRAFT 2. It shows the relationship of questions between DRAFT 2 and the current (FY15) CIP application.



To: Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee
Thru: Elizabeth Nudelman, Director
From: School Facilities
Date: June 7, 2013
Subject: CIP application review work session

At the BRGR meeting of May 8-9, the committee reviewed the current CIP application. With information from that review, the department has prepared the attached outline incorporating the comments by committee members, and prepared the schedule below to complete the review process.

August 1,2 2013, Anchorage:

Work session focus: Group 1: Scope of work/Life safety/Emergency (questions 14&17)
Group 2: Planning/Surveys/Cost Estimate (questions 16&18)

Introduce for next session: Group 3: Inadequacies, Alternates, Options (questions 26-29)

December 3-4,2013, Anchorage

Work session focus: Groups 1&2: ~~ratify recommendations~~ (discuss recommendations)
Group 3: Inadequacies, Alternates, Options (questions 26-29)

Introduce for next session: Group 4: Cleanup/presentation

Late February, 2014, date and location TBD (possible teleconference):

Work session focus: Group 4: ~~ratify recommendations~~ on portions reviewed- (discuss recommendations)

Group 5: develop recommendations

Introduce for next session: Group 4: remaining items for cleanup and presentation

Early April 2013, date TBD, teleconference:

Meeting Focus: Group 4&5: ~~ratify recommendations~~ (discuss recommendations)

April 2013, date and location TBD:

Agenda item at general meeting: ratify completed changes to FY16 application

The department sincerely appreciates the committee's work on this project, and I look forward to seeing you in August.

Items noted for review by Committee, based on BRGR work session May 9, 2013.

Scope of work/Life Safety (#17), Emergency (#14): draft plan discussion August 2013

- ✓ Distinguish between descriptive information and scoring criteria
- ✓ Project description: bring together info currently spread throughout application
- ✓ Emergency description: provide quantifiable criteria
- ✓ Life/Safety description: what type and how specific of verification needed
- ✓ Awarding sufficient points in these categories to give the intended weight to the question
- ✓ Matrix development
- ✓ Mixed scope and effect on scoring: helping applicants understand the process

2. Planning (#16), Surveys(#16), Cost Estimate(#18): draft plan discussion August 2013

- Support materials for consideration:
 - Condition survey: partial/out of date/component-specific
 - Facility survey (CEFPI)
 - Cost Estimate
- Program Planning
 - Educational spec
 - Conceptual design
- Construction Planning
 - 35,65,95% documents
 - RFPs, Bids, contracts
- Review scoring matrix

3. Inadequacies (#26), Alternates (#27), Options (#28), Operating costs (#29): draft plan discussion December 2013

- Inadequacies of space
 - Clarify criteria for evaluation: state mandated vs. elective
 - Local control: how does it affect programming?
 - Program sustainability?
 - Existing vs. new programs?
 - Is this question necessary for major maintenance projects?
- Alternatives
 - Review statutory language as to how this is required
 - Applicable in all situations?
 - This might be about documenting the research process to show there is not a viable alternate: is that sufficient for points?
 - Is this question appropriate for major maintenance projects?
 - Has this question outlived its usefulness?

- Options
 - When is this relevant?
 - Clarify instructions to applicants about what rater is evaluating
- Operating cost savings
 - Criteria for evaluation: review raters guide
 - How is this question relevant to new school construction vs. MM?
 - Change of raters guide text this question, bullet #4: ~~relatively~~
- General: review relevance and legal basis of these questions with counsel

4. Cleanup/presentation: draft plan discussions ongoing throughout the process

- Consider integrating instructions with application
- Group eligibility items together
- Remove redundant items
- Streamline information questions that can be rolled into scope of work description

5. Future topics: draft plan discussions ongoing throughout the process

- 2a: primary purpose: review for applicability to actual projects
- 2c: recovery of funds, background, process
- 6b: adequate documentation: review question for value
- 7a and 7b
- 9: effective age
- 30: preventative maintenance:
 - reevaluate relevance to statute, both in how the law is interpreted (i.e. what type of materials we are requiring)\
 - whether PM is a scoring or eligibility item
 - renewal and replacement schedule given more significant placement
 - energy management: higher scoring value?

Proposed Question #:	Current Question #:	Item
Cover	32-	Certification by Chief School Official
01-a	01-	Type of Funding: Grant or Debt
01-b	02-a	Primary purpose
02-a	03-	Six-year plan
02-b	04-	Fixed asset inventory system
02-c	06-a	CIP not maintenance project
02-d	05-	Insurance
02-d	07-b	Insurance values last five years
02-e	30-	Preventive Maintenance for eligibility
02-f	31-	Attachments for eligibility
03-	24-	Space eligibility: information
03-a	23-	Space eligibility: ADM calculations
03-b	19-	Space eligibility: grade levels housed
03-c	21-	Space eligibility: information
03-d	20-	Space eligibility: other work in area
03-e	25-	Type of space added or created
04-a	02-b	Phases of work included in project
04-a	13-	Space eligibility: impact multiple facilities
04-a	17-	Project description
04-b	31-	Project description attachments
04-c	02-c	Work completed?
04-d	15-	Additional land
04-e	08-	Change in status of buildings
05-a	16-	Facility Condition Survey/Evaluation
05-b	16-	Facility Appraisal [removed as a scoring criteria]
05-c	16-	Schematic Design
05-d	16-	Design Development
05-e	16-	Designer/Design Team
05-f	22-	Anticipated completion date
05-g	18-	Cost Estimate
05-h	30-	Preventive Maintenance for scoring
06-a	14-	Emergency conditions
06-b	17-	Life/Safety/Code
06-c	23-	Housing unhoused students
06-d	12-	Rank on six-year plan
06-e	26-	Inadaquacies of space
06-f	09-	Facilities' age
06-g	27-	Alternate facilities available
06-h	07-a	District wide maintenance expenditures
06-i	28-	Options
06-j	29-	Operational cost savings of project
06-k	10-	Previous funding
instructions	06-b	Note about adequacy
instructions	11-	Waiver of participating share [eliminated on app]
instructions	31-	Attachments / Distributed to related question

Current Question #:	Proposed Question #:	Item
01-	01-a	Type of Funding: Grant or Debt
02-a	01-b	Primary purpose
02-b	04-a	Phases of work included in project
02-c	04-c	Work completed?
03-	02-a	Six-year plan
04-	02-b	Fixed asset inventory system
05-	02-d	Insurance
06-a	02-c	CIP not maintenance project
06-b	instructions	Note about adequacy
07-a	06-h	District wide maintenance expenditures
07-b	02-d	Insurance values last five years
08-	04-e	Change in status of buildings
09-	06-f	Facilities' age
10-	06-k	Previous funding
11-	instructions	Waiver of participating share [eliminated on app]
12-	06-d	Rank on six-year plan
13-	04-a	Space eligibility: impact multiple facilities
14-	06-a	Emergency conditions
15-	04-d	Additional land
16-	05-a	Facility Condition Survey/Evaluation
16-	05-b	Facility Appraisal [removed as a scoring criteria]
16-	05-c	Schematic Design
16-	05-d	Design Development
16-	05-e	Designer/Design Team
17-	04-a	Project description
17-	06-b	Life/Safety/Code
18-	05-g	Cost Estimate
19-	03-b	Space eligibility: grade levels housed
20-	03-d	Space eligibility: other work in area
21-	03-c	Space eligibility: information
22-	05-f	Anticipated completion date
23-	03-a	Space eligibility: ADM calculations
23-	06-c	Housing unhoused students
24-	03-	Space eligibility: information
25-	03-e	Type of space added or created
26-	06-e	Inadaquacies of space
27-	06-g	Alternate facilities available
28-	06-i	Options
29-	06-j	Operational cost savings of project
30-	02-e	Preventive Maintenance for eligibility
30-	05-h	Preventive Maintenance for scoring
31-	02-f	Attachments for eligibility
31-	04-b	Project description attachments
31-	instructions	Attachments / Distributed to related question
32-	Cover	Certification by Chief School Official

This page is intentionally blank



**DRAFT 2: Application for Funding
Capital Improvement Project by Grant
or
State Aid for Debt Retirement**

FY2016

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

- 1) For each application, ~~please~~ submit four complete copies of this application. This includes the application and the attachments specific to that project. One of these must have the original signature of the Superintendent or Chief School Administrator below.
- 2) For each district, ~~please~~ submit one bound set of districtwide materials (PM program, insurance, six-year plan and other eligibility items) as a separate attachment.
- 3) ~~Please s~~Submit the entire application (1 & 2 above) in PDF format that can allow the department to select portions of the information for filing in our databases.
- 4) Each district can submit up to 10 individual project applications per rating period. This includes previous year applications submitted for reuse. A project application can be submitted only once for reuse if no changes are made to the application.
- 5) If the district wishes to reuse an application making no changes or updates, a letter requesting reuse must be submitted by the same deadline as a new application. The template for a reuse of application is included as Appendix __ *((to be developed))*.
- 6) **IMPORTANT BEFORE COMPLETING THIS APPLICATION:** To improve chances of a successful application, ~~please~~ review the supplemental materials associated with this application: Instructions, Rater's Guide and Eligibility Checklist. These are available at: <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html> under CIP Application Information.

CERTIFICATION:

School District: _____

Community: _____

School Name: _____

Project Name: _____

I hereby certify that this information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that the application has been prepared under the direction of the district school board and is submitted in accordance with law.

Superintendent or Chief School Administrator

Date

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

1a. Type of funding requested (*Choose only one funding source*).

Grant Funding

Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

1b. Primary purpose of project (*Choose only one category, per AS 14.11.013 for grant projects, or AS 14.11.100(j)(4) for debt retirement projects*). *The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.*

School Construction:	Major Maintenance:
<input type="checkbox"/> Health and life-safety (Category A, this category is not available for debt retirement)	<input type="checkbox"/> Protection of structure (Category C, this category is not available for debt retirement)
<input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students (Category B; Category A for debt retirement)	<input type="checkbox"/> Building code deficiencies (Category D; Category B for debt retirement)
<input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program (Category F; Category D for debt retirement)	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings (Category E; Category C for debt retirement)

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

Questions 2a-2e require a “yes” response, with substantiating documentation as necessary, in order to be eligible for review and rating.

2a. Has a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) been approved by the district school board, and is it attached to this application? yes no

Submitting a six-year plan signed by the authorizing designate is required for the application to be eligible. The placement of this project on that plan is a rating factor.

See “Section 6: Factors for Rating” later in this application.

2b. Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system? yes no

The department’s annual audit of the districts is used to confirm existence of this system. No information about it is required to be provided with this application. The department strongly recommends applicants confirm this system is in place at the time of the application.

2c. Is the project a capital improvement project and not part of a preventive maintenance program or custodial care? yes no

2d. Districtwide replacement cost insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values. It is the responsibility of the district to submit that information and confirm receipt by the department. Has department receipt of current insurance information been verified? yes no

2e. A district is required to have a preventative maintenance program that is approved (certified) by the department. Is proof of current certification attached to this application? yes no

2f. **Project eligibility attachments:** Listing all attachments to the application on this list assists raters. Eligibility items are all required on applicable projects.

- Six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (*question 2a*)
- Current certification of maintenance and facilities management program (*question 2e*)
- Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (*question 3a*)
- Enrollment projections and calculations (*question 3a*)
- Justification for waiver of participating share (*see AS 14.11.008(d) for more information*)
- For fully or partially completed projects: Documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 (*question 4b*)

3. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED:

NOTE: If you have classified this project as Major Maintenance (Category C-~~or~~ D, or E) and you are not including any new space, skip to Section 4: Project Information. **All applications requesting new or replacement space must provide the information requested in this section.** For the purposes of this section, gross square footage is calculated in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020(e).

It is expected that applicants use average daily membership (ADM) materials and worksheets provided on our website <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. If another method is used, the department will review it and reserves the right to reject the alternative method.

3a. In the table below, provide the attendance area's current and projected ADM

School Year	K-6 ADM	7-12 ADM	Total ADM
2012-2013			
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			

3b. Indicate the student grade levels to be housed in the proposed project facility: _____

3c. Are there school facilities within the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project? yes no

(If the answer is yes, ~~please~~ provide information below about size, student capacity, and grades served in the table below.)

School Name	GSF	Grades	Capacity
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

3d. Is there any work (other than this project) within the attendance area that has been approved by local voters, or has been funded, or is in progress that houses any student grade levels included in the proposed project? yes no

Project Name	GSF	Grades	Capacity
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

In lieu of data in the format above for questions 3c and 3d, we are providing detailed attachments. yes no

3e. Completion of this table is **mandatory for all projects that add space or change existing space utilization**. If the project does not alter the configuration of the existing space, it is not necessary to complete this table. Use gross square feet for space entries in this table.

Table 4. PROJECT SPACE EQUATION						
	A	I	II	III	IV	B
Space Utilization	Existing Space	Space to remain "as is"	Space to be Renovated	Space to be Demolished	New Space	Total Space upon Completion
Elem. Instructional/Resource						
Sec. Instructional/Resource						
Support Teaching						
General Support						
Supplementary						
Total School Space						

[Future discussion on student security as a type of space.](#)

4. PROJECT INFORMATION:

4a. Project description/Scope of work:

The project description is an important part of this application.

*This question asks the applicant to simply describe the work being done. Other questions will ask for an evaluation related to scoring points, such as emergency conditions, life safety, operating cost savings, etc. **Please focus** the explanation of those features in those questions. It is important that the question 4a scope of work description convey to the reviewer a complete picture of the entire project's scope in one cohesive description.*

Location of work: Identify the location of the community and any particular weather, geographic, or physical conditions of the region or site that would help reviewers understand the factors that affect the facilities.

Phases of work being done: Identify if one or all of these phases of work are included in the scope: planning, design, and/or construction.

Identify the facilities: In the case of multiple facilities work, identify which facilities will be having which part of the work done. Referencing buildings by the DEED facility ID number (as well as any district coding, if you wish) is recommended. DEED facility ID numbers can be found on the DEED Facilities website under "School Facility Information".

List of tasks (scope): This description should provide a thorough list of the work to be completed with this project.

Status of work: If prior or subsequent work is included as a part of the description, be sure to clearly identify the components of work to be completed with *this* project.

Projected schedule: Provide an estimated project timeline that includes an estimated date for receipt of funding, construction start date, and construction completion date.

Please use this area for description and/or listing of the scope of work of this application.

4b. Project description attachments: Listing all attachments to the application on this list assists raters. Eligibility items are all required on applicable projects. Not all other items are required.

- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (*question 4c*)
- Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (*questions 4e*)
- Facility condition survey (*question 5a*)
- Facility appraisal (*consider de-listing*)
- Educational specification (*question 5b*)
- Programming documentation other than Ed Spec (*question 5b*)
- Conceptual design (*question 5b*)
- Schematic design documentation (*question 5c*)
- Design development documentation (*question 5d*)
- Cost estimate worksheets (*question 5g*)
- Budget variance justification (*question 5g*)
- Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e., Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*) (*questions 6b*)
- Cost/benefit analysis (*question 6j*)
- Life cycle cost analysis (*questions 6j*)
- Value analysis provided (*question 6j*)

4c. Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete? yes no

~~The department neither rewards nor penalizes projects seeking reimbursement for already completed work within the parameters set out by 4 AAC 31.023(e)(2).~~

4d. Will this project require acquisition of additional land or utilization of a new school site? If so, ~~please~~ submit information that confirms site control that will allow the project to occupy the site for the use intended. yes no

4e. Transition planning: Does this project change the status of any facility ~~on-site~~ within the project scope to one of the below? The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):

- renovated added to demolished surplusd other

NOTE: If the project changes the current status of a facility to “demolished” or “surplusd,” a transition plan is required as part of this application. A transition plan should describe how surplusd state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. See instructions.

5. SCORING FACTORS RELATED TO PLANNING AND MAINTENANCE:

NOTE: The department places a high value on strong analysis and development of project planning that best serves students with facilities solutions that are well-designed and well-constructed to achieve the best long-term benefit to the state with regard to operating costs and maintenance. The department has elected to award points in rating projects for exceptional planning that reflects these goals. See instructions for further information.

5a. Research & Evaluation (Up to 10 points)

1. Is a facility or component condition report attached? yes no
2. Are other pre-planning documents attached? yes no

5b. Analysis (Up to 10 points)

1. Is programming and planning work attached? yes no
2. Is an educational specification attached? yes no
3. Are conceptual design (pre-construction) documents attached? yes no

5c. Schematic Development (Up to 5 points)

1. Are schematic design documents attached? yes no
2. Is a schematic design level budget attached? yes no

5d. Design Development (Up to 5 points)

1. Are design development documents (including specifications) attached? yes no
2. Is a design development budget attached? yes no

- 5e. **Planning/Design Team:** please list parties who have contributed to the evaluation and/or design services thus far for this project. When applicable, a district employee with special expertise should be listed, along with the basis for his or her expertise.

Provider	Expertise
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- 5f. What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility?
This information is used to confirm that any escalation factor added to the cost estimate matches the projected project timeline.
(Provide a project schedule if available.) _____

5g. Cost estimate for total project cost: Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development's 13th Edition Cost Model or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is mandatory.

(Percentages are based on construction cost. See Appendix C for additional information. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, you must provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding the percentage.)

Table 1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE					
Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	I Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant ¹	2 - 4%				
Land ²					
Site Investigation ²					
Seismic Hazard ³					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction ⁴					
Equipment & Technology ^{2,6}	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead ⁵	up to 9%				
Art ⁷	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency ⁸	5%				
Project Total					

NOTE: this draft includes minor changes to existing footnotes, and the addition of note 8.

- Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: \$0-\$500,000 – 4%; 500,001- \$5,000,000 – 3%; over \$5,000,000 – 2%). Since CM and project administration may be done by either of a variety of sources, the department recommends a TOTAL of 18% for any combination of CM by consultant, Design services and District Administrative Overhead.
- Include only if necessary for completion of this project. Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the Project Description (Question 4a), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
- Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.
- Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project; this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost.
- Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department's publication, Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases for calculation methodology (2005). The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate (from the base year of 2005) added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
- Reference: AS 35.27.020. Projects that are limited to structural, mechanical, or building shell maintenance only may be exempt from requiring art, at the district's discretion. Art is required at 1% of the construction budget

(0.5% for REAA and small school districts) for all other projects. For comprehensive scope projects with new or renovated educational or administrative space, the total construction cost of the project is the basis for determining the budget for art.

8. Contingency is not a project cost but an allowance to give districts support for unforeseen circumstances. For grants, the department expects this amount to be returned as unexpended funds unless justification acceptable to the department authorizes its use.

Construction Category	New Construction			Renovation		
	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction ¹						
Special Requirements ²		n/a			n/a	
Sitework and Utilities		n/a			n/a	
General Requirements		n/a			n/a	
Geographic Cost Factor		n/a			n/a	
Size/Dollar Adj. Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
Construction Total						

1. If using the Cost Model, Base Construction = Divisions (1.0+2.0) for new construction, and Division 11.00 for Renovation, otherwise, Base Construction = the total construction cost less the costs that correspond with other cost categories in the table.
2. Explain in detail and justify special requirements.

5h. Quality of district's preventative maintenance program

(Current: up to 55 points as part of PM assessments; in this draft proposed amount TBD)

Provide examples of facilities maintenance strategies and results that demonstrate that the district maintains a PM program that exceeds minimum requirements for certification.

6. SCORING FACTORS RELATED TO ALL OTHER CATEGORIES:

NOTE: The quality of documentation directly affects the ability of reviewers to evaluate and score this project.

In answering the questions below, ~~please~~ provide verifying documentation for your answers. Responses that cannot be verified will be considered as unsubstantiated. Reviewers are limited in their authority to make professional judgments based on unsubstantiated claims. Scoring values associated with these levels can be found in the instructions material.

6a. Emergency conditions (Up to 50 points)

If an emergency condition applies to this application, ~~please~~ determine which question below best identifies the degree of emergency and provide an appropriate answer. (Check all that apply and describe below.)

Per August meeting: What constitutes an emergency.

Per August meeting: Add point ranges?

- Building destroyed? yes no
- Building demonstrably unsafe and has been vacated? yes no
- Demise of this building highly likely? yes no
- Critical structural weakness? yes no
- Subject to event that would trigger building failure with threat of injury? yes no
- District preparing to vacate the building? yes no
- Public safety officials have issued a date certain order to vacate building? yes no
- Documented building or system failure that makes it impossible for the district to fully utilize the facility and a portion of the building has been vacated? yes no
- Is there documented evidence that a reasonably likely natural phenomena would cause significant (resulting in direct risk to life and safety) damage to the structure? yes no
- Anticipated building component or system failure that will constitute a code violation and can be shown to pose potential risk to occupants? The facility itself is not endangered. yes no
- Probable building component or system failure that will constitute a code violation and can be shown to pose a potential risk to occupants? yes no
- Facility not in danger at this time, but should the (specific) potential failure occur can it be shown to pose potential risk to occupants? yes no
- Code violation, potential risk to occupants, no potential for further damage to building? yes no
- Component or system failure without code violation or creation of imminent risk? yes no
- Code violation, potential risk to occupants, potential for further damage to building? yes no
- Other (describe below). yes no

Please use this area for additional description of the cause to describe in more detail the nature of the emergency condition.

6b. Life safety / code conditions (Up to 50 points)

If a life safety condition applies to this application, ~~please~~ determine which question(s) below best identifies the degree of ~~emergency-urgency~~ and provide an appropriate answer(s).
(Check all that apply and describe below.)

Per August meeting: Add point ranges?

Aggressive threat: district has vacated building fully until threat is removed as a reasonably appropriate response based on national standards. Rater able to verify with necessary documentation. yes no

Active threat: Airborne or non-lethal poison potential upon contact with materials that are exposed to children. yes no

Passive threat: Inert materials to remain in place. (Example: mastics beneath floors to remain, threshold mastic, sink underside coating in good condition.) Point range reflects consideration of quantity of inert materials found. yes no

Potential threat: non-emergency, currently functioning system. (Examples: undersized electrical system, code deficiencies unrelated to actual threat to life safety.) yes no

Major code violation and penalty: violation requires vacation of facility until resolved. yes no

Major code violation without penalty: facility allowed to function, but violation causes (degrees of) limitation for students' instructional programming. Explain limitation on student use caused by code violation. yes no

Lesser code violation without penalty: facility allowed to function but violation causes (degrees of) limitation for students instructional programming. Explain limitation on student use caused by code violation. yes no

Other (describe below). yes no

~~Please use~~ this area ~~for additional description of~~ to describe in more detail the impact and severity of the life safety condition.

6c. Housing unhoused students (Up to 80 points)

This category applies only to projects requesting additional new, or complete new replacement of existing space.

Qualifies for _____ additional SF

Applying for _____ additional SF

Materials prepared in Section 3 of this application based on ADM and worksheets in “2013 Space Calculations” are the basis for determining eligibility for this space and how much space can be allowed to be added or replaced. The ADM figures for this year, and interactive worksheets to be completed, can be found on the department website at: <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

Include copies of the worksheets ADM, Current and Future student populations with this application. The department may adjust the submitted figures as necessary for corrections.

6d. Priority assigned by the District (Up to 30 points)

What is the rank of this project under the district’s six-year Capital Improvement Plan?

Rank: _____

6e. New local elementary and secondary programs (Up to 40 points)

Describe inadequacies of existing space. Specifically address how the inadequacies impact the educational program and facility operations.

6f. School facilities and their condition (Up to 30 points)

What buildings or building portion (i.e. original building or addition) will be included in the scope of work of the project?

(The department will utilize GSF records to establish project points (up to 30) in the “Weighted Average Age of Facilities” scoring element. For facility number, name, year, and size information on record, refer to the DEED Facilities Database at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>.)

Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year	GSF
TOTAL GSF			0

6g. Regional community facilities (Up to 5 points)

List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of housing students. Identify by name, distance from current school. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, ~~please~~ note the attachment in question 4b.

--

6h. Operating funds expended for maintenance (Up to 5 points)

Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last five years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded. See instructions for specific accounting codes to be included.

6i. Other options (Up to 25 points)

Describe at least two and preferably more viable (realistic) options in addition to the proposed project that have been considered in the planning and development of this project. Major maintenance projects should include consideration of project execution options (phasing, in-house vs. contracted construction), and material selection options. New school construction projects need to include a discussion of existing building renovation, acquisition or use of alternative facilities, a life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis, and service area boundary changes where there are adjacent attendance areas. Projects proposing the addition or replacement of space need to consider acquisition or use of alternative facilities, a life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis, and a service area boundary change option where there are adjacent attendance areas.

6j. Relationship of cost of project to annual operating cost savings (Up to 30 points)

Quantify the project's annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost.

6k. Phased funding (Up to 30 points)

Provide AS 14.11 administered grants that have been appropriated by the legislature as partial funding in support of this project. This category is score-able by statute only in instances where project funding was intentionally phased.

Applications seeking funds for cost overages, change in scope, or other actions not noted in the original application or legislative appropriation will not be considered eligible for these points.

EED grant #: _____

7. FACTORS FOR RATING AT THE DEPARTMENT'S DISCRETION:

7a. Quality of district's preventative maintenance program

(Current: up to 50 points as part of PM assessments; in this draft proposed amount TBD) Provide examples of facilities maintenance strategies and results that demonstrate that the district maintains a PM program that exceeds minimum requirements for certification.

((see question 5h))

7b. Fundamental project planning (see breakdown next to questions

5a-5d) (Current: Up to 40 points; in this draft: up to 30 points)

Evaluation of existing conditions, concept development of appropriate and cost effective solution, well considered and reasonable budget.

((see question 5a-5d))

7c. Quality of budget development (cost estimate) (Current: up to 30 points)

((see question 5g))

7d. Inadequacies of space (Current: up to 30 points)

((see question 6e))



DRAFT 2: Instructions for completing the Application for Funding for a Capital Improvement Project

FY2016

*Use these instructions with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
AKEED Form #05-13-XXX, Rev 5/2013*

*Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement.
Numbered paragraphs below correspond to numbered questions on the application.*

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

Unless otherwise indicated, each question on the application form must be answered in order for the application to be considered complete. **Only complete applications will be accepted. Incomplete applications will be returned unranked.** The project name on the first page of the application should be consistent with project titles approved by the district school board and submitted with the six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Please submit *one original and three complete copies* of each application and *two copies of each attachment*. *One copy of the attachment may be in portable document format (PDF).*

(Note: The department will only score ten projects from each district during a single rating period.)

Project scope and budget may be altered based on the department's review and evaluation of the application. The department will correct errors noted in the application and make necessary increases or decreases to the project budget. The department may decrease the project scope, but will not increase the project scope beyond that requested in the original application submitted by the September 1 deadline.

Please be sure the application is signed by the appropriate official. Unsigned applications cannot be accepted for ranking.

Application packages should be submitted to:
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Division of School Finance, Facilities
801 W. 10th Street, Suite 200
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

For further information contact:
Stuart Gerger, School Facilities Manager

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

1. Check one box to indicate which type of state aid is being requested. Grant funding applications are submitted to the department by September 1st of each year (Or on a date at the beginning of September designated by the department in the event that the 1st falls on a weekend or holiday.)

Debt funding applications can be submitted at any time during the year if there is an authorized debt program in effect. To verify if there is an authorized debt program in effect, contact the department.

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

- 2a. Check one box to indicate the primary purpose of the project. Each application should be for a single project for a particular facility, and should be independently justified. The district may include work in other categories in a proposed project. These projects will be reviewed and evaluated as mixed-scope projects. Refer to Appendix B of these instructions for descriptions of categories and the limitations associated with category C category D, and category E projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted basis for mixed scope projects. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.¹

- b. Check the applicable phase(s) covered by this funding request. Refer to Appendix A for descriptions of phases.

- c. Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. If the construction work is partially or fully complete, please attach documentation that establishes that the construction was procured in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080 CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES. Competitive sealed bids must be used unless alternative procurement has been previously approved by the department. Projects under \$100,000 can be constructed with district employees if prior approval is received from the department. Projects shall be advertised three times beginning a minimum of 21 days before bid opening. The bid protest period shall be at least 10 days. Construction awards must NOT include provisions for local hire. For construction contracts under \$100,000, districts may use any competitive procurement method practicable. For projects with contracted construction services, attach construction and bid documents utilized to bid the work, advertising information, bid tabulation, construction contract, and performance and payment bonds for contracts exceeding \$100,000. For projects that utilized in-house labor, attach the EED approval of the use of in- house labor [4 AAC 31.080(a)]. If a project utilized in-house labor, or was constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project will not be scored.

- 2a. Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-13-XXX. The project requested in the application must appear on the district's six-year plan in order to be considered for either grant funding or debt reimbursement.

¹ The department's authority to assign a project to its correct category is established in AS 14.11.013(c)(1) and in AS 14.11.013(a)(1) under its obligation to verify a project meets the criteria established by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee under AS 14.11.014(b).

- 2b.** The district does not need to submit any fixed asset inventory system information to the department as part of the CIP application. The department will verify existence of a Fixed Asset Inventory System during its on-site Preventive Maintenance program review every 5 years. The department will annually review the district's most recently submitted annual audit for information regarding its fixed asset inventory system. School districts that do not have an approved fixed asset inventory system, or a functioning fixed asset inventory system (i.e., cannot be audited) will be ineligible for grant funding under AS 14.11.011.
- 2c.** AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request is for a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix D for an explanation of maintenance activities.
- 2d.** The department may not award a school construction grant to a district that does not have replacement cost property insurance. AS 14.03.150, AS 14.11.011(b)(2) and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.
- 2e.** An application must include documentation that the district has a certified PM program. (More text needed.)

3. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED:

NOTE: Gross square footage entries in this section should reflect the measurements specified by 4 AAC 31.020. Space variance requests not already approved by the department must be submitted in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020 by the application deadline in order to receive consideration with the current request.

- 3a.** All projects that are adding new space or replacing existing space must complete Table 3. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM. There are 80 possible points available for unhoused students depending on severity.
- 3b.** The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.
- 3c.** If this project (1) will result in renovated or additional educational space, and (2) will serve students of the same grade levels currently housed or projected to be housed in other schools, the project description should indicate:
- the attendance areas that will be impacted (i.e. will contribute students) by this project,
 - the current and projected student populations in each facility (school) affected by the project, and
 - the EED gross square footage for each affected facility (school) in the attendance area.

Note: for schools housing a combination of elementary and secondary grades, the space allocated to elementary (K-6) and secondary (7-12) may be necessary.

- 3c.** List all schools in the attendance area that serve grade levels equivalent to those of the

proposed project. If the project includes any elementary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving elementary students are to be listed. If the project includes any secondary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving secondary students are to be listed. For each school listed include its size, the grades served, and the school's total student capacity. Use the department's Capacity Worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. Please note that the Capacity Worksheet has been revised to reflect the regulatory changes to 4 AAC 31.020. The Capacity Worksheet is a MS Excel file and is available on the department's web site:

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

- 3d.** Any additional square footage that is funded for construction or approved by local voters for construction should be described, showing student capacity, additional GSF, and grade levels to be served. Include these projects in any capacity/unhoused calculations provided in the year of anticipated occupancy.
- 24.** Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 3. The department will compare the projections to historic growth trends for the attendance area. The department will revise population projections that exceed historical growth rates, show disparate growth between elementary and secondary populations, or are unlikely to be sustained as an attendance area's overall population grows. The application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (i.e. housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.

The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2012 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. *[Note: This information is used in calculating scores for Assessment 4; see Question 31.]*

- 3e.** The response to this question should be consistent with the space utilization table in question 25. Projects that will result in demolition or surplus of existing state-owned or state-leased facilities should include a detailed plan for transition from existing facilities to replacement facilities. If a facility is to be surplus or demolished, the project must provide for the abatement of all hazardous materials as part of the project. The transition plan should describe how surplus state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition.

This table summarizes space utilization in the proposed project expressed in gross square feet. Space figures represented should tabulate to match the gross building square footages reported in question 9 as well as those shown in Table 2 of the cost estimate section. The worksheet at Appendix F lists types of school space that fit in each category. There are up to 30 points possible for the type of space being constructed. <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolF>

[ac.cfm](#)

- ?? Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix E in the attachments to these instructions for detailed information. Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 that are not REAAs, are eligible to request a waiver of participating share. Contact the department for a district's most recent full-value per ADM calculation.

4. PROJECT INFORMATION:

- 4d.** *Acquisition of additional land* refers to expansion of an existing school site using property immediately adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the existing school site. Land acquisition may result from long-term lease, purchase, or donation of land. *Utilization of a new school site* refers to use of a site previously acquired by the district, or a new site acquired as a result of this application and not previously utilized as a public school. If the project site is not yet known, the site description should be the district's best estimate of specific site requirements for the project, and it should be included in the project description. The department's 2011 publication, *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook*, may be useful in responding to this question. A site selection study is required for those projects involving new sites in order to qualify for schematic design points (reference Appendix A)

5. PROJECT PLANNING:

There are five distinct items in this question. Each one has the potential to generate points.

A *facility condition survey* is a technical survey of facilities and buildings, using the department's Guide for School Facility Condition Survey or a similar format, for the purpose of determining compliance with established building codes and standards for safety, maintenance, repair, and operation. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural and engineered systems including site assessment will need to be completed by an architect and/or an engineer. Someone reasonably familiar with the building and its components may complete portions of the condition survey that document the condition of building elements. A facility condition survey is optional; however, a facility condition survey document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request. To receive points for this item, a facility condition survey needs to be less than four years old. The department does not consider submittal of a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan as a condition survey for fuel tank or fuel facility projects. There are up to 5 points possible for a complete condition survey.

A *facility appraisal* is an educational adequacy appraisal following the format of the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International "Guide for School Facility Appraisal". An appraisal is optional; however, an appraisal document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request. There are up to 5 points possible for a complete facility appraisal.

Planning work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix A of this document. There are up to 10 points possible for completed planning work.

Schematic design work includes the items listed under schematic design in Appendix A of this document. There are up to 10 points possible for completed schematic design work.

Design development work includes items listed under design development in Appendix A of this document. There are up to 10 points possible for completed design development work.

The application needs to identify the district's A/E consultant for the Condition Survey, Planning, Schematic Design and Design Development work. If there is no consultant, the district must provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required for the project.

COST ESTIMATES:

For all applications, including those for planning and design, cost estimates should be based on the district's most recent information and should address the project being requested. Refer to Appendix C for descriptions of elements of the total project cost. The cost estimate should be of sufficient detail that its reasonableness can be evaluated. If a project is projected to cost significantly more than would be predicted by the Department's Program Demand Cost Model (13th Edition), provide attachments justifying the higher cost. If there are special requirements, a detailed explanation and justification should be provided in the project description/scope of work.

Acceptable forms of cost estimates:

- 5-10 points: Professional opinion (architect, engineer) with no substantiation
- 5-15 points: Quote by company licensed to perform work proposed in project (for single scope projects only)
- 10-18 points: DEED cost model, depending on degree of specificity used
- 12-25 points: Professionally prepared estimate by qualified estimator, depending on level of project development.
- 25-30 points: Completed project with 100% complete project closeout documentation, no encumbrances on project, full accountability of all expenses and determination by the department that the costs are reasonable for that location and project. Completed projects with lesser documentation may score below 25 points.

In Table 1 all prior AS 14.11 funding for this project should be listed by category and totaled in Column I. If a grant has not been issued, but an appropriation has been made, use the appropriated amount plus participating share in lieu of the issued grant or bond amount. Column II should list the amount of funding being requested in this application, by category and in total. Column III should show a percentage breakdown for the total project allocated costs as a percentage of the total construction cost. Column IV should list the total project cost estimate from inception to completion, all phases. Calculate the percent of construction for all cost categories except Land, Site Investigation, and Seismic Hazard. To calculate the percent of construction divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to \$500,000; 3% for project costs between \$500,000 - \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects of \$5,000,000 or greater

[AS14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, please add a detailed justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 30% in additional percentage costs.

Seismic Hazard costs include the costs required to assess, design, and perform special construction inspections for a school facility. These costs include the costs for an assessment of seismic hazard at the site by a geologist or geotechnical engineer with experience in seismic hazard evaluation, an initial rapid visual screening of seismic risk, investigation of the facility by a structural engineer, design of mitigation measures by a structural engineer, third party review of seismic mitigation measures, and special inspections required during construction of the seismic mitigation components of the project. The costs associated with this budget item must be prepared by a licensed professional engineer with experience in seismic design. The district should refer to the department's website to review information on Peak Ground Acceleration information for various areas of the state. The website location for the information is as follows:

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

Table 2, which summarizes construction costs, is structured to be consistent with the EED cost model. Other estimating formats may not provide an exact correlation; however, the following categories **MUST** be reported to allow adequate comparisons between projects: basic building, site work and utilities, general requirements, contingency, and escalation. Do not blank out or write over this table. If the application includes a cost estimate from a designer or professional cost estimating firm, table two must still be filled out as described above.

Include an attachment with any additional information regarding project cost that may aid in evaluating the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Documents may include a life cycle cost analysis, cost benefit analysis, bid documents, actual cost estimates, final billing statement for completed projects, and any additional supporting documentation justifying projects costs.

Up to 30 points are possible for reasonableness and completeness of the cost estimate provided in support of the project.

- 5f. The date provided here should be the anticipated date the facility will be occupied. This will be the starting point for looking at five-year post-occupancy population projections. If a project schedule is available it should be provided to substantiate the projected date.
31. The attachments checklist is provided for your and the department's convenience to identify additional materials that are referenced in support of the project. Please check to see that your application is complete and indicate additional attachments the department should reference while evaluating the project.

6. FACTORS FOR RATING REQUIRED BY STATUTE OR REGULATION:

6a. Emergency conditions (Up to 50 points) In question 4a the project scope was described. Question 6a is to specifically identify and describe the type and extent of emergency conditions to be considered evaluated by the reviewers.

Supporting documentation of the conditions described is critical for the reviewer's use. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data. Helpful information: photos, component histories (date of installation, etc.), repair records, manufacturers data and field observations by qualified experts on the subject are valuable. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the claimed condition. Less helpful information: dramatic adjectives, photo details without context, and service claims without backup.

The reviewer does not consider all failing systems as critical emergencies. "Failure" of a system is viewed by reviewers as a component or an entire building becoming completely inoperative and requiring total replacement. If a component such as a roof is leaking but still structurally sound, that is not failure or impending failure. It might possibly be considered "potential emergency for a component system" and score in the 1-10 point range.

District efforts and strategy: the list below contains some items that will help reviewers understand the applicant's claim for emergency consideration:

1. A brief summary description of the emergency condition(s).
2. The specific threat this condition(s) pose to students and staff.
3. Does the emergency condition threaten people or areas beyond the site?
4. A history of the strategy the applicant has developed to deal with the condition, including steps that may have already been enacted.
5. Does all or part of the identified emergency qualify for insurance reimbursement or other public funding for emergencies?

The matrix below is used by reviewers as a guide for where to place projects relative to each other based on the described and verified condition:

Complete destruction/not suitable for occupancy

45-50 points: Completely destroyed educational structure to be replaced. (Note: other buildings such as administration, generators or storage score significantly lower than a building with instructional space. Un-utilized elements like decommissioned tanks, unused district buildings or site elements such as fences, walks or roadways score even lower as emergencies.)

6-40 points: Portion of an educational structure completely destroyed, and necessary to be replaced. Verification such as an insurance claim or public official documentation will be used by raters to determine the percentage of building destroyed, that percentage shall be multiplied by 50-60 points.

30-50 points: Building unsafe for occupancy: district has vacated the building. Project remediates and repairs back to occupiable condition. Example: sewer and water system failure that is not repairable. Factors considered: general condition of building aside from reason for vacation, component age and quality of care.

10-25 points: building unsafe for occupancy: district has been ordered by building officials (submit documentation) to vacate the building by a specific date.

System or Component failures:

Critical components: heating, power, sanitation, roof

35-50 points: critical component complete failure: full failure that requires complete component replacement rather than substantial repair. Example: sewer system has failed permanently and honey buckets are in permanent use.

20-35 points: failure is imminent, proven with documentation. Component has broken and has been repaired, but limited functionality and/or expected complete failure are imminent.

15-20 points: critical components: potential failure based on recent documented records.

Non-critical components: empty oil tanks, unoccupied bldgs., backup power systems, fire or sprinkler systems,

15-35 points: full, permanent failure

10-20 points: impending failure

1-10 points: potential failure

6b. Life safety conditions (Up to 50 pts) In question 4a the project scope was described. With information from question 15 reviewers will evaluate the threat to life safety inherent in the current facilities.

Supporting documentation of the conditions described is critical for the reviewer's use. The primary purpose of this documentation is present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data. Helpful information: citations from building officials, specific excerpts from the codes being violated with the violation being documented, hazardous conditions reports with the conclusions that address the specific scope of work, medical or other records verifying the conditions. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the claimed condition.

The matrix below is used by raters as a guide for where to place projects relative to each other based on the described and verified condition:

Life safety scoring based on level of threat

40-50 points: Aggressive: district has vacated building fully until threat is removed as a reasonably appropriate response based on national standards. Rater able to verify with necessary documentation.

30-40 points: Active: Airborne or non-lethal poison potential upon

contact with materials that are exposed to children.

15-30 points: Passive: Inert materials to remain in place (example: mastics beneath floors to remain, threshold mastic, sink underside coating in good condition). Point range reflects consideration of quantity of inert materials found.

5-15 points: Potential: non-emergency, currently functioning system (examples: undersized electrical system, code deficiencies unrelated to actual threat to life safety).

Building code related

40-50 points: Major code violation and penalty: violation requires vacation of facility until resolved.

30-40 points: Major code violation without penalty: facility allowed to function, but violation causes (degrees of) limitation for students' instructional programming. Explain limitation on student use caused by code violation.

15-30 points: Lesser code violation without penalty: facility allowed to function but violation causes (degrees of) limitation for students instructional programming. Explain limitation on student use caused by code violation.

5-15 points: Lesser code violation caused by recent codes superseding those in place at time of installation of non-complying component (examples: stair dimensions, air exchange requirements, conductor sizing, energy standards).

6c. Housing unhoused students

6d. Priority assigned by the district. The district ranking of each project application must be a unique number approved by the district school board and must place each discrete project in priority sequence. The project having the highest priority should receive a ranking of one, and each additional project application of lower priority should be assigned a unique number in priority order. The department will accept only one project with a district ranking of priority one. The ranking of each application should be consistent with the board-approved six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Please refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(2). Both major maintenance projects and school construction projects should be combined into a single six-year plan. There are up to 30 points available for a district's #1 priority. Points drop off at increments of 3 for each corresponding drop in district priority ranking.

The district should provide a listing of projects anticipated for the full six years of the district's six-year plan, not just the first year of the plan.

6e. Inadequacies of the space. Describe the inadequacies of the existing space. Inadequacies can vary from quality of space to amount of space to the configuration of the space. The response should also address how the inadequacies impact the educational program and whether the educational program is a mandatory, existing local or new local program. The maximum number of points available for this question is 40. There are up to 40 points possible for description of mandated educational programs, up to 20 points are available for existing local educational programs, and up to 15 points are available for new local programs.

- 6g.** Statutes require an evaluation of other facilities in the area that may serve as an alternative to accomplishing the project as submitted. Information regarding the availability of such facilities and the effort (i.e. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project. There are up to 5 points available for an adequate description showing that the district has considered alternatives to the proposed project for housing unhoused students.
- 6h.** This question requests information on the year the facility was constructed and size of each element of the facility to establish the weighted average age of facilities score. If a project's scope of work is limited to a portion of a building (i.e., the original or a specific addition), the age of *that building portion* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point calculation. If the project's scope of work expands to multiple portions of a building, the ages of *all building portions receiving work* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point calculation. *Year built* refers to the year the original facility and any additions were completed or were first occupied for educational purposes. If a date of construction is not available, use an estimate indicated by an (*). *Gross square footage (GSF)* of each addition should be the amount of space added to the original facility. *Total size* should equal the total square footage of the existing facility. There are up to 30 points possible depending on the age of the building. Facility number, name, year built, and size are available online at:
- 6i.** Other options. In an effort to support the project, as submitted, as the best possible solution to school facility needs, districts need to consider a full range of options during planning and project development. Options should address the specific scope of the project and the delivery of the project (phasing of the work, in-house labor, etc.). For example, projects that propose construction of a new school should discuss other options such as renovation of the existing building or acquisition of alternative facilities and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected. A project that proposes roof replacement should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or even altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected. If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts must consider service area boundary changes and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes. Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary. There are up to 25 points available for a comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.
- 6j.** Operational Cost vs. Project Cost: Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. The project cost and its impact on operational costs is an important consideration for any project. The project description should include a discussion of ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. Considerations could cover energy costs, costs related to wear-and-tear, maintenance of existing facilities costs, and costs incurred by current functional inadequacies at the

facility and attendance area level. For new facilities, consideration should be given to design choices that will provide periodic and long-term savings in the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Although the addition of square footage is certain to increase overall operational costs, project descriptions for this category of project should include information on methods and strategies used to minimize operational costs over the life of the building. This can include cost benefit analyses that were accomplished on building systems and materials, etc. There are up to 30 points possible for a full and complete description of the costs of the project including life-cycle costs and cost benefit analysis.

- 6k.** Prior state funding refers to **grant funds appropriated by the legislature to the department and administered under AS 14.11 as partial funding for this project only.** Any amounts noted here should also be included in Table 1 of the Cost Estimate, Question #18. No other fund sources apply, including debt retirement. There are up to 30 points available if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11, and the project was intentionally short funded by the legislature.

7. FACTORS FOR RATING AT THE DEPARTMENT'S DISCRETION:

7a. Preventative maintenance program effectiveness

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with this application a description of its preventive maintenance program, as defined by AS 14.11.011(b)(4), AS 14.14.090(10), and 4 AAC 31.013. Refer to Appendix D for details. The scoring criteria for this area now reflect efforts beyond just preventive maintenance. For each element of a qualifying plan outlined in 4 AAC 31.013, documents, including reports, narratives and schedules have been identified for nine separate assessments. These documents will establish the extent to which districts have moved beyond the minimum eligibility criteria and have tools in place for the active management of all aspects of their facility management. The documents necessary for each assessment are listed below. They are grouped according to the five areas of effort established in statute and are annotated as to the type of evaluation (i.e., evaluative or formula-driven). A district should provide any or all of the documents they have available. Refer to the Rater's Guide for additional information on scoring. There are up to 55 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

Energy Management

Assessment #5 – Energy Management Narrative (Evaluative) [up to 5 points available]: Provide a narrative description of the district's energy management program and energy reduction plan.

Address how the district is engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities. Energy *management* should address energy utilization with the goal of reducing consumption. This objective can be achieved through a number of methods: some related to the building's systems, some related to the way the facilities are being used. The results of the energy management program should also be discussed.

Maintenance Training

Assessment #7 – Maintenance Training Narrative (Evaluative) [up to 5 points available]: Provide a narrative description of the district’s training program including but not limited to: identification of training needs, training methods, and numbers of staff receiving building-system-specific training in the past 12 months. In addition to the narrative description, provide a copy of the district’s training log for the past year. The training log should include name of the person trained, the training received, and the date training was received.

Training may include on-the-job training of junior personnel by qualified technicians on staff. For systems or components that are scheduled for replacement, or have been replaced as part of a capital project, manufacturer or vendor training could be made available to the maintenance staff to attain these goals and objectives. In-service training as well as on-line training could be provided for the entire staff. Safety and equipment specific videos are also an inexpensive training resource.

Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)

Assessment #8 – Capital Planning Narrative (Evaluative) [up to 5 points available]: Provide a narrative giving evidence the district has a process for developing a long-range plan for capital renewal.

Discuss the district’s process for identifying capital renewal needs. Renewal and replacement schedules can form the basis for this work, but building user input should also be considered. It is important to move the capital planning process from general data on renewal schedules to actual assessments of conditions on site. This helps to validate the process and allows the district to create capital projects that reflect actual needs. A final step would be to review the systems needing replacement and to organize the work into logical projects (e.g., if a fire alarm and roof are confirmed to be in need of renewal, they may need to be placed in separate projects versus renewal of a fire alarm and lighting which could be effectively grouped in a single project).

7b. Fundamental project planning

7c. Quality of budget development (Cost Estimate)

The list below identifies parts of the application and the corresponding statute (AS) and/or regulation (4 AAC) that is the basis for the component's inclusion in the application. Components also may be referred to in other statutes and regulations.

Component in application	Per statute AS:	Per regulation 4 AAC:
Certification of application by school official	14.11.011(a)	
Type of funding distinguished	14.11.005 and 14.11.007	
Primary purpose of funding stated to determine eligibility	14.11.013(a)(1)(A-G)	
Six-year plan submitted to the department	14.11.011(b)(1)	31.022(c)(1)
Fixed asset inventory system in place	14.11.011(b)(1)	
Distinguish that this is not a maintenance project	14.11.011(b)(3)	
Property loss insurance in place	14.11.011(b)(2) 14.03.150	4 AAC 31.200
Preventative maintenance program in place	14.11.011(b)(4)	
DEED has the authority to reject or modify applications	14.11.013(c)(A-C)	
District requirement to provide sufficient space for students	14.11.013(b)	31.020(c)(2)
Guidelines used to calculate what is sufficient space	14.11.011	31.020(c)
Expectations regarding already completed projects seeking reimbursement of funds		31.023(c)(2) 31.080
Land purchase for school considered part of school construction	14.11.135(3)	
Project planning: information required for grant funding, but not for grant application	14.11.017	
Rating factor: emergency conditions	14.11.013(b)(1)	
Rating factor: life safety conditions	14.11.013(b)(1)	
Rating factor: housing unhoused students (additional space)		31.022(c)(2),(9)
Rating factor: priority of project given by the district	14.11.013(b)(2)	31.022(c)(1)
Rating factor: new local educational programs	14.11.013(b)(3)	31.022(c)(4)
Rating factor: condition of school facilities	14.11.013(b)(4)	31.022(c)(5)
Rating factor: condition of regional facilities	14.11.013(b)(4)	31.022(c)(5)
Rating factor: funds expended by district for maintenance	14.11.013(b)(5)	
Rating factor: other options to address the problem	14.11.013(b)(6)	31.022(c)(6)
Rating factor: operating cost savings over the long term		31.022(c)(3)
Rating factor: previous funding for project (intentionally phased)		31.022(c)(7)

From AS 14.11.013(a)(1) - The department shall verify that each proposed project meets the criteria established under AS 14.11.014(b) and qualifies as a project required to:^{1,2}

- A. “Avert imminent danger or correct life threatening situations.” This category is generally referred to as, “Health and Life Safety.” A project classified under “A” must be documented as having unsafe conditions that threaten the physical welfare of the occupants. Examples might be that seismic design of structure is inadequate; required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative; or the structure and materials are deteriorated or damaged seriously to the extent that they pose a health/life-safety risk. The district must document what actions it has taken to temporarily mitigate a life-threatening situation.
- B. “House students who would otherwise be unhoused.” This category is referred to as “Unhoused Students.” A project to be classified under “B” must have inadequate space to carry out the educational program required for the present and projected student population. Documentation should be based on the current Department of Education & Early Development Space Guidelines. (Refer to 4 AAC 31.020.) This category corresponds to Category A under AS 14.11.100(j), which is used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- C. “Protection of the structure of existing school facilities.” This category is intended to include projects that will protect the structure, enclosure, foundations and systems of a facility from deterioration and ensure continued use as an educational facility. Work on individual facility systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$25,000. The category is for major projects that are not a result of inadequate preventive, routine and/or custodial maintenance. An example could be a twenty year old roof that has been routinely patched and flood coated, but is presently cracking and leaking in numerous locations. A seven year old roof that has numerous leaks would normally only require preventive maintenance and would not qualify. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.
- D. “Correct building code deficiencies that require major repair or rehabilitation in order for the facility to continue to be used for the educational program.” This category, Building Code Deficiencies, was previously referred to as “Code Upgrade.” The key words are “major repair.” A “D” project corrects major building, fire, mechanical, electrical, environmental, disability (ADA) and other conditions required by codes. Work on individual facility systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$25,000. An example could be making all corridors one hour rated. Making one or two toilet stalls accessible would not fit this category. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability

¹ Projects can combine work in the different categories with the majority of work establishing the project’s type. For the purpose of review and evaluation, projects that include significant work elements from categories other than the project’s primary category will be evaluated as **mixed scope** projects [4 AAC 31.022(c)(8)].

² Projects will be considered for replacement-in-lieu-of-renewal when project costs exceed 75% of the current replacement cost of the existing facility, based on a twenty year life cycle cost analysis that includes disposition costs of the existing facility.

to be combined with other project types. This category corresponds to Category B under AS 14.11.100(j), which is used for review of debt reimbursement projects.

- E. “Achieve an operating cost saving.” This category is intended to improve the efficiency of a facility and, therefore, save money. Examples that might qualify are increasing insulation, improving doors and windows, and modifying boilers and heat exchange units for more energy efficiency. The project application must include an economic analysis comparing the project cost to the operating cost savings generated by the project. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types. This category corresponds to Category C under AS 14.11.100(j), which is used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- F. “Modify or rehabilitate facilities for purpose of improving the instructional unit.” Category “F”, Improve Instructional Program, was previously referred to as “Functional Upgrade.” This category is limited to changes or improvements within an existing facility, such as modifications for science programs, computer installation, conversion of space for special education classes, or increase of resource areas. It also covers improvements to outdoor education and site improvements to support the educational program. This category corresponds to Category D under AS 14.11.100(j), which is used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- G. “Meet an educational need not specified in (A)-(F) of this paragraph, identified by the department.” Any situation not covered by (A)-(F) and mandated by the Department of Education and Early Development. (Currently, there are no such mandates.)

Category A - Instructional or Resource

Kindergarten
Elementary
General Use Classrooms
Secondary
Library/Media Center
Special Education
Bi-Cultural/Bilingual
Art
Science
Music/Drama
Journalism
Computer Lab/Technology Resource
Business Education
Home Economics
Gifted/Talented
Wood Shop
General Shop
Small Machine Repair Shop
Darkroom
Gym

Category B - Support Teaching

Counseling/Testing
Teacher Workroom
Teacher Offices
Educational Resource Storage
Time-out Room
Parent Resource Room

Category C - General Support

Student Commons/Lunch Room
Auditorium
Pool
Weight Room
Multipurpose Room
Boys Locker Room
Girls Locker Room
Administration
Nurse
Conference Rooms
Community Schools/PTA Administration
Kitchen/Food Service
Student Store

Category D - Supplementary

Corridors/Vestibules/Entryways
Stairs/Elevators
Mechanical/Electrical
Passageways/Chaseways
Supply Storage & Receiving Areas
Restrooms/Toilets
Custodial
Other Special Remote Location Factors
Other Building Support

The application form emphasizes the value of planning materials that can be verified to substantiate the decisions made in developing design solutions. Below is a basic scope of effort for each phase. Items marked **R** are mandatory (where project type dictates) in order for projects to receive planning, schematic design, and/or design development points. Required documents must be or must have been submitted and received by the department by September 1st.

CONDITION SURVEY (10 points possible)

1. For substantially or completely whole building renovations or additions: a condition survey of the entire building and site items related to building condition - **R**
2. For component replacements or renovations: a condition survey of the components being affected, which includes other components upon which the project work depends. Examples: 1) a new roof project should confirm that the foundation and structural system of the building are in a condition that warrants expenditure for the roof work, 2) an HVAC controls change would evaluate the condition of the heat source, distribution, ventilation, and other portions of the “heating component” to establish the appropriateness of the decision to change out this portion of the system - **R**

PLANNING (10 points possible)

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (if needed) (4 AAC 31.065)
2. Identify need category of project - **R**
3. Verify student populations and trends - **R**
4. Complete education specifications (4 AAC 31.010) - **R** for new educational space
5. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **R** for acquisition of new land
6. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4 AAC 31.025) - **R** for acquisition of new land
7. Complete concept design studies and planning cost estimate - **R**
8. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - **R** for demo or surplus
9. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - **R**

SCHEMATIC DESIGN (5 points possible)

1. Site survey and preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical) - **R**
2. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **R** for new site
3. Complete schematic design documents including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations, and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - **R**
4. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **R**

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (5 points possible)

1. Complete suggested elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **R**
2. Complete design development documents - **R**
3. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction - **R**
4. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **R**

PHASE III - CONSTRUCTION

1. Complete final contract documents (4 AAC 31.040) - **R**
2. Advertising, bidding, and contract award (4 AAC 31.080) - **R**
3. Submit signed construction contract - **R**
4. Construct project
5. Procure furniture, fixtures, and equipment, if applicable
6. Substantial completion request and list of work to final completion
7. Final completion acceptance and move-in by owner/district - **R**
8. Post-occupancy survey
9. Obtain project audit/close out -

Construction Management (CM) by Consultant (private contractor) costs may include oversight of any phase of the project by a private contractor. Construction management includes management of the project's scope, schedule, quality, and budget during any phase of the planning, design and construction of the facility. The maximum for construction management by consultant is 4% of the total project cost as defined in statute [AS 14.11.020(c)].

Land is a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include actual purchase price plus title insurance, fees and closing costs. Land cost is limited to the lesser of the appraised value of the land or the actual purchase price of the land. Land costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Site Investigation is also a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include land survey, preliminary soil testing, environmental and cultural survey costs, but not site preparation. Site investigation costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Design Services should include full standard architectural and engineering (A/E) services as described in AIA Document B141-1997. Architectural and engineering fees can be budgeted based upon a percentage of construction costs. Because construction costs vary by region and size, so may the percentage fee to accomplish the same effort. Additional design services such as educational specifications, condition surveys, and post-occupancy evaluations may increase fees beyond the recommended percentages.

Recommended: 6-10% (Renovation might run 2% higher)

Construction includes all contract work as well as force account for facility construction, site preparation and utilities. This is the base cost upon which others are estimated and equals 100%.

Equipment/Technology includes all moveable furnishing, instructional devices or aids, and electronic and mechanical equipment with associated software and peripherals (consultant services necessary to make equipment operational may also be included). It does not include installed equipment or consumable supplies, with the exception of the initial purchase of library books. Items purchased should meet the district definition of a fixed asset and be accounted for in an inventory control system. The Equipment/Technology budget has two benchmarks for standard funding: percentage of construction costs and per-student costs as discussed in DEED's *Guideline for School Equipment Purchases*. If special technology plans call for higher levels of funding, itemized costs should be presented in the project budget separate from standard equipment.

Recommended: 0-10% of construction cost or between \$1700 - \$3050 per student depending on school size and type.

District Administrative Overhead includes an allocable share of district overhead costs, such as payroll, accounts payable, procurement services, and preparation of the six-year capital improvement plan and specific project applications. In-house construction management should be included as part of this line item. The total of in-house construction management costs and Construction Management by Consultant should not exceed 5% of the construction budget.

Recommended: 2-9%

Percent for Art includes the statutory allowance for art in public places. This may fund selection, design/fabrication, and installation of works of art. One percent of the construction budget is required except for rural projects, which require only one-half of one percent. For this category projects are rural if they are in communities under 3000 or are not on a year-round, publicly-maintained road system and have a construction cost differential greater than 120% of Anchorage, as determined in the Cost Model for Alaskan Schools. The department recommends budgeting for art.

Project Contingency is a safety factor to allow for unforeseen changes. Standard cost estimating by A/E or professional estimators use a built-in contingency in the construction cost of $\pm 10\%$. Because that figure is included in the construction cost, this item is a project contingency for project changes and unanticipated costs in other budget areas.

Recommended: 5% Fixed

Total Project Request is the total project cost, as a percent of the construction cost, and, except in extreme case, should average out close to the same for all projects when the variables of land cost and site investigation are omitted. This item is the best overall gauge of the efficiency of the project.

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

Component

A part of a system in the school facility.

Component Repair or Replacement

The unscheduled repair or replacement of faulty components, materials, or products caused by factors beyond the control of maintenance personnel.

Custodial Care

The day-to-day and periodic cleaning, painting, and replacement of disposable supplies to maintain the facility in safe, clean, and orderly condition.

Deferred Maintenance

Custodial care, routine maintenance, or preventive maintenance that is postponed for lack of funds, resources, or other reasons.

Major Maintenance

Facility renewal that requires major repair or rehabilitation to protect the structure and correct building code deficiencies, and shall exceed \$25,000 per project, per site. It must be demonstrated, using evidence acceptable to the department, that (1) the district has adhered to its regular preventive, routine, and/or custodial maintenance schedule for the identified project request, and (2) preventive maintenance is no longer cost effective.

Preventive Maintenance

The regularly scheduled activities that carry out the diagnostic and corrective actions necessary to prevent premature failure or maximize or extend the useful life of a facility and/or its components. It involves a planned and implemented program of inspection, servicing, testing, and replacement of systems and components that is cost effective on a life-cycle basis. Programs shall contain the elements defined in AS 14.11.011(b)(4) and 4 AAC 31.013 to be eligible for funding.

Renewal or Replacement

A scheduled and anticipated systematic upgrading or replacement of a facility system or component to establish its ability to function for a new life cycle.

System(s)

An assembly of components created to perform specific functions in a school facility, such as a roof system, mechanical system, or electrical system.

Current law - AS 14.11.008(d) - requires that a district provide a participating share for all school construction and major maintenance projects funded under AS 14.11. The department administers all funds for capital projects appropriated to it under the guidelines of AS 14.11 and 4 AAC 31. The following points should be considered by those districts requesting a waiver of the local participating share

1. A district has three years before and after the appropriation to fulfill the participating share requirement.

A review of the annual financial audits and school district budgets indicate that no district is in a financial condition which warrants a full waiver. Local dollars are available to fund all or a portion of the match during the six years. Districts continue to generate and budget for, local interest earnings, facility rental fees and other forms of discretionary revenue adequate to fund some or all of the required local match. If properly documented and not already funded by AS 14.11, prior expenditures for planning, design, and other eligible costs may be sufficient to meet the match requirement.

2. Both the administration and the Legislature have strong feelings that local communities should at least be partially engaged in the funding of projects.

In recognition of the inability of some communities to levy a tax or raise large amounts of cash from other sources, the legislation provides an opportunity for in-kind contributions, in-lieu of cash. All districts need to make a directed effort to provide the local match, utilize fund balances and other discretionary revenue, consider sources of in-kind contributions, document that effort and then request a full or partial waiver-as necessary.

3. All waiver requests require sufficient documentation.

Requests should be accompanied by strong, compelling evidence as to overall financial condition of the school district and in the case of a city/borough school district, the financial condition of the city/borough as well. The attachments should include, at a minimum, cash account reconciliations, balance sheets, cash investment maturity schedules, revenue projection, cash flow analysis and projected use of all fund balances and documentation in support of attempts to meet the local match. Historical expenditures do not provide sufficient evidence of future resource allocations. Consideration should be given to new and replacement equipment purchases, travel and other expenditures that support classroom activity, but may be delayed until the local match is funded. Each district has an opportunity to help itself and provide a safe, efficient school facility through shared responsibility.

4. Districts may request consideration of in-kind contributions of labor, materials or equipment.

Under regulation 4 AAC 31.023 (d) in-kind contributions are allowed. This also affords an opportunity for community participation through contributions to the art requirements for new buildings or other means. This option should be fully explored, as well as the documentation mentioned above, prior to requesting a waiver of all or part of the participating share.

This page is intentionally blank