

# Agenda

## Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

April 14, 2010  
9:00 am to 4:15 pm  
State Board Auxiliary Room  
801 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Juneau, Alaska

Chair: Eddy Jeans

Wednesday, April 14<sup>th</sup> **Agenda Topics**

8:45 – 9:00 AM	<b>Committee Preparation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arrival, Packet Review</li></ul>
9:00 – 9:15 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes</li><li>• New Business, Additions to the Agenda</li><li>• Public Comment</li></ul>
9:15 – 10:30 AM	<b>Staff Briefing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preventive Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)</li><li>• Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (HB 13/HB 373)</li><li>• State Board Actions</li><li>• Final CIP Lists;</li><li>• Cost Model Update</li></ul>
10:30 – 10:45 AM	<b>BREAK</b>
10:45 – 12:30 PM	<b>Legislative Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HB310/SB237, Extension of debt program</li><li>• HB180; Participating Share modification</li><li>• HB305, Omnibus Energy Bill</li><li>• HB393/SB235 Charter School Facilities Program</li></ul>
12:30 – 1:30 PM	<b>LUNCH</b>
1:30 – 3:00 PM	<b>Statute and Regulation Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regulation project in review</li></ul> <b>FY 2012 CIP Application Review and Approval</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FY 2012 Application</li><li>• FY 2012 Application Instructions</li><li>• FY 2012 CIP Eligibility and Scoring Criteria</li><li>• FY 2012 Rater's Guide</li></ul> <b>Publications Update</b>
3:00 – 3:15 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:15 – 3:30 PM	<b>Staff Goals and Objectives</b>
4:15 PM	<b>Adjourn</b>

**Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting**  
**July 17, 2009**  
**Department of Education and Early Development**  
**Talking Book Library**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>EED Staff</b>	<b>Other Attendees</b>
Eddy Jeans-- <b>Chair</b>	Sam Kito III	Don Carney (Mat-Su Borough School Dis.)
Bob Tucker (KIB)		Blair Alden (LKSD)
Mary Cary (ASD)		Rachel Molina (ASD)
Tom Richards (Public)		Harley Hightower
Mark Langberg (AMC)		
Senator Hoffman (Teleconference)		
Carl John (Teleconference)		
Dee Hubbard ( Not Present)		

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**, Chair, called the meeting to order and proceeded with Roll Call.

The committee reviewed the agenda and made no changes. Without objection, Eddy moved to adopt the Agenda.

**Public Comment**

**Mr. Don Carney**— Like it was said in the last meeting regulations are to implement statute not change statute. It seems we have gone that way in more than one area now. I understand it has been a gray area, but to put something in regulation that you are going determine that a district can't renew space doesn't really fit all the needs.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**--- Don, can I interrupt for a second? What Don is referring to is when you have a project to replace existing space. His issue is, as I understand it, and correct me if I am wrong is that the department is leaning towards, a school will have to qualify for that space based on needs or based on the student population.

**Mr. Sam Kito**--- For clarification Don, I think there may be some confusion as to what the regulation change is actually intended to do, and maybe that is something I need to clarify in my presentation, but it seems like you are confusing the replacement space issue with maintenance versus construction list issue. Basically what the regulation does is clarifies the intent of districts

required to be eligible for the amount of square footage they construct. A concern that we have had in rural and urban districts alike is that everyone that comes to the state with an application if they have a case of declining student population or student enrollment but have a building that is in need of repair or replacement. Do they spend the money to repair it? Or do they replace it with a smaller building because of the decline in student enrollment. It is the same regulation we use for replacing a building that was lost in a fire.

**Mr. Don Carney**--- Again, I think the emphasis is important about there being a public discussion of this and there are all kinds of circumstances and this seems to restrict ability to apply and get funding; that's my concern. Maybe you're right; maybe people don't really understand it and before it goes forward with a regulation change, people need opportunity to comment and clearly understand what the implications are- Not only with department, but out here with us. The other thing I'd like to discuss is application-what it does is circumvent statute- statute says have to present a display of need in school district. I cannot give a need in my school district in ten applications. Every year, you turn in an application. Even though it doesn't get funded, that's still a priority for next year. Plus next year's needs are there also. Each year you work on team project and get more points hopefully you can have enough to get funded. You are driving us to put all kinds of things in one application, but it won't score right. In effect, it does penalize a lot of districts. I encourage you to take another look at this, last year; we said we were going to try it for a year, now we are changing regulations, that's not trying it. Department is going forward with a decision that wasn't recommended. I think it's important as a committee and department to hear from the people with real data and not generalities present information to allow them to ask for some reconsideration.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**--- Any questions from committee members?

**Mr. Mark Langberg**- Don, do you think people not hearing about the meeting was a breakdown in communication on your school districts end or the fact that no notification was sent out by the committee?

**Mr. Don Carney** -- If it's just me, I'd say we screwed up over there with all the things going on, but I got notice from other people who got from a source other than the department this was going on. I'm assuming the department this didn't send out notice.

**Mr. Sam Kito** -- What happened this time, I was going to send out a notice, and Kim went on vacation. In getting ready for meeting, I didn't send to Superintendents like Kim has done in the past. I completely forgot about sending to Superintendents and Maintenance Directors.

**Mr. Don Carney** -- Whatever has occurred it has prevented a lot of folks from coming that would have liked to have been here to talk to this issue. I've explained that this has already been submitted to Commissioner so it sound like discussion time has already been.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans** – Well let me clarify that for you, first of all, this committee does not have regulatory authority. This committee makes recommendations to the State Board of Education and then the State Board of Education puts the proposed regulations out for public comment. There's an opportunity for people to comment, written, verbal, for the State Board of Education.

Then the State Board of Education is actually the one that is the regulatory authority for the Department of Education. So what comes out of this committee are actually recommendations. But there would be additional opportunity but I also understand Don's concern about it would be nice to have that discussion beforehand, but I think we had that discussion a number of times and unfortunately we are going to make recommendations to the State Board of Education that some people don't agree with. But that's their opportunity to influence the final adoption of regulations.

**Mr. Sam Kito** -- I've got some comments to make when we get to the regulations that I think may answer some of your questions on that.

**Mr. Don Carney**— It seems to me, I'd want an explanation as to why our recommendation or agreement to the last meeting was changed into regulation.

**Mr. Sam Kito** – I will address that.

**Mr. Don Carney** – In the debt reimbursement area, people have expressed concerns to me and I can understand this as 60-40 area; it seems that in order to give any debt reimbursement, we have to qualify under the rules and regulations. In the past, we've been able to qualify under anything that didn't qualify, we could choose the 60-40 funding route and go that direction; 2 or 3 people have told me that they interpret it as an infringement on that and may cause some issues down the line. I understand where Sam was going. I will need some clarification. I did want to know if there would be discussion on that since I don't know the implications of that. I clearly agree some changes need to be made, but I'm not sure I agree with how we are making the changes.

**Ms. Molina** (ASD) -- Don did a really good job. It would be good to hear today in front of everybody about debt reimbursement clarification and how that affects how districts choose to replace a failing school.

**Mr. Blair** (LKSD)--We were concerned about the proposal to put this in the regulations. We were somewhat concerned with the 25, if we have a school with 15, what that means.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**- What I'd like to do, if no objections, to go to proposed regulations, department's position, where we plan on going. We are going to move to review of regulations while Senator Hoffman is online.

**Mr. Sam Kito**- Page 4 of 39 regulation project update; page 26 of 39 which is the proposed regulation changes, and I'll walk through them.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**- I want committee to be aware we (Sam and I) are under the direction of the Commissioner of Education to go through all the regulations in the facility section and look for areas that need updated.

**Mr. Sam Kito**- When I first started with department, I spent a lot of time going through the statute and regulations to learn what they meant, keeping notes; Commissioner started a regulation review process; where we are at in the review process is collecting information. The

Commissioner hasn't seen any of the regulation proposals yet. This is the culmination of 2 ½ years of making suggestions, pulling things out of regulations, a work in progress; Overall, to address Don's and some of the others questions about timing of having some of these things in there that we discussed and agreed to do on a temporary basis; is regulation process can take 18 months or more, and once we get started and we're not even to that point where we start the clock on it. It's harder to add things in than it is to take things out. That's my concern with the 10 application; easier to remove that section than to add it in. I'm trying to stay in with the timing. In regulation process there is a significant amount of public comment.

First thing is just a typographical change- **4 AAC 31.014**-this is a clarification, there are competing codes now; removed name of competing codes and allowed agency responsible for codes to adopt codes.

**4 AAC 31. 020** guides for planning of education facilities- CEFPI has adopted a new facility planning guide; not new now, adopted in 2004, our statute still references an older document, so we're updating to the newer version of the planning document.

**Mr. Mark Langberg** - Going back to the building codes.....you have a pretty extensive list here. There is the international existing building code, among others. My point is that this list isn't all-inclusive.

**Mr. Sam Kito**- The reason I went with the generic code; the Department of Education actually adopts none of these codes. We respond to other agencies, Department of Public Safety, Department of Labor that actually do adopt the codes so we don't have a say in which ones are used and not used; we are just referencing that the building should be built with the latest state adopted code. And I concur there are a bunch of other codes out there but if we actually added those to this, the Department of Education would become responsible for determining whether or not those codes are adopted for school facilities and we'd have to do that regulation process every couple of years to make sure that we are using the correct code. And we haven't done that in the past. What we are doing is referencing other agencies that are responsible for state adopted codes and then we defer, in our design process, to the local jurisdiction when they adopt their own codes. We are saying as a standard, if other Departments adopt codes, we will follow also.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans**- So if you look at the draft regulations, you'll see at the top in bold **4 AAC 31-** that's Department of Education regulation. Now, in the first line, it says, building code, adopted under 13 AAC, means another department's code. Whatever they adopt for building will be the code we utilize at Department of Education.

**Mr. Sam Kito**- There may be an opportunity or time in the future when the State of Alaska, Department of Education are going to see that certain codes are enforced for schools and if that case, through this organization, public process, look at if the Department of Education should be responsible for adopting a code specific to schools.

**4 AAC 31.021** Application- this is for grant and debt projects- I added the district may apply for up to ten capital improvement grants under AS 14.11.011 by September 1<sup>st</sup> and again that's all

about the timing and if the committee is fully committed to not moving forward and just wanted to try the ten applications out one year, I can pull that out and that won't go forward to the Commissioner, but if this committee and public comment is overwhelming on how to implement the ten application and whether or not we have the ability to do that with statute, then that would come out at a later date. What I'd like to do is see it move forward; however, I'm not locked to it. We do need to be prepared for the upcoming regulation project.

**Mr. Tom Richards--** You mentioned earlier it was easier to take something out or drop it from regulation than to add it. There was a suggestion from the Senator (it may have been Don) that perhaps a sliding scale may be more appropriate if you have a proposed regulation change in place for the process, is it difficult to amend what the change is going to be?

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** I can answer that. As Sam said, it's easier to drop it or even amend it once it's on the table. But once you go and change it, to add something new, you have to go through the whole public process again because you've substantially change the intent of the regulation. To move from a limit of ten to a sliding scale isn't a substantial change. It's a modification. And we do that all the time through the public comment process. But you have to put the comment out on the table first as a starting point.

**Mr. Sam Kito-** Change can be brought about by a response to public comment and I think the BR&GR as an organization as a committee on this issue can actually provide a letter of public comment supporting a change if we do that.

**Ms. Mary Cary-**Can both the 10 application and sliding scale be put in the regulations?

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** The regulations attorney won't let us do that. The fact we are putting it on the table puts people know we are looking at some type of limitation. Either flat out pick a number or we could go to a sliding scale. Or we could completely remove it and leave it the way it is.

**Mr. Carl John-** Are we going to vote to approve this package as one whole item or are we going to break them up?

**Mr. Sam Kito-** My understanding is that this information is being provided as information. I don't know if the BR&GR has the ability to approve/disapprove regulations but these are opportunities to be involved in the development of what goes to the Commissioner.

**Mr. Carl John-** Don't we vote to make recommendations?

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** The committee makes recommendations to the application process not necessarily to all regulations. I understand this one could be construed as part of the application process, so, there's two ways we can go about this. We could go through the entire packet section by section or at the end of Sam's presentation, if anyone wants to make a motion to amend or adjust a particular regulation/recommendation, I'll have to make a call as to whether that applies to the application process and if it does, at that point we can vote. If it's a regulation that doesn't deal with the application process, I don't know that this, based on what I read in

statute, this committee is charged with making those recommendations to the State Board. Does that make sense? Does everybody understand?

**Mr. Tom Richards-** I did until the last sentence. I thought that's what we did was make recommendations.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** Correct, for the application process, not for all regulations pertaining to school facilities. If we went back to the code, that's something Sam and I are going to do through our normal process at the job; it's not something that needs to come before this committee. But we are sharing all of the issues with the committee so you will know what direction we are going. This committee is actually charged with the development and review of the application process. The other items: develop criteria for construction of the schools and the state criteria developed under this paragraph. This is where we were going when we tried to develop construction guidelines. We never quite got there. This committee is also charged at looking at and making recommendation for prototype schools. We've been down that road before. But it doesn't state that this committee is responsible for overall review of regulations pertaining to school construction in this state. So, I don't mean to walk a fine line, but there is a line that we have to draw somewhere. I think what I would like to do, if it's alright with the committee, go through all the regulations, if there is a particular issue that you have with a certain regulation, let's bring it up for discussion at the committee level. I'll have to make a determination whether it falls under this statute or not, for this committee's responsibility, and then we can take a group vote. Sound fair? Sam, go ahead and proceed and in the end we will see what people want to do with what regulation.

**Mr. Sam Kito-** 4 AAC 31.021 application for grant for capital improvement projects, item c, is the clarification that application submitted for new construction, for addition of space, or replacement of space must include verification and another section of regulation under that. For the benefit of the committee I'll read through it. {Missed some of this b/c tape ran out}  
New Tape

**Mr. Sam Kito-** The most recent application we received was a community pool application from Ketchikan. We reviewed that and approved that and I think it works out to school use at about 24% or something which is what the amount reimbursed is about 24% of the entire project which is about, I think, what we reimbursed for Juneau. The annual school construction reports are also included. Summary starting at page 20 of 39- Historic summary of the number of applications; the percentage of districts applying and the numbers of projects reused each year and then how much money was requested on the major maintenance list in the school construction list. You can see we had a high of application at about 206 from I think 31-32 school districts. The most school districts we've ever had were 83%, which is less than 40 school districts. Funding by year for grants and debt is in the table right below. You can see historically what the level of funding has been for the grant program and also the debt program. The debt program isn't actually the money that has gone out from the state that was what was authorized in each of those years. Then we also have another report that identifies projects by fiscal year. So you can see this is debt and grant. We went through regulations, then back to publications, and as before, we haven't really had time to do that much on the publications, with being short-staffed most of this past year. What I did do was rename one of the documents. As I read the "Facilities

Management Guide,” I thought it may be just a little more clear to call it “Preventative Maintenance and Facility Management” since that relates to our statutory requirement of having preventative maintenance program. Just a subtle change, but hopefully will make it easier as districts start looking at the document when we get it put together. It’s going to be geared toward what are the basic requirements that a district needs to meet in order to have a successful preventative maintenance program so it will be less of the philosophical discussion of the benefits of preventative maintenance but more of the practical of what districts can do to get certified in these areas and what the department is looking for. There will be some discussion of the benefits of an overall program. I think it will be more of a prescriptive guideline of sorts that a district can look at. One of the things that were asked in July meeting last year was in regards to the school equipment guideline. We had talked about what I’d told districts in the application they could use the first student amount and they could actually escalate it by 5% per year from 1998 and someone wanted me to check...the guide was actually updated in 2005, but the table wasn’t updated in 2005. I did a couple of test on that. Even escalating 5%, it doesn’t result in an excessive amount of money for students. It actually, if you compare with the percentages, it comes out well below the percentages if you just did 5%. I believe it will be adequate for district needs to use equipment for.

(Man’s voice)- Will the “Preventative Maintenance and Facility Management” document be available to the committee?

**Mr. Sam Kito-** Yes. I’ll get them out as soon as I can once I feel they are in a good draft form. The only other one I’ve heard comments about was the project delivery handbook which is listed as item number 11. That’s the alternative procurement. It’s down on the list, but I’ve had a few people say that would be good to have updated.

### **Staff Goal and Objectives**

**Mr. Sam Kito-** I’ve gone through to begin working on application scoring alternatives (I think I brought to this committee in December); what I think we are doing now is based on the changes we’ve have, kind of settling on to implement them before making any whole scale changes in the scoring. We are going to have a new scorer this year, so we want to make sure we have consistency between years for applications. Then we’ll continue to work on publications. The database project is actually starting to move forward. There are some possibilities of having some things up on the web take place before the database is completely updated, but the overall intent is twofold: 1) to consolidate the databases we have in facilities into a single database 2) to work on a web form, so districts can fill out applications online and it will go directly into our database. Short of that, we have a web project ongoing now, ahead of the database project, where we may be able to identify some kind of trial mechanism, where we can test receiving the application data and maybe the submittals as PDF. in electronic format and have districts submit a PDF or an original faxed or mailed signed signature page. I don’t know that we would require this but may make it as an alternative. I requested for the consultant to look at this for our section.

I’ve added at the last minute if you go back to your package page 31 of 39 you’ll see a listing; this is of our historical student population count. I think there were some questions from last meeting about student populations. I thought I’d go ahead and give you the information we

have. We update each year based on the student population count that's done each October. And then we use a ten year rolling historic average to do a straight-line projection on student population for the 5 years post occupancy plus the 2 years construction so basically 7 years post application. So, it will also give you an idea of some of the sizes of the attendance areas. So this is not school by school, this is total attendance areas that we have. If any of this information is interesting to you, you can always request of me to send you the latest we have. We also have student population collated. This information is collected from a report that our assessments division does; they actually have from student count, the population for the elementary and secondary school by school. I can send you that information too. I know Anchorage had a question about which numbers to use. The question for Eddy was about adding a second student count, and I think we would have to address our tools to maybe address another student count period and figure out how to incorporate that information into our space calculation tool.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** The legislature, or at least the House Education Committee, has been talking about adding a second count in the month of February and averaging the two counts for foundation funding purposes.

**Mr. Sam Kito-** So we'll have to keep an eye on that, because that may become a challenge. We would have to be making sure our tool was updated in time for CIP. It seems that there would be enough time for information from both counts to be collected and then averaged.

**Mr. Eddy Jeans-** Well, the way the averaging would work is it would be the prior Feb. and the current Oct.

**Mr. Sam Kito-** Okay. It sounds the timing will work out just fine for us. Then we are on to work topics. There was one I think I need to add. There is going to be an update on the ten applications. That will take place in December. We can also include the 25 student population and that can be in December. Another update on temporary facilitates in December. Is there anything else that anybody would like to add? OK. That's all I have. That covers the staff report we have tentatively scheduled meeting dates for Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup> which is Wed. right before CEFPI and then tentatively scheduled we do not have April scheduled. Do we want to look at a calendar and schedule April?

Discussion among committee members for dates for April- Next meeting, tentatively April 16<sup>th</sup>

**Mr. Sam Kito-** It's coming close to lunch. I've got a slideshow from some sites we visited and some of the pictures we received from districts. We can do that after lunchtime. One thing before we break, I did finally get a chance to update the website and I should be able to update it fairly efficiently now, so what I'm going to do is put the power point on the website. Last years is up now and as soon as we get back, I can put this year's up. The pictures will be available on the BR&GR website.

LUNCH

MEETING RESUMED WITH SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION.

MEETING ADJOURNED FOLLOWING THE PRESENTATION.

**By:** Sam Kito III, P.E.

**Date:** April 14, 2010

**Phone:** 465-6906

**File:** 2010-04-14 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**

#### ***Preventive Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)***

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report as of April 5, 2010 is attached. Since August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009, the department has visited the following districts:

Yupiit	Kashunamiut
Kodiak	Aleutians East
Unalaska	Yakutat
Cordova	Denali Borough
Nenana City	Tanana City
Kuspuk	Pribilof

Kake City site visit is planned in May 2010 and it will be the last this fiscal year.

The department did not certify the Iditarod School District for the FY2011 CIP application cycle, but staff continues to work with the district to assist them in gaining compliance with the department's PM requirements.

The department provisionally certified the Yukon Koyukuk School District for the FY2011 CIP application cycle, but the six-month data report turned in March of 2010 has fallen short of meeting with the department's PM requirements. Staff will continue to work with the district to assist them in gaining compliance with the department's PM requirements.

The department provisionally certified the Yukon Flats School District for the FY 2011 CIP application cycle, and the six month data report turned in March of 2010 has met with the department's PM requirements. A six month data report will be requested in September 2010.

Other districts that are currently not certified to submit CIP/Debt applications include Aleutians Region, Cordova, Denali Borough, Kashunamiut, Kuspuk, Tanana, and Unalaska. The department is working with these districts to assist them in gaining PM certification.

### ***Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (HB 13/HB373)***

Currently, the total bond amount requested under House Bill 13/373 is \$401,594,672. The total amount approved by the department is \$369,269,221. The total voter approved amount is \$296,625,131. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$269,703,221. There is \$99,566,000 that is EED approved, but not approved by voters. The Mike Smithers Pool Replacement project in Ketchikan was approved by voters, and the department has agreed to the monetary component of the hearing officer decision from the district's appeal, so the approved debt amount has been updated. The Gastineau Renovations project in Juneau was approved by voters, and certified election results were received so the department has issued debt approval for the project.

### ***State Board Actions***

The State Board of Education approved the final CIP lists at its March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting which took place in Juneau. The Board also considered and approved the Facilities regulation changes which are discussed later in this report.

### ***Final CIP Lists***

The Final CIP lists are included in the packet.

For FY2011, 39 of 53 school districts submitted a total of 175 applications for the first year of the districts' revised six-year plans, 140 of the applications were scored, and the districts requested that 35 application scores be re-used for the FY 2011 list. The department determined that 10 applications were ineligible, modified the category of 4 projects that resulted in a change of list, and adjusted the budgets of 46 projects under the provisions of AS 14.11.

The major maintenance list contains a total of 130 projects amounting to a total of over \$272 million, and the school construction list contains a total of 35 projects amounting to a total of over \$412 million.

### ***Cost Model Update***

The department has contracted with HMS Inc. to update the Cost Model tool to assist school districts in estimating construction and renovation costs. The Cost Model (12<sup>th</sup> Edition) is estimated to be completed before the department's annual CIP training session which will take place in Anchorage on May 18, 2010.

### ***Legislative Update***

There are several pieces of legislation that impact facilities before the Legislature this year. The Governor's Capital budget bills include approximately \$24 million for the major maintenance list, which funds the first eight projects. A listing and brief descriptions of the other legislation are provided below:

**HB310/SB237, Extension of debt program** – These bills initially proposed a simple extension of the bond debt reimbursement program from the current end date of November 30, 2010, to November 30, 2013. SB 237 has been amended as of the writing of this report to eliminate the debt program expiration, require a report to the legislature, and to establish a school construction funding mechanism for schools in Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAA's)

**HB180; Participating Share modification** – This legislation proposes to add a 20% level to the participating share table in statute. The participating share table is used by the department to determine the level of local contribution for grant projects. The current levels are based on a measure of the full, taxable value of property located within the boundaries of the school district as compared to the most recent Average Daily Membership (ADM) count of students in the school district. The current table includes participating share rates of 2% for REAA's, 5% for FV/ADM up to \$150,000, 10% for FV/ADM up to \$275,000, 30% for FV/ADM up to \$800,000, and 35% for FV/ADM greater than \$800,000. The legislation would add a 20% level for FV/ADM up to \$500,000. The most current participating share report is attached for reference.

**HB305/SB220; Omnibus Energy Bill** – These two pieces of legislation affect school facilities differently. In the most recent Committee Substitute, as of the writing of this report, HB305 authorizes the department to adopt standards for energy efficient construction in schools, and requires that the department review a report on projected energy costs for each project funded under the department's grant or debt program. SB 220 includes authorization for school districts to be able to participate in an AHFC loan program for improving energy efficiency in schools.

**HB393/SB235; Charter School Facilities Program** – These two pieces of legislation add a new facilities grant program for charter school facilities. The funding for this program is a token amount that is contingent upon the department getting funding from the federal government under a charter school facilities funding assistance program. The federal program is not currently funded, and it is not clear if, when, or for how much the program will be funded. The federal program is also a competitive program, and the state is not currently in a position to compete well against other states should funding become available.

### ***Regulation Project Update***

As mentioned above, on March 25<sup>th</sup>, the Board of Education considered the facilities regulations following public comment. Public comment resulted in a few significant, but not substantive changes to the regulations. The revised regulation package is attached for the committee. The Board adopted the regulations.

### ***FY2012 Application Changes***

The department has made the following changes to the CIP application for the FY2012 application cycle.

04/14/10

Application Question 2a. Added a note to clarify that the department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project, and included a footnote identifying the department's statutory authority to make a change to a project category.

Application Question 9. Provided an internet link to the state's online database for school facility information.

Application Question 11. Provided a clarifying note that only districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 are eligible to apply for a waiver of participating share, and that REAA's are not eligible to request a waiver of participating share.

Application Question 14. Provided space for districts to answer the Emergency question with Question 14 as opposed to under the project description.

Application Question 17. Added a note that requests that districts provide an estimated project timeline.

Application Question 18. Updated the note for Land and Site Investigation costs that reinforces the requirement that costs associated with these items need to be supported in the project description and attachments. Added a new budget line to accommodate anticipated or realized seismic hazard mitigation costs, and provided supporting notes. The District Administrative Overhead note was updated to include a mention of in-house construction management costs. Updated the equipment note to clarify that escalation can be included for estimated equipment costs in an amount of 5% from the base year of 2005, the year when the equipment guidelines were last updated.

Application Question 28. This question was rewritten to provide clarification on the types of options that the department would like to see considered in development of the requested project.

Instructions Question 2a. Updated the description to include a comment and included the same footnote reference corresponding to the change identified in Application Question 2a.

Instructions Question 4. Corrected a typographical error and clarified that districts need to have a department approved fixed asset inventory system, or have no audit findings in order to be eligible to submit grant applications.

Instructions Question 11. Added the same clarification as in Application Question 11 regarding eligibility to request a waiver of participating share.

Instructions Question 12. Added a note clarifying that the district should provide project listing for all years of the submitted six-year plan, and not just a listing of projects for the first year of the six-year plan.

Instructions Question 14. Removed reference to answering this question under Question 17, as space is now provided under Question 14 to provide a narrative answer.

Instructions Question 16. Clarification on the responsibility to provide information in the application regarding the A/E consultant for the work associated with the project.

Instructions Question 17. Removed references to answering Question 14 under Question 17. Added a note corresponding to the note added in the application that requests the districts provide a project timeline for the project.

Instructions Question 17. Under the description for Question 16, corrected grammar.

Instructions Question 18. Updated the description to include a narrative supporting the seismic hazard mitigation component of the budget that was added in Table 1. The description identifies the type of work, and the responsibility for estimating the costs.

Instructions Question 18. Under the discussion for Table 2, clarified that districts need to fill out this table even if they do not use the department's cost model and have had an estimator prepare an estimate for the project.

Instructions Question 23. Added a clarification that projects proposing the replacement of existing space as well as addition of new space, need to complete Table 3, and provide information about student population.

Instructions Question 28. Made some small wording changes, and added a statement that, for districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, districts must provide a discussion of boundary changes as one of the options considered.

Instructions Question 30. Under Assessments #2, and 3, clarified grammar to help districts understand what information is being requested. Under Assessment #4, clarified language to make it clear that this question does not require a response from the district.

Instructions Appendix C. Under District Administrative Overhead, added a note clarifying that the total costs for Construction Management by Consultant, and In-House Construction Management should not exceed 5%.

Raters Guide Added a clarifying note that only projects with a primary purpose of either Protection of Structure, or Code Compliance, and including renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components will be considered as Major Maintenance projects.

### ***Publications Update***

Following is a list of publications currently managed by the department along with the estimated revision priority, and the year of publication or latest draft.

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

### ***Staff Goals and Objectives***

Application Scoring – Staff will continue a review of the application scoring process and report back to the committee as potential improvements are identified.

Publications – Staff will continue to review and update department publications as time permits.

Database review – The Facilities Section currently operates with six separate, but interlinked databases that were developed over a long period of time. The goal of staff is to continue to work with the Information Technology staff in the department in the effort to incorporate all of the databases into one secure, integrated database structure.

Online application submittal – Staff will continue to track the possibility of developing an online CIP Application. Data entry online for the CIP process has the potential to save district's time in application preparation, and costs associated with application submittal. Online application submittal will also save a significant amount of staff time during CIP review time and will allow staff to spend more time reviewing the substance of applications more thoroughly.

### ***Staff Goals and Objectives***

The department recently advertised and is recruiting for a School Finance Specialist I. This position replaces the former Stat/Tech II position, and will assist department staff with a variety of tasks including support during the annual CIP scoring process.



# PM State-of-the-State

## Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS Of 04/05/2010

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	5/10/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
<b>Aleutian Region</b>	<b>8/31/2005</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>NP</b>	<b>2 of 5</b>	<b>School Dude</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Aleutians East	10/8/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Anchorage	7/17/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
<b>Annette Island</b>	<b>2/27/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>School Dude</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
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	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	QQuest	Yes	No
Chatham	7/11/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chugach	1/16/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Copper River	5/7/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Cordova	11/16/2009	2015	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	4 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
Craig City	6/25/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Delta/Greely	5/9/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Denali Borough	12/7/2009	2015	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	0 of 5	Quick Time	No	Yes
<b>Dillingham City</b>	<b>4/10/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Fairbanks	7/15/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	JW Edward	Yes	No
Galena	7/19/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
<b>Haines</b>	<b>4/3/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Hoonah City	6/15/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Hydaburg City	6/26/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Iditarod Area	4/14/2009	2014	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	I	3 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
<b>Juneau</b>	<b>1/10/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Kake City</b>	<b>11/9/2005</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Kashunamiut	8/27/2009	2015	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	0 of 5	Maximo*	No	Yes
Kenai Peninsula	1/14/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
<b>Ketchikan</b>	<b>1/25/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>School Dude</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Klawock City	7/27/2007	2013		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	N	N	N	N	N	I	0 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
Lake & Peninsula	2/25/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	QQuest	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	12/10/2006	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	5 of 5	C	Yes	No
Nenana City	12/14/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Nome City	1/28/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No



# PM State-of-the-State

## Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS Of 04/05/2010

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	7/17/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
<b>Northwest Arctic</b>	<b>3/26/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Pelican City	5/22/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude**	Yes	No
<b>Petersburg City</b>	<b>1/23/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<b>I</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>School Dude</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Pribilof Island</b>	<b>8/27/2005</b>	<b>2010</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Sitka City Borough	2/26/2007	2012		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	6/28/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
<b>Southwest Region</b>	<b>4/11/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<b>I</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
St Mary's	3/13/2009	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Tanana City	12/9/2009	2015	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	S	4 of 5	Maximo*	No	Yes
Unalaska City	10/12/2009	2015	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	D	3 of 5	D	No	Yes
Valdez City	12/17/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Micro-Main	Yes	No
<b>Wrangell City</b>	<b>1/24/2006</b>	<b>2011</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<b>S</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>	<b>Maximo*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Yakutat City	11/9/2010	2015		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	Yes
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	N	N	Y	N	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	No	Yes
Yupiit	8/24/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No

**In Compliance** 14 46 47 50 47 48 45 44

**Legend**

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

**State of Alaska**  
**Department of Education and Early Development**  
**Capital Improvement Projects**  
**HB13/HB373 Debt Reimbursement Program - Effective 10/1/2006 - 11/30/2010**

<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>
<b>Anchorage</b>										
		Bartlett High School Synthetic Field Surface Installation	1/26/2009	\$2,380,000	\$0	\$2,380,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		2009 projects did not pass voter approval on 4/7/09
		Bleacher Replacement, 2 Schools	1/26/2009	\$725,000	\$0	\$725,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Eagle River High School, Connect to Public Water/Sewer Service	1/26/2009	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$2,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Electrical Projects, 9 Sites	1/26/2009	\$3,520,000	\$0	\$3,520,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Girdwood School Upgrade and Addition Design	1/26/2009	\$680,000	\$0	\$680,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Mechanical Upgrades, 2 Schools	1/26/2009	\$3,320,000	\$0	\$3,320,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Parking and Site Circulation Upgrades, 2 Schools	1/26/2009	\$6,550,000	\$0	\$6,550,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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>
		Roof Replacement, 2 Schools	1/26/2009	\$2,155,000	\$0	\$2,155,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Security System Upgrades, 5 Schools	1/26/2009	\$1,165,000	\$0	\$1,165,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Service High School Addition and Renewal	1/26/2009	\$66,700,000	\$0	66,700,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Aquarian Charter School Sprinkler System	1/26/2009	\$1,165,000	\$0	\$1,165,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
DR-07-110		Clark Middle School Replacement	2/6/2007	\$65,000,000	\$65,000,000	65,000,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2007 Anchorage projects voter approved April 3, 2007
DR-07-111		Districtwide Code/Hazardous Materials/ADA Projects	2/6/2007	\$1,265,000	\$1,265,000	\$1,265,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DR-07-112		Districtwide Roof Replacement and Repairs	2/6/2007	\$1,950,000	\$1,950,000	\$1,950,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DR-07-113		Districtwide Security System Upgrades	2/6/2007	\$890,000	\$890,000	\$890,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DR-07-114		Emergency Communication Systems-2 High Schools	2/6/2007	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$650,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DR-07-115		Districtwide Building Renewal Projects	2/6/2007	\$4,110,000	\$4,110,000	\$4,110,000	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-07-116	Districtwide Electrical Projects	2/6/2007	\$2,190,000	\$2,190,000	\$2,190,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-07-117	Districtwide Mechanical Projects	2/6/2007	\$5,845,000	\$5,845,000	\$5,845,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-07-118	Traffic Safety Upgrades, 3 Elementary Schools	2/6/2007	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-103	Chester Valley Addition and Renewal	1/17/2008	\$16,500,000	\$16,500,000	16,500,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2008 Anchorage projects voter approved April 1, 2008
	DR-08-104	Sand Lake Addition and Renewal	1/17/2008	\$17,500,000	\$17,500,000	17,500,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-105	Girdwood K-8 School Design	1/17/2008	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-106	Code Hazmat, 2 Schools	1/17/2008	\$465,000	\$465,000	\$465,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-107	Roof Replacement, 2 Schools	1/17/2008	\$950,000	\$950,000	\$950,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-108	Traffic Safety Upgrades, 2 Schools	1/17/2008	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-109	Electrical Upgrades, 8 Schools	1/17/2008	\$1,475,000	\$1,475,000	\$1,475,000	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-08-110	Mechanical Upgrades, 5 Schools	1/17/2008	\$1,950,000	\$1,950,000	\$1,950,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-08-111	Building Renewal, 7 Schools	1/17/2008	\$1,240,000	\$1,240,000	\$1,240,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-08-112	Track Improvements, 3 Schools	1/17/2008	\$2,250,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,250,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-08-113	Emergency Communications Systems, 3 Schools	1/17/2008	\$480,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Anchorage Totals:</b>				<b>\$219,570,000</b>	<b>\$128,710,000</b>	<b>\$219,570,000</b>				
<b>Cordova</b>										
	DR-09-101	Mt. Eccles Elementary School Renovation	9/9/2008	\$10,699,415	\$10,670,111	10,699,415	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-09-102	Mt. Eccles Elementary School Addition	9/9/2008	\$5,944,889	\$5,944,889	\$5,944,889	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Cordova Totals:</b>				<b>\$16,644,304</b>	<b>\$16,615,000</b>	<b>\$16,644,304</b>				
<b>Dillingham City</b>										
	DR-08-101	Dillingham Elementary/Middle/High School Addition/Upgrade	8/28/2007	\$1,257,551	\$1,257,551	\$1,257,551	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-08-101	Dillingham Elementary/Middle/High School Upgrade	8/28/2007	\$14,433,697	\$13,843,697	13,843,697	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One project agreement
<b>Dillingham City Totals:</b>				<b>\$15,691,248</b>	<b>\$15,101,248</b>	<b>\$15,101,248</b>				
<b>Fairbanks</b>										
	DR-07-104	Barnette Elementary Renovation, Phase 2	11/17/2006	\$6,591,000	\$6,591,000	\$6,591,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-07-105	Ryan Middle School Renovation, Phase 1	11/17/2006	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Fairbanks Totals:</b>				<b>\$8,391,000</b>	<b>\$8,391,000</b>	<b>\$8,391,000</b>				
<b>Juneau City Borough</b>										
	DR-03-125	New Juneau High School, Amendment #2	3/30/2007	\$17,100,000	\$17,100,000	17,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amendment #2
	DR-06-111	Glacier Valley Elementary Renovation	9/14/2007	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amends DR-06-111 (DR-00-009)
	DR-08-100	Harborview Elementary Renovation	9/14/2007	\$15,300,000	\$15,300,000	15,300,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-102	Thunder Mountain High School Pool	6/26/2007	\$19,800,000	\$19,800,000	\$8,650,853	60% <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-09-103	Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School Covered Play Area	7/24/2008	\$1,680,000	\$1,680,000	\$1,680,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-10-101	Gastineau Elementary School Renovation	11/24/2009	\$11,800,000	\$11,800,000	11,800,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Juneau City Borough Totals:</b>				<b>\$72,780,000</b>	<b>\$72,780,000</b>	<b>\$61,630,853</b>				
<b>Ketchikan</b>										
		Schoenbar Middle School Repair/Remediation	8/18/2006	\$8,706,000	\$0	\$8,706,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not receive voter approval.
	DR-10-100	Mike Smithers Pool Replacement	5/29/2009	\$23,500,000	\$23,500,000	\$7,050,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Ketchikan Totals:</b>				<b>\$32,206,000</b>	<b>\$23,500,000</b>	<b>\$15,756,000</b>				
<b>Kodiak Island</b>										
	DR-05-110	New Kodiak MS/HS Pool	1/22/2007	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amends previous amount for a total project of \$14,210,000
<b>Kodiak Island Totals:</b>				<b>\$8,000,000</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>				
<b>Mat-Su Borough</b>										

<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-08-115	Districtwide Safety & Security Upgrade	6/10/2008	\$19,520,957	\$14,236,720	14,236,720	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-116	Cottonwood Creek Site Circulation & Parking/Safety Improvements	6/10/2008	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-116	Wasilla HS Fire Hydrant Installation	6/10/2008	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-116	Wasilla HS Site Circulation & Parking/Safety Improvements	6/10/2008	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-117	Palmer HS Original Building Roof Replacement	6/10/2008	\$1,791,163	\$1,791,163	\$1,791,163	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Mat-Su Borough Totals:</b>				<b>\$24,312,120</b>	<b>\$19,027,883</b>	<b>\$19,027,883</b>				
<b>Unalaska City</b>										
	DR-08-114	Unalaska Jr./Sr. High School Roof Replacement	8/24/2007	\$2,400,000	\$2,900,000	\$3,198,515	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-114	Unalaska Jr./Sr. High School Carpet/Flooring Replacement	8/24/2007	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$766,704	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-08-114	Unalaska Jr./Sr. High School Kitchen/Energy/Technology Upgrades	8/24/2007	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,182,714	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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Unalaska City				\$4,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$5,147,933				
<b>Totals:</b>										
<b>Grand Totals:</b>				\$401,594,672	\$296,625,131	\$369,269,221				
<b>Total of Projects Both Voter and EED Approved:</b>				\$269,703,221						
<i>(This is a total of the EED Approved Amount.)</i>										

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
 School Construction Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Lower Yukon	Alakanuk K-12 School Replacement	\$47,394,170	\$47,394,170	\$0	\$47,394,170	\$947,883	\$46,446,287	\$46,446,287
2	2	2	Lower Kuskokwim	Kipnuk K-12 School Renovation / Addition	\$56,344,082	\$50,841,480	\$0	\$50,841,480	\$1,016,830	\$49,824,650	\$96,270,937
3	3	3	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwigillingok K-12 School Renovation / Addition	\$39,128,740	\$32,750,467	\$0	\$32,750,467	\$655,009	\$32,095,458	\$128,366,395
4	4	4	Lower Kuskokwim	Napaskiak K-12 School Replacement	\$40,921,255	\$33,586,431	\$0	\$33,586,431	\$671,729	\$32,914,702	\$161,281,097
5	5	5	Lower Yukon	Emmonak K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$28,898,799	\$40,075,445	\$0	\$40,075,445	\$801,509	\$39,273,936	\$200,555,033
6	6	6	Lower Kuskokwim	Kuinerramiut Elitnaurviat K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Quinhagak	\$31,160,414	\$31,160,414	\$0	\$31,160,414	\$623,208	\$30,537,206	\$231,092,239
7	7	7	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Renovation/Addition	\$15,414,491	\$15,414,491	\$0	\$15,414,491	\$4,624,347	\$10,790,144	\$241,882,383
8	8	8	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwethluk K-12 School Replacement	\$60,489,918	\$45,445,163	\$0	\$45,445,163	\$908,903	\$44,536,260	\$286,418,643
9	9	9	Southwest Region	Koliganek K-12 School Replacement	\$26,311,134	\$23,187,062	\$0	\$23,187,062	\$463,741	\$22,723,321	\$309,141,964
10	10	10	Lower Kuskokwim	Nightmute K-12 School Renovation / Addition	\$33,913,215	\$23,770,075	\$0	\$23,770,075	\$475,401	\$23,294,674	\$332,436,638
11	11	11	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	\$12,363,060	\$12,363,060	\$0	\$12,363,060	\$247,261	\$12,115,799	\$344,552,437
12	12	12	Northwest Arctic	Districtwide Clock Upgrade	\$178,760	\$178,760	\$0	\$178,760	\$53,628	\$125,132	\$344,677,569
13	13	13	Craig City	Craig Schools Alternative Wood Heat Project, Recovery Of Funds	\$179,080	\$179,080	\$0	\$179,080	\$8,954	\$170,126	\$344,847,695
14	14	14	Lake & Peninsula	Port Alsworth Classroom Addition	\$6,752,414	\$6,838,249	\$0	\$6,838,249	\$683,825	\$6,154,424	\$351,002,119
15	15	15	Galena	Galena Regional Learning Center Iditarod Classroom Conversion	\$14,340,516	\$13,916,787	\$0	\$13,916,787	\$695,839	\$13,220,948	\$364,223,067
16	16	16	Kuspuk	Johnie John Sr. K-12 Replacement School, Crooked Creek	\$13,314,890	\$13,314,890	\$0	\$13,314,890	\$266,298	\$13,048,592	\$377,271,659
17	17	17	Northwest Arctic	Buckland Heating System Improvements	\$220,200	\$220,200	\$0	\$220,200	\$66,060	\$154,140	\$377,425,799
18	18	18	Anchorage	Mears Middle School & Huffman Elementary Paving and Site Circulation	\$7,505,000	\$7,505,000	\$0	\$7,505,000	\$2,251,500	\$5,253,500	\$382,679,299
19	19	19	Saint Marys	Playground Equipment Replacement	\$291,107	\$291,107	\$0	\$291,107	\$14,555	\$276,552	\$382,955,851
20	20	20	Mat-Su Borough	Iditarod Elementary School Interior Renovation	\$8,128,531	\$8,128,531	\$0	\$8,128,531	\$2,438,559	\$5,689,972	\$388,645,823
21	21	21	Southeast Island	Kassan K-12 Covered Physical Education Area	\$474,004	\$474,004	\$0	\$474,004	\$9,480	\$464,524	\$389,110,347
22	22	22	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Asphalt Repairs	\$1,561,600	\$1,561,600	\$0	\$1,561,600	\$546,560	\$1,015,040	\$390,125,387

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
 School Construction Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
23	23	23	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track and Field Construction	\$4,584,988	\$4,584,988	\$0	\$4,584,988	\$91,700	\$4,493,288	\$394,618,675
24	24	24	Valdez City	Districtwide Technology Upgrades	\$3,072,367	\$2,386,635	\$0	\$2,386,635	\$835,322	\$1,551,313	\$396,169,988
25	25	25	Mat-Su Borough	Mat-Su Day School New Construction	\$10,798,001	\$10,798,001	\$0	\$10,798,001	\$3,239,400	\$7,558,601	\$403,728,589
26	26	26	Juneau City Borough	Floyd Dryden Middle School Covered Play Area & Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School Trail Addition	\$1,960,000	\$1,960,000	\$0	\$1,960,000	\$686,000	\$1,274,000	\$405,002,589
27	27	27	Petersburg City	Districtwide Boiler Upgrades	\$2,180,335	\$2,180,335	\$0	\$2,180,335	\$654,100	\$1,526,235	\$406,528,824
28	28	28	Mat-Su Borough	Talkeetna Elementary School Playground Equipment Replacement	\$121,121	\$78,584	\$0	\$78,584	\$23,575	\$55,009	\$406,583,833
29	29	29	Mat-Su Borough	Meadow Lakes Elementary School Playground Equipment Replacement	\$121,121	\$78,584	\$0	\$78,584	\$23,575	\$55,009	\$406,638,842
30	30	30	Mat-Su Borough	Colony High School Chalk Boards Replacement	\$149,601	\$141,564	\$0	\$141,564	\$42,469	\$99,095	\$406,737,937
31	31	31	Juneau City Borough	Juneau School District Site / Safety / Security Improvements	\$1,700,000	\$1,700,000	\$0	\$1,700,000	\$595,000	\$1,105,000	\$407,842,937
32	32	32	Mat-Su Borough	Track And Field Renovation, 3 Schools	\$2,766,635	\$2,766,635	\$0	\$2,766,635	\$829,990	\$1,936,645	\$409,779,582
33	33	33	Petersburg City	Districtwide Covered Sidewalks	\$1,157,466	\$972,618	\$0	\$972,618	\$291,785	\$680,833	\$410,460,415
34	34	34	Juneau City Borough	Districtwide Food Service Upgrades	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000	\$0	\$1,450,000	\$507,500	\$942,500	\$411,402,915
35	35	35	Lower Yukon	Pilot Station K-12 School Access Road Remediation	\$614,537	\$614,537	\$0	\$614,537	\$12,291	\$602,246	\$412,005,161
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$475,961,552</b>	<b>\$438,308,947</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$438,308,947</b>	<b>\$26,303,786</b>	<b>\$412,005,161</b>	

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Nome City	Nome Beltz Junior/ Senior High School Fire Alarm System Replacement	\$120,482	\$120,482	\$0	\$120,482	\$36,145	\$84,337	\$84,337
2	2	2	Nome City	Nome-Beltz Junior/ Senior High School Emergency Generator Automatic Switching Replacement	\$42,582	\$42,582	\$0	\$42,582	\$12,775	\$29,807	\$114,144
3	3	3	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Renovation Alternates	\$1,227,463	\$1,227,463	\$0	\$1,227,463	\$24,549	\$1,202,914	\$1,317,058
4	4	4	Chugach	Whittier K-12 School Sprinkler Installation & Interior Renovations	\$1,922,797	\$1,798,511	\$0	\$1,798,511	\$35,970	\$1,762,541	\$3,079,599
5	5	5	Saint Marys	Yup'ik Vocational Education Building Water Service And Boiler Replacement	\$130,212	\$130,212	\$0	\$130,212	\$6,511	\$123,701	\$3,203,300
6	6	6	Saint Marys	Yup'ik Vocational Education Building Roof Replacement	\$84,978	\$84,978	\$0	\$84,978	\$4,249	\$80,729	\$3,284,029
7	7	7	Anchorage	Service High School Renovation	\$32,850,000	\$30,437,330	\$0	\$30,437,330	\$9,131,199	\$21,306,131	\$24,590,160
8	8	8	Haines	Mosquito Lake Elementary Mechanical Upgrades	\$277,678	\$277,678	\$0	\$277,678	\$97,187	\$180,491	\$24,770,651
9	9	9	Yukon Flats	Arctic Village K-12 School Soil Remediation	\$4,545,717	\$4,545,717	\$0	\$4,545,717	\$90,914	\$4,454,803	\$29,225,454
10	10	10	Yakutat City	Yakutat Elementary Kitchen Renovation Completion	\$73,401	\$381,699	\$308,298	\$73,401	\$22,020	\$51,381	\$29,276,835
11	11	11	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K. Demoski K-12 School Renovation, Nulato	\$12,264,315	\$12,264,315	\$0	\$12,264,315	\$245,286	\$12,019,029	\$41,295,864
12	12	12	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Mechanical And Electrical Upgrades	\$2,383,090	\$3,483,942	\$1,100,852	\$2,383,090	\$47,662	\$2,335,428	\$43,631,292
13	13	13	Annette Island	Metlakatla Elementary School Underground Fuel Tank Replacement	\$362,062	\$362,062	\$0	\$362,062	\$7,241	\$354,821	\$43,986,113
14	14	14	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$1,411,109	\$1,403,762	\$0	\$1,403,762	\$70,188	\$1,333,574	\$45,319,687
15	15	15	Aleutians East	Akutan K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$96,698	\$96,698	\$0	\$96,698	\$29,009	\$67,689	\$45,387,376
16	16	16	Lower Kuskokwim	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat Elementary Renovations Phase 2 - Bethel	\$11,797,824	\$11,797,824	\$0	\$11,797,824	\$235,956	\$11,561,868	\$56,949,244
17	17	17	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School ADA Upgrades / Erosion Control	\$739,308	\$739,308	\$0	\$739,308	\$36,965	\$702,343	\$57,651,587
18	18	18	Galena	Sydney Huntington High School Floor Upgrade, Galena	\$122,265	\$122,265	\$0	\$122,265	\$6,113	\$116,152	\$57,767,739
19	19	19	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Maintenance	\$111,960	\$111,960	\$0	\$111,960	\$33,588	\$78,372	\$57,846,111
20	20	20	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	\$827,225	\$827,225	\$0	\$827,225	\$16,544	\$810,681	\$58,656,792

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
21	21	21	Haines	Haines Vocational Education Building Mechanical Upgrades	\$508,236	\$508,236	\$0	\$508,236	\$177,883	\$330,353	\$58,987,145
22	22	22	Anchorage	Districtwide Roof Replacement & Structural Upgrades, 3 Schools	\$5,710,000	\$5,710,000	\$0	\$5,710,000	\$1,713,000	\$3,997,000	\$62,984,145
23	23	23	Ketchikan	Valley Park Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,396,212	\$1,396,212	\$0	\$1,396,212	\$418,864	\$977,348	\$63,961,493
24	25	25	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock And Intercom Replacement	\$850,884	\$530,174	\$0	\$530,174	\$185,561	\$344,613	\$64,306,106
25	26	26	Mat-Su Borough	Wasilla Middle School, Wasilla High School, Palmer Middle Schools Roof Replacement	\$13,717,086	\$13,717,086	\$0	\$13,717,086	\$4,115,126	\$9,601,960	\$73,908,066
26	27	33	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Generator & Fuel Tank Relocation	\$675,683	\$528,546	\$0	\$528,546	\$10,571	\$517,975	\$74,426,041
27	28	27	Fairbanks	North Pole Middle School Mechanical Systems & Energy Efficiency Upgrades	\$6,029,398	\$5,890,257	\$0	\$5,890,257	\$1,767,077	\$4,123,180	\$78,549,221
28	29	28	Yakutat City	Yakutat Swimming Pool Upgrades	\$142,923	\$137,555	\$0	\$137,555	\$41,266	\$96,289	\$78,645,510
29	30	29	Bering Strait	Shaktoolik K-12 School Renovation	\$10,508,124	\$8,378,673	\$0	\$8,378,673	\$167,573	\$8,211,100	\$86,856,610
30	31	30	Annette Island	Metlakatla Elementary School Renovation	\$9,042,384	\$9,042,384	\$0	\$9,042,384	\$180,848	\$8,861,536	\$95,718,146
31	32	31	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Newtok	\$339,238	\$339,238	\$0	\$339,238	\$6,785	\$332,453	\$96,050,599
32	33	32	Kake City	Kake Elementary School Ventilation System Upgrade	\$373,303	\$767,332	\$394,029	\$373,303	\$111,991	\$261,312	\$96,311,911
33	34	80	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Window Replacements, 4 Schools	\$1,797,282	\$1,569,345	\$0	\$1,569,345	\$549,271	\$1,020,074	\$97,331,985
34	35	34	Anchorage	Girdwood K-8 School Design	\$800,000	\$295,378	\$0	\$295,378	\$88,613	\$206,765	\$97,538,750
35	36	35	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Upgrades	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$97,580,508
36	37	36	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Bethel	\$166,119	\$166,119	\$0	\$166,119	\$3,322	\$162,797	\$97,743,305
37	38	37	Anchorage	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades, 6 Facilities	\$875,000	\$875,000	\$0	\$875,000	\$262,500	\$612,500	\$98,355,805
38	39	38	Lower Kuskokwim	Tununak K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$6,746,276	\$6,746,276	\$0	\$6,746,276	\$134,926	\$6,611,350	\$104,967,155
39	40	39	Mat-Su Borough	Roof Replacement & Repairs, 4 Schools	\$8,875,636	\$8,875,636	\$0	\$8,875,636	\$2,662,691	\$6,212,945	\$111,180,100
40	41	40	Valdez City	Valdez High School Roof Replacement	\$3,163,557	\$2,765,812	\$0	\$2,765,812	\$968,034	\$1,797,778	\$112,977,878
41	42	41	Nome City	Nome Elementary Boiler Replacement	\$450,854	\$450,854	\$0	\$450,854	\$135,256	\$315,598	\$113,293,476

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
42	43	42	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$3,591,139	\$3,497,435	\$0	\$3,497,435	\$69,949	\$3,427,486	\$116,720,962
43	44	43	Valdez City	Valdez High School Fire Alarm and Sprinkler Replacement	\$3,157,078	\$2,517,772	\$0	\$2,517,772	\$881,220	\$1,636,552	\$118,357,514
44	45	44	Anchorage	Inlet View Elementary School Design	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$0	\$450,000	\$135,000	\$315,000	\$118,672,514
45	46	45	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School & Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$273,018	\$273,018	\$0	\$273,018	\$81,905	\$191,113	\$118,863,627
46	47	46	Saint Marys	Backup Generator Replacement, 3 Buildings	\$1,559,284	\$1,559,284	\$0	\$1,559,284	\$77,964	\$1,481,320	\$120,344,947
47	48	47	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Annex Renovation	\$644,794	\$644,794	\$0	\$644,794	\$12,896	\$631,898	\$120,976,845
48	49	48	Anchorage	Districtwide Electrical Projects, 4 Elementary Schools	\$2,555,000	\$2,555,000	\$0	\$2,555,000	\$766,500	\$1,788,500	\$122,765,345
49	50	49	Copper River	Glennallen High School Upgrade	\$3,210,830	\$3,210,830	\$0	\$3,210,830	\$64,217	\$3,146,613	\$125,911,958
50	51	50	Delta/Greely	Delta High School Back-Up Generator	\$998,921	\$998,921	\$0	\$998,921	\$19,978	\$978,943	\$126,890,901
51	52	51	Copper River	Copper Center Elementary School Upgrade	\$555,145	\$555,145	\$0	\$555,145	\$11,103	\$544,042	\$127,434,943
52	53	52	Pelican City	Pelican High School Mechanical Upgrades	\$223,104	\$223,104	\$0	\$223,104	\$78,086	\$145,018	\$127,579,961
53	54	53	Copper River	Kenny Lake High School Upgrade	\$361,129	\$361,129	\$0	\$361,129	\$7,223	\$353,906	\$127,933,867
54	55	54	Hoonah City	Hoonah Schools Major Maintenance	\$7,299,733	\$7,299,733	\$0	\$7,299,733	\$2,189,920	\$5,109,813	\$133,043,680
55	56	55	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Nunapitchuk	\$799,301	\$799,301	\$0	\$799,301	\$15,986	\$783,315	\$133,826,995
56	57	56	Lower Yukon	Pitka's Point K-8 School Renovation	\$7,333,524	\$7,333,524	\$0	\$7,333,524	\$146,670	\$7,186,854	\$141,013,849
57	58	57	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik Water Tank Replacement	\$1,405,840	\$1,003,757	\$0	\$1,003,757	\$20,075	\$983,682	\$141,997,531
58	59	58	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$1,369,697	\$1,369,697	\$0	\$1,369,697	\$27,394	\$1,342,303	\$143,339,834
59	60	59	Mat-Su Borough	Butte, Cottonwood Creek, Pioneer Peak & Snowshoe Elementary Wash Fountain Replacements	\$138,829	\$138,829	\$0	\$138,829	\$41,649	\$97,180	\$143,437,014
60	61	60	Mat-Su Borough	Administration Building Generator And Related Electrical Replacement	\$633,920	\$633,920	\$0	\$633,920	\$190,176	\$443,744	\$143,880,758
61	62	61	Kake City	Kake High School Underground Storage Tank and Boiler Replacement	\$218,985	\$218,985	\$0	\$218,985	\$65,695	\$153,290	\$144,034,048
62	63	62	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Building Renovation	\$3,841,560	\$3,841,560	\$0	\$3,841,560	\$76,831	\$3,764,729	\$147,798,777
63	64	63	Anchorage	Districtwide Mechanical Upgrades, 7 Schools	\$8,135,000	\$8,135,000	\$0	\$8,135,000	\$2,440,500	\$5,694,500	\$153,493,277

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
64	65	64	Anchorage	Gladys Wood Elementary School Design	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000	\$0	\$1,150,000	\$345,000	\$805,000	\$154,298,277
65	66	65	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Roof Replacements: Seward High School Auditorium, Kalifornsky Beach Elementary and Warehouse	\$4,844,346	\$4,844,346	\$0	\$4,844,346	\$1,695,521	\$3,148,825	\$157,447,102
66	67	66	Yukon Flats	Venetie Generator Building Renovation	\$765,731	\$765,731	\$0	\$765,731	\$15,315	\$750,416	\$158,197,518
67	68	67	Southeast Island	Port Alexander and Thorne Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$2,999,201	\$2,827,395	\$0	\$2,827,395	\$56,548	\$2,770,847	\$160,968,365
68	69	68	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades	\$2,259,411	\$2,259,411	\$0	\$2,259,411	\$677,823	\$1,581,588	\$162,549,953
69	70	69	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Security Systems	\$1,977,134	\$1,977,134	\$0	\$1,977,134	\$691,997	\$1,285,137	\$163,835,090
70	71	70	Kuspuk	Districtwide Heating System Upgrades	\$9,246,510	\$9,246,510	\$0	\$9,246,510	\$184,930	\$9,061,580	\$172,896,670
71	72	71	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades	\$3,963,488	\$3,963,488	\$0	\$3,963,488	\$1,189,046	\$2,774,442	\$175,671,112
72	73	72	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Exterior Repairs	\$711,617	\$1,033,755	\$322,138	\$711,617	\$14,232	\$697,385	\$176,368,497
73	76	75	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$592,128	\$592,128	\$0	\$592,128	\$11,843	\$580,285	\$176,948,782
74	74	73	Lower Kuskokwim	Bulk Fuel Tank Upgrade - Eek	\$1,809,301	\$1,809,301	\$0	\$1,809,301	\$36,186	\$1,773,115	\$178,721,897
75	75	74	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Stage Lighting System Replacement	\$270,510	\$270,510	\$0	\$270,510	\$81,153	\$189,357	\$178,911,254
76	77	76	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$1,557,469	\$1,557,469	\$0	\$1,557,469	\$31,149	\$1,526,320	\$180,437,574
77	83	83	Chatham	Angoon K-12 Mechanical Upgrades, 2 Schools	\$901,757	\$901,757	\$0	\$901,757	\$18,035	\$883,722	\$181,321,296
78	78	77	Fairbanks	Pearl Creek Elementary Septic System Replacement & Plumbing Systems Upgrade	\$963,558	\$956,031	\$0	\$956,031	\$286,809	\$669,222	\$181,990,518
79	79	78	Petersburg City	Petersburg Elementary School Lunchroom Renovation	\$1,577,187	\$1,577,187	\$0	\$1,577,187	\$473,156	\$1,104,031	\$183,094,549
80	80	79	Fairbanks	Salcha Elementary Roof & Building Envelope Replacement & Upgrade	\$1,136,984	\$1,128,102	\$0	\$1,128,102	\$338,431	\$789,671	\$183,884,220
81	81	81	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water System Pipe Replacement	\$53,194	\$53,194	\$0	\$53,194	\$1,064	\$52,130	\$183,936,350
82	82	82	Ketchikan	Districtwide Major Maintenance	\$866,673	\$866,673	\$0	\$866,673	\$260,002	\$606,671	\$184,543,021
83	84	84	Alaska Gateway	Northway K-12 School Building Renovation	\$1,076,665	\$1,076,665	\$0	\$1,076,665	\$21,533	\$1,055,132	\$185,598,153

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
84	85	85	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Akiuk	\$810,768	\$810,768	\$0	\$810,768	\$16,215	\$794,553	\$186,392,706
85	86	86	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon K-12 School Soil Remediation & Tank Farm Replacement	\$8,764,331	\$8,764,331	\$0	\$8,764,331	\$175,287	\$8,589,044	\$194,981,750
86	87	87	Mat-Su Borough	Snowshoe Elementary, Finger Lake Elementary, Cottonwood Elementary, Colony Middle School Flooring Replacements	\$1,383,561	\$1,383,561	\$0	\$1,383,561	\$415,068	\$968,493	\$195,950,243
87	88	88	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer Middle School Lockers Replacement	\$299,355	\$299,355	\$0	\$299,355	\$89,806	\$209,549	\$196,159,792
88	89	89	Bering Strait	Districtwide Fuel Tank Demolition	\$797,570	\$797,570	\$0	\$797,570	\$15,951	\$781,619	\$196,941,411
89	90	90	Pelican City	Pelican Middle School Roof Replacement	\$223,566	\$223,566	\$0	\$223,566	\$78,248	\$145,318	\$197,086,729
90	91	91	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$319,237	\$319,237	\$0	\$319,237	\$6,385	\$312,852	\$197,399,581
91	92	92	Anchorage	Districtwide Building Renewal Projects, 5 Schools	\$1,460,000	\$1,460,000	\$0	\$1,460,000	\$438,000	\$1,022,000	\$198,421,581
92	93	93	Fairbanks	North Pole High School Vocational Wing Renovation	\$3,491,818	\$3,441,576	\$0	\$3,441,576	\$1,032,473	\$2,409,103	\$200,830,684
93	94	94	Juneau City Borough	Marie Drake Building Renovation	\$13,900,000	\$17,586,523	\$3,686,523	\$13,900,000	\$4,865,000	\$9,035,000	\$209,865,684
94	95	95	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 Gymnasium Relocation and Foundation	\$149,848	\$125,198	\$0	\$125,198	\$2,504	\$122,694	\$209,988,378
95	96	96	Mat-Su Borough	Big Lake Elementary, Renovate Old Classroom Wing	\$1,690,486	\$1,690,486	\$0	\$1,690,486	\$507,146	\$1,183,340	\$211,171,718
96	97	97	Petersburg City	Digital HVAC Controls	\$491,591	\$491,591	\$0	\$491,591	\$147,477	\$344,114	\$211,515,832
97	98	98	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	\$1,103,305	\$1,103,305	\$0	\$1,103,305	\$330,991	\$772,314	\$212,288,146
98	99	99	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Mechanical Control Upgrades	\$877,083	\$877,083	\$0	\$877,083	\$17,542	\$859,541	\$213,147,687
99	100	100	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Bus Zone & Paving	\$357,289	\$357,289	\$0	\$357,289	\$107,187	\$250,102	\$213,397,789
100	101	101	Fairbanks	Districtwide Technology Upgrades	\$7,440,783	\$7,440,783	\$0	\$7,440,783	\$2,232,235	\$5,208,548	\$218,606,337
101	102	102	Lower Kuskokwim	Nunapitchuk Fire Alarm Replacement	\$359,397	\$127,019	\$0	\$127,019	\$2,540	\$124,479	\$218,730,816
102	103	103	Fairbanks	Weller Elementary Septic System Replacement	\$427,374	\$427,374	\$0	\$427,374	\$128,212	\$299,162	\$219,029,978
103	104	104	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades	\$409,587	\$384,348	\$0	\$384,348	\$115,304	\$269,044	\$219,299,022
104	105	105	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay and Port Protection Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	\$405,822	\$405,822	\$0	\$405,822	\$8,116	\$397,706	\$219,696,728

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
105	106	106	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Locker Replacements, 6 High Schools	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$350,000	\$650,000	\$220,346,728
106	107	107	Kodiak Island	Districtwide Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$506,328	\$388,533	\$0	\$388,533	\$116,560	\$271,973	\$220,618,701
107	108	108	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Gym Floor Replacement	\$372,673	\$372,673	\$0	\$372,673	\$111,802	\$260,871	\$220,879,572
108	109	109	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer High School Flooring Replacements	\$1,467,806	\$1,412,677	\$0	\$1,412,677	\$423,803	\$988,874	\$221,868,446
109	110	110	Fairbanks	North Pole Middle School Roof & Clerestories Replacement	\$2,924,052	\$2,901,207	\$0	\$2,901,207	\$870,362	\$2,030,845	\$223,899,291
110	111	111	Mat-Su Borough	Snowshoe, Pioneer Peak, Big Lake Elementary Schools, ADA Parking And Access Improvements	\$196,519	\$196,519	\$0	\$196,519	\$58,956	\$137,563	\$224,036,854
111	112	112	Alaska Gateway	Eagle K-12 School Building Renovation	\$5,227,433	\$5,227,433	\$0	\$5,227,433	\$104,549	\$5,122,884	\$229,159,738
112	113	113	Fairbanks	Woodriver Elementary Gymnasium Upgrade	\$1,165,569	\$1,156,603	\$0	\$1,156,603	\$346,981	\$809,622	\$229,969,360
113	114	0	Kodiak Island	Akhiok School Sewer Line Repair	\$74,263	\$74,263	\$0	\$74,263	\$22,279	\$51,984	\$230,021,344
114	115	114	Yukon Flats	Venetie Soil Remediation And Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,796,363	\$1,796,363	\$0	\$1,796,363	\$35,927	\$1,760,436	\$231,781,780
115	116	115	Mat-Su Borough	Renovate HVAC Systems, 5 Schools	\$22,619,426	\$22,619,426	\$0	\$22,619,426	\$6,785,828	\$15,833,598	\$247,615,378
116	117	116	Petersburg City	Petersburg Elementary Exterior Upgrades	\$885,508	\$885,508	\$0	\$885,508	\$265,652	\$619,856	\$248,235,234
117	118	117	Fairbanks	Ticasuk Brown Elementary Septic System Replacement	\$427,374	\$427,374	\$0	\$427,374	\$128,212	\$299,162	\$248,534,396
118	119	118	Juneau City Borough	Mendenhall River Community School Renovation	\$3,749,000	\$3,710,790	\$0	\$3,710,790	\$1,298,776	\$2,412,014	\$250,946,410
119	120	119	Lake & Peninsula	Newhalen Kitchen Renovation	\$118,176	\$118,176	\$0	\$118,176	\$11,818	\$106,358	\$251,052,768
120	121	120	Mat-Su Borough	Houston Middle School Lockers Replacement	\$217,714	\$217,714	\$0	\$217,714	\$65,314	\$152,400	\$251,205,168
121	122	121	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Mechanical Upgrades, 4 Schools	\$14,414,951	\$14,414,951	\$0	\$14,414,951	\$4,324,485	\$10,090,466	\$261,295,634
122	123	122	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Air Conditioning Units Replacement	\$2,479,143	\$2,459,774	\$0	\$2,459,774	\$737,932	\$1,721,842	\$263,017,476
123	124	123	Juneau City Borough	District Maintenance Facility Renovation	\$3,553,413	\$3,160,556	\$185,587	\$2,974,969	\$1,041,239	\$1,933,730	\$264,951,206
124	125	124	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$998,760	\$998,760	\$0	\$998,760	\$19,975	\$978,785	\$265,929,991
125	126	125	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Kitchen Upgrade	\$1,771,215	\$1,771,215	\$0	\$1,771,215	\$35,424	\$1,735,791	\$267,665,782

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2011)  
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 15	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
126	127	126	Petersburg City	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades	\$471,085	\$336,489	\$0	\$336,489	\$100,947	\$235,542	\$267,901,324
127	128	127	Pribilof Island	St. Paul K-12 School Sprinkler System Installation	\$1,041,325	\$1,041,325	\$0	\$1,041,325	\$20,826	\$1,020,499	\$268,921,823
128	129	128	Pribilof Island	St. Paul K-12 School Gym Renovation	\$811,267	\$804,930	\$0	\$804,930	\$16,099	\$788,831	\$269,710,654
129	130	129	Pribilof Island	St. Paul K-12 School Lighting Upgrades	\$1,035,930	\$1,035,930	\$0	\$1,035,930	\$20,719	\$1,015,211	\$270,725,865
130	131	130	Juneau City Borough	Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School Renovation	\$2,608,000	\$2,608,000	\$0	\$2,608,000	\$912,800	\$1,695,200	\$272,421,065
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$348,176,730</b>	<b>\$345,120,235</b>	<b>\$5,997,427</b>	<b>\$339,122,808</b>	<b>\$66,701,743</b>	<b>\$272,421,065</b>	

# *Alaska Department of Education and Early Development*

## *FY 2011 Participating Share Requirement*

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2009 Full Values</b>	<b>2009 ADM</b>	<b>Value Per ADM</b>	<b>LocalShare</b>
Alaska Gateway	0	383.26	0.00	2 %
Aleutian Region	0	37.00	0.00	2 %
Aleutians East	156,158,100	248.75	627,771.26	30 %
Anchorage	35,128,863,600	48,227.36	728,401.14	30 %
Annette Island	0	267.55	0.00	2 %
Bering Strait	0	1,652.95	0.00	2 %
Bristol Bay Borough	243,019,900	144.65	1,680,054.69	35 %
Chatham	0	151.75	0.00	2 %
Chugach	0	224.80	0.00	2 %
Copper River	0	502.90	0.00	2 %
Cordova	224,618,160	368.40	609,712.71	30 %
Craig City	105,587,400	723.32	145,976.05	5 %
Delta/Greely	0	1,077.44	0.00	2 %
Denali Borough	230,334,500	407.79	564,836.06	30 %
Dillingham City	177,004,500	500.45	353,690.67	30 %
Fairbanks	9,268,836,820	14,147.57	655,153.97	30 %
Galena	30,397,300	3,649.40	8,329.40	5 %
Haines	327,494,200	305.25	1,072,872.07	35 %
Hoonah City	70,798,300	123.45	573,497.79	30 %
Hydaburg City	14,036,300	66.63	210,660.37	10 %
Iditarod Area	0	280.43	0.00	2 %
Juneau City Borough	4,335,282,900	4,972.69	871,818.46	35 %
Kake City	27,592,100	93.35	295,576.87	30 %
Kashunamiut	0	312.50	0.00	2 %
Kenai Peninsula	8,133,669,680	9,255.77	878,767.52	35 %
Ketchikan	1,606,849,700	2,126.83	755,513.91	30 %
Klawock City	53,607,400	125.10	428,516.39	30 %
Kodiak Island	1,288,364,300	2,597.89	495,927.22	30 %
Kuspuk	0	339.65	0.00	2 %
Lake & Peninsula	73,323,700	368.68	198,881.69	10 %
Lower Kuskokwim	0	3,953.55	0.00	2 %
Lower Yukon	0	2,031.10	0.00	2 %
Mat-Su Borough	8,929,096,710	16,480.83	541,786.83	30 %
Nenana City	26,080,800	1,001.66	26,037.58	5 %
Nome City	314,755,100	673.71	467,196.70	30 %
North Slope Borough	14,988,085,125	1,580.70	9,481,929.26	35 %

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2009 Full Values</b>	<b>2009 ADM</b>	<b>Value Per ADM</b>	<b>LocalShare</b>
Northwest Arctic	681,749,730	1,857.30	367,064.94	30 %
Pelican City	13,667,200	14.55	939,326.45	35 %
Petersburg City	362,376,900	517.17	700,692.06	30 %
Pribilof Island	0	109.65	0.00	2 %
Saint Marys	12,933,000	176.80	73,150.45	5 %
Sitka City Borough	1,178,401,100	1,316.21	895,298.73	35 %
Skagway City	330,245,100	94.55	3,492,808.98	35 %
Southeast Island	0	167.20	0.00	2 %
Southwest Region	0	633.50	0.00	2 %
Tanana City	8,947,400	39.15	228,541.50	10 %
Unalaska City	498,432,000	402.35	1,238,802.02	35 %
Valdez City	2,321,728,750	691.60	3,357,039.95	35 %
Wrangell City	186,045,900	323.73	574,694.63	30 %
Yakutat City	66,929,700	121.25	551,997.53	30 %
Yukon Flats	0	270.80	0.00	2 %
Yukon-Koyukuk	0	1,367.98	0.00	2 %
Yupiit	0	444.75	0.00	2 %

4 AAC 31.013(a)(2) is amended to read:

(2) an energy management plan that includes recording energy consumption for all the utilities on a monthly basis for each building; for facilities constructed before **December 15, 2004** [12/15/2004], a district **may** [MY] record energy consumption for utilities on a monthly basis when multiple buildings are served by one utility plant;

(Eff. 5/24/2001, Register 158; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am 12/15/2004, Register 172; am \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.020            AS 14.11.011            AS 14.11.132  
AS 14.02.060

4 AAC 31.014(a) is amended to read:

(a) The chief school administrator shall assure that a new school facility, addition, or major renovation complies with applicable facility codes and regulations of the state and with those of the municipality in which the facility is located. The chief school administrator may meet the obligation by providing documentation from the appropriate state or municipal official that the facility, addition, or renovation complies with an applicable code or regulation. For purposes of this subsection, the applicable codes and regulations of the state with which facilities, additions, or renovations must comply are

(1) the **building code** [UNIFORM BUILDING CODE], adopted by 13 AAC 50.020;

(2) the **electrical code** [NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE], adopted by 8 AAC 70.025;

(3) the **plumbing code** [UNIFORM PLUMBING CODE], adopted by AS 18.60.705(a);

(4) the **mechanical code** [UNIFORM MECHANICAL CODE], adopted by 13 AAC 50.023;

(5) **the** [THE] ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, adopted by 8 AAC 80.010; and

(6) the **fire code** [UNIFORM FIRE CODE], adopted by 13 AAC 50.025.

(Eff. 4/17/98, Register 146; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** **AS 14.07.020** [AS 14.07.020(a)(7)]

4 AAC 31.020(a)(1) is repealed and readopted to read:

(1) for a school capital project application submitted to the department, *Creating Connections: The CEFPI Guide for Educational Facility Planning*, 2004 Edition, as published by the Council of Educational Facilities Planners International;

4 AAC 31.020(f) is repealed:

(f) Repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_.

(Eff. 3/1/78, Register 65; am 6/9/83, Register 86; am 12/2/83, Register 88; am 8/31/90, Register 115; am 10/7/95; Register 136; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 2/18/99, Register 149; am 7/13/2000, Register 155; am 8/23/2001, Register 159; am 12/20/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.020 AS 14.11.011 AS 14.11.100  
AS 14.07.060 AS 14.11.020 AS 14.11.132

4 AAC 31.021(a) is amended to read:

(a) A school district, as the term "district" is defined in AS 14.11.135, may apply for **up to 10** [A] capital improvement **grants** [GRANT] under AS 14.11.011 by September 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the request is made. The application shall be made on forms prescribed by the commissioner and be accompanied by the school district's current six-year capital improvement plan prepared under 4 AAC 31.011, and the chief school administrator must certify that the application is submitted in accordance with law.

The lead-in language of 4 AAC 31.021(c) is amended to read:

(c) A grant application **that includes new construction, addition of space, or replacement of space,** must include [AS APPLICABLE] verification that

...

4 AAC 31.021(c)(6) is repealed:

(6) repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_;

4 AAC 31.021 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(h) **A grant application must include verification that insurance or a program of self-insurance exists under 4 AAC 31.200 – 4 AAC 31.225 and will be revised, if necessary, to include the proposed facility.**

(Eff. 8/31/90, Register 115; am 8/12/93, Register 127; am 3/10/96, Register 137; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 7/13/2000, Register 155; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.060 AS 14.11.011 AS 14.11.132  
AS 14.11.008 AS 14.11.013

4 AAC 31.022(b)(2) is amended to read:

(2) major maintenance projects are those projects the primary purpose of which is to accomplish work under the categories established in AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(C) and (D), except that a major maintenance project may not include additional **or replacement square footage** [INTENDED TO ACCOMMODATE UNHOUSED STUDENTS].

4 AAC 31.022(c)(9) is amended to read:

(9) the inclusion of new square footage to support unhoused students; the department staff shall place projects that add **or replace** square footage [FOR UNHOUSED STUDENTS] on the school construction list.

4 AAC 31.022(e)(3) is repealed:

(3) repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_;

(Eff. 8/31/90, Register 115; am 8/12/93, Register 127; am 10/7/95, Register 136; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 7/13/2000, Register 155; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.060 AS 14.11.013 AS 14.11.132  
AS 14.11.011

4 AAC 31.060(b) is amended to read:

(b) In accepting state aid from the department, the municipality or school district receiving the grant **or debt reimbursement** shall comply with all pertinent state statutes, codes, standards, and regulations related to construction of a public facility. Further, the recipient shall comply with conditions, requirements, and stipulations in the forms prescribed by the commissioner for the capital improvement project agreement.

4 AAC 31.060(f)(2) is repealed:

(2) repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_;

4 AAC 31.060 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(m) A school facility that falls under AS 14.11.100(j)(4), and that proposes to construct new space, add space, or replace existing space, must meet the eligibility requirements of this chapter.

(n) A district requesting financial assistance for a new school must demonstrate a minimum of 25 unhoused students in the attendance area, during the five year post occupancy projection unless otherwise approved by the commissioner. (Eff. 3/1/78, Register 65; am 2/24/83, Register 85; am 12/2/83, Register 88; am 9/12/85, Register 96; am 2/8/86, Register 97; am 5/30/90, Register 114; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 7/13/2000, Register 155; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.020 AS 14.11.020 AS 14.11.102  
AS 14.07.060 AS 14.11.100 AS 14.11.132  
AS 14.11.011

4 AAC 31.063(a) is repealed:

(a) Repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_.

4 AAC 31.063(b) is repealed:

(b) Repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_.

4 AAC 31.063(c) is repealed:

(c) Repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_.

4 AAC 31.063(d) is repealed:

(d) Repealed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_.

4 AAC 31.063(e) is amended:

(e) Interest on proceeds of rant money appropriated for approved projects shall be held by the district to pay for project cost overruns, change orders, [OR OTHER LEGITIMATE PROJECT COSTS AS STATED IN (B) OF THIS SECTION] **contract amendments, contractor's claims, or other modifications necessary because of unavoidable or unforeseeable circumstances that are not the result of imprudent management, as determined by the commissioner.** If at the completion of the project, any money earned as

interest remains, the district shall transfer that amount to a district capital account for school capital projects.

(Eff. 2/8/86, Register 97; am 7/11/86, Register 99; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.060 AS 14.11.100 AS 14.11.132

4 AAC 31.085(d) is amended to read:

(d) If a municipal government proposes a use for the facility, the department **may** [WILL, IN ITS DISCRETION,] convey the facility to the municipality without charge. Removal from state-owned land, of the facility conveyed under this subsection is required, unless the **department** [DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES] determines that no state agency has use for the land which the facility is located and approves conveyance of the land to the municipality.

4 AAC 31.085 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(i) If removal of a facility disposed of under (g) of this section is not feasible, the commissioner may determine that it is in the best interest of the state to approve the granting of a long-term lease with the non-profit entity that has been approved for use of the facility. (Eff. 10/4/90, Register 115; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.030 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 31.200(d) is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(3) “replacement cost” includes all costs associated with replacement of the facility including construction management, design, equipment, technology, district overhead, and art costs necessary to insure that the facility is fully operational at no additional cost to the district.

4 AAC 31.200 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(e) If a school facility operated by a regional educational attendance area and owned by the state is damaged or destroyed, the district shall include the department in all insurance negotiations. (Eff. 8/31/90, Register 115; am 6/11/97, Register 142; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.03.150 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 31.215(c) is amended to read:

(c) If a grant under AS 14.11 is sought to repair or replace a facility, the **project** [GRANT] amount will be reduced by the amount of insurance proceeds received **by the district**, and as provided in 4 AAC 31.210, by the amount of the deductible paid. (Eff. 8/31/90, Register 115; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 7/13/200, Register 155; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.03.150 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 31.900(4) is repealed and readopted to read:

(4) “elementary and secondary schools” means buildings that have been built or converted predominantly for instruction of students in grades kindergarten through 12, and buildings for the support of that instruction;

(i) elementary students are those in grades kindergarten – 6<sup>th</sup>; and

(ii) secondary students are those in grades 7<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup>;

4 AAC 31.900(22) is amended to read:

(22) “temporary” as applied to facilities means facilities, typically providing classroom or administrative space, of temporary construction, intended for use for a limited period of time, and installed with minimal site support and without water or sewer [FULL UTILITY] services or a foundation of permanent construction;

(Eff. 3/1/78, Register 65; am 6/9/83, Register 86; am 12/2/83, Register 88; am 9/12/85, Register 96; am 8/31/90, Register 115; am 9/29/90, Register 115; am 10/7/95, Register 136; am 4/17/98, Register 146; am 2/18/99, Register 149; am 7/13/2000, Register 155; am 8/23/2001, Register 159; am 12/20/2002, Register 164; am 12/20/2002, Register 164; am \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_, Register \_\_\_\_)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.020            AS 14.11.020            AS 14.11.102  
                 AS 14.07.060            AS 14.11.100            AS 14.11.132  
                 AS 14.11.011



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

**FY2012**

For each funding request submit **one original** and **three complete copies of this application** and **two copies of each attachment**.

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

School District: \_\_\_\_\_

Community: \_\_\_\_\_

School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**TYPE OF PROJECT AND FUNDING REQUEST**

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

- Grant Funding                       Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

2a. **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.<sup>1</sup>

**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"/> Achieve operating cost savings (Category E; Category C for debt retirement)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program (Category F; Category D for debt retirement)	

b. Phases of project to be covered by this funding request (Indicate **all** applicable phases)

- Planning (Phase I)     Design (Phase II)     Construction (Phase III)

c. Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete?

(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 and please note the  yes     no

<sup>1</sup> 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)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

attachment in question 31.)

## BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

3. Has a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) been approved by the district school board?  yes  no  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b), and 4 AAC 31.011(c); attach a copy of the 6-year Plan.)*
4. Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system?  yes  no  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1).)*
5. Is evidence of required insurance attached to this application or has evidence been submitted as required to the department?  yes  no  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(2).)*
6. Is the project a capital improvement project and not part of a preventive maintenance program or custodial care?  yes  no  
*(The scope of work as outlined in the project description, question 18, must meet the requirements of AS 14.11.011(b)(3).)*

## DISTRICT INFORMATION

- 7a. Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last 5 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.)*
- 7b. Districtwide replacement cost insurance values for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

## EXISTING FACILITIES

8. The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):  
 renovated  added to  demolished  surplus  other
- (If the project will result in demolition or surplus of building(s), provide for hazardous material abatement and demolition as part of the project. If the building(s) are state-owned or state-leased facilities, attach a transition plan for protection and disposal of the properties.)*

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

9. 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. Refer to the EED Facilities Database at*

*<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm> for facility number, name, year, and size information on record.)*

Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year Built	GSF
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL GSF	_____	_____	_____

## RELATED FUNDING

10. Provide AS 14.11 administered grants that have already been appropriated by the legislature as partial funding in support of this project. This does not include debt retirement projects. (30 points possible for previous funding)

EED grant # \_\_\_\_\_

EED grant # \_\_\_\_\_

11. Is the district applying for a waiver of participating share?  yes  no
- Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 are eligible to apply for a waiver of participating share. REAA's are not eligible to request a waiver of participating share.*
- (If the district is applying for a waiver, attach justification. Refer to AS 14.11.008(d) and Appendix E of the application instructions.)*

## PROJECT INFORMATION

12. What is the rank of this project under the district's six-year Capital Improvement Plan? (30 points possible for CIP priority) Rank: \_\_\_\_\_
13. Does this project impact multiple facilities?  yes  no
- (If the answer is yes, describe in the project description and provide applicable data as identified in the instructions.)*

14. Is this project an emergency? (50 points possible)

yes

no

*(Refer to AS 14.011.013(b)(1) and the instructions. If the answer is yes, ~~the project description should~~ describe the nature of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions.)*

15. Will this project require acquisition of additional land or utilization of a new school site?

yes

no

*(If the answer is yes, attach site description or site requirements. If a new site has been identified, attach the site selection analysis used to select the new site. Note the attachment in question 31.)*

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

16. Has a facility condition survey been completed?\* (5 points possible)  yes  no  
*(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies and Note the attachment in question 31.)*
- Has a facility appraisal been completed? (5 points possible)  yes  no  
*(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies and Note the attachment in question 31.)*
- Has work been completed on planning?\* (10 points possible)  yes  no  
*(If yes, attach documentation supporting planning as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)*
- Has work been completed on schematic design?\* (10 points possible)  yes  no  
*(If yes, attach documentation supporting schematic design as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)*
- Has work been completed on design development?\* (10 points possible)  yes  no  
*(If yes, attach documentation supporting design development as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)*

\* - Identify the A/E consultant. If there is no A/E consultant for this project, provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required.

17. Project Description/Scope of Work: The project description should provide a clear description of the project scope to be completed with this project. 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 THIS** project. Provide an estimated project timeline that includes an estimated date for receipt of funding, construction start date, and construction completion date. (50 points possible for description of severity of life/ safety and code issues)
- (Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and to the instructions accompanying this form. Appendices A and C accompanying the instructions may be particularly helpful. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

## COST ESTIMATES

**18.** Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development's 12<sup>th</sup> Edition Cost Model or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is **mandatory**. (30 points possible)

*(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. The total of all additive percentages should not exceed 130%, if the additive percentages exceed 130% a detailed explanation must be provided or the department will adjust the percentages to meet the individual and overall percentage guidelines)*

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 <sup>1</sup>	2 - 4%				
Land <sup>2</sup>					
Site Investigation <sup>2</sup>					
Seismic Hazard <sup>7</sup>					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction <sup>3</sup>					
Equipment & Technology <sup>2,5</sup>	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead <sup>4</sup>	up to 9%				
Art <sup>6</sup>	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
<b>Project Total</b>					

1. 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%).
2. 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 17), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
3. Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
4. 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.-
5. 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.
6. Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).
7. Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and construction 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.

**Table 2. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

Construction Category	New Construction			Renovation		
	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction <sup>2</sup>						
Special Requirements <sup>1</sup>		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 Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
<b>Construction Total</b>						

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

**ATTENDANCE AREA AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM)**

**Please Note:** If you have classified this project as Major Maintenance (Category C or D) and you are not including any new space skip to question 25. **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).

19. Indicate the student grade levels to be housed by in the proposed project facility: \_\_\_\_\_

20. Within the attendance area, is there any work (other than this project) 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

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

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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

21. Within the attendance area, are there school facilities 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

In lieu of data in the format above for questions 20 and 21, we are providing detailed attachments.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

22. What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility?  
*(Provide a project schedule if available.)* \_\_\_\_\_
23. In the table below provide the attendance area's current and projected ADM: (80 points possible for unhoused students)

Table 3. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM			
School Year	K-6 ADM	7-12 ADM	Total ADM
2009-2010			
2010-2011			
2011-2012			
2012-2013			
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			

24. By what method(s) were ADM projections calculated?  
*(Attach calculations and justifications.)* \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT SPACE**

25. 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. (30 points possible available for type of space constructed)

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

26. Describe inadequacies of existing space. Specifically address how the inadequacies impact the educational program and facility operations. (40 points possible for inadequacy of space)  
*(Refer to 4 AAC 31.022 (c)(4). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

**ALTERNATIVE FACILITIES AND OPTIONS**

27. List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of housing students. (5 points possible)  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(4). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

28. Describe two or more viable options to this project that have been considered. 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.

(25 points possible)

*(Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(6). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

29. Quantify the project's annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost. (30 points possible)  
*(Refer to 4 ACC 31.022(c)(3). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

## FACILITY MANAGEMENT

30. Provide documents related to the district's maintenance and facility management program. Include management reports, renewal and replacement schedules, work orders, energy reports, training schedules, custodial activities, and any other documentation that will enhance the requirements listed in the instructions. *(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1), AS 14.11.011(b)(4), AS 14.14.090(10), 4 AAC 31.013 and accompanying instructions. Note attached documentation in question 31.)* (55 points possible)

<b>Assessment # 1)</b>	<i>Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 2)</b>	<i>Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Objective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 3)</b>	<i>PM corrective maintenance reports (Up to 10 Objective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 4)</b>	<i>5-Year Average Expenditure on maintenance (Up to 5 Objective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 5)</b>	<i>Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 6)</b>	<i>Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 7)</b>	<i>Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)</i>
<b>Assessment # 8)</b>	<i>Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)</i>

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

## ATTACHMENTS

31. Please check to indicate all items that are attached to this application and note that two copies of each attachment should be included. Attachments designated as **Required** must be included for the application to be considered complete. Some items may not be applicable to specific projects.

- Documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 (*question 2c*)
- Six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (*question 3*); **Required for eligibility**
- Description of maintenance and facilities management program (*question 30*); **Required for eligibility**
- Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (*question 8*)
- Justification for waiver of participating share (*question 11*)
- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (*question 15*)
- Facility condition survey (*question 16*)
- Facility Appraisal (*question 16*)
- Planning documentation (*question 16*)
- Schematic Design documentation (*question 16*)
- Design Development documentation (*question 16*)
- Cost/benefit analysis (*questions 17, 18, 28, 29*)
- Life cycle cost analysis (*questions 17, 18, 28, 29*)
- Value analysis provided (*question 17, 18, 28, 29*)
- Budget variance justification (*question 18*)
- Cost estimate worksheets (*question 18*)
- Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (*question 20, 21*)
- Enrollment projections and calculations (*question 23*)
- Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e., Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*)

## CERTIFICATION

32. 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



**Instructions for completing the  
Application for Funding  
for a  
Capital Improvement Project**

**FY2012**

*Use these instructions with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development AKEED Form #05-95-017a, Rev 4/2009*

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

**TYPE OF PROJECT AND FUNDING REQUEST**

- 1.** Check one box to indicate which type of state aid is being requested. Grant funding applications are submitted to the department by September 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, or on a date at the beginning of September designated by the department in the event that the 1<sup>st</sup> 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.
  
- 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 and category D projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted basis for

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

mixed scope projects. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.<sup>1</sup>

- 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 utilizes in-house labor, or is constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project will not be scored.

### BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

3. Attach a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-96-006. 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.
4. 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 ~~Assent~~-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.
5. 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

<sup>1</sup> 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)

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.

6. 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.

### DISTRICT INFORMATION

7. 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, 2000 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.]*

### EXISTING FACILITIES

8. 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.
9. 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:

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

## RELATED FUNDING

10. 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.
11. 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 REAA's, are eligible to request a waiver of participating share. Contact the department for a district's most recent full-value per ADM calculation.

## PROJECT INFORMATION

12. 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.

13. 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.*

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

14. Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(1). If this project is an emergency, ~~the project description shall describe:~~
- the nature of the emergency,
  - the facility condition related to the emergency,
  - the threat to students and staff,
  - the consequence of continued utilization of the facility,
  - the individuals or groups affected by the condition,
  - what action the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions, and
  - the extent to which any portion of the project is eligible for insurance reimbursement or emergency funding from any state or federal agency.

Evaluation of the emergency will consider all of the information submitted and the responses to each of the emergency elements noted in these instructions. Based on the information submitted ~~in the narrative and other portions of the application~~, the emergency condition can generate up to 50 possible points.

15. *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 1997 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).
16. 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 conditions survey.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK

17. The project description/scope of work should include (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, (3) a description of the scope of the project and what the project will accomplish, and (4) information or detail related to the project’s cost. If the construction of a new school is proposed, describe any code issues at existing facilities in the attendance area that will be relieved by the project. The scope should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state. The project description/scope of work is a good place to include responses to questions 6, 8, 13, ~~14~~, 15, and 16, where applicable. It is helpful to identify the question number if you are answering one of the previously mentioned questions in the project description. There are up to 50 points possible for descriptions identifying the severity of life safety issues addressed by the project.

In addition to the description of the project, provide an estimated project timeline that includes, at a minimum, the estimated date for receipt of funding, estimated construction start date, and estimated construction completion date.

Question #6: Statute requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the project is not preventive maintenance, routine maintenance, or custodial care. Refer to Appendix D of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

Question #8: When a new, renovation, new-in-lieu-of-renewal, or Category E project is proposed, the project description shall include a **detailed cost/benefit analysis and a life cycle cost analysis**. These documents shall provide data documenting conditions that justify the project [AS 14.11.011(b)(1)]. If these documents are attached, they can be summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the project description. The detailed plan for demolishing or surplusizing state-owned or leased properties should incorporate a draft of the department's Form 05-96-007, Excess Building. For the CIP process, furnish building data and general information; signatures and board resolutions may be excluded

Question #13: If the project impacts multiple facilities, the project description shall identify the facilities impacted and describe how each will be impacted. This applies to district wide projects as well as projects adding space. For projects adding space, use question #21 to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

~~Question #14: If the project is an emergency, the description shall address all the items specified in the instructions for question 14.~~

Question #15: Site description should include location, size, availability, cost and other pertinent information as appropriate. If a site selection and evaluation report is attached, the information can be referenced with a brief summary rather than being reproduced in this section.

Question #16: If a facility condition survey, facility appraisal, schematic design, or design development documents is-are attached, ~~it-they~~ can be summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the descriptions of project need, justification, and scope.

Cost Estimate Support: The project description shall include sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is to be incorporated into Tables 1 and 2 of question 18, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. This is especially true for lump-sum elements used in the department's cost model in sitework and utilities. The project description and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phase's advance.

The description of project scope should include information that will allow the department to evaluate the criteria specified in AS 14.11.013. Please refer to Appendix C for guidelines covering project cost estimate percentages for factored cost items.

### COST ESTIMATES

18. 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

project is projected to cost significantly more than would be predicted by the Department's Program Demand Cost Model (12th 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.

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, ~~and~~ 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 mitigate the seismic risk 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.

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~~ **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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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.

### ATTENDANCE AREA AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM)

**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.

19. The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.
20. 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.
21. 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>
22. 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.
23. 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.
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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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.

### PROJECT SPACE EQUATION

25. 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.
26. 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.

### ALTERNATIVE FACILITIES AND OPTIONS

27. 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.
28. In an effort to support the project, as submitted, as the best possible solution to school facility needs, districts ~~should~~ needs 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 ~~center area~~ boundary changes and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, Aat 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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.

29. **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.

### FACILITY MANAGEMENT

30.

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., subjective or objective). 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.

### Maintenance Management

**Assessment #1 – Maintenance management narrative (Subjective)** [up to 5 points available]:

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

Provide a narrative description of the effectiveness of your work order based maintenance management system.

How *effective* is your work order-based maintenance management system? How do you assess effectiveness? Describe the formal system in place that tracks timing and costs as stated in regulation and attach documentation (sample work orders, etc.).

## **Assessment #2 – Maintenance Labor Reports (Objective)** [up to 15 points available]:

*Item A:* Produce a districtwide report showing total maintenance labor hours collected on work orders by type of work [e.g., ~~scheduled~~preventive, corrective, operations support, etc.] vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

*Item B:* Produce a districtwide report that shows ~~scheduled~~all scheduled work orders and completed work orders by month, for the previous 12 months.

*Item C:* Produce a districtwide report showing the number of incomplete work orders sorted by age [30 days, 60 days, 90 days, etc.] and status. [deferred, awaiting materials, ~~scheduled~~assigned, etc.]

These reports will demonstrate a district's ability to manage maintenance activities related to the level and scope of labor requirements.

## **Assessment #3 – PM/corrective maintenance reports (Objective)** [up to 10 points available]:

*Item A:* Provide a districtwide report that compares ~~scheduled~~preventive maintenance work order hours to unscheduled maintenance work order hours by month for the previous 12 months.

*Item B:* Provide a districtwide report with monthly trend data for unscheduled work orders showing both hours and numbers of work orders by month for the previous 12 months.

These reports support the district's ability to manage maintenance activities related to scheduled maintenance and unscheduled work. One factor in determining the effectiveness of a preventive maintenance program is a comparison of the time and costs of scheduled maintenance in relation to the time and costs of unscheduled maintenance.

## **Assessment #4 – 5-year average expenditure for maintenance (Objective)** [up to 5 points available]:

The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. [This ~~information is provided in~~assessment is calculated based on information identified in application question #7 and ~~in from~~ district insurance records submitted separately to the department. No ~~other~~ information need be submitted with the application for this Assessment.]

## **Energy Management**

### **Assessment #5 – Energy Management Narrative (Subjective)** [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.

## **Custodial Program**

### **Assessment #6 – Custodial Narrative (Subjective) [up to 5 points available]:**

Provide a narrative description of the district's custodial program and evidence to show it was developed using data related to inventories and frequency of care.

Minimal custodial programs do not have to be quantity-based nor time-based relative to the level of care. Quality custodial programs take both these factors into account and customize a custodial plan for a facility on the known quantities and industry standards for a given activity (i.e., vacuuming carpet, dusting horizontal surfaces, etc). Describe how your scope of custodial services is directly related to the type of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, the quantity of those items, and the frequency of the care for each. Describe how the district has customized its program to deal with different surfaces and care needs on a site-by-site basis.

## **Maintenance Training**

### **Assessment #7 – Maintenance Training Narrative (Subjective) [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 (Subjective) [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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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).

### ATTACHMENTS

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.

### CERTIFICATION

32. 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:**

Sam Kito III, P.E., School Facilities Engineer  
(907) 465-6906

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX A: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

The application form requires designation of the phase(s) for which the district requests funding. Below is a basic scope of effort for each phase. Items marked **Required** 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 1<sup>st</sup>.

PHASE I-PLANNING (10 points possible)

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (if needed)(4 AAC 31.065) - (as required)
2. Prepare a school facility appraisal (as required) (see application question 16)
3. Prepare a facility condition survey (as required) (see application question 16)
4. Identify need category of project - **(Required)**
5. Verify student populations and trends - **(Required)**
6. Complete education specifications (design the educational program - 4AAC 31.010) - **(Required)**
7. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **(Required)**
8. Complete concept design studies and planning cost estimate - **(Required)**

PHASE IIA - SCHEMATIC DESIGN (10 points possible)

1. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4AAC 31.025) - **(Required)**
2. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - **(Required)**
3. Accomplish site survey and perform preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical)
4. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - **(Required)**
5. Complete schematic design documents including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - **(Required)**
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

PHASE IIB-DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (10 points possible)

1. Complete suggested elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **(Required)**
2. Review and confirm planning (4AAC 31.030)
3. Accomplish a condition survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project includes renovation)**
4. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **(Required)**
5. Complete design development documents - **(Required)**
6. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
7. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

PHASE III-CONSTRUCTION

1. Complete suggested elements of planning and design not previously completed - **(Required)**
2. Prepare final cost estimate
3. Complete final contract documents and legal review of construction documents (4AAC 31.040)
4. Advertising, bidding and contract award (4AAC 31.080)
5. Submit signed construction contract
6. Construct project
7. Procure furniture, fixtures and equipment, if applicable
8. Substantial completion
9. Final completion and move-in
10. Post occupancy survey
11. Obtain project audit/close out

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX B: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

AS 14.11.013(a)(1)- annually review the six-year plans submitted by each district under [AS 14.11.011](#) (b) and recommend to the board a revised and updated six-year capital improvement project grant schedule that serves the best interests of the state and each district; in recommending projects for this schedule, 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<sup>2, 3</sup>

- 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; that required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative; or that 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 AAC 31.020) This category corresponds to category A under AS 14.11.100(j) 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, which 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 which 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)].

<sup>3</sup> 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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX B: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

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 to be combined with other project types. This category corresponds to category B under AS 14.11.100(j) 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, 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. This category corresponds to category C under AS 14.11.100(j) 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) 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. (Currently, there are no such mandates.)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 1~~47~~, ~~2008~~2010

Construction Management (CM) by a 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 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, 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, nor 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 EED'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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 1~~47~~, ~~2008~~2010

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, except in extreme cases, should average out close to the same for all projects, and 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%

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS OF MAINTENANCE  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 18, 2001

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX E: WAIVER OF PARTICIPATING SHARE/IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 23, 1999

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX F: Type of Space Added or Improved  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 18, 1997

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

**Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
Capital Improvement Project Application  
Project Eligibility Checklist  
FY2012**

Date \_\_\_\_\_

District \_\_\_\_\_ Project \_\_\_\_\_

Is the project eligible? Yes  No

The following items are requirements for projects to be eligible for grants or bond reimbursement as required by statute or regulations. Please check YES or NO if project application is in compliance or not.

Primary Application Question(s)		Yes	No
A	All	The application is complete and all questions are fully answered - AS 14.11.013 (c)(3)(A)	
B	#3	The district's CIP-6 year plan has been submitted - AS 14.11.011(b)(1)	
C	#4	The district has an auditable fixed asset inventory system - AS 14.11.011(b)(1)	
D	#5	Evidence of replacement cost property insurance - AS 14.11.011(b)(2)	
E	#11	If the district has requested a waiver of participating share, is the request attached? (If not applicable, leave blank) - AS 14.11.008(d)	
F	#6	Evidence that project should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance or custodial care - AS 14.11.011 (b)(3)	
G	#17	Evidence that project meets the criteria of one of the A-F categories - AS 14.11.013 (a)(1)	
H	#17	A detailed scope of work, project budget and documentation of need - AS 14.11.011 (b)(1)	
I	#17 & 18	The scope of work should include all information requested in the application instructions and should include life cycle cost analysis, cost benefit analysis or any other quantifiable analysis which demonstrates that the project is in the best interest of the district <b>AND</b> the state - AS 14.11.013 (c)(3)(C)	
J	#19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24	For projects requesting additional space, evidence of space eligibility based on supported 2-year and 5-year-post-occupancy student population projection data - 4 AAC 31.021(c)(1)&(c)(3)	
K	#17, 26, 27, & 28	Evidence that the existing facility can not adequately serve or that alternative projects are in the best interest of the state – AS 14.11.013 (c)(3)(B)	
L	#27 & 28	Evidence that the situation can not be relieved by adjusting service area boundaries and transportation - 4 AAC 31.021(c)(2) & AS 14.11.013 (b)(6)	
M	#31 & 32	EED certification that the school district has a facility management program that complies with 4 AAC 31.013 and a description of the district's preventive maintenance program - AS 14.11.011 (b)(1)	



## **Guidelines for Raters of the FY2012 CIP Applications**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Education & Early Development is charged with the task of compiling a prioritized list of projects to be used in preparing a six-year capital plan for submittal to the governor and the legislature (AS 14.11.013 (a)(3)). The criteria for accomplishing the priorities are established in statute (AS 14.11.013 (B)) and are awarded points based on a scoring system developed by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee under their statutorily imposed mandate (AS 14.11.014 (b)(6)).

The guidelines provided here are to assure that raters are using a common set of terms and standards when awarding points for the subjective scoring criteria.

### **Base Philosophy**

The following positions will define the base philosophy for rating applications.

Since districts are required to submit a request for a capital project no later than September 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which they are applying, no rater shall review, rank or give feedback regarding scoring a project prior to this deadline.

Applications will be ranked based on the information submitted with the application, or applicants may use information submitted to the department in support of a project, provided the submission occurs on or before September 1. Each rater shall arrive at the initial ranking of each project independently. Raters will be expected to go through each application question by question. They will also review all attachments for content, completeness and bearing on each scoring element. Consistency in scores from year-to-year shall be considered. It is expected that projects will demonstrate different levels of completeness in descriptions and detail depending on the stage of project development.

Projects are prioritized in two lists: the School Construction List and the Major Maintenance List and reflect the two statutory funds established for education capital projects. Under the definitions provided in statute and regulation, projects which add space to a facility are classed as School Construction projects and must fall in categories A, B, E, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (category C and D) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure or Code Compliance, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components should be considered as maintenance projects.

Each rater should have an eligibility checklist available during rating. Eligibility items A, F, G, I, J and L will be evaluated by each rater. Other eligibility items will be the responsibility of support team members doing data input and capacity/allowable calculations. Discussion regarding project eligibility should be brought to the attention of the rating team as soon as it becomes an issue in one rater's mind.



## Subjective Rating Guidelines

For each of the subjective rating categories, raters will consider the factors listed when evaluating and scoring applications. The list is not exclusive, nor exhaustive. As raters read and evaluate projects, review of the listed elements is to be done for referential purposes. Raters should also refer to the Application Instructions for each question.

Effectiveness of Maintenance & Facilities Management Program (Application Question 30; Points possible: 25)

<p><b>Maintenance Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine?</li> <li>• How well does the program work for each individual school?</li> <li>• Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil?</li> <li>• Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?</li> <li>• Who participates in the program and how does it function?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Energy Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities?</li> <li>• Is a comprehensive set of methods being used?</li> <li>• Is the program districtwide in scope?</li> <li>• Is the program achieving results?</li> <li>• Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Custodial Narrative (points possible: 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the district's custodial program complete?</li> <li>• Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice?</li> <li>• Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?</li> <li>• Is the program districtwide in scope?</li> <li>• Is the program achieving results?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Maintenance Training Narrative (Points possible: 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff?</li> <li>• Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems?</li> <li>• Are training schedules attached?</li> <li>• How is Training Recorded?</li> <li>• How is effectiveness measured?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Capital Planning Narrative (Points possible: 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs?</li> <li>• Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?</li> <li>• Does the system involve building occupants and users?</li> <li>• Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?</li> <li>• Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?</li> </ul>



Emergency (Application question 14; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency: NO points!
- Consider the 'level of threat' to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider how well points noted in instructions are addressed.
- Consider the 'immediacy' of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider information provided in all portions of the application in assessing the emergency.
- Scoring should be weighted in the case of mixed-scope projects (i.e., does the project address emergency and non-emergency conditions?)

Seriousness of Life Safety and Code Conditions (Application Questions 14 and 17; Points possible: 50)

- Consider the documentation provided: how specific?, source/author?, reasonable categories?
- Consider information provided on type and nature of code violations. How specific?
- Mandatory or optional? Especially consider this in light of code condition comparisons between standards for new buildings and the requirements for older buildings.
- Does the project provide relief from life safety & code conditions for facilities affected by the project?
- Seriousness of emergency conditions?
- Seriousness of code conditions?
- Scoring should be weighted in the case of mixed scope projects.
- Life safety description should provide relationship to definitions provided in Appendix B.

Existing Space (Application Question 26; Points possible: 40)

- This score should be adjusted for mixed scope projects (i.e., does the project only involve improvements to inadequate space or does it also incorporate work in adequate spaces?)
- Rating should consider the adequacy of the space in terms of both form and function.
- There should be a balance between consideration of educational adequacy of physical arrangement versus functional factors.
- Points are awarded based on the inability of existing space to adequately serve the educational program. No points for code violations!
- Mandated programs can receive 40 points maximum, existing local programs can receive 20 points maximum, and new local programs can receive 15 points maximum (should be spelled out in the application).



Cost or Cost Estimate (Application Questions 18; Points possible: 30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- Check for double entries, especially for factored items.
- Primary evaluation should test both the “reasonableness” and the “completeness” of the cost estimate (i.e., How well can this estimate be used to advocate for this project?)
- Rating considers the full range of estimates: from conceptual to detail design to actual construction costs. It should be noted that because this scoring element covers the full range of estimate possibilities, it is anticipated that conceptual estimates score less than more detailed construction estimates and actual construction cost documentation.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate or actual construction costs.
- Check percentages and justification (**with backup**) when percentages exceed EED guidelines.
- Check cost after adjustment for geographic factor.
- Review cost benefit analysis and life cycle cost analysis. Note if these are not present. Note specific deficiencies.

Relationship of the Project Cost to the Annual Operating Cost (Application question 29; Points possible: 30)

- This should be rated based on information provided which specifically address this issue.
- Evaluation should be based on district provided data and analysis rather than opinion.
- Evaluation may reward efforts to contain or reduce operating costs even if the project doesn't save money or have a payback (i.e. – utilizing LEED or CHPS standards for construction).
- Top scores should be reserved for those projects that can demonstrate a payback within a relatively brief period of time.
- Should be consistent with life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis (if provided).
- This may have either a positive or a negative relationship to justification of a project.



Alternative Facilities (Application question 27; Points possible: 5)

- Consider the effort/results in identifying alternative facilities.
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there **documentation** with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- Were judgments about the viability of alternate facilities made with “institutional knowledge”, professional assessment, third party objectivity and/or economic analysis?
- Is the rationale behind alternative facility viability provided?
- Are facilities listed in a narrative discussion or are they documented with supplemental data such as photos, maps, facility profile, etc.?

Options (Application Question 28; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed.
- Was the option to phase the project considered?
- Should consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For equipment: was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new.
- For over-crowding, was double shifting considered? If not, why not?
- Were the options considered viable alternatives?
- The rating of this scoring element should consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other.
- Scoring should increase in accordance with the amount of detailed information; graduated into three levels of: 1. unsupported narrative 2. well supported narrative and 3. detailed cost analysis.

Adequacy of Documentation (Points possible: 30)

- This score should be the last score awarded.
- Consider all attachments in evaluating this element.
- Points awarded for this element should reflect how well information needed to assess each of the other scoring elements was provided.
- Consideration should be given to congruency between documents supporting an application.
- Consideration should be given to how well documents and submittals responded to both the letter and the intent of questions.



**Objective Rating Form (continued)**

<b>Max Points</b>		<b>School Construction A, B, E, F</b>	<b>Major Maintenance C, D</b>
<b>30</b>	<p><b>9. Preventive Maintenance (Question 30)</b></p> <p>A. Maintenance Management Program</p> <p>1. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters 15 points</p> <p>2. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters 10 points</p> <p>3. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. 5 points</p> <p>If % ≤ 4, then (% x 1.25)</p> <p>If % &gt; 4, then 5</p>		
<b>270</b>	<b>Total Points</b>		

**Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
Capital Improvement Project Application  
Subjective Rating Form  
FY2012**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2010

School District \_\_\_\_\_  
 School Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Title \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fund \_\_\_\_\_ Category \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phase \_\_\_\_\_ Maximum Points \_\_\_\_\_  
 Rater \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Note: Points for elements two through eight will be weighted to apply to each specific category of a mixed-scope project.

Max Points		School Construction A, B, E, F	Major Maintenance C, D
25	<b>1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program</b> (Question 30) A. Maintenance Management Narrative = 5 points maximum B. Energy Management Narrative = 5 points maximum C. Custodial Narrative = 5 points maximum D. Maintenance Training Narrative = 5 points maximum E. Capital Planning Narrative = 5 points maximum		
50	<b>2. Emergency</b> (Question 14)		
50	<b>3. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions</b> (Questions 14 & 17)		
40	<b>4. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs</b> (Question 26) A. Mandated Program = 40 points maximum B. Local existing program = 20 points maximum C. New approved local program = 15 points maximum		
30	<b>5. Reasonableness &amp; completeness of cost or cost estimate</b> (Question 18)		
30	<b>6. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings</b> (Question 29)		
5	<b>7. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project</b> (Question 27)		
25	<b>8. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project</b> (Question 28)		
30	<b>9. Adequacy of documentation</b> (All questions)		
<b>285</b>	<b>Total Points</b>		

**2010 Work Topics for the BR & GR Committee**  
 Reviewed 4/14/10

<b>2010 Work Items</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
1. Subjective Scoring Review	Staff	December 10
2. FY2012 CIP List Review	Committee	December 10
3. Database Review		
3.1. Consolidation into a single Database	Staff	July 10
3.2. Coordination with the Unity project	Staff	July 10
3.3. Incorporate renewal and replacement information	Staff	July 10
4. 2012 Application	Staff	April 10
5. Online CIP Application Status	Staff	December 10
6. Statute/Regulation Changes	Staff	April 10
7. Publications Review	Staff	Ongoing
7.1. Swimming Pool Guidelines	Staff	July 10
7.2. Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Guide	Staff	December 10
7.3. A/E Selection Guide	Staff	April 11
7.4. Outdoor Facilities Guidelines		
7.5. Space Guidelines		
7.6. Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook		
7.7. Site Selection Criteria Handbook		
7.8. Condition Survey		
7.9. Renewal and Replacement Guideline		
7.10. Project Delivery Handbook		
7.11. Equipment Purchase Guideline		
7.12. Educational Specifications Handbook		
7.13. Capital Project Coordinators Handbook		

**Projected Meeting Dates**

July 16-17, 2010 ( )

December 02, 2010 (Anchorage)

March 16, 2011