

# Agenda

## Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

March 5, 2014 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

March 6, 2014 8:30 am to 4:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

<b>Chair:</b>	Elizabeth Nudelman
<b>Wednesday, March 5th</b>	
8:30 – 8:45 AM	<b>Committee Preparation</b> <b>Arrival, Packet Review, Roll Call</b> <b>Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes</b>
8:45 – 9:00 AM	<b>Public Comment</b>
9:00 – 10:15 AM	<b>Staff Briefing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Debt Reimbursement Funding Status</b></li> <li>• <b>Final CIP Lists</b></li> <li>• <b>Cost Model</b></li> </ul>
10:15 – 10:30 AM	<b>BREAK</b>
10:30 – 11:15 AM	<b>Staff Briefing (continued)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>FY 2016 CIP Application Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>FY 2016 Application</b></li> <li>- <b>FY 2016 Application Instructions</b></li> <li>- <b>FY 2016 Project Eligibility Checklist</b></li> <li>- <b>FY 2016 Rater's Guide</b></li> <li>- <b>FY 2016 Rating Forms</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
11:15 – 12:00 PM	<b>Action Items</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Approve FY2016 CIP application and supporting documentation</b></li> </ul>
12:00 – 1:00 PM	<b>LUNCH</b>
1:00 – 1:15 PM	<b>Public Comment</b>
1:00 – 2:30 PM	<b>FY 2017 CIP Application Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>FY2017 Application</b></li> <li>• <b>FY2017 Instructions</b></li> </ul>
2:30 – 2:45 PM	<b>Public Comment</b>
2:45 – 3:00 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:00 – 4:30 PM	<b>FY 2017 CIP Application Review (continued)</b>
4:30 PM	<b>Recess</b>

The department will provide teleconference access to this meeting in its entirety. To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 6470 and the # key.

# Agenda

## Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

March 5, 2014 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

March 6, 2014 8:30 am to 4:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

<b>Chair:</b>	Elizabeth Nudelman
<b>Thursday, March 6<sup>th</sup></b>	
8:30 – 8:45 AM	<b>Call to Order, Roll Call</b>
8:45 – 9:00 AM	<b>Public Comment</b>
9:00 – 10:15 AM	<b>FY 2017 CIP Application Review (continued)</b>
10:15 – 10:30 AM	<b>BREAK</b>
10:30 – 11:45 AM	<b>FY 2017 CIP Application Review (continued)</b>
11:45 – 12:00 PM	<b>Public Comment</b>
12:00 – 1:00 PM	<b>LUNCH</b>
2:00 – 3:00 PM	<b>FY 2017 CIP Application Review (continued)</b>
3:00 – 3:15 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:15 – 3:55 PM	<b>Committee Comments</b>
3:55 – 4:00 PM	<b>Set Date for Next Meeting</b>
4:00 PM	<b>Adjourn</b>

The department will provide teleconference access to this meeting in its entirety. To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 6470 and the # key.

BR & GR December 3,4 2013  
Anchorage – Talking Book Library  
MEETING MINUTES – FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

**Committee Members Present**

Elizabeth Nudelman  
Doug Crevensten  
Mary Cary  
Mark Langberg  
Robert “Bob” Tucker  
Carl John  
Dean Henrick  
Senator Dunleavy

**Staff**

Stuart Gerger  
Elwin Blackwell  
Wayne Marquis  
Courtney Preziosi

**Additional Participants**

Robert Reed (LYSD)  
Don Hiley (SERRC)  
Larry Morris (FNSB)  
Don Carney (Mat Su)  
Kevin Lyon (Kenai)  
Dave Norum (FNSB)  
Kathy Christy  
Gale Bourne (YKSD)

**DECEMBER 3****CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL AT 8:40 AM****REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA**

Agenda reviewed and approved.

**REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES**

Minutes approved as submitted. *Dean* thanked the committee for sending the minutes and agenda early.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Larry Morris* would like the restrictions as far as use of maintenance equipment to be reevaluated. He feels as though having equipment purchased for a project at one school should also be able to be used at a different school. The expense of equipment makes it difficult for some districts to have ample maintenance equipment for schools.

*Senator Dunleavy* questioned whether the use of equipment purchased only for a certain school was on the honor system and if there is any monitoring of the use. *Larry* answered that it was on the honor system. *Don Hiley* also agreed that the department needs to revisit the rules on the use of equipment.

**STAFF BRIEFING**

*Doug* asked why the amount requested on the School Construction and Major Maintenance lists in FY2015 has decreased from previous years (referencing page 21 of 97). *Elwin* said that he speculates that it has something to do with the fact that major renovations have taken place in previous years as well as there is better preventative maintenance programs taking place. *Mary* stated that the debt reimbursement program may be taking the burden of projects that would normally be seen on the grant application process. *Doug* asked if the decrease is indicative of a trend. *Elwin* said that it is not.

*Bob* referenced a time when the debt program was not being reimbursed by the State. *Elizabeth* clarified that there was a time when the debt program wasn't funding at 100%, but rather payments

were prorated. Elwin stated that there were a couple of years where the state did not fund 100%. As far back as he can remember there was never a time when no money was appropriated.

*Bob* wanted to know how many projects on the current FY2015 initial list were already completed. *Stuart* did not recall. *Elizabeth* said the department will get that information.

*Elwin* gave an overview of the Debt Reimbursement Funding Status under SB237. *Senator Dunleavy* asked how much debt has currently been paid down. *Elizabeth* stated that the department can certainly put that information together for the committee. *Elwin* stated that the SB237 report has the current functioning piece of the statute. *Elizabeth* said that the department can bring back what the outstanding liability for the debt projects currently is.

*Carl* asked if the legislature is presented with the 6-year plans so that they are aware of the need around the state. *Elizabeth* stated that comments she has heard is that the dollar amount on the 6-year plan is only a start and does not accurately depict the need of the state. *Mary* suggested that a key be added to the 6-year plans so that the readers of the 6-year plan would be able to distinguish the categories.

*Don Hiley* stated that in his opinion you realistically only have a 1 in 10 chance on a project being funded. Districts that are able to bond for projects may apply for the debt program rather than the grant process. *Don Carney* added that 6-year plans for districts change dramatically. He feels as though the list is a living document and it is hard to plan for failure. He believes that until funding is increased, for some districts, maintenance will just accumulate.

*Senator Dunleavy* brought up the topic of buildings becoming obsolete after only 50 years. *Mark* answered that in a lot of cases the school district is saying you have to implement a certain program. By the time you add up the cost of all the compliant changes, you may as well build a new school somewhere. Some entity will use that building as is. *Kevin* stated that updating buildings according to the current codes adds an exponential cost. Once a minor modification is made, you have to bring the whole building up to code. In his borough, he says there are some buildings they cannot do anything with. *Bob* added that the state has a tab in their cost model that will tell you how long each section should last. You can calculate based on the size of the building. The cost of operating the building will far exceed the cost of the building.

## **BREAK**

### **Preventative Maintenance Update**

*Wayne* gave an overview of the Preventative Maintenance State of the State. *Senator Dunleavy* asked whether Pribilof and Aleutian Region were ever qualified. *Wayne* stated that Aleutian Region is really close to being qualified. The PM State of the State outlines what category each district is qualified for. Aleutian Region does not have a certified Maintenance Management program. *Stuart* added that the department has been contacted by Pribilof and that they want to get their program back on track.

*Don Carney* stated that it is difficult for some districts to maintain a preventative maintenance program with limited resources and personnel. It takes a lot of time and effort.

*Wayne* added that school districts are on a 5-year visit rotation. *Carl* asked if a visit is made sooner than 5 years if that district failed its initial inspection. *Wayne* answered yes.

*Stuart* added that the PM handbook is currently being updated by *Wayne* to be tailored as a more user friendly resource. Dean asked if the committee will see the draft. *Stuart* answered yes.

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

## **LUNCH BREAK**

## **CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION**

*Stuart* began the discussion of the CIP application beginning with question 6a, Emergency Conditions. *Stuart* reviewed what had been discussed in the August meeting regarding this question. *Stuart* stated that in the instructions there is an addition of point ranges. *Bob* asked why in the instructions there was a 6-40 point range in the matrix (page 82 of 97). *Stuart* explained that it's a draft, and this question was only for the portion of the educational structure. *Stuart* noted that the removal of 'multiplied by 50-60' will be replaced with 'multiplied by 50'. *Elizabeth* stated that the application should add 'based on the portion that is destroyed'. *Carl* was asking about the different categories of emergency. *Bob* stated that each category will explain that point range for the type of emergency.

*Elwin* stated that as a rater he will take into consideration the amount of space that is now compromised and the type of space that is unusable. He stated that if a portion of the building that has burned down lost educational space, it will be weighted higher than, say, storage space. *Elizabeth* reiterated that these point areas are very rare, whereas the 'System or Component failures' portion is an event that is more likely to happen.

*Doug* would like to see the word "Critical" on page 83 of 97 to be omitted. He stated that the application should ask for "components" that are failing and leave out the descriptor. *Elizabeth* asked if we should bring the last category to a 0-20 point range. *Bob* stated that this question should state "based on recent documented records". *Bob* suggested that this point category be 0-20 points and strike out everything below. It would simplify the question. *Doug* reiterated the point that the more good documentation that is provided, the likelihood of the project scoring higher is greater. *Mary* mentioned that the third paragraph on page 82 of 97 would need to change "1-10 point range" as that point range would no longer be accurate.

*Elizabeth* suggested that the department select 10 or 15 applications to check for error.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Don Carney* expressed his concern that a school district cannot put kids in danger; if they have to, that is an emergency. Anytime a kid is at risk it's an emergency. He mentioned that most districts do not have extra places to put kids. *Don* stated that a 25 point limit for 'a building is unsafe for occupancy' is not fair as no child should be in a building that is unsafe.

*Larry Morris* said he was pretty happy with what has been done so far in the application. He feels that a few more descriptors in the raters guide would be helpful to the user. He feels as though the committee is going in the right direction.

*Elizabeth* asked *Don* whether this draft speaks to his concern about emergency points. *Don* answered that the draft is much better. *Don* agreed that more descriptors and more established minimums will be beneficial to the application process.

*Kevin Lyon* expressed concern that security is not even addressed in the life safety component of the application.

## **CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION**

*Elizabeth* summarized what she felt the consensus of the meeting was, that emergency is not just when a building is burning down, for example.

*Mary* stated that there are different tiers of asbestos and she suggests that hazmat expert advice is given in order to ensure that the wording in the application is in alignment with industry protocols. *Elizabeth* clarified that this was in 6b, Life Safety Conditions. *Stuart* continued with 6b, Life Safety Conditions. The Committee suggested putting check boxes next to point ranges so that the rater has a better idea of where the applicant feels their emergency is. *Carl* reiterated that the applicant still needs to describe their issue no matter what.

*Carl* expressed concern that the application should not be made simplified for the sake of smaller districts. He feels as though we are diluting the importance of the CIP application by providing check boxes. He stated that this is a highly competitive process and there is a lot of money to be awarded.

*Doug* wants the boxes included in the application to be made larger in order to ensure that districts don't feel as though the box is a sufficient enough space. The committee suggested putting in a sentence that states "please attach a separate page for any further description". *Elizabeth* agreed that a sentence should be there for those that may think they need to limit their description to the size of the box.

*Mark* suggested that 6b of the instructions be reworded to "Life Safety/Code Conditions" in order to match the application.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Larry Morris* referenced 6h, Funds expended for Maintenance. He stated that looking at past rating years, the districts with the highest points are the ones who spent the least maintaining their facilities. He feels as though there needs to be more points for this category. He also referenced 5g, Cost estimate for total project cost. He is concerned with Table 1 as far as District Administrative Overhead and the percentages in accordance with the project total. He does not believe that a high dollar project will need 9% of the project total for District Administrative Overhead. He feels as though that will free up percentage for other budgeted categories. He stated that the Committee has talked about Commissioning in the past. He would like Commissioning to be taken into account. *Mark* clarified that the table states "up to 9%". *Larry* answered that most projects use the full 9%. *Larry* would like some of that percentage be put in Construction Management and adjusting the percentage to the project total. *Carl* asked where *Larry* would like to see Commissioning. *Larry* answered that it should be put at its own line item. *Mark* agreed that commissioning should be a line item and be added as "up to 2%".

*Elizabeth* asked whether the Department made changes to question 5g. *Stuart* answered that there have been changes to the footnotes, but not since August 1, 2013. *Stuart* stated that he is almost positive the only change was the addition of number 8 in the footnote on page 69 as well as a few word changes. *Mark* asked that the word “electrical” be added as a category to Footnote 7 on page 68. *Elizabeth* asked whether this footnote was just a reiteration of the Statute. *Stuart* said yes, but then added that the law says for “any project” the 1% Art is required. *Stuart* stated that the Department was given clarification on this law by the State Council of the Arts. *Bob* asked whether this was in writing. *Mark* asked whether Footnote 7 was then an interpretation of the State Council of the Arts.

*Kathy Christy* suggested making the 130% of construction cost limitation for the total project cost as a part of the application and not just the instructions. The committee agreed that this should be added as a footnote under Table 1 of question 5g. *Elizabeth* said that they will leave it in the instructions and add the footnote to the application. *Kathy* added that a 10% limit for design services has been hard for districts to comply with, especially smaller projects. *Bob* agreed with *Kathy*, his experience is that it is hard to stay within a 10% budget for design services.

*Don Hiley* disagrees that Design fees should be micromanaged by the department. He agrees that 10% Design budget for small projects is really hard to meet.

*Don Carney* believes that the design fee should be increased, but so should the 130% of the construction cost. *Mary* stated that we are asking the A/E to do more in the past, so the inflation level has increased proportionately with the services provided. *Don Carney* stated that he did not mean to imply that they were ramping their prices up, but given services have become more complex, the percentage has not changed to reflect that. *Mark* advocates increasing that percentage as well.

*Doug* asked if the Department has authority to change that percentage. *Elizabeth* said the Department can discuss the possibility and check with the proper Regulation and Statute.

## **BREAK**

## **CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION**

*Stuart* continued the discussion with section 5, Scoring Factors Related to Planning and Maintenance, of the Application. *Mary* wants the committee to revisit the nomenclature of some of categories. *Mary* suggested renaming 5b from “Analysis” to “Planning and Analysis”.

*Bob* stated that the current drafted application states that for question 5, Scoring Factors Related to Planning and Maintenance, they can earn “up to” the certain points but the instructions are a more “all or none concept”. He feels this is misleading if they are earning zero or ten points, not “up to” ten points. *Stuart* asked the committee how they feel the points should be awarded. *Mary* wanted clarification as to whether the documents submitted in question 5 are being graded on the quality of the document or whether they are awarded points if they are simply checked “yes”.

*Bob* said that currently the application is graded on whether the document is submitted, not necessarily qualitative. *Stuart* stated that the Department does not have the expertise to rate the documents. Currently the applicant is given points if the document is there. *Mary* suggested that the note at the top of question 5 on page 67 leads the applicant to believe the rater is looking at the quality of the documents. *Doug* suggested that the application could say that “adequate documentation and a

picture of complete planning are necessary to show that there is quality or completeness". *Stuart* said that the last sentence then should be removed because it would not be accurate.

*Bob* mentioned that some of the check boxes for question 5 on page 67 are not applicable to all projects. *Doug* suggested putting a box next to each sub section in question 5 that reads "Not Applicable".

*Carl* expressed concern that districts have already done schematic design for some of their projects. The current FY2015 application does not require a site survey or preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical). The drafted application now requires it on page 92. He said the districts in good faith have proceeded without this but now is required.

*Doug* suggested that those projects that select "Not Applicable" provide a brief explanation why their project is not applicable to the requirements on page 92.

*Don Hiley* asked whether it is appropriate to dictate what a design professional is doing for a specific project. *Don* cautioned the committee about making changes for the sake of change. He has not seen any issue currently that would elicit change.

*Bob* pointed out that he likes the new version as is but reiterates what was said earlier regarding putting "zero or ten" instead of "up to ten" and the addition of a "Not Applicable" box. *Carl* stated that the drafted version is now more difficult for smaller districts to get points because of the costs. *Mary* disagreed, saying that the only difference now is the requirement of the signed letter of commitment from the land owner. *Mary* said that this is actually a less impact for the district.

*Elizabeth* recessed the committee meeting at 4:30p and noted the next day's start time to be 8:30 AM on December 4<sup>th</sup>.

**DECEMBER 4****CALL TO ORDER**

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 8:40 AM.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Don Carney* thanked staff for all the hard work that has been put into the CIP application. He would like the committee to look into emergency point minimums. He would like to see better distribution of emergency points. He also urged the committee to not change parts of the application for the sake of change. He stated that he sees real solid improvement to the application.

*Kathy Christy* said she appreciated all the effort and progress towards reorganizing the application. She feels as though it's hard to rate a smaller project versus a larger project using the same application. She suggests when the draft is done, running various projects through the new application and analyzing the results.

**CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION****INADEQUACIES OF SPACE**

*Elwin* began the discussion explaining the rater's mentality when it comes to this question. Typically the upper end of the space points are given when a district's inadequacy of space is affecting the ability to house a good portion of the population. The amount of students unhoused will affect a district's points accordingly. *Mary* wanted to know whether that was applicable to only new programs, as that is what the new question 6e on page 72 is. *Stuart* said it seems like an error that the question title referenced "New" programs. *Stuart* said that the current instructions have not been adjusted since the last committee meeting.

*Bob* asked if there has been an issue rating this question as it stands now. *Elwin* stated he does not recall hearing too many issues with applicants regarding space, but states he has only been involved in the reconsideration aspect of the CIP process for a few years.

*Larry* said the only time he has used Inadequacy of Space points is in a major renovation. *Larry* feels as though this is really only appropriate for new space, because then mechanical/electrical major maintenance points will not get their deserved points. He says it works the way it is written but questions its reliability for major maintenance.

*Carl* said that although it's not always applicable to a major maintenance project, it still needs to be left there so it can be considered.

*Kevin* stated that a project he submitted got zero points for security in the inadequacy of space category. He said he got 8 points in life/safety for security.

*Kathy* is concerned that too many different projects are being held against the same criteria. She asked whether the department would entertain the idea of two separate applications for Major Maintenance and School Construction.

*Bob* asked why the application sets different point values for a Local program and a New Local program. He feels as though there could be a really good reason for a new local program, but the application would limit the amount of points that program would get.

*Elwin* stated that as a rater he takes into consideration whether the inadequacy of space will significantly impact the student's ability to learn. If it does, the space is inadequate. *Elwin* said his biggest concern as a rater is that the project's funding should serve its primary function, which is giving a place for children to be educated. *Elwin* said this question is geared more towards construction.

*Elizabeth* referenced recent scoring for this question. It looks as though that major maintenance projects were not awarded many points for this question. *Elizabeth* reiterated a previous public comment that both major maintenance and construction projects are rated against each other on this question. *Bob* feels as though this question needs to stay for both lists.

*Don Carney* said that when he was a rater the system that was in place had a way to counterbalance the inability for major maintenance projects to score high for inadequacy of space. He stated that the projects that aren't scoring high in this area will make up points in different areas.

*Doug* suggested a language change for this question. He would like question 6e to read "Inadequacies of existing space". In the explanation of this question, he would like to see the addition of "in terms of mandated programs, existing local programs, or a proposed new local program" after facility operations. This would point out the three areas of inadequacy that would be addressed. *Bob* added that somewhere we should add that this question is still applicable to major maintenance. *Mark* suggested that go in the instructions and agreed with *Doug's* proposed change.

*Elizabeth* asked if the practice of this question has now changed. *Bob* answered no, that only the wording has been changed.

*Mary* wanted to clarify that inadequacy of space is not only determined by size, but whether it has the right features to support the programs. *Mark* said he feels as though security needs to be worked into the application somehow. *Bob* asked if security would be addressed in the life safety question. *Mark* stated that security would either be addressed there or it would be addressed in question 6e, inadequacy of space.

*Bob* asked if the points in the instructions are going to change. Currently the instructions read "20 points are available for existing local education programs" and "15 points are available for new local programs". *Dean* suggested having it read "up to 20 points" for both programs. *Bob* agreed. *Elizabeth* asked if there was a consensus that points should be consistent for new and existing space. The committee agreed.

*Don Carney* stated that if you don't have adequate space for a mandated program, the idea was that it was a higher priority than a district who wants to put in a new program. A district that cannot support their mandated program would be outscored by a new program.

## **ALTERNATIVES AND OPTIONS**

*Stuart* continued the application discussion with page 58, Alternatives and Options. *Stuart* said that even if there are no alternatives or options for a project, it is expected that an explanation or research proving there are no alternatives will be provided. *Bob* asked if this has been used on the major

maintenance list. *Elwin* answered yes. *Elwin* stated that in the past in order to provide equity, if a district has gone ahead and answered it, the raters will score it. The only time a district has been awarded zero points is if they leave the question blank. He stated that applicants sometimes get frustrated when they feel as though this question does not apply to their project. *Elwin* stated that all options need to be explored, and in order to get some points, applicants need to provide some written explanation.

*Carl* said that in the past when he has wrote “not applicable to this project” he has gotten zero points. *Elizabeth* said that it’s important for applicants to know that the raters are looking for an explanation.

*Larry* expressed his thought that for major maintenance, this question is not relevant. His feeling is that the department should head towards two applications, one for major maintenance and one for construction. *Don Hiley* disagreed saying that even on a boiler project, if your boiler fails and your school is closed, there aren’t a lot of options but there are temporary solutions. He feels that this question applies mostly to construction but it’s not completely useless for major maintenance.

*Don Carney* said that it was discussed a few years back where it was proposed that there be a part of the instructions that say “if you are not adding space, skip to”. He feels as though in the new application that would be an easy way to solve the statute issue.

*Kevin* stated that it may be beneficial to just award the 5 points if it is not applicable. He said that for many years he never answered this question. *Carl* rebutted that all major maintenance points should get zero. *Kevin* answered that’s fine as long as every major maintenance project is getting the same points.

*Bob* suggested that the department look at the top 15 of both categories and run them through the new drafted application. *Elizabeth* stated that the department needs to look at a significant sample and see what, if any, changes are on the two lists. *Carl* suggested scoring the top 5. *Bob* thinks that the department should also score where the funding stops. *Doug* stated that the department needs to ensure that the new drafted application is equitable across the board.

*Elizabeth* stated that this question will be scored for construction and not major maintenance. The department will then come back with an analysis of how the projects will score and come up with some sort of an analysis. *Bob* questioned whether both 6g and 6c will be for only construction.

**BREAK**

**CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION**

**ALTERNATES AND OPTIONS**

*Stuart* continued the CIP application discussion with question 6i, Other Options. *Mark* asked if 6i has been reworded or just renumbered. *Stuart* answered that 6i has been renumbered and has not been reworded since August’s Draft 1. *Elwin* mentioned that when rating this question, the more that is written usually indicates that the applicant spent time evaluating all options for the project.

*Bob* asked if the committee feels the points awarded on this question should be changed from 25 to 20. *Elizabeth* stated that if there is not a problem with the question, this should be left as is.

*Dave* raised the concern that some projects don't really have many options. For example, a seismic issue would score low. He referenced roof projects and that the most cost effective way to replace it is a design build. That project would then not get planning points for that. *Elizabeth* said that people have to take in mind that at the end of the day different projects rate differently for some questions.

*Larry* said he likes this question although his personal belief is that it is highly overweighted. He said that although some of the options don't have answers yet, you have to list them out as a writer. *Kevin* said that he submitted an application for a project and listed out, what he feels, every option available but only got 17 points.

*Doug* asked that this question include the statutory reference.

## **LUNCH**

### **CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION**

*Stuart* began the afternoon discussion with question 6j of the application, Operating Cost Savings. He directed the committee's attention to page 88 of 97 where the Statute and Regulations are referenced. *Stuart* explained that, for the draft application, this was the common area where applicants are able to see what regulation or statute backs each component. *Stuart* mentioned that some applicants leave this question blank. He proposed making the instructions for this question clearer. *Elwin* clarified that question 6j is not limited to Category E applications. He also stated that districts that provide adequate documentation to back up their claims usually score higher on this question. He would also like the question to provide more clarification in the instructions.

*Don Carney* agreed that this question is working. His theory is that points increase in categories that were reviewed at the CIP Workshop. He stated that this was a perfect opportunity for districts to partake in the training opportunity and should be fully utilized.

*Larry* said he likes this question as well. He feels as though question 6j has a lot to do with experience, and that with time districts are able to get their deserved points for annual operating cost savings.

*Dave* referenced this year's points and agreed that this question is a great teaching moment.

*Mary* stated that districts need to meet energy standards, so in essence this question is just an elaborated explanation. She said that if there was a model for districts to see, they would have a better understanding as to what the raters are looking for. *Mary* referenced the Alaska Housing Finance Committee and handbook they have regarding energy efficiency.

*Don Carney* said that over the years raters have developed a system as far as rating. He said that in the old application there was a section that allowed raters to rate the application in general. This was an opportunity for districts to get more points for this question. The current drafted application does not have that opportunity. He feels as though the application is used to rate hundreds of different applications and reality is there are going to be ups and downs for some categories.

*Kevin* expressed that as a writer you pretty much know where you are going to get your points. He feels that the application can't be fixed so that all applications score high.

*Stuart* reiterated that the committee feels as though this questions works although there needs to be more clarification in the instructions as well as a note that states it's important for all projects to complete this question.

*Elizabeth* stated that the department will need to come back with a final draft of the product that has been worked on as well as analysis and testing. Information and a final draft will be brought back to the committee.

*Carl* mentioned that the first page of the draft application, page 61 of 97, has an error. *Carl* stated that the draft application says each district can submit up to ten applications. He said that in the past it has been ten applications and ten reuse for a total of 20. *Elizabeth* said it was an error and this will be fixed.

*Doug* asked if it was decided there would be two separate applications. *Bob* stated that there is not enough time nor personnel to complete two applications for this upcoming rating period. *Elizabeth* explained that if the committee felt as though there should be two applications, there would need to be a long discussion. *Doug* said that he feels he has heard enough testimony that it is difficult to rate both a major maintenance and school construction project against the same question. He would like this to be discussed in a future meeting.

*Don Hiley* said that if there is no compelling reason to change, then it should be left alone. He believes there are some pretty significant scoring changes taking place this year. He expressed concern that reuse projects are using the old applications scores. He pleads caution that changes shouldn't be made for the sake of change.

*Carl* reiterated what *Don Carney* and *Don Hiley* stated. He stated that districts have spent money based on the current application. He urges the committee to test it and feels putting out the application this year is too early. He feels the committee needs to proceed with caution.

*Bob* stated that districts should know how their scores will differ with the new application. His feeling is that if districts feel they can get a better score by resubmitting an application instead of reusing scores, they should do so.

*Mary* asked what the transition plan was as far as submitting a reuse of score since the application has changed. *Elizabeth* responded that in the past if a question has been eliminated, those points would be eliminated from the reuse score. She said the only categories that will see changes on this upcoming application would be planning, emergency/life safety, and alternatives. She also reiterated what *Bob* said as far as districts evaluating whether they would score higher with the new application or whether to reuse scores from a previous year. *Doug* asked what the plan would be as far as number of applications able to be submitted since this may adversely affect the number of applications would be submitted with the new application as opposed to reuse of last year's scores.

*Elwin* said districts will have to go through the same evaluative process they have gone through in the past. He said the main reason for limiting the number of allowable submitted applications to ten was to make the review process more successful. He mentioned that in the past, when districts were allowed to submit more than 10 applications, the quality became decreased.

*Don Hiley* stated that this is all not that simple. Facility appraisal has been eliminated, condition survey has now changed, design points have changed. He said the change is not that clean. He said that in past meetings it has been stated that these are all changes to be discussed and that nothing has been ratified just yet. He mentioned that Superintendents have not even seen the changes. He wants everyone to be well aware of the changes, as it has real world consequences.

*Larry* wanted to remind people that the reason changes are being made is because there were districts that wanted change. He feels at some point there is going to be a change, and no matter what year the change is there is going to be a problem. If the process is delayed, the same complaints will be made. *Dave* encouraged the board to move forward on the changes.

*Don Carney* feels the committee will come back with a usable application. He stresses that the department should contemplate the suggestion of submitting more than 10 applications. His suggestion to accommodate the changes would be to allow no reuses but maybe allow 15 applications to be submitted. He would like the changes to be made next year and not this upcoming application period.

*Doug* asked that the next meeting allow time to discuss school security issue. *Elizabeth* stated that to her understanding points have been awarded to school security issues in the life safety category. She proposed going back and seeing what category it fits in and that it would be a separate discussion to be had. *Bob* thinks school security belongs in life safety. He feels that the current application doesn't provide a clear spot for where applications would receive points for school security. *Doug* suggested that *Stuart* possibly, before the next meeting, come up with language to put in the instructions that would incorporate school security and its point range.

### **Future Meeting Date**

*Elizabeth* stated that at the next meeting, a final draft and some analysis will be brought back to the committee. *Bob* wanted clarification that after the next meeting a new revised application will be put out for this next application period. The committee confirmed. A tentative meeting date was set for March 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> in Anchorage. *Mary* asked that the committee and Superintendents see the proposed draft application before, preferably late February. *Elizabeth* answered as early as possible. She stated that Superintendents will receive an email. The committee suggested that the email also be sent to the Facility managers at the districts.

### **Committee Member Comments**

*Carl* praised staff for all the work that has been done, although he does not agree with all the changes that have been made. *Doug* thought this was a productive two days and looks forward to seeing this through to completion. *Mary* would like to add to a future discussion the list of category of spaces on page 91. She would like those updated at a future time. *Bob* thanked staff for their work. He likes having some of the raters here for their input. *Dean* appreciates the input from users and feels that is helpful. *Mark* agreed with *Doug* that this has been a productive meeting.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

*State of Alaska*

**Department of Education & Early Development**  
Division of School Finance/Facilities

**By:** Facilities Staff

**Date:** March 5, 2014

**Phone:** 465-6906

**File:** 2014-03-05 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**

---

### ***Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB 237)***

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

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

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

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

The final Major Maintenance list is included in the packet; it will be presented at the next State Board of Education meeting on March 13<sup>th</sup>/14<sup>th</sup> for approval.

Due to an appeal, a final School Construction list has not been issued; the reconsideration list is included in the packet. The appeal is currently awaiting a decision by the administrative law judge.

For FY2015, 34 of 53 school districts submitted a total of 121 applications for the first year of the districts' revised six-year plans; 96 of the applications were scored, and the districts requested that 23 application scores be re-used for the FY 2015 list. The department determined that 2 applications were ineligible.

The major maintenance list contains a total of 102 projects amounting to a total state share request of \$183,505,181, and the school construction list currently contains 17 projects with a state share request of \$274,150,436.

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

The Cost Model tool which is used to assist school districts in estimating construction and renovation costs will be due for updating in 2015. The 13<sup>th</sup> Edition that was updated in 2013 will be edited for use in the FY2016 application cycle and will be posted on the department's website before the annual CIP training workshop.

## ***FY2016 Application Changes***

The following changes have been identified for the FY2016 CIP application and instructions:

### Application Changes

- Question 23 – The year column has been updated to the current ADM year and subsequent ten years for student population data.
- Footer – The form number reference will be changed to reflect the correct form number when it is issued.

### Application Instruction Changes

- Question 32 – The facilities contact information has been updated.
- Footer – The form reference will be changed to reflect the correct form number when it is issued, and the revision date will be changed to reflect approval month of the Application Instructions by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee.

### Eligibility Form Changes

- No changes.

### Rater's Guide Changes

- No changes.

### Rating Form Changes

- No changes.

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

## ***Staffing Update***

The Technical Engineer I/Architect I position is currently vacant. All other facilities staff positions are filled.

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

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

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

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-131	Design Projects; Girdwood K-8 Airport Hts Elem	3/23/2012	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-106	Districtwide Building Life Extension Projects	3/19/2013	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-107	Bartlett HS Cafeteria/Kitchen Renovations	3/19/2013	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-108	District wide Planning and Design Projects- 9 Schools (Anchorage and JBER)	3/19/2013	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-109	Aurora Elementary School Gym Addition	3/19/2013	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-110	Girdwood K-8 School Construction	3/19/2013	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Anchorage Totals:</b>				<b>\$231,670,000</b>	<b>\$121,270,000</b>	<b>\$231,130,000</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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Cordova</b>										
	DR-11-107	Cordova Jr/Sr HS ILP Building Project	4/6/2011	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Cordova Totals:</b>				<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>				
<b>Fairbanks</b>										
	DR-12-102	North Pole Middle School Roof Replacement	7/15/2011	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-103	North Pole Vocational Wing Renovation	7/15/2011	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-104	Ryan Renovation Phase II	7/15/2011	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	voters approved \$9,900,000 for Ryan Phase II
	DR-12-105	Salcha Roof and Envelope Upgrades	7/15/2011	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-14-107	Two Rivers Elementary Classroom Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$797,464	\$797,464	\$797,464	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Fairbanks Totals:</b>				<b>\$76,840,000</b>	<b>\$76,840,000</b>	<b>\$76,840,000</b>				
<b>Juneau City Borough</b>										
	DR-11-101	Auke Bay Elementary School Renovation Project	9/3/2010	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amended 12-17-11 for additional voter approved amount of \$1,400,000
	DR-11-200	Auke Bay Elementary Ground Source Heat Pump	12/17/2011	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	amends DR-11-101
	DR-12-101	Adair-Kennedy Synthetic Turf Replacement Project	8/2/2011	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Juneau City Borough Totals:</b>				<b>\$21,291,000</b>	<b>\$21,291,000</b>	<b>\$21,291,000</b>				
<b>Kenai Peninsula</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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-11-100	Districtwide Roofing Project	7/16/2010	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-100	Homer High School Turf Upgrade	7/8/2013	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-101	Roof Replacement - 10 Schools	7/8/2013	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Kenai Peninsula Totals:</b>				<b>\$39,853,500</b>	<b>\$39,853,500</b>	<b>\$39,853,500</b>				
<b>Ketchikan</b>										
	DR-11-106	Ketchikan High School Roof Replacement	12/22/2010	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-100	Districtwide Major Maintenance	9/10/2012	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Voters approved \$5,500,000 for five projects.

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-13-101	Schoenbar Middle School Field Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$232,000	\$232,000	\$232,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-102	Fawn Mountain Elementary Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-103	Districtwide Site Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$228,728	\$228,728	\$228,728	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-104	Smithers Pool Demolition	9/10/2012	\$2,374,020	\$1,363,253	\$1,363,253	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Add'l \$221,759 of redirected funds from DR-10-100; Reduced \$10,767 b/c of voter apvl
	DR-13-105	Valley Park Bus Pullout	9/10/2012	\$314,775	\$0	\$0	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Funds are redirected from DR-10-100
<b>Ketchikan Totals:</b>				<b>\$10,225,542</b>	<b>\$8,900,000</b>	<b>\$8,900,000</b>				
<b>Kodiak Island</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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-100	Kodiak High School Renovation/Addition	2/1/2012	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	project agreement uses \$68,679,814 of the approved amount
<b>Kodiak Island Totals:</b>				<b>\$76,310,000</b>	<b>\$76,310,000</b>	<b>\$76,310,000</b>				
<b>Lake &amp; Peninsula</b>										
	DR-13-111	Tanalian School Addition and Renovation	4/18/2013	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-112	Newhalen Kitchen and Gym Remodel and Expansion	4/18/2013	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Lake &amp; Peninsula Totals:</b>				<b>\$18,200,000</b>	<b>\$18,200,000</b>	<b>\$18,200,000</b>				
<b>Mat-Su Borough</b>										
	DR-11-102	Fire Alarm System Replacement, 10 Schools	11/17/2010	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

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

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

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-122	Districtwide HVAC Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-123	Emergency Power Generators & Switch Gear, 9-Schools	2/29/2012	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-124	Houston HS Exterior Envelope Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-125	Houston MS/Palmer MS Locker Replacement	2/29/2012	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-126	Districtwide ADA Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-127	Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Mat-Su Borough Totals:</b>				<b>\$247,830,051</b>	<b>\$247,830,051</b>	<b>\$247,830,051</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>
<b>North Slope Borough</b>										
	DR-12-132	Nuiqsut Trapper School Renovation	6/28/2012	\$5,587,194	\$5,815,000	\$5,815,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	\$750,000 approved in 10/7/08 election; \$5,065,000 approved in 10/6/09 election
	DR-12-133	Tikigaq School Gym and Locker Room Renovation	6/28/2012	\$1,808,200	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>North Slope Borough Totals:</b>				<b>\$7,395,394</b>	<b>\$6,915,000</b>	<b>\$6,915,000</b>				
<b>Valdez City</b>										
	DR-12-134	George H. Gilson Junior High School Replacement	6/28/2012	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Valdez City Totals:</b>				<b>\$39,804,183</b>	<b>\$39,804,183</b>	<b>\$39,804,183</b>				
<b>Grand Totals:</b>				<b>\$769,919,670</b>	<b>\$657,713,734</b>	<b>\$767,573,734</b>				
<b>Total of Projects Both Voter and EED Approved:</b>				<b>\$657,713,734</b>						
<b>(This is a total of the EED Approved Amount.)</b>										

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

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler Rehabilitation	\$36,657	\$36,657	\$0	\$36,657	\$10,997	\$25,660	\$25,660
2	2	2	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K Demoski K-12 School Renovation, Nulato	\$10,528,383	\$10,528,383	\$0	\$10,528,383	\$210,568	\$10,317,815	\$10,343,475
3	3	3	Nome City	Districtwide Lighting Replacement	\$267,165	\$267,165	\$0	\$267,165	\$80,149	\$187,016	\$10,530,491
4	4	4	Fairbanks	Barnette K-8 Magnet School Renovation, Phase 4	\$10,168,215	\$10,168,215	\$0	\$10,168,215	\$3,050,464	\$7,117,751	\$17,648,242
5	5	5	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Boiler Replacement	\$2,646,326	\$2,646,326	\$0	\$2,646,326	\$52,927	\$2,593,399	\$20,241,641
6	6	6	Kake City	Kake High School Boiler Replacement, Phase 2	\$250,924	\$250,924	\$0	\$250,924	\$25,092	\$225,832	\$20,467,473
7	7	7	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary HVAC System Upgrades	\$1,454,370	\$1,454,370	\$0	\$1,454,370	\$509,029	\$945,341	\$21,412,814
8	8	8	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	\$1,594,652	\$1,594,652	\$0	\$1,594,652	\$478,396	\$1,116,256	\$22,529,070
9	9	9	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	\$1,015,715	\$1,015,715	\$0	\$1,015,715	\$20,314	\$995,401	\$23,524,471
10	10	10	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	\$242,304	\$242,304	\$0	\$242,304	\$48,461	\$193,843	\$23,718,314
11	11	11	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	\$290,724	\$290,724	\$0	\$290,724	\$101,753	\$188,971	\$23,907,285
12	12	12	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	\$57,225	\$57,225	\$0	\$57,225	\$1,144	\$56,081	\$23,963,366
13	13	13	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Sprinkler Upgrades	\$91,103	\$91,103	\$0	\$91,103	\$31,886	\$59,217	\$24,022,583
14	14	14	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Headquarters Classroom Building Renovation	\$7,708,674	\$7,708,674	\$0	\$7,708,674	\$385,434	\$7,323,240	\$31,345,823
15	15	15	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	\$3,717,328	\$3,717,328	\$0	\$3,717,328	\$185,866	\$3,531,462	\$34,877,285
16	16	16	Haines	Haines Vocational Education Building Mechanical Upgrades	\$1,697,626	\$1,697,626	\$0	\$1,697,626	\$594,169	\$1,103,457	\$35,980,742
17	17	17	Northwest Arctic	Buckland K-12 Heating System Improvements	\$736,786	\$736,786	\$0	\$736,786	\$147,357	\$589,429	\$36,570,171
18	18	18	Galena	Sidney Huntington High School Floor Renovation	\$560,297	\$560,297	\$0	\$560,297	\$28,015	\$532,282	\$37,102,453
19	19	19	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, And Intercom Replacement	\$539,621	\$539,621	\$0	\$539,621	\$188,867	\$350,754	\$37,453,207

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

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
20	20	20	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Multipurpose Building Roof Replacement	\$233,431	\$233,431	\$0	\$233,431	\$4,669	\$228,762	\$37,681,969
21	21	21	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door & Flooring Replacement	\$138,462	\$138,462	\$0	\$138,462	\$13,846	\$124,616	\$37,806,585
22	22	22	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	\$1,258,584	\$1,258,584	\$0	\$1,258,584	\$25,172	\$1,233,412	\$39,039,997
23	23	23	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Sound & Acoustic Renovation	\$303,487	\$303,487	\$0	\$303,487	\$6,070	\$297,417	\$39,337,414
24	24	24	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	\$119,149	\$119,149	\$0	\$119,149	\$35,745	\$83,404	\$39,420,818
25	25	25	Craig City	Craig Middle School Renovation	\$11,176,539	\$11,176,539	\$0	\$11,176,539	\$1,117,654	\$10,058,885	\$49,479,703
26	26	26	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$578,960	\$578,960	\$0	\$578,960	\$11,579	\$567,381	\$50,047,084
27	27	27	Hoonah City	Hoonah Campus Boiler Replacement	\$246,757	\$246,757	\$0	\$246,757	\$74,027	\$172,730	\$50,219,814
28	28	28	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary East Wing Flooring Replacement	\$313,604	\$313,604	\$0	\$313,604	\$109,761	\$203,843	\$50,423,657
29	29	29	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$3,674,171	\$3,674,171	\$0	\$3,674,171	\$183,709	\$3,490,462	\$53,914,119
30	30	30	Yupit	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Removal/Replacement	\$6,165,858	\$6,165,858	\$0	\$6,165,858	\$123,317	\$6,042,541	\$59,956,660
31	31	31	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Biomass Boiler	\$2,083,615	\$2,083,615	\$0	\$2,083,615	\$625,084	\$1,458,531	\$61,415,191
32	32	32	Copper River	District Office Renovation	\$1,042,043	\$1,042,043	\$0	\$1,042,043	\$20,841	\$1,021,202	\$62,436,393
33	33	33	Kenai Peninsula	Kenai Middle School Asbestos Removal/Security Upgrade	\$7,458,445	\$7,458,445	\$0	\$7,458,445	\$2,610,456	\$4,847,989	\$67,284,382
34	34	34	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	\$2,838,677	\$2,838,677	\$0	\$2,838,677	\$56,774	\$2,781,903	\$70,066,285
35	35	35	Haines	Haines High School Air Handlers Replacement	\$500,911	\$500,911	\$0	\$500,911	\$175,319	\$325,592	\$70,391,877
36	36	36	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$440,959	\$440,959	\$0	\$440,959	\$8,819	\$432,140	\$70,824,017
37	37	37	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	\$903,644	\$903,644	\$0	\$903,644	\$180,729	\$722,915	\$71,546,932
38	38	38	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	\$581,315	\$581,315	\$0	\$581,315	\$11,626	\$569,689	\$72,116,621
39	39	39	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwarmiut K-12 School Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	\$1,037,460	\$1,037,460	\$0	\$1,037,460	\$20,749	\$1,016,711	\$73,133,332

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

**Final List**

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
40	40	40	Yukon Flats	Boiler & Control Upgrades, 4 Schools (Fort Yukon, Beaver, Chalkyitsik, Stevens Village K-12)	\$2,768,223	\$2,768,223	\$0	\$2,768,223	\$55,364	\$2,712,859	\$75,846,191
41	41	41	Fairbanks	Woodriver Elementary Renovation, Phase 3	\$9,952,322	\$9,952,322	\$0	\$9,952,322	\$2,985,697	\$6,966,625	\$82,812,816
42	42	42	Bristol Bay Borough	Bristol Bay School Boiler Installation	\$637,626	\$637,626	\$0	\$637,626	\$223,169	\$414,457	\$83,227,273
43	43	43	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Roof & Siding Replacement, Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$2,062,100	\$2,062,100	\$0	\$2,062,100	\$412,420	\$1,649,680	\$84,876,953
44	44	44	Kenai Peninsula	Homer High School Roofing Replacement	\$5,616,930	\$5,616,930	\$0	\$5,616,930	\$1,965,925	\$3,651,005	\$88,527,958
45	45	45	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Security Upgrades	\$1,029,688	\$1,029,688	\$0	\$1,029,688	\$308,906	\$720,782	\$89,248,740
46	46	46	Denali Borough	Districtwide Security Upgrades	\$2,249,662	\$2,249,662	\$0	\$2,249,662	\$449,932	\$1,799,730	\$91,048,470
47	47	47	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Air Handler Replacement	\$149,245	\$149,245	\$0	\$149,245	\$52,236	\$97,009	\$91,145,479
48	48	48	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$885,683	\$885,683	\$0	\$885,683	\$265,705	\$619,978	\$91,765,457
49	49	49	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School/Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrades	\$501,011	\$501,011	\$0	\$501,011	\$150,303	\$350,708	\$92,116,165
50	50	50	Valdez City	Valdez High School/Hermon Hutchens Elementary Gym Lighting Upgrades	\$865,814	\$865,814	\$0	\$865,814	\$303,035	\$562,779	\$92,678,944
51	51	51	Fairbanks	Tanana Middle School Mechanical Upgrades	\$9,663,174	\$9,663,174	\$0	\$9,663,174	\$2,898,952	\$6,764,222	\$99,443,166
52	52	52	Copper River	Slana K-12 School Renovation	\$1,375,840	\$1,375,840	\$0	\$1,375,840	\$27,517	\$1,348,323	\$100,791,489
53	53	53	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	\$2,613,670	\$2,613,670	\$0	\$2,613,670	\$52,273	\$2,561,397	\$103,352,886
54	54	54	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	\$3,935,200	\$3,935,200	\$0	\$3,935,200	\$78,704	\$3,856,496	\$107,209,382
55	55	55	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting System Installation	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$107,251,140
56	56	56	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	\$605,696	\$605,696	\$0	\$605,696	\$60,570	\$545,126	\$107,796,266
57	57	57	Haines	Haines High School & Pool Locker Room Renovation	\$1,979,264	\$1,979,264	\$0	\$1,979,264	\$692,742	\$1,286,522	\$109,082,788

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

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
58	58	58	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$651,236	\$651,236	\$0	\$651,236	\$13,025	\$638,211	\$109,720,999
59	59	59	Lower Yukon	Fuel Tank & Soil Remediation, 4 Sites (Pilot Station, Ignatius Beans, Pitka's Pt., Scammon Bay K-12 Schools)	\$5,230,620	\$5,230,620	\$0	\$5,230,620	\$104,612	\$5,126,008	\$114,847,007
60	60	60	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	\$1,351,847	\$1,351,847	\$0	\$1,351,847	\$27,037	\$1,324,810	\$116,171,817
61	61	61	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$1,347,878	\$1,347,878	\$0	\$1,347,878	\$26,958	\$1,320,920	\$117,492,737
62	62	62	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Emergency Generator	\$2,384,470	\$2,384,470	\$0	\$2,384,470	\$715,341	\$1,669,129	\$119,161,866
63	63	63	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	\$88,806	\$88,806	\$0	\$88,806	\$1,776	\$87,030	\$119,248,896
64	64	64	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation, Bethel	\$302,720	\$302,720	\$0	\$302,720	\$6,054	\$296,666	\$119,545,562
65	65	65	Kodiak Island	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,199,100	\$1,199,100	\$0	\$1,199,100	\$359,730	\$839,370	\$120,384,932
66	66	66	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Plumbing Renovations	\$456,876	\$456,876	\$0	\$456,876	\$137,063	\$319,813	\$120,704,745
67	67	67	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Provisions Installation	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$120,746,503
68	68	68	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	\$176,649	\$176,649	\$0	\$176,649	\$17,665	\$158,984	\$120,905,487
69	69	69	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium DDC Controls Upgrade	\$337,956	\$337,956	\$0	\$337,956	\$101,387	\$236,569	\$121,142,056
70	70	70	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Locker Room Renovation	\$499,879	\$499,879	\$0	\$499,879	\$149,964	\$349,915	\$121,491,971
71	71	71	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades	\$6,159,526	\$6,159,526	\$0	\$6,159,526	\$1,847,858	\$4,311,668	\$125,803,639
72	72	72	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$298,329	\$298,329	\$0	\$298,329	\$5,967	\$292,362	\$126,096,001
73	73	73	Fairbanks	Joy Elementary Roof Replacement	\$1,102,435	\$1,102,435	\$0	\$1,102,435	\$330,730	\$771,705	\$126,867,706
74	74	74	Kodiak Island	East Elementary & Karluk K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacements	\$1,241,679	\$1,241,679	\$0	\$1,241,679	\$372,504	\$869,175	\$127,736,881
75	75	75	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	\$1,838,495	\$1,838,495	\$0	\$1,838,495	\$551,548	\$1,286,947	\$129,023,828

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

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
76	76	76	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon K-12 School Soil Remediation & Tank Farm Replacement	\$8,889,258	\$8,889,258	\$0	\$8,889,258	\$177,785	\$8,711,473	\$137,735,301
77	77	77	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 School Renovation	\$2,621,463	\$2,621,463	\$0	\$2,621,463	\$52,429	\$2,569,034	\$140,304,335
78	78	78	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$1,182,262	\$1,182,262	\$0	\$1,182,262	\$23,645	\$1,158,617	\$141,462,952
79	79	79	Kuspuk	Districtwide Heating & Sprinkler Upgrades	\$5,706,032	\$5,706,032	\$0	\$5,706,032	\$114,121	\$5,591,911	\$147,054,863
80	80	80	Copper River	Glennallen K-12 School & Kenny Lake K-12 School Energy Upgrade	\$2,510,322	\$2,510,322	\$0	\$2,510,322	\$50,206	\$2,460,116	\$149,514,979
81	81	81	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Upgrade	\$738,248	\$738,248	\$0	\$738,248	\$14,765	\$723,483	\$150,238,462
82	82	82	Bering Strait	Districtwide Fuel Tank Demolition	\$937,600	\$937,600	\$0	\$937,600	\$18,752	\$918,848	\$151,157,310
83	83	83	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$264,405	\$264,405	\$0	\$264,405	\$79,321	\$185,084	\$151,342,394
84	84	84	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrades	\$264,549	\$264,549	\$0	\$264,549	\$5,291	\$259,258	\$151,601,652
85	85	85	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Mechanical Control Upgrades	\$1,333,881	\$1,333,881	\$0	\$1,333,881	\$26,678	\$1,307,203	\$152,908,855
86	86	86	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,601,895	\$1,601,895	\$0	\$1,601,895	\$32,038	\$1,569,857	\$154,478,712
87	87	87	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	\$3,056,476	\$3,056,476	\$0	\$3,056,476	\$61,130	\$2,995,346	\$157,474,058
88	88	88	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 School Gymnasium Relocation & Foundation	\$175,163	\$175,163	\$0	\$175,163	\$3,503	\$171,660	\$157,645,718
89	89	89	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline, 2 Sites (Pilot Station & Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	\$1,843,507	\$1,843,507	\$0	\$1,843,507	\$36,870	\$1,806,637	\$159,452,355
90	90	90	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	\$3,894,017	\$3,894,017	\$0	\$3,894,017	\$77,880	\$3,816,137	\$163,268,492
91	91	91	Kodiak Island	East Elementary, Peterson Elementary & Ouzinkie K-12 School Flooring Replacements	\$2,361,982	\$2,361,982	\$0	\$2,361,982	\$708,595	\$1,653,387	\$164,921,879
92	92	92	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-8 School Renovation	\$4,977,122	\$4,977,122	\$0	\$4,977,122	\$99,542	\$4,877,580	\$169,799,459
93	93	93	Yupit	Akiak K-12 School Power Generation	\$903,926	\$903,926	\$0	\$903,926	\$18,079	\$885,847	\$170,685,306
94	94	94	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 School Renovation	\$4,731,834	\$4,731,834	\$0	\$4,731,834	\$94,637	\$4,637,197	\$175,322,503

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

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 17	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
95	95	95	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School Fire Panel Replacement	\$449,422	\$449,422	\$0	\$449,422	\$134,827	\$314,595	\$175,637,098
96	96	96	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School & Peterson Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement	\$2,861,862	\$2,861,862	\$0	\$2,861,862	\$858,559	\$2,003,303	\$177,640,401
97	97	97	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	\$681,636	\$681,636	\$0	\$681,636	\$13,633	\$668,003	\$178,308,404
98	98	98	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,069,876	\$1,069,876	\$0	\$1,069,876	\$21,398	\$1,048,478	\$179,356,882
99	99	99	Kodiak Island	East Elementary Interior Renovation	\$2,582,623	\$2,582,623	\$0	\$2,582,623	\$774,787	\$1,807,836	\$181,164,718
100	100	100	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	\$293,640	\$293,640	\$0	\$293,640	\$5,873	\$287,767	\$181,452,485
101	101	101	Lower Yukon	Security Access System Upgrades - 6 Sites	\$1,519,482	\$1,519,482	\$0	\$1,519,482	\$30,390	\$1,489,092	\$182,941,577
102	102	102	Kodiak Island	Underground Storage Tank Replacements, 4 Sites (Chiniak, Port Lions, Old Harbor, Larsen Bay K-12 Schools)	\$805,148	\$805,148	\$0	\$805,148	\$241,544	\$563,604	\$183,505,181
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$214,602,666</b>	<b>\$214,602,666</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$214,602,666</b>	<b>\$31,097,485</b>	<b>\$183,505,181</b>	

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

Dec. 17	Nov. 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwethluk K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	\$57,678,571	\$57,678,571	\$25,518,469	\$32,160,102	\$643,202	\$31,516,900	\$31,516,900
2	2	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	\$100,065,442	\$61,197,650	\$0	\$61,197,650	\$12,239,530	\$48,958,120	\$80,475,020
3	3	Saint Marys	Andreafski High School Gym Construction	\$12,381,990	\$12,381,990	\$0	\$12,381,990	\$619,099	\$11,762,891	\$92,237,911
4	4	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Tuntutuliak	\$55,462,324	\$55,462,324	\$0	\$55,462,324	\$1,109,246	\$54,353,078	\$146,590,989
5	5	Yukon-Koyukuk	Jimmy Huntington K-12 Addition/Renovation, Huslia	\$19,159,236	\$19,159,236	\$0	\$19,159,236	\$383,185	\$18,776,051	\$165,367,040
6	6	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Atmautluak	\$45,188,824	\$45,188,824	\$0	\$45,188,824	\$903,776	\$44,285,048	\$209,652,088
7	7	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$18,594,511	\$18,594,511	\$0	\$18,594,511	\$371,890	\$18,222,621	\$227,874,709
8	8	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional High School Cafeteria Addition	\$9,157,375	\$9,157,375	\$0	\$9,157,375	\$183,147	\$8,974,228	\$236,848,937
9	9	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	\$13,799,174	\$13,799,174	\$0	\$13,799,174	\$275,983	\$13,523,191	\$250,372,128
10	10	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	\$451,346	\$451,346	\$0	\$451,346	\$157,971	\$293,375	\$250,665,503
11	11	Kuspuk	Johnnie John Sr. K-12 Replacement School, Crooked Creek	\$10,034,721	\$10,034,721	\$0	\$10,034,721	\$200,694	\$9,834,027	\$260,499,530
12	12	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area	\$430,601	\$430,601	\$0	\$430,601	\$8,612	\$421,989	\$260,921,519
13	13	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	\$109,374	\$109,374	\$0	\$109,374	\$38,281	\$71,093	\$260,992,612
14	14	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	\$6,173,568	\$6,173,568	\$0	\$6,173,568	\$123,471	\$6,050,097	\$267,042,709
15	15	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track & Field Improvements	\$5,398,431	\$5,398,431	\$0	\$5,398,431	\$107,969	\$5,290,462	\$272,333,171
16	16	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Drainage and Traffic Upgrades	\$1,062,398	\$1,062,398	\$0	\$1,062,398	\$21,248	\$1,041,150	\$273,374,321
17	17	Yupitit	Parking & Drive Resurfacing, 3 Schools	\$791,954	\$791,954	\$0	\$791,954	\$15,839	\$776,115	\$274,150,436
Totals:				\$355,939,840	\$317,072,048	\$25,518,469	\$291,553,579	\$17,403,143	\$274,150,436	

This page is intentionally blank

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



on for

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

FY2015
2016

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

For instructions on completing this application, please refer to the department's Capital Project Information and References website at:

http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html

\*\*(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.)
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).

Table with 2 columns: School Construction and Major Maintenance. Rows include categories like Health and life-safety, Unhoused students, Improve instructional program, Protection of structure, Building code deficiencies, and Achieve operating cost savings.

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

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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

c. Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete?  yes  no  
*(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 and please note the 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).)*
- 6a. 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).)*
- b. Is adequate documentation provided?  yes  no  
*(Reference: AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1)*

**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.)*
- b. 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

**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, 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.)*

**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 Design consultant. If there is no Design consultant for this project, provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required.

**Design Consultant - \_\_\_\_\_**

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 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 13<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 special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.

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/Dollar Adj. 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, D or E) 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.  yes  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
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			
2022-2023			

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)

**Table 4. PROJECT SPACE EQUATION**

	A	I	II	III	IV	B
Space Utilization	Existing Space	Space to remain "as is"	Space to be Renovated	Space to be Demolished	New Space	Total Space upon Completion
Elem. Instructional/Resource						
Sec. Instructional/Resource						
Support Teaching						
General Support						
Supplementary						
<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.)*

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

- 28.** 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.)*

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 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)

- Assessment # 1**      *Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)*
- Assessment # 2**      *Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Formula-Driven Points)*
- Assessment # 3**      *PM/corrective maintenance reports (Up to 10 Formula-Driven Points)*
- Assessment # 4**      *5-Year Average Expenditure on maintenance (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)*
- Assessment # 5**      *Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)*
- Assessment # 6**      *Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)*
- Assessment # 7**      *Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)*
- Assessment # 8**      *Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)*

# 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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



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

**FY2015 2016**

Use these instructions with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development AKEED Form #05-  
~~1314-050XXX~~, Rev 5/~~2013~~ 2014

**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 category D, and category E projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

## BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

- 3. Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-~~1314-050XXX~~. 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 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

<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

---

31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.

- 6a. 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.
- b. An application must include adequate documentation to verify the claims made in the application. The department may reject an application that does not have complete information or adequate documentation. See AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1).

### 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, 2012 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. *[Note: This information is used in calculating scores for Assessment 4; see Question 31.]*

### 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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 REAAs, 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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

*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.*

14. Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(1). If this project is an emergency, 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, 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 2011 publication, *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook*, may be useful in responding to this question. A site selection study is required for those projects involving new sites in order to qualify for schematic design points (reference Appendix A).

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,

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan as a condition survey for fuel tank or fuel facility projects. There are up to 5 points possible for a complete condition survey.

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

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

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

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

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

### 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, 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

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 referenced summarized and rather than reproduced in the project description. The detailed plan for demolishing or surplusing 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 #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 are attached, they can be summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the description 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 (13<sup>th</sup> 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, Site Investigation, and Seismic Hazard. To calculate the percent of construction divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to \$500,000; 3% for project costs between \$500,000 - \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects of \$5,000,000 or greater [AS14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, please add a detailed justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 30% in additional percentage costs.

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

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

Table 2, which summarizes construction costs, is structured to be consistent with the EED cost model. Other estimating formats may not provide an exact correlation; however, the following categories **MUST** be reported to allow adequate comparisons between projects: basic building, site work and utilities, general requirements, contingency, and escalation.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Do not blank out or write over this table. If the application includes a cost estimate from a designer or professional cost estimating firm, table two must still be filled out as described above.

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

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

## 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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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 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 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or even altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected. If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts must consider service area boundary changes and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes. Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary. There are up to 25 points available for a comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

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., evaluative or formula-driven). A district should provide any or all of the documents they have available. Refer to the

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 (Evaluative)** [up to 5 points available]:

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.). Discuss the quality of your program as it is reflected in the submitted formula-driven reports (i.e diversity in work types, hours available is accurate, there is a high percentage of reported hours).

**Assessment #2 – Maintenance Labor Reports (Formula-Driven)** [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., preventive, corrective, operations support, etc.] vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

*Item B:* Produce a districtwide report that shows a comparison of completed work orders to all work orders initiated, 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 for the previous 12 months. [deferred, awaiting materials, 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 (Formula-Driven)** [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 (preventive) maintenance and unscheduled work (repairs). 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 (Formula-Driven)** [up to 5 points available]:

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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

### **Energy Management**

**Assessment #5 – Energy Management Narrative (Evaluative)** [up to 5 points available]:

Provide a narrative description of the district’s energy management program and energy reduction plan.

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

### **Custodial Program**

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

Provide a narrative description of the district’s training program including but not limited to: identification of training needs, training methods, and numbers of staff receiving building-system-specific training in the past 12 months. In addition to the narrative description, provide a copy of the district’s training log for the past year. The training log should include name of the person trained, the training received, and the date training was received.

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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

provided for the entire staff. Safety and equipment specific videos are also an inexpensive training resource.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

### **Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)**

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

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

#### **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:**

[Stuart Gerger, School Facilities Manager](#)  
[School Facilities Front Desk](#)  
[\(907\) 465-6906 2891](#)

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 4 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

<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

Deficiencies, was previously referred to as "Code Upgrade." The key words are "major repair." A "D" project corrects major building, fire, mechanical, electrical, environmental, disability (ADA) and other conditions required by codes. Work on individual facility systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$25,000. An example could be making all corridors one hour rated. Making one or two toilet stalls accessible would not fit this category. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability 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. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types. This category corresponds to category C under AS 14.11.100(j) 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 20, 2012

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 20, 2012

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

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)		
N	#6b	Adequate documentation supporting the project request – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1)		



## **Guidelines for Raters of the 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 evaluative 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, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (categories C, D, and E) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure, Code Compliance, or Achieve an Operating Cost Savings, 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, L and N 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.



## Evaluative Rating Guidelines

For each of the evaluative 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>Maintenance Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</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>Energy Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</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>Custodial Narrative (points possible: 5)</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>Maintenance Training Narrative (Points possible: 5)</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>Capital Planning Narrative (Points possible: 5)</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.

This page is intentionally blank



**Formula-Driven Rating Form (continued)**

<b>Max Points</b>		<b>School Construction A, B, F</b>	<b>Major Maintenance C, D, E</b>
<b>30</b>	<p><b>9. Preventive Maintenance (Question 30)</b></p> <p>A. Maintenance Management Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters 15 points</li> <li>2. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters 10 points</li> <li>3. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. 5 points</li> </ul> <p>If % ≤ 4, then (% x 1.25)                      If % &gt; 4, then 5</p>		
<b>270</b>	<b>Total Points</b>		

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2012

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.

<b>Max Points</b>		<b>School Construction A, B, F</b>	<b>Major Maintenance C, D, E</b>
<b>25</b>	<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		
<b>50</b>	<b>2. Emergency</b> (Question 14)		
<b>50</b>	<b>3. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions</b> (Questions 14 & 17)		
<b>40</b>	<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		
<b>30</b>	<b>5. Reasonableness &amp; completeness of cost or cost estimate</b> (Question 18)		
<b>30</b>	<b>6. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings</b> (Question 29)		
<b>5</b>	<b>7. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project</b> (Question 27)		
<b>25</b>	<b>8. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project</b> (Question 28)		
<b>255</b>	<b>Total Points</b>		

This page is intentionally blank

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



DRAFT 3: Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement

FY2017

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

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

The department will only score ten project applications from each district during a single rating period. In addition, a district can submit a letter to reuse prior year application scores.

For instructions on completing this application, please refer to the department's Capital Project Information and References website at:

http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html

PROJECT INFORMATION:

School District: \_\_\_\_\_
Community: \_\_\_\_\_
School Name: \_\_\_\_\_
Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

CERTIFICATION:

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

Superintendent or Chief School Administrator \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

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

[ ] Grant Funding [ ] Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

**1c. Phases of project** to be covered by this funding request. Indicate **all** applicable phases:  
 Planning (Phase I)     Design (Phase II)     Construction (Phase III)

## 2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

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

**2a.** Has a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) been approved by the district school board?     yes     no  
(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b), and 4 AAC 31.011(c); attach a copy of the 6-year plan.)

**2b.** Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system?     yes     no  
(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1).)

**2c.** 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).)

**2d.** 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 3d, must meet the requirements of AS 14.11.011(b)(3).)

<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

2e. Does the district have a preventative maintenance program that is approved by the department?  yes  no

2f. Districtwide replacement cost insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

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

*This section is in progress.*

Six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (question 2a)

### 3. PROJECT INFORMATION:

3a. **Priority assigned by the District** (Up to 30 points)

What is the rank of this project under the district's six-year Capital Improvement Plan? Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

3b. **School facilities and their condition** (Up to 30 points)

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

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

Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year	GSF
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL GSF	_____	_____	0

3c. **Transition planning:** Does this project change the status of any facility within the project scope to one of the below? The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):

renovated  added to  demolished  surplusd  other

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

**3d. Project description/Scope of work:** The project description/scope of work narrative is a required element of this application (Reference AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)).

**Project Description**

Provide a clear, detailed description of the project. At a minimum, include the following:

- Facilities impacted by the project
- Age of facility/system(s)
- Facility/system conditions requiring capital improvement
- Other discussion

**Scope of Work**

Provide a clear, detailed description of the scope of work that addresses the items in the project description. At a minimum, include the following:

- Work items to be completed with this project
- Work items already completed (if any)
- Project schedule
  - Estimated receipt of funding date
  - Contract with design team
  - Begin design
  - Design work 100% complete
  - Project out to bid
  - Begin construction
  - Complete construction
- Other discussion

**Cost estimate discussion**

At a minimum, include the following:

- Identify source of construction cost estimate
- Identify source of lump sum costs
- Identify assumptions
- Other discussion

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

**3e. Project description attachments:** Listing all attachments to the application on this list assists raters. Eligibility items are all required on applicable projects. Not all other items are required.

- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (question 3g)
- Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (question 3c)
- Facility condition survey (question 6a)
- Facility appraisal (question 6b)
- Educational specification (question 6b)
- Conceptual design (question 6b)
- Schematic design documentation (question 6c)
- Design development documentation (question 6d)
- Cost estimate worksheets (question 7a)
- Budget variance justification (question 7a)
- Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e.*, *Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*) (question 4a, 9a)
- Cost/benefit analysis (question 9d)
- Life cycle cost analysis (question 9d)
- Value analysis provided (question 9d)
- Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (question 5e)
- Enrollment projections and calculations (question 5e)
- Justification for waiver of participating share (question 9f)
- For fully or partially completed projects: documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 (question 3f)

**3f.** Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete?  yes  no  
If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with 4 AAC 31.080.

**3g.** 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 3e.

**4. CODE DEFICIENCIES / PROTECTION OF STURCTURE / LIFE SAFETY**

**4a. Code Deficiencies / Protection of Structure / Life safety (Up to 50 points)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

~~Other (describe below).~~  yes  no

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of protection of structure, life safety, and or code deficiencies; attach supporting documentation.

Categorize the issues described and explained above by checking the boxes that apply to the building condition(s).

Building Code Deficiencies: Deficiencies related to building code violations where there is no threat to life safety. These issues include compliance with various current building and accessibility codes. (0 to 35 points)

Protection of Structure: Deficiencies that, when left unrepaired, will lead to new or continued damage to the existing structure, building systems, and finishes resulting in a shortened life of the facility. (0 to 35 points)

Health and Life Safety: Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions potentially threatening the health and life safety of students, staff and the public; unforeseen disasters such as fire, earthquakes, floods; and building/fire code violations potentially impacting health and life safety. (20 to 35 points)

Building Failure: Complete or imminent building failure resulting in unhoused students. (35 to 50 points)

**5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED:**

**NOTE:** If you have classified this project as Major Maintenance (Category C, D, or E) and you are not including any new space, skip to 5g. **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). Worksheets to be completed are available at the department website at: <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

**5a.** Indicate the student grade levels to be housed in the proposed project facility: \_\_\_\_\_

**5b.** Is there any work (other than this project) within the attendance area that has been approved by local voters, or has been funded, or is in progress that houses any student grade levels included in the proposed project?  yes  no

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

**5c.** Are there school facilities within the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project?  yes  no  
*(If the answer is yes, 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 5b and 5c, we are providing detailed attachments. <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
--

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

**5e.** In the table below, provide the attendance area’s current and projected ADM

<b>Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM</b>			
<b>School Year</b>	<b>K-6 ADM</b>	<b>7-12 ADM</b>	<b>Total ADM</b>
2012-2013			
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			

**Housing unboxed students** (Up to 80 points)  
 This category applies only to projects requesting additional new, or complete new replacement of existing space.

Qualifies for \_\_\_\_\_ additional SF  
 Applying for \_\_\_\_\_ additional SF

**5f.** Were the ADM projections used by the district based on the department’s worksheets?  yes  no  
 Attach calculations and justifications.

**5g. Regional community facilities** (Up to 5 points)  
 List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of housing students. Identify the facility by name, its condition, and provide the distance from current school. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, note the attachment in question 3e.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

**5h.** 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.

<b>Table 4.2 PROJECT SPACE EQUATION</b>						
	A	I	II	III	IV	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>						

**6. PROJECT PLANNING:**

**NOTE:** The department places a high value on strong analysis and development of project planning that best serves students with facilities solutions that are well-designed and well-constructed to achieve the best long-term benefit to the state with regard to operating costs and maintenance.

**6a. Condition survey (0 or 5 points)**

Has a facility or component condition survey been completed?  yes  no  
 (If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies and Note the attachment in question 3e.)

**6b. Planning / Concept design (0 or 10 points)**

Has work been completed on planning?  yes  no  
 (If yes, attach documentation supporting planning as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 3e.))

**6c. Schematic design (0 or 10 points)**

Has work been completed on schematic design?  yes  no  
 (If yes, attach documentation supporting schematic design as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 3e.))

**6d. Design development (0 or 10 points)**

Has work been completed on design development?  yes  no  
 (If yes, attach documentation supporting design development as described in Appendix A, and note the attachment in question 3e.)

**6e. Planning/Design team:** list parties who have contributed to the evaluation and/or design services thus far for this project. When applicable, a district employee with special expertise should be listed, along with the basis for his or her expertise.

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

DRAFT

**7. COST ESTIMATE**

**7a. Cost estimate for total project cost (30 points possible):** Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development’s 13<sup>th</sup> Edition Cost Model or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is mandatory.

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

<b>Project Budget Category</b>	<b>Maximum % without justification</b>	<b>I Prior AS 14.11 Funding</b>	<b>II Current Project Request</b>	<b>III % of Total Construction Cost</b>	<b>IV Project Total</b>
CM - By Consultant <sup>1</sup>	2 - 4%				
Land <sup>2</sup>					
Site Investigation <sup>2</sup>					
Seismic Hazard <sup>3</sup>					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction <sup>4</sup>					
Equipment & Technology <sup>2,5</sup>	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead <sup>6</sup>	up to 9%				
Art <sup>7</sup>	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
<b>Project Total <sup>8</sup></b>					

- Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: \$0-\$500,000 – 4%; 500,001- \$5,000,000 – 3%; over \$5,000,000 – 2%). Since CM and project administration may be done by either of a variety of sources, the department recommends a TOTAL of 18% for any combination of CM by consultant, Design services and District Administrative Overhead.
- Include only if necessary for completion of this project. Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the Project Description (Question 3d), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
- Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.
- Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- 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.
- 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.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 7. Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).
- 8. Project total should not exceed 130% of construction cost.

**Table 7.2 CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

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

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

## 8. FACILITY MANAGEMENT

### 8a. District’s preventative maintenance and facility management (55 points possible)

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 3e.*

- Assessment # 1)** Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- Assessment # 2)** Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Formula-Driven Points)
- Assessment # 3)** PM/Corrective Maintenance Reports (Up to 10 Formula-Driven Points)
- Assessment # 4)** 5-Year Average Expenditure on Maintenance. Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)
- Assessment # 5)** Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- Assessment # 6)** Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- Assessment # 7)** Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- Assessment # 8)** Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

**9. ADDITIONAL PROJECT ELEMENTS:**

**NOTE:** Documentation directly affects the ability of reviewers to evaluate this project. In answering the questions below, provide verifying documentation for your answers. Responses that cannot be verified will be considered as unsubstantiated. Scoring values associated with these levels can be found in the instructions material.

**9a.** Is this project an emergency? (Up to 50 points)  yes  no

If the answer is yes, describe below the nature of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions.

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

- Building destroyed? (50 points)
- Building demonstrably unsafe and has been vacated? (25 to 50 points)
- Demise of this building highly likely? (25 to 50 points)
- Critical structural weakness? (5 to 45 points)
- Subject to event that would trigger building failure? (5 to 25 points)
- District preparing to vacate the building? (5 to 25 points)
- Public safety officials have issued a date certain order to vacate building? (5 to 25 points)
- Documented building or system failure that makes it impossible for the district to fully utilize the facility and a portion of the building has been vacated? (35 to 50 points)
- Documented evidence that a reasonably likely natural phenomena would cause significant (resulting in direct risk to life and safety) damage to the structure? (5 to 25 points)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Anticipated building component or system failure that will constitute a code violation and can be shown to pose potential risk to occupants? The facility itself is not endangered. (5 to 25 points)
- Probable building component or system failure that will constitute a code violation and can be shown to pose a potential risk to occupants? (20 to 35 points)
- Facility not in danger at this time, but should the (specific) potential failure occur can it be shown to pose potential risk to occupants? (5 to 25 points)
- Code violation, potential risk to occupants, no potential for further damage to building? (5 to 25 points)
- Code violation, potential risk to occupants, potential for further damage to building? (20 to 35 points)
- Other (describe above). (0 to 25 points)

**9b. Inadequacies of existing space** (Up to 40 points)

Describe and specifically address how the inadequacies of existing space impact 1) the mandated educational program and facility operations and/or 2) new or existing local programs.

**9c. Other options** (Up to 25 points)

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

**9d. Relationship of cost of project to annual operating cost savings** (Up to 30 points)

Quantify the project’s annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost. It is important for the applicant to evaluate their project to identify any operational cost savings and to quantify them below.

**9e. Phased funding** (Up to 30 points)

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

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

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

**9f. 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.)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



## DRAFT 3: Instructions for completing the Application for Funding for a Capital Improvement Project

**FY2017**

*These instructions support AKEED Form #05-13-XXX, Rev  
Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement.*

### PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

**Answer all questions:** 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 considered ineligible and returned unranked.** If a question is not applicable, please note as NA. The department has the authority to reject applications due to incomplete information or documentation provided by the district.

**Project name to be accurate and consistent:** 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). The project name should begin with the name of the school and type of school (ex: K-12). Multi-school projects should list the schools that are part of the scope unless the work is districtwide at most or all school sites in the district.

**Limited to ten applications:** The department will only score up to ten individual project applications from each district during a single rating period. A district can submit a letter to request reuse of prior year application scores.

**The department may adjust parts of the application:** 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<sup>st</sup> deadline.

### CERTIFICATION:

**Authorizing signature:** The application must be 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:**  
School Facilities Manager

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

## 1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

- 1a. Type of funding requested.** 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.

**Aid for Debt Retirement:** 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.

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

- 1c. Phases of project.** Check the applicable phase(s) covered by this funding request. Refer to Appendix A for descriptions of phases.

## 2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

- 2a. District six-year plan.** Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-13-050. 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.

- 2b. Fixed asset inventory system.** The district does not need to submit any fixed asset inventory system information to the department as part of the CIP application. The department will verify existence of a Fixed Asset Inventory System during its on-site Preventive Maintenance program review every 5 years. The department will annually review the district's most recently submitted annual audit for information regarding its fixed asset inventory system. School districts that do not have an approved fixed asset inventory system, or a functioning fixed asset inventory system (i.e., cannot be audited) will be ineligible for grant funding under AS 14.11.011.

---

<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

---

- 2c. Property insurance.** The department may not award a school construction grant to a district that does not have replacement cost property insurance. AS 14.03.150, AS 14.11.011(b)(2) and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.
- 2d. Capital improvement project.** 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 \_\_ for an explanation of maintenance activities.
- 2e. Preventative maintenance program.** A district must have a certified preventative maintenance program to be eligible for funding.
- 2f. Insurance.** The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2012 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. *[Note: This information is used in calculating scores for Assessment 4; see Question 8a.]*
- 2g. Project eligibility attachments.**  
This section is in progress.

### 3. PROJECT INFORMATION:

- 3a. Priority assigned by the district. (30 points possible)** 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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

**3b. School facilities and their condition. (30 points possible)** 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>

**3c. Transition planning.** The response to this question should be consistent with the space utilization table in question 5h. 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 demolished or surplus, the project must provide for the abatement of all hazardous materials as part of the project scope. The transition plan should describe how surplus state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. The detailed plan for demolishing or surplus 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.

**3d. Describe the scope of work of the entire project.** 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. It is helpful to identify the question number if you are answering one of the previously mentioned questions in the project description.

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 2e: 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 3g: 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 referenced summarized and rather than reproduced in the project description.

Question 3c: 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 \_\_: 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 this question to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

Question 5c: 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.*

Question 3g: 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 6a-6d: If a facility condition survey, facility appraisal, schematic design, or design development documents are attached, they can be summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the description of project need, justification, and scope.

Question 7a. 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 7.1 and 7.2 of question 7a, 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 phases advance.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 \_\_\_ for guidelines covering project cost estimate percentages for factored cost items.

**3e. Project description attachments.** 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.

**3f. Complete or partially completed project.** Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. If the construction work is partially or fully complete, attach documentation that establishes that the construction was procured in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080.

- 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. For projects that utilized in-house labor, attach the EED approval of the use of in-house labor [4 AAC 31.080(a)]. If a project utilized in-house labor, or was constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project will not be scored.
- 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. 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.

**3g. Acquisition of additional land.** *Acquisition of additional land* refers to expansion of an existing school site using property immediately adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the existing school site. Land acquisition may result from long-term lease, purchase, or donation of land. *Utilization of a new school site* refers to use of a site previously acquired by the district, or a new site acquired as a result of this application and not previously utilized as a public school.

If the project site is not yet known, the site description should be the district's best estimate of specific site requirements for the project, and it should be included in the project description. The department's 2011 publication, *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook*, may be useful in responding to this question. A site selection study is required for those projects involving new sites in order to qualify for schematic design points (reference Appendix \_\_\_).

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

### 4. CODE DEFICIENCIES / PROTECTION OF STURCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

**4a. Life safety /code conditions (Up to 50 points)** In question 3d the project scope was described.

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

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

Combined life safety and code related scoring

**35-50 points:** Life safety or code condition(s) that have resulted in the district vacating the building until the life safety or code condition(s) are corrected. The district will not be able to use the building until the life safety or code condition is mitigated. The district discovers aggressive and extensive mold in the facility and air quality tests show that the air has a dangerously high level of mold spores and the building is ordered vacated.

**20-35 points:** Life safety or code conditions that pose a threat to the facility occupants but have been temporarily mitigated. Example: Facility has a failed fire alarm system and the district has instituted a fire watch until the alarm is replaced.

**0-20 points:** Life safety or code conditions that require updating but do not pose a threat to the student population. The life safety or code condition will need to be corrected if renovation work is done. Example: A portion of the 20 year old facility will be renovated and the district is required to bring the facility up to the current life safety and code standards.

When evaluating multiple life safety and code conditions, between 5-10 points are generally awarded for each life safety and code conditions such as asbestos/hazmat, roof, heating, ventilation, electrical, plumbing, security, fire/sprinkler, etc. that are addressed in the project. (The list of life safety and code conditions does not represent an exhaustive list but a sample of conditions that are evaluated.) The points that are awarded for projects that have multiple life safety and code conditions are cumulative.

The evaluation of mixed scope projects that have life safety and code work and non-life safety and code work will weigh the amount of life safety and code related work as related to the entire scope of the project. Also, projects such as district wide projects that mix critical and non-critical life safety or code conditions the points for the critical portion of the project will be weighed against the entire scope of the project.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Single scope projects addressing a life safety or code condition receive double life safety or code points to a maximum of 20 points, unless the severity of the life safety or code condition has caused the facility to be vacated or poses a significant threat to the students or facility.

### Life safety scoring based on level of threat

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

~~30-40 points: Active: Airborne or non-lethal poison potential upon contact with materials that are exposed to children.~~

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

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

### Building code related

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

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

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

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

## 5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED:

**NOTE:** Gross square footage entries in this section should reflect the measurements specified by 4 AAC 31.020. Space variance requests not already approved by the department must be submitted in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020 by the application deadline in order to receive consideration with the current request. The department will not consider space variance requests during the application review process for work proposed in the application.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

**5a. Project grade levels.** The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.

**5b. District voter-approved projects.** Any additional square footage that is funded for construction or approved by local voters for construction should be listed with a descriptive project name, additional GSF, grade levels to be served, and anticipated student capacity. Include these projects in any capacity/unhoused calculations provided in the year of anticipated occupancy.

**5c. Other school facilities.** 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 GSF Capacity MS Excel worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. A link to this form can be found under "Space Guidelines" at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html> Please note that the Capacity Worksheet has been revised to reflect the regulatory changes to 4 AAC 31.020.

**5d. Date of anticipated occupancy.** 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.

**5e. Attendance Area ADM.** All projects that are adding new space or replacing existing space must complete Table 5.1. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM.

**Housing unhoused students. (80 points possible)** Materials prepared in this section of this application are based on the ADM and worksheets in the "2013 Space Calculations" and are the basis for determining eligibility for space and how much space can be added or replaced. The ADM figures for this year, and the worksheets to be completed, are found on the department's website at: <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

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

The points for 5e are based on the following formulas:

1. Current Unhoused Students: If current capacity is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If current capacity is over 100% than one point for every 3% percent over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a current capacity over 250% the full 50 points will be awarded.
2. Unhoused Students in Seven Years: If capacity seven years out is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If capacity seven years out is over 100% than one point for

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

every 5% over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a capacity seven years out over 250% the full 30 points will be awarded.

- 5f. ADM projection method.** Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 3. The department will compare the projections to historic growth trends for the attendance area. The department will revise population projections that exceed historical growth rates, show disparate growth between elementary and secondary populations, or are unlikely to be sustained as an attendance area's overall population grows. The application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (i.e. housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.
- 5g. Regional community facilities. (5 points possible)** 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.
- 5h. Project space equation. (30 points possible)** 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 \_\_ as well as those shown in Table \_\_ of the cost estimate section. The worksheet at Appendix \_\_ lists types of school space that fit in each category. There are up to 30 points possible for the type of space being constructed.

### 6. PROJECT PLANNING:

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

- 6a. Condition survey (0 or 5 points possible)** 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.

## 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.

- 6b. Planning / Concept Design (0 or 10 points possible)** *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.
- 6c. Schematic development (0 or 10 points possible)** *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.
- 6d. Design development (0 or 10 points possible)** *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.
- 6e. Planning team.** 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. For others besides licensed design professionals currently registered in the State of Alaska, provide the qualifications for design team members that the district accepted. For example, if one is a school board member who is also an electrician, please note both. Likewise, note a district employee with X years as a licensed roofing contractor, or a maintenance person with X years as the lead mechanical custodian for the district.

## 7. COST ESTIMATE

- 7a. Cost estimate: Construction cost and total project cost. (30 points possible)** 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 \_\_\_ for descriptions of elements of the total project cost. The cost estimate should be of sufficient detail that its reasonableness can be evaluated. If a project is projected to cost significantly more than would be predicted by the Department’s current Program Demand Cost Model, 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.

**Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate.** 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

construction cost. Column IV should list the total project cost estimate from inception to completion, all phases. Calculate the percent of construction for all cost categories except Land, Site Investigation, and Seismic Hazard. To calculate the percent of construction divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to \$500,000; 3% for project costs between \$500,000 - \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects of \$5,000,000 or greater [AS14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, please add a detailed justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 30% in additional percentage costs.

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

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

**Table 7.2 Construction Cost Estimate.** This summarization of construction costs is structured to be consistent with the DEED cost model. Other estimating formats may not provide an exact correlation; however, the following categories **MUST** be reported to allow adequate comparisons between projects: basic building, site work and utilities, general requirements, contingency, and escalation. Do not blank out or write over this table. If the application includes a cost estimate from a designer or professional cost estimating firm, Table 7.2 must still be filled out as described above.

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

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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

### 8. FACILITY MANAGEMENT

**8a. District’s preventative maintenance and facility management (55 points possible)**

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 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 eight separate assessments. These documents will establish the extent to which districts have moved beyond the minimum eligibility criteria and have tools in place for the active management of all aspects of their facility management. The documents necessary for each assessment are listed below. They are grouped according to the five areas of effort established in statute and are annotated as to the type of evaluation (i.e., evaluative or formula-driven). 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.

Reminder: Only two sets, one of which may be an electronic copy, should be provided by the district, regardless of the number of submitted applications.

#### Maintenance Management

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

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.). Discuss the quality of your program as it is reflected in the submitted formula-driven reports (i.e. diversity in work types, hours available is accurate, there is a high percentage of reported hours).

**Assessment #2 – Maintenance Labor Reports (Formula-Driven)** [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., preventive, corrective, operations support, etc.] vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

*Item B:* Produce a districtwide report that shows a comparison of completed work orders to all work orders initiated, 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 for the previous 12 months. [deferred, awaiting materials, assigned, etc.]

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 (Formula-Driven)** [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 (preventive) maintenance and unscheduled work (repairs). 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 (Formula-Driven)** [up to 5 points available]:

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

The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. [No information need be submitted with the application for this Assessment.]

### **Energy Management**

**Assessment #5 – Energy Management Narrative (Evaluative)** [up to 5 points available]:

Provide a narrative description of the district's energy management program and energy reduction plan.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 (Evaluative)** [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 (Evaluative)** [up to 5 points available]:

Provide a narrative description of the district's training program including but not limited to: identification of training needs, training methods, and numbers of staff receiving building-system-specific training in the past 12 months. In addition to the narrative description, provide a copy of the district's training log for the past year. The training log should include name of the person trained, the training received, and the date training was received.

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

### **Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)**

#### **Assessment #8 – Capital Planning Narrative (Evaluative)** [up to 5 points available]:

Provide a narrative giving evidence the district has a process for developing a long-range plan for capital renewal.

Discuss the district's process for identifying capital renewal needs. Renewal and replacement schedules can form the basis for this work, but building user input should

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

### 9. ADDITIONAL PROJECT ELEMENTS

**9a. Emergency conditions (50 points possible)** In question 3d the project scope was described. Question 9a is to specifically identify and describe the type and extent of emergency conditions. An emergency exists when students are currently unhoused due to the loss of the facility, or loss of the use of the facility by the district due to circumstances associated with the emergency. An emergency also exists when the district's ability to utilize the facility is impacted or there is an immediate or high probability of a threat to property, life, health or safety.

The emergency descriptions with check boxes contained in question 9a are to help the applicant identify the type of emergency the project is resolving. The applicant must provide a description of the particular emergency in the application and include all relevant documentation that supports the immediacy or high probability of the threat or emergency. An application that checks an emergency type box without a description of the emergency will receive no points.

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

Not all systems or components that have reached the end of their useful life or are starting to fail are considered to be emergencies. A system or component that has reached the end of its useful life or has started to fail but routine or preventative maintenance prolongs the life of the system or component is not considered to be an emergency. Example: A roof that has started to leak and is still structurally sound and the leaking is stopped with routine maintenance would not constitute an emergency. A roof is leaking and rot has been found in the structure of the roof and routine maintenance no longer prevents water from entering the building, could be considered an emergency.

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

- A summary description of the emergency condition(s).

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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

The matrix below is used as a guide to evaluate where to place projects relative to each other based on the described and verified condition: The scoring of mixed scope projects, which address both emergency and non-emergency conditions, will be weighted based on the amount of emergency work that is included in the project.

**Note:** If an application declares an emergency and does not supply any supporting documentation to substantiate the claim the question will not receive the suggested points.

### Building

- 50 Points: Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. Example: A flood or seismic event that has destroyed or left the building so structurally compromised that the building must be demolished.
- 25-45 Points: Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. Example: The roof of a school comes off in a severe wind storm with water damage to interior finishes. Scoring will be based on the scope of repairs and the impact to the student population.
- 5-25 Points: Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. Example: It is discovered that the building does not meet current seismic standards and the building will need to be made current with seismic standards within the next five years. Documentation substantiating the order needs to be supplied.
- 5-45 Points: A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. Example: The roof leaks over the gym causing structural damage to the walls, which restricts the use of the gym until the repairs are made.

### Components or Systems

- 25-45 Points: A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

facility unusable to the student population until replaced. Example: A schools heating plant has completely failed leaving the building unusable to the student population and susceptible to freezing and further damage.

5-25 Points: A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed but has been repaired, and has limited functionality. If the component fails the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. Example: A fire alarm system has a history of components failing and given the age of the system, parts are no longer available. The system has a high probability of failing completely and district may have to vacate the building.

**9b. Inadequacies of space. (40 points possible)** 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 20 points are available for new local programs.

**9c. Other options. (25 points possible)** In an effort to support the project submitted as the best possible, districts need to consider a full range of options during planning and project development. This question asks districts to document that process by displaying the analysis as to how they arrived at their solution. One or more of these considerations should be provided:

- District-adopted capital planning, energy management, or other planning policies used as guidelines in the planning process.
- Materials/methods options: are there optional materials or construction methods that were considered and if so, why were they rejected in favor of that proposed?
- 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.
- A project that proposes component replacement should discuss the merits of alternative products or even alternative design solutions to the problem if applicable.
- A cost/benefit analysis or other evaluative processes used by the district in reaching its design solution should be included with the application.
- If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts must consider service area boundary changes and any space available in adjacent attendance areas

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes.

- Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary.

There are up to 25 points available for a comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

### 9d. Relationship of cost of project to annual cost savings. (30 points possible)

Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. Projects not in this category are still eligible to score points if the information demonstrates that design solutions affecting operating costs were made to optimize the return on their investment.

- This response should include a discussion of ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. Consider 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.
- Providing benchmark values (fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, historical record of problems to be addressed by this project) will be considered valuable for evaluation of anticipated savings.
- 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.
- When a new, renovation, new-in-lieu-of-renewal, or Category E project is proposed, the project description in question 4a shall include a detailed cost/benefit analysis and a life cycle cost analysis.

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.

- ### 9e. Phased funding. (30 points possible)
- 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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

**9f. Participating share waiver.** Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix \_\_ in the attachments to these instructions for detailed information. Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 that are not REAAs, are eligible to request a waiver of participating share. Contact the department for a district's most recent full-value per ADM calculation.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
**APPENDIX A: STATUTORY & REGULATORY REFERENCES**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
 Draft presented August 1, 2013

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
 APPENDIX B: CRITERIA REQUIRED TO QUALIFY FOR A GRANT  
 \_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
 Draft presented August 1, 2013

From AS 14.11.013(a)(1) - The department shall verify that each proposed project meets the criteria established under [AS 14.11.014](#) (b) and qualifies as a project required to:<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 4 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 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,

<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: CRITERIA REQUIRED TO QUALIFY FOR A GRANT  
 \_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
 Draft presented August 1, 2013

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. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types. This category corresponds to category C under AS 14.11.100(j) 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: 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  
 APPENDIX D: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES  
 \_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
 Draft presented August 1, 2013

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 &amp; Early Development

## APPENDIX E: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

\_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement &amp; Grant Review Committee

April 20, 2012

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 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.

## Alaska Department of Education &amp; Early Development

## APPENDIX E: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

\_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement &amp; Grant Review Committee

April 20, 2012

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 &amp; Early Development

## APPENDIX F: DEFINITIONS OF MAINTENANCE

\_\_\_\_\_ by the Bond Reimbursement &amp; 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 G: INFORMATION REGARDING PARTICIPATING SHARE & IN-KIND  
 CONTRIBUTIONS OR REQUEST FOR FULL WAIVER  
 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

This page is intentionally blank