Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
March 5 & 6, 2014
Anchorage – Talking Book Library
MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present	**Staff**	**Additional Participants**
Elizabeth Nudelman	Kimberly Andrews	Kevin Lyon (Kenai)
Doug Crevensten	Elwin Blackwell	Don Hiley (SERRC)
Mary Cary	Wayne Marquis	Larry Morris (FNSB) via telephone
Mark Langberg	Courtney Preziosi	Don Carney (Mat Su)
Robert "Bob" Tucker		Blair Alden (Lower Kuskokwim)
Carl John		Dave Norum (FNSB)
Dean Henrick		Kathy Christy

MARCH 5th

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL AT 8:40AM

REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA

Agenda reviewed and approved.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes approved as submitted.

STAFF BRIEFING

Elizabeth noted that the Facilities Manager position is currently vacant and the department is searching for an Engineer or Architect to fill that position. *Kim* briefed the committee on the SB 237 report that was included in the meeting packet; the amounts added since the last meeting were Fairbanks debt projects. *Kim* referenced the CIP lists and noted that the maintenance list is final whereas the school construction list is not. The school construction list is dependent upon the outcome of the appeal. *Kim* gave an update on the cost model; the upcoming year will be a technical update.

Carl mentioned that there is a discrepancy in the cost model. He stated that HMS has a higher inflation rate than what the EED Cost Model provides. *Kim* said that the escalation rate hasn't been determined yet for the upcoming year. *Kim* stated that HMS indicated this year that there weren't significant shifts in cost and that they didn't anticipate major increases for the upcoming year. She said that by the time the CIP workshop is held, the escalation rate will have been determined.

Elizabeth spoke about the Governor's budget. *Elizabeth* stated that the Governor's budget allows for $31.5 million dollars for the Kwethluk project, which is the fourth school involved in the Kasayulie settlement. *Elizabeth* noted that the Governor's budget did not have dollars for the major maintenance list. *Carl* expressed concern and asked if the Administration is aware of the need for major maintenance funding. *Elizabeth* answered that they are aware. *Elizabeth* mentioned that the Legislature does take public comment and added that for the last 15 or 20 years the Legislature has funded down the list in order.

Wayne gave an overview of his recent Preventative Maintenance site visits. *Carl* thanked *Wayne* for his visit. He said that the LYSD Maintenance Director, Robert Reed, really appreciated the visit and the knowledge *Wayne* gave to the district.

Doug referenced three points in the previous meeting's minutes that EED staff would get back to the committee on. He stated that *Bob* wanted to know how many projects on the current CIP list were already completed projects. *Kim* said that the project descriptions are on the web, and in the project descriptions, it will note if the project is already completed. *Doug* said Senator Dunleavy, at the last meeting, asked how much debt has currently been paid down. *Elizabeth* answered that the Department has had multiple requests from the Legislature regarding debt and noted that the SB237 report has been provided to the Legislature this year. This department does not provide the total State liability but rather the total reimbursement. *Doug* stated the last point from the previous meeting was a question *Don* asked about the 10% limit on design services in the total project budgets. *Doug* asked if it was allowable to increase the 10%. *Kim* noted that Appendix C of the CIP application states that the amount for renovation may run 2% higher. *Elizabeth* said that the discussion can continue once the committee gets to that item in the FY2016 CIP Application discussion.

Doug mentioned the discussion of coming up with two separate applications for School Construction and Major Maintenance. *Elizabeth* stated that she does not see a lot of upsides to creating two applications. She said to be able to use one application has pros to it. *Kim* added that it would be very challenging to have two applications. *Don Hiley* added that he also does not see the upside to two applications.

Elizabeth wrapped up, saying that the Department will send out an email to the committee with answers to *Bob*'s question regarding already completed projects and an answer as to whether the committee would be able to increase the 10% design services percentage.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Hiley asked whether the public could see the debt project descriptions posted along with the grant project descriptions. *Kim* stated that the department does not prepare those. *Don* asked whether the debt project descriptions were provided to the legislature. *Elizabeth* stated that debt projects descriptions are not sent to the legislature. She mentioned that in the staff report, on page 17, you can see the project title but not an in depth project description. *Elizabeth* stated that in accordance with statute the SB 237 report is sent to the legislature and encompasses the past 3 years of the debt program. *Elwin* noted it was on the front page of the Facilities website.

BREAK

FY2016 CIP APPLICATION DISCUSSION

Elizabeth started the discussion stating that there is an action item on the agenda for the committee to review and approve the FY2016 CIP Application. She noted that the application is currently being worked on and any changes will be implemented into the FY2017 CIP Application. *Elizabeth* clarified that changes to the FY2016 Application were annual updates.

Elizabeth reviewed the Project Cost Estimate, question 18 on page 43, as this was an item put on the discussion list. *Kim* explained that question 18 is an embedded excel spreadsheet in

the application. The writer enters the construction amount and the other percentages are based off the construction line item. *Kim* stated that inputting accurate information and justification is really important. Page 57 of the packet indicates when added detail justification is necessary. *Kim* reiterated that CM by consultant is set in statute.

Bob asked if the department sees projects usually coming close to the 10% in design services. *Kim* answered that to make that broad generalization would be hard. *Carl* added that when commissioning is an expense of the project, that's when it is hard to stay within the 10% design services amount. *Elizabeth* asked which category condition surveys are booked against. *Kim* answered that condition surveys are usually in the design services line item. *Don Hiley* mentioned that projects with smaller dollar amounts have a particularly hard time staying within the 10%. *Doug* feels as though allowing 12% would be reasonable. *Bob* responded that he would understand that justification if projects were bumping up against the 10% all the time, but that is not the case. *Kim* agreed. *Kim* mentioned that adding 2% on every project is significant. *Elizabeth* also agreed that, unless 12% is established to be a better number, 10% is sufficient.

Kathy Christy commented that a real issue is the 130% overhead percentage. She said that to put commissioning into a different line item than design services would allow districts to stay within the 10% design services allowance. *Don Carney* added that to stay within 130%, there are some things the district needs to give up in order to stay within budget. He stated that usually negotiating down means a lesser product. He said that usually the architect will work with the 10% as they know that is what they need to stay within. *Elizabeth* asked where he moved the commissioning to at project closeout. *Don* answered that he puts commissioning at CM by Consultant. *Mark* added that the percentage of commissioning will go up in relation to the size of the project.

Elizabeth mentioned that clarification in the application regarding certain projects that could possibly be awarded the "up to 2%" increase from the 10% design services might help applicants writing the application. *Dave Norum* cautioned about adding 2% across the board as architects will simply negotiate to that percentage. *Doug* stated that a clarification that some projects will run higher should be added to the application. *Bob* reminded him that there needs to be justification, not just a bill; there has to be a reason why the design line item is beyond the 10%. *Mark* asked how often the department sees projects going beyond the 130%. *Kim* said that not often, as districts know the percentage limit. As far as *Kim* knows, it has been 130% since at least 2000. *Mark* suggested adding a line item labeled "Commissioning" and bumping the total to 132%. *Elizabeth* expressed concern that adding 2% is a lot of money.

Bob asked that the department investigate where the 130% came from before making any changes. He expressed concern that his district's current project is bumping up against the Construction Management budget. *Doug* asked if the wording of the appendix is going to change for this question to include reasons as to why districts may run higher on the 10% design services. *Bob* thinks that the appendix should include asking for justification backing up the increase in design services expenses. *Elizabeth* stated that page 57 of the packet in the instructions does ask for justification. *Kim* added that asking for justification is also in question 18 of the application, so it is in two places. *Mary* stated that complexity, project scope, and project scale are all determining factors into an increased design services budget. *Elizabeth* agreed that the department can add "renovation, complexity of scope and scale may run 2% higher" to Appendix C. *Elizabeth* reiterated that when the committee approves the FY2016

application, the approval would include the addition of the discussed addition to Appendix C. *Kim* added that the top of Appendix C would then change to today's date.

Elizabeth said that the department can do some research into commissioning. She expressed concern that she doesn't want to overcommit the department, but there can be a small project that goes into coming up with basic data from current projects. *Elizabeth* said the department can come back with Construction Management percentages of a few closed projects. *Kim* asked the committee to bear in mind that some of the projects are not current. *Kim* said a lot of the projects that are closing out now are 2010 or 2011 construction projects. *Elizabeth* said that the department can pick 15 projects or so and ask a question or two about commissioning. The committee agreed that was a good number. *Mark* suggested picking larger school renovation or construction projects. *Kim* mentioned that some of these projects will require the department to contact the district regarding what their commissioning costs were, as sometimes that is not stated in the closeout worksheet. *Bob* said that the statistics that should be shown is the cost of commissioning, what line item it was put on, and, if commissioning wasn't done, why not? *Don Carney* suggested using the tool "Survey Monkey" in order to gather data for this research project. He thinks it will broaden the information base beyond just 15 projects.

Mark asked to make a motion to approve the FY2016 Application. The FY2016 was unanimously approved as amended.

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

LUNCH BREAK

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Elizabeth asked for public comment. No public comments were given.

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

Elwin provided an overview of the changes between the December draft and the draft in the packet, including organization, layout, and wording. *Elizabeth* reiterated that keeping the eligibility items together was continued in this draft. *Elwin* noted that there are additional sections to provide better flow and grouping to the questions. Project information is grouped together. Project scope is separated from life safety/code since scope is not scored and life safety is. The project scope question has changed from the last version; the header of "Life safety/Code deficiencies" section has been expanded to include protection of structure and the building condition checkbox language has been revised. Questions in the "Requirements for space to be added or replaced" section have been grouped together and the section has been reorganized to correspond to the space calculation worksheets. "Project planning" will need additional development to refine point assignment. No significant changes have been made to the "Cost estimate" section. The "Facility management" section placeholder was removed and the language has been brought back from the original application, including Assessment 4, which had been pulled out and moved elsewhere in the draft. The final category "Additional project elements," has been renamed and includes other scoring questions as well as the added back in question regarding waiver of participating share. The Instructions follow the same layout, with the Appendices kept separate.

Elwin noted that a tracked-changes version of the application and instructions were available on the website that track from December's draft to the one presented. *Mary* asked if there was a version from the current FY16 application to the application in the packet. *Elizabeth* responded that the department had done tracked changes and proofing from the original application to the December draft, but that version is not presented. *Elizabeth* noted that there was a bit of backtracking due to the large amount of rearranging.

Mary asked that the intent and expectation of the application that was just approved be explained: what is the purpose of and why are we changing it? *Elizabeth* said that we set out to have a public vetting and transparent process and that the other issue was to make sure that the project, and not the application, was rated. *Elwin* said that the intent is to add more clarity on how points are awarded; anyone writing an application would be like a new rater and have to figure out how an answer would affect scoring and placement on the list. Trying to minimize the 'up to interpretation' portions as much as possible.

Bob asked where the new draft changed points from the December version, if anywhere. *Elizabeth* said that the purpose of the draft was not to change points, but to clean up and go over previously discussed items. Only change is 5 points for the condition survey that was brought back. *Mary* summarized that the intent was two-fold, one, the ease of a district to go through the application and see how it is rated and, two, the emergent needs project will get a higher scoring in the evaluation. *Elizabeth* responded that statute establishes multiple priorities, so no one type of project should necessarily go to the front of the list. The department would like to shift emphasis to rate factors about the project, and shift how applications are scored in life safety so that the severity of the issue presented would get more points.

Elizabeth noted that the draft left 10 points for design development, but it should be 5 points, per committee conversations to lighten up the back end of planning. However, the department couldn't define how to tell a district why there were so many points for the first phase of planning. *Elizabeth* stated that the department wanted to come back to the planning and design section to re-vet where the committee was at.

Carl asked for clarification regarding facility appraisal getting points or not. *Elizabeth* responded that facility appraisal was something the department wanted clarification on.

Mary asked if the draft has been checked against the current application, as far as the salient features were concerned. *Kim* responded that the department had been concerned over items that had unintentionally been left out in prior drafts. There are some language changes, like in the case of the cost estimate in question 7a, where the 130% project total language is now a footnote. *Elizabeth* went through the first portions of the draft with tracked changes to summarize the modifications; project scope, life safety, and planning are the main areas of change to focus on.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Norum said that he liked the reorganization and question groupings. He noted that the intent in December was to try and get people to do things in house and not spend money. Points in planning were weighted down so more work could be done in house to make the playing field fair.

Don Carney said that it's moving to the point, if we're not careful, that positions on the lists can be bought. There are districts adamant about putting money in the classroom versus funding for design and planning. There needs to be a balance that allows a project to score high for districts that can't afford to hire a design team at the time of the application. He would like to recommend that raters be able to judge on the information provided, regardless of whether it came from a professional engineer or district staff. Discussion followed regarding value of having an engineer provide information versus knowledgeable district staff, and whether the department could make a determination for scoring. *Elizabeth* noted that in the past we had a condition survey worth 5 points that needed to be done by a professional, with 30 points in planning. It needs to be decided how to assign points and, when being assigned points, whether a professional is needed versus in-house work.

Doug expressed concern that the changes from the prior draft to the current one are more than minor, from his reading of the tracked changes documents, headings and point values have changed in the project planning section. *Elizabeth* responded that the department went back to the drawing board for planning and the committee can work from previous application wording. *Kim* noted the department tried to compare it back to the appendix.

Kathy Christy noted that it was helpful to understand that the draft is basically reorganizing the existing application rather than changing it. She suggested that 6d was a potential place to buy the list.

Kevin Lyon expressed concern that "0 or 10" in planning was not what was discussed in December. It was "up to 10" points and that should be based on the planning necessary for that project; raters could look at the expertise that has been provided on the team, determine if the team member is qualified to provide the information that is there, and assign points.

BREAK

Elizabeth called the meeting to order and brought up the topic of planning, noting the committee will start where it left off in December and discuss a condition survey being done by a professional versus someone with expertise.

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

Kim said that a condition survey is very informative to many aspects of a project. She noted that for a single scope project, a specific component survey is acceptable. *Elwin* agreed that a descriptive condition survey helps a rater understand the scope and severity of a project. *Mary* said it sounds like raters may choose projects that are less at risk for unseen conditions, and those projects are valued over projects that don't have as much information, but may be of equal need. *Elwin* responded that without a good condition survey, there are too many unknowns for the raters to evaluate the neediness of a project. *Mary* stated then for a roof, raters are looking for a structural analysis, maybe haz-mat, with existing conditions, and any other unforeseen components that might be wrong.

Carl asked whether a condition survey can be submitted by someone other than a licensed professional. *Elizabeth* said that *Kim* and *Elwin* will answer that question as to what the department currently does and then discuss if that needs to be changed. *Kim* responded that there

are two issues, rating the life safety points and the points for condition survey. *Kim* stated that currently the condition survey does need to be done by a professional and the condition survey cannot be over 4 years old. *Elwin* agreed that it does need to be done by a licensed professional. *Kim* said that this is stated in the instructions on page 54 of the packet. *Mark* added that the instructions do state that members familiar with the building may do portions of the condition survey. *Kim* explained that awarding the points is at the discretion of the Facility Manager at the Department and that the five points for the condition survey are not rated, it's a yes or no question.

Doug asked that as a proposed change, could the department work with a range of points instead of five points or zero.

Bob stated that if the condition survey is of a whole building, then that is where the stamped professional should probably be needed. He thinks the department should accept a condition survey by someone who knows the building if it's just on a component. *Mary* stated that she takes issue with what is referenced on page 54 of the packet, the Guide for School Facility Condition Survey. She feels there needs to be a new standard set.

Elizabeth reiterated what *Mary* had suggested: question 5A (referencing the tracked changes Draft 2 version distributed at this meeting) should cover facility condition, educational adequacy, facility appraisal, energy, and seismic. *Carl* added it should be stated that those are "potential" components. *Kim* walked through the proposed changes: part 1 of the question would be facility or component report, check yes and 5 points are awarded. She went on to 5A part 2, which is up to the rater's judgment. *Kim* said that the documents previously discussed are not listed out in part 2. *Mark* suggested an "N/A" check box. *Mary* asked if question 5A and 5B were the equivalent of Phase I and II on page 122. *Kim* suggested that the title "Analysis" be changed to "Concept Design". *Mark* suggested renaming 5A to "Pre-Planning" and 5B to "Concept Design" if it made sense to the raters.

Elizabeth asked the committee if they wanted to make the Condition Survey part of Pre-Planning. The committee agreed. *Doug* asked whether the Department recognizes a Condition Survey from a member of the school district but doesn't necessarily have the stamp of a licensed professional. *Kim* said she would recognize it. She likes the aspect of question 5E that asks for the expertise. *Doug* asked about implementing a range of points instead of zero or ten. *Carl* suggested that it would be more subjective then. *Kim* said that there are some condition surveys done by a licensed professional that may not be as useful to the project application. *Elizabeth* suggested that there be some criteria, as we would be allowing unlicensed condition surveys as acceptable. *Dean* asked if the condition survey is read. *Elwin* and *Kim* both answered yes.

Doug asked about whether the time frame a Condition Survey is valid for can move from 4 years. *Kim* answered that the 4 year time limit was probably implemented due to changing codes. She said that the 4 years can be a topic of discussion. *Mark* mentioned he agrees with the sliding scale for condition surveys. *Kim* clarified that the Condition Survey would then be an evaluative question. *Kim* referenced page 79 of the packet and that there are currently 270 Formula-Driven points in comparison to page 81 which has 255 Evaluative points. If the facility appraisal is gone, and the condition survey becomes evaluative, there would be 260 Formula-Driven points and 265 Evaluative points. *Mark* went back to question 5A, and asked if the condition survey report can be dependent on a sliding scale. It would be possible to get an

additional 5 points for pre-planning. He emphasized the point that the more work a district does, the more points they should get.

Kim referenced page 91 were it does say condition survey. She suggested making it "up to five points" instead of zero or five. *Carl* asked if now the adequacy of documentation is playing a factor. *Bob* answered yes. *Carl* asked if points for Pre-Planning can be "up to ten points" as that is what was discussed at the December meeting. *Bob* stated that the points should be based on the usefulness of scoring the project and that, in the instructions, having a licensed professional should be taken out. *Kim* asked if 6A on page 91 is now called "Condition Survey". The committee agreed. *Kim* said that page 81 of the packet will now have an added number 9, which will read "Condition Survey - 10 points maximum". The maximum points on page 81 will now become 265. Page 80 will have a maximum of 260 points and item number 1 on page 79 goes away. *Mark* suggested adding a statement next to the condition survey that reads "Component Condition survey reports may be older than 4 years, as appropriate". *Bob* suggesting going back to the department now that the committee has provided some direction as far as updating the rater's guide to accommodate the new changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Hiley said he can see in the planning part of the application where a sliding scale of points would be applicable, but he feels that the product coming from the design team shouldn't be up to the discretion of the raters. *Bob* asked him whether he is referring to schematic design and up. *Don* said yes.

Elizabeth recessed the committee meeting at 4:30p and noted the next day's start time to be 8:30 AM on March 6th.

MARCH 6th

CALL TO ORDER

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

Elwin wanted to clarify that in the December packet there was "up to ten points" in the Planning Section. After reading the minutes he saw that there was discussion on having "zero or ten" points being awarded for this question. The minutes show that the discussion left off as a "zero to ten" point range. *Elwin* said that he feels that making this question evaluative may be limited by the expertise of the raters to really be able to determine the quality of the condition survey. He urges the committee to consider this before making the rest of planning evaluative.

Referencing a handout based on Draft 2's questions 5A – 5D, *Kim* continued the planning discussion with question 5B and how the committee discussed calling that "Concept Design" versus "Analysis". *Kim* referenced part 1 and proposed adding "as required" in regards to the architectural or engineering consultant selection. Part 2 will then read "Are Concept Design studies/planning cost estimates attached?" Question 5B would now have 3 parts, and part 3 would read "New Construction projects: are education specifications, site selection analysis, and student population projections attaches? – as required".

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Carney believes the committee has a great plan going. He would like the department to go back and then come to the committee with a document that can be easily discussed instead of trying to solve all the problems here. He said it was really difficult to follow the previous day's discussion as it went in many directions.

Don Hiley agreed with *Don Carney* in regards to losing track as to what is going on. He likes what *Kim* just discussed. He would like to add that districts who put more effort and money into a project should be rewarded. He thinks it's important to remember it is a very competitive process.

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

Carl asked what the department sees as a condition survey. *Elizabeth* said the condition survey is something professionally done or something that is done by someone with expertise, knowledge, and with appropriate detail sufficient enough to address the project. She also reiterated that component surveys can be accepted if work is being done on only the roof, for example. *Doug* asked if 5 points were evaluative and 5 points were formula-driven. *Bob* feels that district's should not receive points for just having a condition survey if it's not a good product. *Elizabeth* said that the guidance from the committee is that the raters should rate on a scale from zero to ten.

Don Carney said that the discussion ended yesterday as a zero to ten point range and that's what *Kim* adjusted on the score sheet. *Doug* said he agrees with that as long as the Department is comfortable with writing a description as to what would constitute a zero or a one and so on. The committee agreed that a zero to ten point range would be acceptable. *Don Carney* suggested that if a district wants a good condition survey, the RFP should reference those expectations.

Kim mentioned that question 5B says "all elements required for 15 points" should be changed to "all elements required for 0 or 10 points". The committee agreed.

Don Hiley asked what the department's stance is on projects that don't require design at all. He said there are other projects that require design but at the planning stage a consultant isn't really necessary. He asked if the district can do some of these things in house and still get the points for it. *Elizabeth* answered that question 5B calls for a consultant as required and that districts are asked to explain why it is not necessary.

Doug asked if the instructions include accepting the cost model as a concept level estimate. He also asked if there can be added explanation as to when an architect would not be required. *Kim* said that in the past the department has referred people to the appendix on page 108 of the packet. *Kim* said that perhaps that is the spot where clarification can be added.

Kim continued to Schematic Design in question 5C. She said the only proposed changes would be two check boxes and adding 35%. *Carl* suggested putting this in the instructions as well. *Elizabeth* asked if there was an AIA definition of Schematic Design. *Kim* added that one of the appendices references a dated AIA document. *Doug* asked if this question is a "zero or ten" point category. The committee agreed that that would be a good idea.

Elizabeth brought up the topic of completed projects. *Carl* feels as though any completed project should get all of the planning points. Most of these already completed projects are smaller dollar value projects. He thinks many school districts cannot afford to pay for that up front. He thinks any school district who puts forth the initiative to make sure that their building remains operational should be rewarded for that. *Bob* is concerned that some already completed projects are receiving funding over projects that are truly an emergency and need the funding. *Carl* explained that he has some completed projects that are at number 40 on the list, so it can go either way. *Elizabeth* stated that we would need to confirm how to award points for a condition survey for an already completed project.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kevin Lyon would like to see Schematic Design stay at ten points. He feels that if points are going to be added somewhere, it should be added to at the Concept Design level. He thinks it's a big financial risk to take a project past Schematic Design if it's not a definite that the project will get funded. *Don Carney* said that in order to make the design points worth it, he feels there should be 10 points. He referenced his district's million dollar design projects and that they would not be able to afford to front that cost, especially if it's only valued at 5 points. *Don* noted that for some of his projects that involve a boiler replacement, he's not doing all the planning outlined in question 5 but since the project is complete, he's getting those points. *Don* feels completed projects should be scored just like any other project.

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

Carl said that in order to be eligible for reimbursement, districts need to follow the state procurement regulations. He said that if a project is completed, they have already gone through the process. *Bob* stated that state procurement doesn't require a condition survey. *Carl* answered that these already completed projects are small dollar amounts.

Elwin said under the current system a completed project would be awarded the Concept, Schematic, and Design points. He also added that under the current system, a district would only receive condition survey points if they actually have the condition survey. *Kim* added that most of the smaller completed projects do not have the condition survey.

Don Hiley added that most small districts will not do a project unless they have a pretty strong feeling that the project will be reimbursed.

Mary suggested that there be a separate section in question 5 for already completed projects so there is a different scoring matrix. She feels this will eliminate completed projects just automatically receiving the points for Concept Design, Schematic Design, and Design Development. *Elizabeth* said her preference would be to put something in the instructions regarding this topic. *Bob* added that he wouldn't be opposed to that suggestion, but feels as though completed projects shouldn't automatically be awarded Condition Survey points. He suggested making Concept Design 5 points instead of 10 because that will shift the weight of points. *Elwin*'s concern about shifting points down at the planning level is that at the earlier stages, a project is just starting to come together. The more you go up, the project really starts coalescing. If points are being stripped from the top, there will be no advantage to taking a project to a higher level before being funded. He feels projects submitted to the department will be far less defined or far less thought out. *Carl* and *Kim* agreed with *Elwin*.

Don Hiley recommends putting "as applicable" next to the list of documents in question 5. He said the elements in question 5 are geared more towards an architectural project, not necessarily an engineering project. *Doug* said that in the instructions it explains that if a document is missing, the writer is asked to explain why they do not have that item. *Elizabeth* said that next to Schematic Design and Design Development it can read "as applicable to the project". *Doug* said that in the instructions there can be examples as to when a certain document is not needed.

Kim reviewed the edits that were previously discussed: on page 79, item 5 is now 25 points, item 1 went away, and the total on page 80 is now 255 points; item 1 moved to number 9 on page 81 and is worth 10 points, so the total on page 81 is now 265 points.

BREAK

Elwin referenced page 87 and mentioned that the total number of points for this category still remains at 50. *Kim* mentioned that the check boxes are to help the writer know the category their project falls into and there is also the description box for districts to clearly state what the issue is.

Elwin stated that in the proposed FY17 application, there have been some organizational changes in order to provide a logical progression. The committee discussed question 4 "Code Deficiencies/Protection of Structure/Life Safety." *Doug* asked where security of students falls into the application, as far as new locks or doors on a building. *Carl* mentioned that the current application allows for districts to put it in Building Code Deficiencies or Protection of Structure. *Bob* said without direction from the Legislature, it would be hard to tackle the issue of security.

Elizabeth moved onto the Emergency question on page 95. *Elizabeth* explained that the Instructions for this question on page 113 will need some changes if allowed by the committee. *Mary* mentioned that question 9 allows for Emergency points where they would have already received emergency points under the Code Deficiencies/Life Safety question. *Elwin* explained that if a project needs to be funded because it is an absolute emergency, they will need these points as well. Since there is no emergency funding, districts rely on this process and they really need those points. *Mary* asked if the writer has to do a narrative for both sections. *Kim* answered yes, but the instructions for the Emergency questions ask the writer to key in on really specific items. *Carl* added that if he was writing an emergency application, he wouldn't mind reiterating on both sections because the more explanation there is the more the rater understands the emergency.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Hiley added that as a writer, he doesn't have a problem with doing a narrative in both sections of the application. He said that these applications tell a story and after reading them the rater should have a really good idea about the project. *Don* thanked *Elizabeth* and staff for their work on the application and feels as though this product is far superior than what was presented previously.

Don Carney agreed with *Don Hiley* and says he likes this product better than what was previously put forth. He is glad that it has been revisited and echoed *Don*'s appreciation.

Dave Norum thanked the committee for the chance for the public to participate. He believes the final product will be great.

Kevin Lyon thanked the committee as well. He feels with this new application the right projects will be coming forwarded to be funded.

FUTURE MEETING DATE

The committee proposed future meeting date of September 9th and 10th. *Elizabeth* said tentatively on September 9th and 10th the Department will come back with a final draft.

Don Hiley asked that the topic of reusing scores be added to the agenda to the September meeting. *Bob* asked the department to research what has been done in the past. *Elizabeth* said from this point forward there is a lot of time for district's to decide whether they will reuse scores or submit a new application.

Bob suggested that the department send a memo to the Superintendents before this CIP period saying that there is going to be changes as far as scoring. *Don Hiley* added that they would need to specifically know exactly what is changing. *Elizabeth* said the department will decide the pros and cons of a notification being sent.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Carl thanked staff for their work into making this application better. He feels it is a good working document now. *Bob* said he appreciates all the work and agrees that it is a better document than before. *Dean* said he appreciates the progress. *Doug* complimented staff for their work. He said at first he was taken aback by all the changes, but he understands now why that

was done. He appreciated the back and forth with people in the audience, as it has made for a much better application.

Elizabeth thanked the committee for hanging in there during some backtracking from December. She stated that the department didn't want to change the substance from the December meeting, but rather make it better. She thanked the public for their participation and acknowledged everyone's patience.

MEETING ADJOURNED