

# Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

April 2, 2026, Thursday, 2:00 pm to 4:30 pm

April 3, 2026, Friday, 8:30 am to 3:00 pm

Lecture Hall at the Andrew P. Kashevaroff (APK) Building  
Alaska State Library, Archives, & Museum, 395 Whittier Street, Juneau, Alaska

Video Teleconference available through free online Zoom application.

[Join Online – Meeting Number: 851 737 33674](#)

Join by Phone – Toll Call-in number (US/Canada): 1 (253) 215-8782; Meeting: 851 737 33674

**Chair:** Heather Heineken

**Thursday, April 2**

## Agenda Topics

---

2:00 – 2:10 PM	Committee Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Call-in, Roll Call, Introductions, Chair’s Opening Remarks</li><li>• Agenda Review/Approval</li><li>• December 02, 2025, Meeting Minutes Review/Approval</li></ul>
2:10 – 2:15 PM	New Member Welcome and Orientation
2:15 – 2:30 PM	Public Comment
2:30 – 3:00 PM	Department Briefing <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FY2027 CIP Report<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Reconsideration &amp; Final Lists</li></ul></li><li>• Report: School Capital Project Funding Under SB 237</li><li>• REAA and Small Municipal Fund Report</li><li>• Legislative Updates</li></ul>
3:00 – 3:15 PM	BREAK
3:15 – 3:30 PM	Department Briefing <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FY2028 CIP Application &amp; Support Materials</li></ul>
3:30 – 4:30 PM	FY 2028 Application Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FY 2028 Application</li><li>• FY 2028 Application Instructions</li><li>• FY 2028 CIP Eligibility and Scoring Criteria</li><li>• FY 2028 Rater’s Guide</li></ul>
4:30 PM	Recess

**Friday, April 3**

## **Agenda Topics**

---

8:30 – 8:45 AM

Committee Preparation

- Call-in, Roll Call
- Chair’s Opening Remarks

8:45 – 9:00 AM

Public Comment

9:00 – 11:00 AM

FY2028 Application Review (continued)

Action Item

- Approve FY 2028 Application and Supporting Documents

11:15 – 11:30 AM

BREAK

11:30 – 12:00 PM

Cost Model Update

- 25<sup>th</sup> Edition Model School Elements, Proposed Changes
- HMS, Inc. Teleconference

12:00 – 1:15 PM

LUNCH

1:15 – 1:45 PM

Publications

1:45 – 2:15 PM

Subcommittee Work

- School District Support Preventative Maintenance Administration
- School District Support Capital Improvement Project Administration

2:15 – 2:20 PM

Set Date for Next Meeting

2:20 – 2:30 PM

DEED Wrap-up

2:30 – 3:00 PM

Committee Member Comments

3:00 PM

Adjourn

**BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, December 2, 2025, 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Heather Heineken, Chair  
Randy Williams  
Larry Morris  
Kevin Lyon  
Douglas Hayman  
Branzon Anania  
Senator Matt Clayman

**Staff**

Michael Butikofer  
Sharol Roys  
Alex Watts  
Lori Weed

**Additional Participants**

Dale Smythe  
Dena Strait  
Katrina Church-Chmielowski  
Warren Nicolai

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Heather Heineken called the meeting to order. Roll was taken, and a quorum was established to conduct business.

**CHAIR’S OPENING REMARKS**

Heather Heineken gave opening remarks which included a notification of a BRGR committee position vacancy and DEED staff updates.

**AGENDA REVIEW / APPROVAL**

Larry Morris **MOVED** to approve the agenda as presented, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objections, the motion **PASSED**.

**PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW / APPROVAL**

Kevin Lyon **MOVED**, Randy Williams **SECONDED** for approval of the minutes of February 18, 2025, the minutes were approved as presented.

Branzon Anania **MOVED**, Douglas Hayman **SECONDED** for approval of the minutes of April 9-10, 2025, the minutes were approved as presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

A public comment period was offered, and no public testimony was received.

**DEPARTMENT BREIFING:**

***FY2027 CIP Report***

Michael Butikofer reviewed the FY 2027 CIP report with the following highlights:

- 124 applications were received this year.
- There were 32 budget revisions this year.
- There were seven ineligible projects.

- An increase in costs was seen for both the construction and maintenance lists.
- There were three requests for reconsideration, which will be finalized in the next coming weeks.

### ***Statewide Six-year Plan***

Six-year plans were received from districts of potential projects for state aid. Not all districts submit plans, but currently about \$2.55 billion is estimated as needed for projects.

Larry Morris **MOVED** that the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee recommend the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the department’s FY2027 list of projects eligible for funding under the School Construction Grant Fund and the Major Maintenance Grant Fund, **SECONDED** by Kevin Lyon. Hearing no objections, the motion **PASSED**.

### ***School Capital Project Funding Report***

The FY2026 operating budget funded the REAA Fund capitalization at \$17,163,300 and the municipal debt reimbursement at \$34,882,150, a reduction of 25% from the statutory calculations. The Major Maintenance Grant Fund was reduced to \$12,975,001 by a line-item veto.

Priorities #1 and #2 on the School Construction list were fully funded with the REAA Fund. Priority #3 received limited support for gravel production using lapsed school construction funding. Priorities #1-6 on the Major Maintenance list were funded with a combination of FY2026 Major Maintenance Fund appropriation, FY2026 REAA Fund appropriation, and lapsed funding from previous years.

The moratorium on school debt reimbursement expired on July 1, 2025.

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

Districts cannot apply for CIP projects if their program is not compliant. Chatham School District is the only district on a provisional program, and only two are not currently certified. Forty-nine of fifty-two school districts have certified PM programs.

Michael Butikofer provided a brief update on Typhoon Halong and highlighted a need for formalized emergency management plans for all districts, and clear procedures for tracking and supporting individuals sheltered in school buildings.

### ***Administrative Order No. 360 – 4 AAC 31 and related guidance documents***

This administrative order is for all state agencies to conduct a regulation review and identify sections of regulation, guidance documents, and technical publications that may be redundant, outdated, unclear, or unnecessarily burdensome for school districts.

Michael Butikofer communicates that the department is currently conducting a review of 4 AAC 31 and all associated facilities publications in alignment with this order.

Heather Heineken states that the department can also review any forms or documents to lower the burden on districts.

### ***Capital Needs Forecast Database***

This is a project focused on establishing a data-driven statewide assessment of capital renewal and new construction needs on an annual basis.

Michael Butikofer states that the project is in the final stages of completion.

### ***Publications***

Michael Butikofer states that currently the department is not recommending any changes to publications; the department is currently evaluating and revising the current publication update schedule.

### ***Department Staffing Update***

There are two positions that the department is currently recruiting for. One is a Building Management Specialist, and the other is a School Finance Specialist II.

### ***Committee Member Update***

Michael Butikofer mentions that there is one committee seat currently vacant that the department is seeking to fill. The position is for an individual with a professional degree and experience in school construction. All other seats are filled with terms running through 2027 and 2029.

Heather Heineken asks the committee if there are any questions regarding the department update.

Randy Williams asks a question about Administrative Order No. 360 and a discussion about the specifics of that order takes place.

Katrina Church-Chmielowski asks why some applications are left unscored. Michael Butikofer explains that some are a reuse of previously scored applications and others are ineligible projects.

## **BRIEFING PAPERS**

### ***FY 2027 CIP Issues and Clarifications***

Michael Butikofer presents the CIP application briefing. 36 districts submitted 124 applications this year, the highest participation since FY2022. The number of applications remained steady due to ongoing deferred maintenance pressures despite the uncertainty of the future about state funding.

Michael Butikofer noted that common application issues are in sections 4 (Life/Safety/Code Conditions), 7 (Cost Estimate), and 8 (Other Project Factors). Those problems include missing documentation, cost estimates not applied to the application effectively, and limited support for ADM projections. These issues may reflect application complexity or limited administrative capacity in smaller districts. The Department recommends additional training and clear instructions, especially for section 7 of the application.

### ***Online Application Submittal***

Michael Butikofer states that this was the first year of electronic only submissions. While the department overall felt this simplified the process, there were a few drawbacks; notably some districts missed uploading some intended items, and there were some long file paths that required IT intervention. The department will refine the instructions and streamline the process.

### ***Eligibility***

Seven applications were deemed ineligible. Two did not meet space requirements for consideration of school construction or renovation addition. Two were reused applications that were previously deemed ineligible in FY2026. One lacked a submitted application, despite providing other submittals. One project was deemed ineligible to combine it with another application involving the same facility. Finally, one identified a need that was already met by existing facilities.

### ***Rating Issues***

During the FY2027 rating process, some issues were noted during rating process. Michael Butikofer goes through sections of the evaluative scoring that presented challenges for raters and applicants.

Branzon Anania asks for clarification regarding the alternative projections for ADM that can be utilized in section 5 of the application.

Heather Heineken provides an explanation of the alternative ADM projection tools that the department uses. Lori Weed provides further information and historical context.

Michael Butikofer states that the department will provide additional information to the application instructions for section 5 to be presented to the BRGR committee in the April meeting.

### ***General Observations***

Michael Butikofer provides closing remarks regarding the FY2027 CIP application, notably the departments need to address overbuilt schools.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### ***School Space***

Dale Smythe presents recommended regulation changes to the committee.

### ***School District Support Preventative Maintenance Administration***

Kevin Lyon presents on the training materials being developed as part of this subcommittee as well as further plans.

### ***Capital Improvement Project Administration***

Larry Morris presents progress made by the subcommittee and expresses a need for more involvement.

Heather Heineken agrees that more involvement is needed.

Warren Nicolai from LKSD expresses interest in participating in this subcommittee.

### **BRGR WORKPLAN REVIEW & UPDATE**

Michael Butikofer mentions that work done by the design ratio subcommittee done in the past still needs to be addressed and presented in April's meeting. Sections of note include 5.4.1 references future work towards right sizing. 5.4.2 is new and moved the application to electronic submission. 6.1 CIP administration and participation work that has been added to the workplan. A change of review of the publications from every 5 years to 7 years is mentioned.

Dena Strait expressed that she liked the electronic upload process that was done this CIP cycle. She requested a "submit" button or way to know that the submission was sent to and received by the department.

Branzon Anania agrees that the electronic upload is something that the department should continue.

Randy Williams asks for more information regarding the publication update schedule.

Michael Butikofer explains that the department does not have the current capacity to review one to two publications a year.

Heather Heineken asks the committee to provide input if there is a publication that they think should be addressed urgently.

### **SET NEXT MEETING DATE**

Next meeting is proposed for April 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> in Juneau due to being just after the ACSA fly-in (March 28-April 1). This can lead to more interested parties being present in the area who can have the opportunity to participate with the committee.

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

Larry Morris thanked DEED staff for their reports. He mentions hoping for the committee to accomplish redoing the application and simplifying it. He also mentions frustration with a lack of adequate funding to address the state's growing school facility's needs.

Kevin Lyon agrees with Larry Morris and expresses frustration with the growing unmet needs of school districts.

Randy Williams also states a need to address the source of the funds to meet school district needs.

Douglas Hayman expresses that he is also concerned about the funding issues, and that homeschooling is growing more popular. He states that homeschool is a way to save money, but there are still facility needs that need to be met. He encourages the committee to think about homeschooling needs as the state moves more in that direction.

Branzon Anania acknowledges the funding issues.

Senator Matt Clayman shares the concern of just how many capital improvement projects are needed in the state.

### **ADJOURN**

Larry Morris **MOVED** to adjourn, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objections, Heather Heineken adjourned the meeting at 3:27 p.m.



## Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

As of: April 1, 2026

Member	Appointed	Re-appointed	Term Expires
<b>Heather Heineken</b> Commissioner or Commissioner's Designee <div style="text-align: right;">Chair</div>	Commissioner's Designee	--	--
<b>Representative Alyse Galvin</b> House of Representatives Member	Appointed by Speaker	--	--
<b>Senator Matt Claman</b> Senate Member	Appointed by President	--	--
<b>Randy Williams</b> Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction	03/01/2019	03/01/2023	02/28/2027
<b>Vacant</b> Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction	Vacant	n/a	02/28/2029
<b>Larry Morris</b> Experience in Urban or Rural School Facilities Management	03/01/2023	n/a	02/28/2027
<b>Kevin Lyon</b> Experience in Urban or Rural School Facilities Management	03/01/2021	03/01/2025	02/28/2029
<b>Douglas Hayman</b> Public Representative	03/01/2023	n/a	02/28/2027
<b>Branzon Anania</b> Public Representative	03/01/2021	03/01/2025	02/28/2029

Members appointed by commissioner unless noted. See AS 14.11.014 and 4 AAC 31.087.



To: Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
From: School Facilities  
Date: April 2, 2026

## DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

---

### ***FY2027 Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Report***

The department ranked 117 applications for the FY2027 Capital Improvement Programs. Of these, 32 required budget revisions. In addition, 7 projects were deemed ineligible. Both the construction and maintenance project lists saw an increase in costs compared to previous years.

Two requests for reconsideration were submitted by two districts regarding a project. In the initial lists issued on December 19, 2025, the Department reconsidered its determination, changes were made to the projects scope and budget. The districts appealed the reconsideration and the Department of Law and districts settled with an adjustment to the budget of each appeal application. The appeals did not change the project rankings. The final lists were issued on February 20, 2026, and subsequently approved by the State Board of Education on March 11, 2026.

The final Major Maintenance list includes 103 projects with a total state share request of \$400,975,573, while the School Construction list comprises 14 projects with a state share request of \$442,916,669. An updated sheet on the CIP grant request and funding history from FY16 to FY26 is included for reference.

### ***School Capital Project Funding Report***

AS 14.11.035 requires, beginning in February 2013, publication of an annual report on school construction and major maintenance funding. The statute requires reports of spending from each of the three funding programs providing state aid for capital improvement projects—school construction and major maintenance fund grants under AS 14.11.011, regional education attendance area and small municipal school district school fund (REAA Fund) allocations under AS 14.11.025, and school construction debt reimbursement under AS 14.11.100. Summary tables from the 2026 report showing the funding activity by program, fiscal year, and category are included in the packet. The final report is available on the Department's website located here: [FY2026 Funding Report \(pdf\)](#).

A sheet on the CIP grant request and funding history FY17-FY27 is included for reference.

The moratorium on school debt reimbursement expired on July 1, 2025. The department anticipates an influx of new debt applications in the coming year; however, this may be mitigated by the

program funding reduction in FY2026 and statements by the Senate Finance Committee about the potential for reduced funding in future years. There is legislation in committee that would reinstitute the moratorium (HB 76/SB 82, SB184).

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

The Preventive Maintenance State-of-the-State Report was updated on August 15, 2025, and is included in the packet with a chart showing compliance history. For the current FY27 CIP cycle, 50 of 52 school districts have certified or provisional preventive maintenance programs.

Districts not currently certified include:

- Aleutian Region
- Hydaburg City

The following district provided documentation to be granted provisional and was upgraded from non-compliant. The district is working with the department to develop a full year of evidence of plan adherence:

- Chatham

In-person site visits for FY 2026 have been completed from September to February for the following school districts:

- Annette Island
- Dillingham
- Haines
- Hoonah
- Juneau
- Ketchikan
- Northwest Arctic
- Petersburg
- Southwest Region
- Wrangell

Aleutians Region School District is due in FY2026 and is still pending. The Building Maintenance Specialist position is vacant and the department is actively recruiting. In the interim, the Department will continue coordinating with the Aleutians Region School District to complete the visit. Planning for FY2027 site visits will begin in anticipation of filling the vacant position and maintaining the regular visit schedule.

### ***REAA and Small Municipal Fund Report***

The Regional Education Attendance Area School Fund was established by chapter 93, SLA 2010 (SB 237). The amount of money available each fiscal year is tied to the annual debt service incurred under AS 14.11.100. In 2013, the fund was amended to include “small municipal school districts”. In 2018, the fund was amended to allow funding of major maintenance grants but to maintain the primary function of funding school construction projects. Since the first appropriation in FY2013, \$469,388,378 has been deposited into the REAA Fund. From FY13 through FY15, \$869,528 in interest also accrued to the fund for a total of \$486,551,678.

There is no unobligated fund balance in the REAA Fund. The projected FY2027 appropriation is anticipated to be \$19,603,000. If appropriated, this funding would provide partial funding for the following project ranked 1, on the school construction list:

- Bering Strait School District - Stebbins K-12 School Replacement - Amount: \$71,311,250

## ***Legislative Updates***

The 2<sup>nd</sup> regular session of the 34<sup>th</sup> Legislature started on January 20, 2026. Below is a summary of education bills being considered and presentations given by the department.

The Facilities Section along with the Commissioner have provided presentations to the Senate Finance, Senate Education, House Finance, and House Education Committees on the following topics:

- The CIP application process and eligibility requirements for receiving a grant under AS 14.11;
- Participation trends in the CIP program;
- Recent funding trends; and
- A comparison of recommended versus actual funding levels.

Legislators have expressed concern that the CIP application process—and the associated steps required to receive a grant—are overly complex and in need of reform. There is also concern that it has become political and inequitable.

HB 42 sponsored by Representative Allard relates to school grants and bond debt reimbursement. The deadline for submission of a six-year plan would move from September 1 to July 1. Additionally, bond debt reimbursement to a municipality would be limited to one school construction project from the Department's school construction list, and two major maintenance projects from the Department's major maintenance list - unless all maintenance projects fall within the top 20 on list. HB 42 is in the House Education Committee.

HB 76/SB 82 are the Governor's Omnibus bill which extends the bond debt reimbursement moratorium to July 1, 2030. The bill also addresses public school attendance; mobile communication devices in schools; reading proficiency incentive grants; authorization of charter schools; transportation of students; funding and reporting by Alaska technical and vocational education programs; and authorizes lump sum payments for certain teachers as retention and recruitment incentives. HB 76 is currently in the House Education Committee. SB 82 is currently in the Senate Education Committee.

HB 174/SB 146 sponsored by the Senate Finance Committee relates to the REAA fund. The bill seeks to expand the REAA fund to support construction and major maintenance projects for Mt. Edgecumbe High School. SB 146 has passed the Senate and is currently in the House Finance Committee. HB 174 was passed by both the House and Senate in the first session of the 34<sup>th</sup> legislature but vetoed by the Governor.

HB231 sponsored by Representative Burke includes policy changes to support and retain teachers including the establishment of an educator housing subsidy and educator housing upgrade grant program. This bill is currently in House Education.

### **Bills Affecting District Operations**

During the first session HB 69 passed to increase the base student allocation (BSA) from \$5,960 to \$6,960. The Governor vetoed the bill and the veto was upheld by legislators. HB 57 was passed which included policy changes for education, increased funding to pupil transportation, grants for reading and an increase to the BSA from \$5,960 to \$6,660. This bill was also vetoed by the Governor, however the veto was overridden and the bill was enacted.

There are other education bills in the process including HB261, HB374, SB277 which all increase operational funding for districts.

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

The DEED Program Demand Cost Model, which is a tool used to assist school districts in estimating construction and renovation costs, will be updated again in 2026. This will be the 25th Edition of the tool. The contract with HMS, Inc. calls for final products on April 25 for use in the FY2028 application cycle and will be posted and available on the Department's website in time for the annual CIP training workshop, April 28-29 in Anchorage.

A teleconference with HMS, Inc. has been scheduled to allow the committee to provide input on potential changes to the elements of the Model School Building Escalation Study per the Model Alaskan School subcommittee recommendation. See separate agenda item and supplemental materials.

### ***Department Projects***

#### **Capital Needs Forecast Database Tool**

The Department has continued its work with Inzata Analytics to develop a Capital Needs Forecast Database tool. The current contract for this project is scheduled to conclude on June 30, 2026. While progress has been made, the tool has not yet achieved the level of accuracy needed for reliable cost projections. Inzata also currently hosts the Department's capital planning dashboards. The Department is in communication with Inzata to explore the feasibility of extending the contract and evaluating next steps.

### ***Special Projects***

#### **Administrative Order No. 360**

The department is continuing the comprehensive review of 4 AAC 31 and all associated facilities publications in alignment with the directives of Administrative Order 360 (AO 360). The first phase of the project has been completed which includes identifying regulations that need to be removed, revised or retained. With the help of BRGR input, the department has identified approximately 56 regulations to review and consider revision or possible removal. The department will adjust the identified regulations based on the feedback received and prepare them for the next phase of the process. In addition, revisions to related forms and application materials are being evaluated to support the objectives outlined in AO 360. The review is being carried out with the goal of achieving required reductions in regulatory burden while preserving the integrity and effectiveness of Alaska's school facility planning, construction, and maintenance framework.

## ***Publications Update***

Following is a list of publications managed by the department along with an estimated revision priority and the year of publication. The Facilities section is currently evaluating a revised schedule for updating publications. Those in bold are publications that require committee approval as they relate the CIP Application.

1. **A Handbook to Writing Educational Specifications (2019)**
2. Renewal & Replacement Schedule (2001)
3. **Space Guidelines Handbook (1996)**
4. Facility Appraisal Guide (1997)
5. **Guide for School Facility Condition Surveys (2020)**
6. Cost Format – *EED Standard Construction Cost Estimate Format* (2020)
7. Site Selection Criteria & Evaluation Handbook (2021)
8. **Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases (2022)**
9. **School Design and Construction Standards Handbook (2022)**
10. Capital Project Administration Handbook (2022)
11. **Project Delivery Method Handbook (2022)**
12. **Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook (2023)**
13. Professional Services for School Capital Projects (2023)
14. **Swimming Pool Guidelines (2019)**
15. **Life Cycle Cost Analysis Handbook (2025)**

## ***Department Staffing Update***

The department is recruiting for the following positions:

- Building Management Specialist and
- Architectural Assistant.

We are excited to welcome Sammy Legg to the team as the new School Finance Specialist 2, which assists with capital grant projects and serves as the department's land manager. Sammy joined the team on March 10, 2026

## ***Committee Member Update***

In January 2026 the Department opened a recruitment for a recent vacancy due to a resignation of a committee member with a professional degree and experience in school construction. One application was received and evaluated. A recommendation has been forwarded to the Commissioner for approval. The new member term will expire in February 2029.

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	DEED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Bering Strait	Stebbins K-12 School Replacement	\$120,128,285	\$72,766,582	\$0	\$72,766,582	\$1,455,332	\$71,311,250	\$71,311,250
2	2	2	Northwest Arctic Borough	Deering K-12 School Replacement	\$59,937,547	\$59,422,729	\$0	\$59,422,729	\$17,826,819	\$41,595,910	\$112,907,160
3	3	3	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Replacement, Sleetmute	\$40,172,964	\$35,140,862	\$0	\$35,140,862	\$702,817	\$34,438,045	\$147,345,205
4	4	4	Lower Kuskokwim	Nelson Island K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Toksook Bay	\$102,060,254	\$80,556,270	\$22,055,612	\$58,500,658	\$1,170,013	\$57,330,645	\$204,675,850
5	5	5	Lower Kuskokwim	Anna Tobeluk Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Nunapitchuk	\$117,926,651	\$117,926,651	\$0	\$117,926,651	\$2,358,533	\$115,568,118	\$320,243,968
6	6	6	Yukon-Koyukuk	Johnny Oldman K-12 School Replacement, Hughes	\$49,360,977	\$32,627,946	\$0	\$32,627,946	\$652,559	\$31,975,387	\$352,219,355
7	7	7	Lower Kuskokwim	Rocky Mountain K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Goodnews Bay	\$84,384,011	\$73,475,802	\$0	\$73,475,802	\$1,469,516	\$72,006,286	\$424,225,641
8	8	8	Anchorage	Kincaid Elementary School Site Improvements	\$10,627,294	\$10,627,294	\$0	\$10,627,294	\$3,719,553	\$6,907,741	\$431,133,382
9	9	9	Kenai Peninsula Borough	Kenai Middle School Security and Kitchen Remodel	\$1,878,020	\$1,878,020	\$0	\$1,878,020	\$657,307	\$1,220,713	\$432,354,095
10	10	10	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 3, 5 Sites	\$9,036,461	\$9,036,461	\$0	\$9,036,461	\$3,162,761	\$5,873,700	\$438,227,795
11	11	11	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 2, 3 Sites	\$816,985	\$816,985	\$0	\$816,985	\$285,945	\$531,040	\$438,758,835
12	12	12	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 1, 3 Sites	\$1,085,084	\$1,085,084	\$0	\$1,085,084	\$379,779	\$705,305	\$439,464,140
13	13	13	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 North, 4 Sites	\$3,489,791	\$3,489,791	\$0	\$3,489,791	\$1,221,427	\$2,268,364	\$441,732,504
14	14	14	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 South, 4 Sites	\$1,821,793	\$1,821,793	\$0	\$1,821,793	\$637,628	\$1,184,165	\$442,916,669
<b>Totals:</b>					<b>\$602,726,117</b>	<b>\$500,672,270</b>	<b>\$22,055,612</b>	<b>\$478,616,658</b>	<b>\$35,699,989</b>	<b>\$442,916,669</b>	

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	DEED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Craig City	Craig Elementary and Middle Schools Rehabilitation, Supplemental	\$578,579	\$13,978,755	\$13,400,176	\$578,579	\$115,716	\$462,863	\$462,863
2	2	2	Galena City	Sidney C Huntington Elementary and High Schools Renovation	\$36,533,012	\$36,533,012	\$0	\$36,533,012	\$1,826,651	\$34,706,361	\$35,169,224
3	3	3	Aleutians East Borough	Sand Point K-12 Major Maintenance, Supplemental	\$337,828	\$7,149,224	\$6,811,396	\$337,828	\$118,240	\$219,588	\$35,388,812
4	4	4	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley School Septic System Upgrades	\$1,152,256	\$1,152,256	\$0	\$1,152,256	\$230,451	\$921,805	\$36,310,617
5	5	5	Iditarod Area	Blackwell K-12 School Renovation, Anvik, Supplemental	\$5,230,948	\$19,257,859	\$11,959,552	\$7,298,307	\$145,966	\$7,152,341	\$43,462,958
6	6	6	Anchorage	East High School Safety Upgrades	\$9,097,603	\$9,097,603	\$0	\$9,097,603	\$3,184,161	\$5,913,442	\$49,376,400
7	7	7	Anchorage	Service High School Health and Safety Improvements	\$5,462,781	\$5,462,781	\$0	\$5,462,781	\$1,911,973	\$3,550,808	\$52,927,208
8	8	8	Fairbanks Borough	North Pole High School Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades	\$12,799,814	\$12,799,814	\$0	\$12,799,814	\$4,479,935	\$8,319,879	\$61,247,087
9	9	9	Lake & Peninsula Borough	Fire Suppression System Upgrades, 4 Sites	\$4,645,081	\$4,645,081	\$0	\$4,645,081	\$1,393,524	\$3,251,557	\$64,498,644
10	10	10	Kenai Peninsula Borough	West Homer Elementary School North Wall Improvement	\$356,760	\$356,760	\$0	\$356,760	\$124,866	\$231,894	\$64,730,538
11	11	11	Anchorage	Mears Middle School Heating Upgrades	\$575,376	\$575,376	\$0	\$575,376	\$201,382	\$373,994	\$65,104,532
12	12	12	Ketchikan Borough	Schoenbar Middle School Drainage and Gym Floor Replacement	\$629,975	\$629,975	\$0	\$629,975	\$220,491	\$409,484	\$65,514,016
13	13	13	Nenana City	Nenana School Boiler Replacement	\$255,324	\$255,324	\$0	\$255,324	\$12,766	\$242,558	\$65,756,574
14	14	14	Anchorage	Mears Middle School Roof Replacement	\$6,403,930	\$6,403,930	\$0	\$6,403,930	\$2,241,375	\$4,162,555	\$69,919,129
15	15	15	Fairbanks Borough	Arctic Light Elementary School Exterior Renovation	\$9,518,999	\$7,872,633	\$0	\$7,872,633	\$2,755,422	\$5,117,211	\$75,036,340
16	16	16	Valdez City	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Exterior Renovation	\$10,290,872	\$10,290,872	\$0	\$10,290,872	\$3,601,805	\$6,689,067	\$81,725,407
17	17	17	Denali Borough	Districtwide Electrical Code Upgrades	\$1,656,076	\$1,656,076	\$0	\$1,656,076	\$331,215	\$1,324,861	\$83,050,268
18	18	18	Kashunamiut	Chevak K-12 School Campus Renovation	\$40,947,693	\$13,459,533	\$0	\$13,459,533	\$269,191	\$13,190,342	\$96,240,610
19	19	19	Lower Yukon	Marshall K-12 School Emergency Tank Farm Repair	\$1,809,501	\$1,809,501	\$0	\$1,809,501	\$36,190	\$1,773,311	\$98,013,921
20	20	20	Aleutians East Borough	Sand Point K-12 School Doors and Locker Replacement	\$590,748	\$590,748	\$0	\$590,748	\$206,762	\$383,986	\$98,397,907
21	21	21	Kuspuk	Bob R. McHenry District Office Energy Upgrades	\$1,727,116	\$1,727,116	\$0	\$1,727,116	\$34,542	\$1,692,574	\$100,090,481
22	22	22	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg Aquatic Center Sewer Line Repair	\$1,213,760	\$833,148	\$0	\$833,148	\$291,602	\$541,546	\$100,632,027
23	23	23	Northwest Arctic Borough	Buckland K-12 School Boiler Replacement	\$387,771	\$387,771	\$0	\$387,771	\$116,331	\$271,440	\$100,903,467
24	24	24	Anchorage	College Gate Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$5,287,071	\$5,183,403	\$0	\$5,183,403	\$1,814,191	\$3,369,212	\$104,272,679
25	25	25	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg High/Middle School Security and Access Renovation	\$1,829,140	\$1,829,140	\$0	\$1,829,140	\$640,199	\$1,188,941	\$105,461,620
26	26	26	Anchorage	Campbell Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$5,251,951	\$5,149,141	\$0	\$5,149,141	\$1,802,199	\$3,346,942	\$108,808,562
27	27	27	Southeast Island	Barry Craig Stewart Kasaan and Whale Pass Schools Renovation	\$1,099,751	\$1,099,751	\$0	\$1,099,751	\$21,995	\$1,077,756	\$109,886,318

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	DEED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
28	28	28	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School Renovation, Mekoryuk	\$71,514,776	\$55,467,369	\$0	\$55,467,369	\$1,109,347	\$54,358,022	\$164,244,340
29	29	29	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay Emergency Tank Farm Pad Repair	\$5,011,296	\$5,011,296	\$0	\$5,011,296	\$100,226	\$4,911,070	\$169,155,410
30	30	30	Lower Kuskokwim	Akula Elitnavik K-12 School Renovations, Kasigluk-Akula, Supplemental	\$8,037,182	\$13,075,180	\$5,775,602	\$7,299,578	\$145,992	\$7,153,586	\$176,308,996
31	31	31	Haines Borough	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	\$1,330,699	\$1,330,699	\$0	\$1,330,699	\$465,745	\$864,954	\$177,173,950
32	32	32	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Partial Roof Replacement	\$632,933	\$624,543	\$0	\$624,543	\$12,491	\$612,052	\$177,786,002
33	33	33	Haines Borough	Haines High School Roof Replacement	\$958,471	\$958,471	\$0	\$958,471	\$335,465	\$623,006	\$178,409,008
34	34	34	Klawock City	Klawock School Gymnasium Roof Replacement	\$1,790,008	\$1,790,008	\$0	\$1,790,008	\$537,002	\$1,253,006	\$179,662,014
35	35	35	Anchorage	Kasuun and Kincaid Elementary Schools Roof Replacement	\$11,187,700	\$11,187,700	\$0	\$11,187,700	\$3,915,695	\$7,272,005	\$186,934,019
36	36	36	Yukon-Koyukuk	Tanana K-12 School Playground Replacement	\$462,998	\$462,998	\$0	\$462,998	\$9,260	\$453,738	\$187,387,757
37	37	37	Denali Borough	Generator Replacement, 2 Schools	\$1,777,729	\$1,777,729	\$0	\$1,777,729	\$355,546	\$1,422,183	\$188,809,940
38	38	38	Anchorage	Stellar Secondary School Fire Alarm	\$389,096	\$389,096	\$0	\$389,096	\$136,184	\$252,912	\$189,062,852
39	39	39	Pribilof Island	St. Paul K-12 School Exterior Renovation	\$1,506,366	\$1,130,001	\$0	\$1,130,001	\$22,600	\$1,107,401	\$190,170,253
40	40	40	Kodiak Island Borough	Fire Alarm Upgrades, 5 Sites	\$635,052	\$635,052	\$0	\$635,052	\$222,268	\$412,784	\$190,583,037
41	41	41	Kodiak Island Borough	Main Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,378,223	\$599,811	\$0	\$599,811	\$209,934	\$389,877	\$190,972,914
42	42	42	Lower Kuskokwim	Akiuk Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Kasigluk-Akiuk	\$6,014,523	\$6,014,523	\$0	\$6,014,523	\$120,290	\$5,894,233	\$196,867,147
43	43	43	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg Gym Sewer Line Repair	\$477,671	\$477,671	\$0	\$477,671	\$167,185	\$310,486	\$197,177,633
44	44	44	Petersburg Borough	Peterburg Campus Security Upgrades	\$1,551,939	\$1,551,939	\$0	\$1,551,939	\$543,179	\$1,008,760	\$198,186,393
45	45	45	Mat-Su Borough	Elevator Code and Compliance Upgrades, 2 Sites	\$957,775	\$957,775	\$0	\$957,775	\$335,221	\$622,554	\$198,808,947
46	46	46	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-12 School Renovation	\$6,651,205	\$6,651,205	\$0	\$6,651,205	\$133,024	\$6,518,181	\$205,327,128
47	47	47	Anchorage	Anchorage Warehouse Roof Replacement	\$3,571,711	\$3,571,711	\$0	\$3,571,711	\$1,250,099	\$2,321,612	\$207,648,740
48	48	48	Alaska Gateway	Northway K-12 Mechanical Renovation	\$1,494,287	\$1,366,572	\$0	\$1,366,572	\$27,331	\$1,339,241	\$208,987,981
49	49	49	Nenana City	Nenana School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$1,640,885	\$1,640,885	\$0	\$1,640,885	\$82,044	\$1,558,841	\$210,546,822
50	50	50	Kake City	Kake Career and Technical Education Building Rehabilitation	\$3,811,718	\$3,736,320	\$0	\$3,736,320	\$747,264	\$2,989,056	\$213,535,878
51	51	51	Aleutians East Borough	King Cove K-12 School Piping Project	\$834,856	\$696,877	\$0	\$696,877	\$243,907	\$452,970	\$213,988,848
52	52	52	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-12 School Renovation	\$9,224,037	\$9,224,037	\$0	\$9,224,037	\$184,481	\$9,039,556	\$223,028,404
53	53	53	Fairbanks Borough	Weller Elementary School Renovation	\$8,123,964	\$37,933,127	\$0	\$37,933,127	\$13,276,594	\$24,656,533	\$247,684,937
54	54	54	Yakutat Borough	Yakutat Jr/Sr High School Envelope Replacement	\$7,735,488	\$7,203,958	\$0	\$7,203,958	\$2,521,385	\$4,682,573	\$252,367,510
55	55	55	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Kitchen Upgrade	\$606,676	\$548,203	\$0	\$548,203	\$10,964	\$537,239	\$252,904,749
56	56	56	Ketchikan Borough	Valley Park and Pt. Higgins Elementary Schools Playground Upgrades	\$389,666	\$389,666	\$0	\$389,666	\$136,383	\$253,283	\$253,158,032

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	DEED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
57	57	57	Yukon Flats	Tsuk Taih K-12 School Renovation, Chalkyitsik	\$4,535,743	\$4,535,743	\$0	\$4,535,743	\$90,715	\$4,445,028	\$257,603,060
58	58	58	Valdez City	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Floor Replacement	\$421,694	\$421,694	\$0	\$421,694	\$147,593	\$274,101	\$257,877,161
59	59	59	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag and Koyukuk K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	\$1,781,982	\$1,781,982	\$0	\$1,781,982	\$35,640	\$1,746,342	\$259,623,503
60	60	60	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank K-12 School Boiler Replacement, Beaver	\$173,000	\$173,000	\$0	\$173,000	\$3,460	\$169,540	\$259,793,043
61	61	61	Yupitit	Tuluksak K-12 School Fuel Tank Replacement	\$5,259,301	\$5,259,301	\$0	\$5,259,301	\$105,186	\$5,154,115	\$264,947,158
62	62	62	Mat-Su Borough	Boiler Replacement, 3 Sites	\$2,328,677	\$2,328,677	\$0	\$2,328,677	\$815,037	\$1,513,640	\$266,460,798
63	63	63	Kodiak Island Borough	Chiniak K-12 School Water Code Compliance and Upgrade	\$2,035,824	\$1,851,951	\$0	\$1,851,951	\$648,183	\$1,203,768	\$267,664,566
64	64	64	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School HVAC System Upgrade	\$2,840,215	\$2,515,455	\$0	\$2,515,455	\$50,309	\$2,465,146	\$270,129,712
65	65	65	Yupitit	Akiak K-12 School Fire Alarm System Replacement	\$244,994	\$244,994	\$0	\$244,994	\$4,900	\$240,094	\$270,369,806
66	66	66	Iditarod Area	McGrath and Nikolai Schools Heating System Replacement	\$5,973,411	\$5,973,411	\$0	\$5,973,411	\$119,468	\$5,853,943	\$276,223,749
67	67	67	Mat-Su Borough	Colony Middle School Roof Replacement	\$4,387,259	\$4,387,259	\$0	\$4,387,259	\$1,535,541	\$2,851,718	\$279,075,467
68	68	68	Anchorage	Bear Valley Elementary School Domestic Water Replacement	\$2,665,758	\$2,665,758	\$0	\$2,665,758	\$933,015	\$1,732,743	\$280,808,210
69	69	69	Ketchikan Borough	Districtwide School Security Upgrades	\$1,258,644	\$1,258,644	\$0	\$1,258,644	\$440,525	\$818,119	\$281,626,329
70	70	70	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Upgrades	\$635,406	\$635,406	\$0	\$635,406	\$12,708	\$622,698	\$282,249,027
71	71	71	Juneau Borough	Dzantik'i Heeni School Roof Replacement	\$2,650,000	\$2,650,000	\$0	\$2,650,000	\$927,500	\$1,722,500	\$283,971,527
72	72	72	Saint Marys City	St. Mary's Campus Renewal and Repairs	\$1,012,911	\$1,012,911	\$0	\$1,012,911	\$101,291	\$911,620	\$284,883,147
73	73	73	Fairbanks Borough	Woodriver Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	\$8,682,677	\$4,962,127	\$0	\$4,962,127	\$1,736,744	\$3,225,383	\$288,108,530
74	74	74	Mat-Su Borough	HVAC Control Upgrades, 4 Sites	\$14,178,309	\$14,178,309	\$0	\$14,178,309	\$4,962,408	\$9,215,901	\$297,324,431
75	75	75	Mat-Su Borough	Generator Replacement, 3 Sites	\$2,556,820	\$2,556,820	\$0	\$2,556,820	\$894,887	\$1,661,933	\$298,986,364
76	76	76	Iditarod Area	McGrath K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$4,003,744	\$4,003,744	\$0	\$4,003,744	\$80,075	\$3,923,669	\$302,910,033
77	77	77	Lower Kuskokwim	Qugcuun Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Oscarville	\$6,276,417	\$6,276,417	\$0	\$6,276,417	\$125,528	\$6,150,889	\$309,060,922
78	78	78	Fairbanks Borough	Howard Luke High School Exterior Renovation	\$4,313,170	\$3,528,295	\$0	\$3,528,295	\$1,234,903	\$2,293,392	\$311,354,314
79	79	79	Ketchikan Borough	Information and Alert System Replacement, 4 Sites	\$5,846,128	\$5,846,128	\$0	\$5,846,128	\$2,046,145	\$3,799,983	\$315,154,297
80	80	80	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage and Treatment, Kongiganak	\$10,977,788	\$10,860,643	\$0	\$10,860,643	\$217,213	\$10,643,430	\$325,797,727
81	81	81	Lower Yukon	LYSD Maintenance Building Renovation	\$1,201,501	\$1,137,187	\$0	\$1,137,187	\$22,744	\$1,114,443	\$326,912,170
82	82	82	Juneau Borough	Riverbend Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000	\$0	\$2,800,000	\$980,000	\$1,820,000	\$328,732,170
83	83	83	Anchorage	Ptarmigan Elementary School Intercom Replacement	\$512,955	\$512,955	\$0	\$512,955	\$179,534	\$333,421	\$329,065,591
84	84	84	Fairbanks Borough	Ticasuk Brown Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	\$10,171,421	\$9,220,975	\$0	\$9,220,975	\$3,227,341	\$5,993,634	\$335,059,225
85	85	85	Kodiak Island Borough	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$2,177,465	\$2,177,465	\$0	\$2,177,465	\$762,113	\$1,415,352	\$336,474,577
86	86	86	Fairbanks Borough	University Park Elementary School Classroom Upgrades	\$7,470,074	\$7,819,252	\$0	\$7,819,252	\$2,736,738	\$5,082,514	\$341,557,091

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	DEED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
87	87	87	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	\$991,068	\$991,068	\$0	\$991,068	\$198,214	\$792,854	\$342,349,945
88	88	88	Copper River	Kenny Lake High School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$1,040,957	\$1,040,957	\$0	\$1,040,957	\$20,819	\$1,020,138	\$343,370,083
89	89	89	Mat-Su Borough	Wasilla Middle School Partial Roof Replacement	\$1,505,449	\$1,505,449	\$0	\$1,505,449	\$526,907	\$978,542	\$344,348,625
90	90	90	Mat-Su Borough	Talkeetna Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,861,280	\$1,861,280	\$0	\$1,861,280	\$651,448	\$1,209,832	\$345,558,457
91	91	91	Anchorage	Facilities Support Center Roof C Replacement	\$485,010	\$485,010	\$0	\$485,010	\$169,753	\$315,257	\$345,873,714
92	92	92	Mat-Su Borough	Boiler and Boiler Control Upgrades, 6 Sites	\$3,650,822	\$3,650,822	\$0	\$3,650,822	\$1,277,788	\$2,373,034	\$348,246,748
93	93	93	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System	\$1,452,608	\$1,452,608	\$0	\$1,452,608	\$29,052	\$1,423,556	\$349,670,304
94	94	94	Lower Yukon	Kotlik and Pilot Station K-12 Schools Renewal and Repair	\$3,431,716	\$3,431,716	\$0	\$3,431,716	\$68,634	\$3,363,082	\$353,033,386
95	95	95	Fairbanks Borough	Anderson Crawford Elementary School Exterior Renovation	\$9,518,999	\$9,453,696	\$0	\$9,453,696	\$3,308,794	\$6,144,902	\$359,178,288
96	96	96	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point K-12 School Exterior Repairs, Nunam Iqua	\$4,064,842	\$4,064,842	\$0	\$4,064,842	\$81,297	\$3,983,545	\$363,161,833
97	97	97	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$4,220,915	\$4,220,915	\$0	\$4,220,915	\$84,418	\$4,136,497	\$367,298,330
98	98	98	Mat-Su Borough	Seismic Upgrades, 14 Sites	\$12,637,758	\$12,637,758	\$0	\$12,637,758	\$4,423,215	\$8,214,543	\$375,512,873
99	99	99	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwigillingok K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$1,439,063	\$1,439,063	\$0	\$1,439,063	\$28,781	\$1,410,282	\$376,923,155
100	100	100	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-12 School Renovation	\$10,791,156	\$10,791,156	\$0	\$10,791,156	\$215,823	\$10,575,333	\$387,498,488
101	101	101	Lower Kuskokwim	Z John Williams Memorial School Bulk Fuel Storage Replacement, Napaskiak	\$2,556,738	\$2,556,738	\$0	\$2,556,738	\$51,135	\$2,505,603	\$390,004,091
102	102	102	Sitka Borough	Blatchley Middle School Roof and Envelope Replacement	\$12,717,972	\$12,717,972	\$0	\$12,717,972	\$4,451,290	\$8,266,682	\$398,270,773
103	103	103	Bering Strait	Gambell K-12 School Bulk Fuel Tank Farm Replacement	\$2,760,000	\$2,760,000	\$0	\$2,760,000	\$55,200	\$2,704,800	\$400,975,573
<b>Totals:</b>					<b>\$519,868,287</b>	<b>\$535,228,558</b>	<b>\$37,946,726</b>	<b>\$497,281,832</b>	<b>\$96,306,259</b>	<b>\$400,975,573</b>	

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction Grant Fund  
Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative  
Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emer-gency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
1	1	1	Bering Strait	Stebbins K-12 School Replacement	30.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.35	50.00	30.00	23.15	10.00	25.00	2.33	1.33	3.33	1.67	1.00	50.00	50.00	38.33	21.33	0.00	5.00	0.00	364.83
2	2	2	Northwest Arctic Borough	Deering K-12 School Replacement	30.00	13.08	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.62	11.39	19.03	23.48	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	25.00	50.00	26.33	21.33	11.00	5.00	6.67	318.95
3	3	3	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Replacement, Sleetmute	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00	18.13	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.67	3.00	4.00	2.00	46.67	50.00	30.00	20.33	8.33	0.33	19.33	297.34
4	4	4	Lower Kuskokwim	Nelson Island K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Toksook Bay	30.00	15.00	30.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	14.40	8.64	21.25	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	41.93	26.33	15.67	9.33	0.00	9.33	283.13
5	5	5	Lower Kuskokwim	Anna Tobeluk Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Nunapitchuk	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	20.30	12.18	21.53	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	19.93	23.33	15.33	9.00	0.00	20.67	242.53
6	6	6	Yukon-Koyukuk	Johnny Oldman K-12 School Replacement, Hughes	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	18.01	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	50.00	5.00	16.67	10.00	0.00	24.33	229.36
7	7	7	Lower Kuskokwim	Rocky Mountain K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Goodnews Bay	9.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	7.62	14.77	21.64	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	19.73	30.00	14.67	9.33	1.00	16.00	220.00
8	8	8	Anchorage	Kincaid Elementary School Site Improvements	0.00	5.50	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	9.92	0.33	25.67	8.00	1.00	11.67	145.95
9	9	9	Kenai Peninsula Borough	Kenai Middle School Security and Kitchen Remodel	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	5.00	16.00	6.33	0.00	8.00	140.04
10	10	10	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 3, 5 Sites	0.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	26.33	1.00	3.00	5.67	131.27
11	11	11	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 2, 3 Sites	0.00	12.57	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	25.67	1.00	3.00	5.67	128.18
12	12	12	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 1, 3 Sites	0.00	6.28	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	27.00	1.00	3.00	5.67	123.23
13	13	13	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 North, 4 Sites	0.00	13.79	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	5.33	27.00	0.33	0.00	5.00	120.32
14	14	14	Anchorage	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 South, 4 Sites	0.00	9.38	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	5.33	26.33	0.33	0.00	5.00	115.32

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development**  
**FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects**  
**Major Maintenance Grant Fund**  
**Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative**  
**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
1	1	1	Craig City	Craig Elementary and Middle Schools Rehabilitation, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	2.33	3.00	45.00	49.00	4.33	30.00	4.00	0.00	10.00	270.08
2	2	2	Galena City	Sidney C Huntington Elementary and High Schools Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	3.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.67	3.00	2.00	3.00	8.33	50.00	1.33	23.00	8.33	0.00	10.00	221.35
3	3	3	Aleutians East Borough	Sandpoint K-12 Major Maintenance, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	41.13	5.00	29.33	5.00	0.00	1.00	202.32
4	4	4	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley School Septic System Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	10.00	32.33	4.00	18.33	0.00	0.00	13.67	196.84
5	5	5	Iditarod Area	Blackwell K-12 School Renovation, Anvik, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.33	1.33	2.00	2.00	2.00	25.00	10.35	4.00	16.33	4.00	0.00	10.00	190.70
6	6	6	Anchorage	East High School Safety Upgrades	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	25.72	0.33	27.00	0.33	0.00	10.00	189.64
7	7	7	Anchorage	Service High School Health and Safety Improvements	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	20.20	2.67	27.00	2.33	0.00	5.33	182.50
8	8	8	Fairbanks Borough	North Pole High School Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	3.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.33	4.00	18.33	30.22	0.00	13.67	7.00	0.00	0.33	181.94
9	9	9	Lake & Peninsula Borough	Fire Suppression System Upgrades, 4 Sites	30.00	13.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	25.00	30.61	3.33	15.00	0.33	0.00	7.67	178.63
10	10	10	Kenai Peninsula Borough	West Homer Elementary School North Wall Improvement	30.00	6.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	12.00	0.33	29.00	6.00	0.00	8.67	176.71
11	11	11	Anchorage	Mears Middle School Heating Upgrades	24.00	13.40	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	11.00	3.33	27.67	6.33	0.00	2.00	171.59
12	12	12	Ketchikan Borough	Schoenbar Middle School Drainage and Gym Floor Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	12.00	3.67	28.00	4.67	0.00	6.67	171.47
13	13	13	Nenana City	Nenana School Boiler Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	15.00	2.00	16.33	12.67	0.00	10.00	171.26
14	14	14	Anchorage	Mears Middle School Roof Replacement	21.00	12.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	9.54	2.00	27.67	4.67	0.00	6.67	168.41
15	15	15	Fairbanks Borough	Arctic Light Elementary School Exterior Renovation	24.00	8.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	21.00	168.36
16	16	16	Valdez City	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Exterior Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	0.67	3.00	2.00	2.67	0.00	20.31	1.67	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	165.58
17	17	17	Denali Borough	Districtwide Electrical Code Upgrades	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	28.00	2.67	15.33	4.00	0.00	9.33	164.84
18	18	18	Kashunamiut	Chevak K-12 School Campus Renovation	30.00	3.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	3.33	3.33	3.67	1.67	0.00	19.26	1.00	18.00	8.67	0.00	8.33	164.46
19	19	19	Lower Yukon	Marshall K-12 School Emergency Tank Farm Repair	27.00	0.20	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	3.67	2.00	2.33	3.67	2.00	6.67	9.61	0.00	28.00	4.33	0.00	7.67	164.33
20	20	20	Aleutians East Borough	Sandpoint K-12 School Doors and Locker Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	18.00	3.00	29.33	3.33	0.00	0.67	164.19
21	21	21	Kuspuk	Bob R. McHenry District Office Energy Upgrades	27.00	12.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	3.67	2.00	3.00	3.67	1.67	0.00	47.00	5.00	15.33	7.00	0.00	4.33	163.78
22	22	22	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg Aquatic Center Sewer Line Repair	21.00	7.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	16.26	4.33	27.33	4.00	0.00	11.00	163.18
23	23	23	Northwest Arctic Borough	Buckland K-12 School Boiler Replacement	27.00	6.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	15.50	0.33	27.33	13.67	0.00	0.00	162.06

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development**  
**FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects**  
**Major Maintenance Grant Fund**  
**Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative**  
**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
24	24	24	Anchorage	College Gate Elementary School Roof Replacement	15.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	13.82	2.33	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	161.75
25	25	25	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg High/Middle School Security and Access Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	4.70	5.00	28.33	1.33	0.00	5.00	161.61
26	26	26	Anchorage	Campbell Elementary School Roof Replacement	18.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	9.79	1.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	159.39
27	27	27	Southeast Island	Barry Craig Stewart Kasaan and Whale Pass Schools Renovation	24.00	13.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	50.00	4.00	12.00	6.00	0.00	2.00	158.56
28	28	28	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School Renovation, Mekoryuk	12.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	26.01	3.67	14.33	10.00	0.00	16.00	158.26
29	29	29	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay Emergency Tank Farm Pad Repair	30.00	1.60	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	2.33	1.67	20.00	3.69	0.00	27.00	4.67	0.00	6.00	156.77
30	30	30	Lower Kuskokwim	Akula Elitnavik K-12 School Renovations, Kasigluk-Akula, Supplemental	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	3.33	25.46	2.33	15.67	2.67	0.00	6.00	156.71
31	31	31	Haines Borough	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	0.00	24.65	1.00	16.67	6.33	0.00	7.33	152.00
32	32	32	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Partial Roof Replacement	27.00	7.80	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	4.00	1.33	2.00	0.67	2.67	0.00	25.00	1.00	15.00	5.33	0.00	13.67	150.53
33	33	33	Haines Borough	Haines High School Roof Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	0.00	6.00	1.33	28.00	6.67	0.00	9.00	150.01
34	34	34	Klawock City	Klawock School Gymnasium Roof Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	20.00	3.67	12.67	2.67	0.00	6.67	149.36
35	35	35	Anchorage	Kasuun and Kincaid Elementary Schools Roof Replacement	0.00	6.50	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	10.00	5.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	12.33	148.43
36	36	36	Yukon-Koyukuk	Tanana K-12 School Playground Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	13.68	3.33	15.33	1.33	0.00	5.00	148.03
37	37	37	Denali Borough	Generator Replacement, 2 Schools	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	20.33	0.00	15.33	3.67	0.00	5.00	146.83
38	38	38	Anchorage	Stellar Secondary School Fire Alarm	6.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	20.00	0.00	26.33	4.67	0.00	0.00	146.27
39	39	39	Pribilof Island	St. Paul K-12 School Exterior Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	3.00	1.67	2.67	1.67	2.00	0.00	27.00	3.00	12.00	4.00	0.00	6.00	144.99
40	40	40	Kodiak Island Borough	Fire Alarm Upgrades, 5 Sites	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.33	4.33	5.00	0.00	17.00	5.00	16.33	6.00	0.00	5.00	144.56
41	41	41	Kodiak Island Borough	Main Elementary School Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	16.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	143.90
42	42	42	Lower Kuskokwim	Akiuk Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Kasigluk-Akiuk	15.00	7.50	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	35.48	1.00	15.67	2.67	0.00	5.00	143.56
43	43	43	Petersburg Borough	Petersburg Gym Sewer Line Repair	27.00	3.02	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	27.67	3.67	0.00	5.33	142.73
44	44	44	Petersburg Borough	Peterburg Campus Security Upgrades	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	15.33	5.00	16.67	4.00	0.00	5.00	142.25
45	45	45	Mat-Su Borough	Elevator Code and Compliance Upgrades, 2 Sites	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	3.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	8.33	141.54
46	46	46	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-12 School Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	41.67	0.00	14.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	141.39
47	47	47	Anchorage	Anchorage Warehouse Roof Replacement	3.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	9.52	0.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	141.11

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development**  
**FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects**  
**Major Maintenance Grant Fund**  
**Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative**  
**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
48	48	48	Alaska Gateway	Northway K-12 Mechanical Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.00	1.33	2.00	0.67	2.67	0.00	11.97	3.00	14.67	5.33	0.00	3.33	141.03
49	49	49	Nenana City	Nenana School Fire Suppression System Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	13.33	5.00	0.33	14.67	5.00	0.00	10.00	140.59
50	50	50	Kake City	Kake Career and Technical Education Building Rehabilitation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.67	1.33	3.00	1.33	2.00	0.33	25.85	1.00	13.67	4.00	0.00	7.00	138.37
51	51	51	Aleutians East Borough	King Cove K-12 School Piping Project	27.00	1.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	12.00	4.00	15.00	3.33	0.00	6.00	136.79
52	52	52	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-12 School Renovation	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	8.33	27.33	5.00	15.67	5.00	0.00	3.33	136.06
53	53	53	Fairbanks Borough	Weller Elementary School Renovation	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	30.05	0.00	12.00	9.33	0.00	6.67	135.81
54	54	54	Yakutat Borough	Yakutat Jr/Sr High School Envelope Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	26.27	1.33	13.67	2.67	0.00	6.67	135.64
55	55	55	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Kitchen Upgrade	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	4.23	5.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	11.33	134.91
56	56	56	Ketchikan Borough	Valley Park and Pt. Higgins Elementary Schools Playground Upgrades	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	12.00	3.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	4.33	134.81
57	57	57	Yukon Flats	Tsuk Taih K-12 School Renovation, Chalkyitsik	27.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	1.67	1.00	1.67	1.33	1.00	0.00	25.79	1.67	12.00	7.00	0.00	5.00	134.71
58	58	58	Valdez City	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Floor Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	0.67	3.00	2.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	0.00	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	134.60
59	59	59	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag and Koyukuk K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	5.33	1.67	15.33	7.33	0.00	6.67	133.68
60	60	60	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank K-12 School Boiler Replacement, Beaver	30.00	14.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	1.33	1.67	2.00	0.67	1.33	5.00	4.00	1.00	30.00	3.00	0.00	6.67	133.52
61	61	61	Yupiiit	Tuluksak K-12 School Fuel Tank Replacement	30.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	15.00	5.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	9.33	133.45
62	62	62	Mat-Su Borough	Boiler Replacement, 3 Sites	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	11.77	4.00	13.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	132.97
63	63	63	Kodiak Island Borough	Chiniak K-12 School Water Code Compliance and Upgrade	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	131.56
64	64	64	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School HVAC System Upgrade	30.00	10.65	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.00	0.00	14.00	2.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	130.09
65	65	65	Yupiiit	Akiak K-12 School Fire Alarm System Replacement	27.00	1.80	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	0.67	20.00	0.33	0.00	5.00	129.25
66	66	66	Iditarod Area	McGrath and Nikolai Schools Heating System Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.33	1.33	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	24.10	2.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	129.12
67	67	67	Mat-Su Borough	Colony Middle School Roof Replacement	21.00	12.60	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	25.00	3.67	14.33	2.00	0.00	5.00	128.80
68	68	68	Anchorage	Bear Valley Elementary School Domestic Water Replacement	0.00	13.40	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	8.95	0.00	26.67	4.67	0.00	3.00	125.96
69	69	69	Ketchikan Borough	Districtwide School Security Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	14.00	3.33	0.00	3.67	125.81
70	70	70	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Upgrades	21.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	18.00	0.00	12.00	5.00	0.00	2.33	125.47
71	71	71	Juneau Borough	Dzantik'i Heeni School Roof Replacement	30.00	6.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	11.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	121.23

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development**  
**FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects**  
**Major Maintenance Grant Fund**  
**Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative**  
**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
72	72	72	Saint Marys City	St. Mary's Campus Renewal and Repairs	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	12.00	0.33	0.00	6.67	121.19
73	73	73	Fairbanks Borough	Woodriver Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	12.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	34.00	0.00	0.00	8.67	0.00	6.00	120.42
74	74	74	Mat-Su Borough	HVAC Control Upgrades, 4 Sites	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	23.33	3.67	14.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	120.20
75	75	75	Mat-Su Borough	Generator Replacement, 3 Sites	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	4.67	0.00	14.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	119.87
76	76	76	Iditarod Area	McGrath K-12 School Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.33	2.00	1.67	1.00	2.00	4.33	8.67	2.00	11.67	4.67	0.00	5.00	119.63
77	77	77	Lower Kuskokwim	Qugcuun Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Oscarville	6.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	9.76	3.33	16.33	2.00	0.00	5.00	118.68
78	78	78	Fairbanks Borough	Howard Luke High School Exterior Renovation	15.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	21.01	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	5.00	118.23
79	79	79	Ketchikan Borough	Information and Alert System Replacement, 4 Sites	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	9.33	1.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	5.00	117.81
80	80	80	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage and Treatment, Kongiganak	21.00	1.01	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	2.00	1.33	0.00	5.33	116.93
81	81	81	Lower Yukon	LYSD Maintenance Building Renovation	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.33	0.67	2.67	1.67	1.33	0.00	19.50	0.00	14.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	116.59
82	82	82	Juneau Borough	Riverbend Elementary School Roof Replacement	27.00	4.50	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	11.00	3.00	0.00	7.33	113.06
83	83	83	Anchorage	Ptarmigan Elementary School Intercom Replacement	9.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	3.33	8.00	1.67	15.00	3.00	0.00	2.33	111.59
84	84	84	Fairbanks Borough	Ticasuk Brown Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	27.00	13.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	7.20	0.00	9.33	7.67	0.00	1.67	111.03
85	85	85	Kodiak Island Borough	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.33	0.00	3.67	0.00	2.00	110.56
86	86	86	Fairbanks Borough	University Park Elementary School	9.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	17.27	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	6.00	109.49
87	87	87	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	2.67	2.00	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.33	12.67	2.33	0.00	9.67	108.72
88	88	88	Copper River	Kenny Lake High School Fire	30.00	12.82	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	1.00	0.67	1.67	0.67	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	107.93
89	89	89	Mat-Su Borough	Wasilla Middle School Partial Roof Replacement	9.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	26.24	3.33	14.00	2.00	0.00	5.00	107.77
90	90	90	Mat-Su Borough	Talkeetna Elementary School Roof Replacement	6.00	11.87	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	19.33	1.67	14.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	107.08
91	91	91	Anchorage	Facilities Support Center Roof C Replacement	12.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	0.33	15.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	106.93
92	92	92	Mat-Su Borough	Boiler and Boiler Control Upgrades, 6 Sites	15.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	0.33	14.33	2.00	0.00	10.00	106.87
93	93	93	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System	27.00	10.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	15.33	0.67	0.00	0.00	106.09
94	94	94	Lower Yukon	Kotlik and Pilot Station K-12 Schools Renewal and Repair	24.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	2.33	1.67	0.00	5.68	3.00	14.67	4.00	0.00	6.00	105.84
95	95	95	Fairbanks Borough	Anderson Crawford Elementary School Exterior Renovation	21.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	5.95	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	6.67	105.04
96	96	96	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point K-12 School Exterior Repairs, Nunam Iqua	21.00	1.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	2.33	1.67	0.00	2.00	0.00	14.67	5.00	0.00	6.00	100.69
97	97	97	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	18.00	9.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	6.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	2.33	98.32

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development**  
**FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects**  
**Major Maintenance Grant Fund**  
**Total Points - Formula Driven and Evaluative**  
**Final List**

Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Altern at-ives	Options	Total Project Points
98	98	98	Mat-Su Borough	Seismic Upgrades, 14 Sites	12.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	98.20
99	99	99	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwigillingok K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	18.00	4.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	1.67	4.00	0.33	12.00	0.00	0.00	3.67	95.64
100	100	100	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-12 School Renovation	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	82.73
101	101	101	Lower Kuskokwim	Z John Williams Memorial School Bulk Fuel Storage Replacement, Napaskiak	3.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	14.33	0.67	0.00	0.00	80.25
102	102	102	Sitka Borough	Blatchley Middle School Roof and Envelope Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	3.00	0.00	4.33	80.21
103	103	103	Bering Strait	Gambell K-12 School Bulk Fuel Tank Farm Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.33	1.33	3.33	1.67	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	79.35

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction and Major Maintenance by Districts**

**Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative  
Final List**

School District	Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	MM/SC	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter nat-ives	Options	Total Project Points
Alaska Gateway	32	32	32	M	Tok K-12 School Partial Roof Replacement	27.00	7.80	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	4.00	1.33	2.00	0.67	2.67	0.00	25.00	1.00	15.00	5.33	0.00	13.67	150.53
Alaska Gateway	48	48	48	M	Northway K-12 Mechanical Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.00	1.33	2.00	0.67	2.67	0.00	11.97	3.00	14.67	5.33	0.00	3.33	141.03
Aleutians East Borough	3	3	3	M	Sand Point K-12 Major Maintenance, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	41.13	5.00	29.33	5.00	0.00	1.00	202.32
Aleutians East Borough	20	20	20	M	Sand Point K-12 School Doors and Locker Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	18.00	3.00	29.33	3.33	0.00	0.67	164.19
Aleutians East Borough	51	51	51	M	King Cove K-12 School Piping Project	27.00	1.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.67	0.00	12.00	4.00	15.00	3.33	0.00	6.00	136.79
Anchorage	8	8	8	C	Kincaid Elementary School Site Improvements	0.00	5.50	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	9.92	0.33	25.67	8.00	1.00	11.67	145.95
Anchorage	10	10	10	C	Secure Vestibules, Group 3, 5 Sites	0.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	26.33	1.00	3.00	5.67	131.27
Anchorage	11	11	11	C	Secure Vestibules, Group 2, 3 Sites	0.00	12.57	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	25.67	1.00	3.00	5.67	128.18
Anchorage	12	12	12	C	Secure Vestibules, Group 1, 3 Sites	0.00	6.28	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	0.00	6.00	27.00	1.00	3.00	5.67	123.23
Anchorage	13	13	13	C	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 North, 4 Sites	0.00	13.79	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	5.33	27.00	0.33	0.00	5.00	120.32
Anchorage	14	14	14	C	Secure Vestibules, Group 4 South, 4 Sites	0.00	9.38	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	5.33	26.33	0.33	0.00	5.00	115.32
Anchorage	6	6	6	M	East High School Safety Upgrades	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	25.72	0.33	27.00	0.33	0.00	10.00	189.64
Anchorage	7	7	7	M	Service High School Health and Safety Improvements	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	20.20	2.67	27.00	2.33	0.00	5.33	182.50
Anchorage	11	11	11	M	Mears Middle School Heating Upgrades	24.00	13.40	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	3.00	2.00	0.00	11.00	3.33	27.67	6.33	0.00	2.00	171.59
Anchorage	14	14	14	M	Mears Middle School Roof Replacement	21.00	12.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	9.54	2.00	27.67	4.67	0.00	6.67	168.41
Anchorage	24	24	24	M	College Gate Elementary School Roof Replacement	15.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	13.82	2.33	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	161.75
Anchorage	26	26	26	M	Campbell Elementary School Roof Replacement	18.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	9.79	1.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	159.39
Anchorage	35	35	35	M	Kasuun and Kincaid Elementary Schools Roof Replacement	0.00	6.50	0.00	25.00	2.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	10.00	5.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	12.33	148.43
Anchorage	38	38	38	M	Stellar Secondary School Fire Alarm	6.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	20.00	0.00	26.33	4.67	0.00	0.00	146.27
Anchorage	47	47	47	M	Anchorage Warehouse Roof Replacement	3.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	9.52	0.00	27.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	141.11
Anchorage	68	68	68	M	Bear Valley Elementary School Domestic Water Replacement	0.00	13.40	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	8.95	0.00	26.67	4.67	0.00	3.00	125.96
Anchorage	83	83	83	M	Ptarmigan Elementary School Intercom Replacement	9.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	3.33	8.00	1.67	15.00	3.00	0.00	2.33	111.59
Anchorage	91	91	91	M	Facilities Support Center Roof C Replacement	12.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.67	2.00	4.67	5.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	0.33	15.00	1.33	0.00	1.00	106.93
Bering Strait	1	1	1	C	Stebbins K-12 School Replacement	30.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.35	50.00	30.00	23.15	10.00	25.00	2.33	1.33	3.33	1.67	1.00	50.00	50.00	38.33	21.33	0.00	5.00	0.00	364.83
Bering Strait	103	103	103	M	Gambell K-12 School Bulk Fuel Tank Farm Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.33	1.33	3.33	1.67	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	79.35
Copper River	88	88	88	M	Kenny Lake High School Fire Suppression System Replacement	30.00	12.82	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	1.00	0.67	1.67	0.67	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	107.93
Craig City	1	1	1	M	Craig Elementary and Middle Schools Rehabilitation, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	2.33	3.00	45.00	49.00	4.33	30.00	4.00	0.00	10.00	270.08
Denali Borough	4	4	4	M	Tri-Valley School Septic System Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	10.00	32.33	4.00	18.33	0.00	0.00	13.67	196.84
Denali Borough	17	17	17	M	Districtwide Electrical Code Upgrades	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	28.00	2.67	15.33	4.00	0.00	9.33	164.84
Denali Borough	37	37	37	M	Generator Replacement, 2 Schools	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	3.67	1.00	3.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	20.33	0.00	15.33	3.67	0.00	5.00	146.83
Fairbanks Borough	8	8	8	M	North Pole High School Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	3.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.33	4.00	18.33	30.22	0.00	13.67	7.00	0.00	0.33	181.94
Fairbanks Borough	15	15	15	M	Arctic Light Elementary School Exterior Renovation	24.00	8.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	21.00	168.36

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction and Major Maintenance by Districts**

**Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative  
Final List**

School District	Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	MM/SC	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Existing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alternatives	Options	Total Project Points
Fairbanks Borough	53	53	53	M	Weller Elementary School Renovation	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	30.05	0.00	12.00	9.33	0.00	6.67	135.81
Fairbanks Borough	73	73	73	M	Woodriver Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	12.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	34.00	0.00	0.00	8.67	0.00	6.00	120.42
Fairbanks Borough	78	78	78	M	Howard Luke High School Exterior Renovation	15.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	21.01	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	5.00	118.23
Fairbanks Borough	84	84	84	M	Ticasuk Brown Elementary School Mechanical Renovation	27.00	13.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	7.20	0.00	9.33	7.67	0.00	1.67	111.03
Fairbanks Borough	86	86	86	M	University Park Elementary School Classroom Upgrades	9.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	17.27	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	6.00	109.49
Fairbanks Borough	95	95	95	M	Anderson Crawford Elementary School Exterior Renovation	21.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.00	0.00	5.95	0.00	12.00	8.67	0.00	6.67	105.04
Galena City	2	2	2	M	Sidney C Huntington Elementary and High Schools Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	3.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.67	3.00	2.00	3.00	8.33	50.00	1.33	23.00	8.33	0.00	10.00	221.35
Haines Borough	31	31	31	M	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	0.00	24.65	1.00	16.67	6.33	0.00	7.33	152.00
Haines Borough	33	33	33	M	Haines High School Roof Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	0.00	6.00	1.33	28.00	6.67	0.00	9.00	150.01
Iditarod Area	5	5	5	M	Blackwell K-12 School Renovation, Anvik, Supplemental	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.33	1.33	2.00	2.00	2.00	25.00	10.35	4.00	16.33	4.00	0.00	10.00	190.70
Iditarod Area	66	66	66	M	McGrath and Nikolai Schools Heating System Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.33	1.33	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	24.10	2.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	129.12
Iditarod Area	76	76	76	M	McGrath K-12 School Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.33	2.00	1.67	1.00	2.00	4.33	8.67	2.00	11.67	4.67	0.00	5.00	119.63
Juneau Borough	71	71	71	M	Dzantik'i Heeni School Roof Replacement	30.00	6.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	11.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	121.23
Juneau Borough	82	82	82	M	Riverbend Elementary School Roof Replacement	27.00	4.50	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.33	3.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	11.00	3.00	0.00	7.33	113.06
Kake City	50	50	50	M	Kake Career and Technical Education Building Rehabilitation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.67	1.33	3.00	1.33	2.00	0.33	25.85	1.00	13.67	4.00	0.00	7.00	138.37
Kake City	87	87	87	M	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	2.67	2.00	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.33	12.67	2.33	0.00	9.67	108.72
Kashunamiut	18	18	18	M	Chevak K-12 School Campus Renovation	30.00	3.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	3.33	3.33	3.67	1.67	0.00	19.26	1.00	18.00	8.67	0.00	8.33	164.46
Kenai Peninsula Borough	9	9	9	C	Kenai Middle School Security and Kitchen Remodel	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	5.00	16.00	6.33	0.00	8.00	140.04
Kenai Peninsula Borough	10	10	10	M	West Homer Elementary School North Wall Improvement	30.00	6.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	12.00	0.33	29.00	6.00	0.00	8.67	176.71
Ketchikan Borough	12	12	12	M	Schoenbar Middle School Drainage and Gym	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	12.00	3.67	28.00	4.67	0.00	6.67	171.47
Ketchikan Borough	56	56	56	M	Valley Park and Pt. Higgins Elementary Schools Playground Upgrades	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	12.00	3.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	4.33	134.81
Ketchikan Borough	69	69	69	M	Districtwide School Security Upgrades	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	14.00	3.33	0.00	3.67	125.81
Ketchikan Borough	79	79	79	M	Information and Alert System Replacement, 4 Sites	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	0.00	9.33	1.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	5.00	117.81
Klawock City	34	34	34	M	Klawock School Gymnasium Roof Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	20.00	3.67	12.67	2.67	0.00	6.67	149.36
Kodiak Island Borough	40	40	40	M	Fire Alarm Upgrades, 5 Sites	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.33	4.33	5.00	0.00	17.00	5.00	16.33	6.00	0.00	5.00	144.56
Kodiak Island Borough	41	41	41	M	Main Elementary School Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	16.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	143.90
Kodiak Island	63	63	63	M	Chiniak K-12 School Water Code Compliance	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	131.56
Kodiak Island Borough	85	85	85	M	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.33	0.00	3.67	0.00	2.00	110.56
Kuspuk	3	3	3	C	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Replacement, Sleetmute	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00	18.13	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.67	3.00	4.00	2.00	46.67	50.00	30.00	20.33	8.33	0.33	19.33	297.34

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction and Major Maintenance by Districts**

**Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative  
Final List**

School District	Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	MM/SC	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Existing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alternatives	Options	Total Project Points
Kuspuk	21	21	21	M	Bob R. McHenry District Office Energy Upgrades	27.00	12.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	3.67	2.00	3.00	3.67	1.67	0.00	47.00	5.00	15.33	7.00	0.00	4.33	163.78
Lake & Peninsula Borough	9	9	9	M	Fire Suppression System Upgrades, 4 Sites	30.00	13.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	25.00	30.61	3.33	15.00	0.33	0.00	7.67	178.63
Lower Kuskokwim	4	4	4	C	Nelson Island K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Toksook Bay	30.00	15.00	30.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	14.40	8.64	21.25	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	41.93	26.33	15.67	9.33	0.00	9.33	283.13
Lower Kuskokwim	5	5	5	C	Anna Tobeluk Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Nunapitchuk	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	20.30	12.18	21.53	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	19.93	23.33	15.33	9.00	0.00	20.67	242.53
Lower Kuskokwim	7	7	7	C	Rocky Mountain K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Goodnews Bay	9.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	7.62	14.77	21.64	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	19.73	30.00	14.67	9.33	1.00	16.00	220.00
Lower Kuskokwim	28	28	28	M	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School Renovation, Mekoryuk	12.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	26.01	3.67	14.33	10.00	0.00	16.00	158.26
Lower Kuskokwim	30	30	30	M	Akula Elitnavuk K-12 School Renovations, Kasigluk-Akula, Supplemental	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	3.33	25.46	2.33	15.67	2.67	0.00	6.00	156.71
Lower Kuskokwim	42	42	42	M	Akiuk Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Kasigluk-Akiuk	15.00	7.50	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	35.48	1.00	15.67	2.67	0.00	5.00	143.56
Lower Kuskokwim	77	77	77	M	Qugcuun Memorial K-12 School Renovation, Oscarville	6.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	9.76	3.33	16.33	2.00	0.00	5.00	118.68
Lower Kuskokwim	80	80	80	M	Water Storage and Treatment, Kongiganak	21.00	1.01	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	2.00	1.33	0.00	5.33	116.93
Lower Kuskokwim	99	99	99	M	Kwigillingok K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	18.00	4.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	1.67	4.00	0.33	12.00	0.00	0.00	3.67	95.64
Lower Kuskokwim	101	101	101	M	Z John Williams Memorial School Bulk Fuel Storage Replacement, Napaskiak	3.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	4.33	2.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	14.33	0.67	0.00	0.00	80.25
Lower Yukon	19	19	19	M	Marshall K-12 School Emergency Tank Farm Repair	27.00	0.20	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	3.67	2.00	2.33	3.67	2.00	6.67	9.61	0.00	28.00	4.33	0.00	7.67	164.33
Lower Yukon	29	29	29	M	Hooper Bay Emergency Tank Farm Pad Repair	30.00	1.60	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	2.33	1.67	20.00	3.69	0.00	27.00	4.67	0.00	6.00	156.77
Lower Yukon	81	81	81	M	LYSD Maintenance Building Renovation	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	3.33	0.67	2.67	1.67	1.33	0.00	19.50	0.00	14.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	116.59
Lower Yukon	94	94	94	M	Kotlik and Pilot Station K-12 Schools Renewal and Repair	24.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	2.67	2.33	1.67	0.00	5.68	3.00	14.67	4.00	0.00	6.00	105.84
Lower Yukon	96	96	96	M	Sheldon Point K-12 School Exterior Repairs, Elevator Code and Compliance Upgrades, 2 Sites	21.00	1.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	2.33	1.67	0.00	2.00	0.00	14.67	5.00	0.00	6.00	100.69
Mat-Su Borough	45	45	45	M	Boiler Replacement, 3 Sites	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	3.33	14.33	2.33	0.00	8.33	141.54
Mat-Su Borough	62	62	62	M	Colony Middle School Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	11.77	4.00	13.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	132.97
Mat-Su Borough	67	67	67	M	HVAC Control Upgrades, 4 Sites	21.00	12.60	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	25.00	3.67	14.33	2.00	0.00	5.00	128.80
Mat-Su Borough	74	74	74	M	Generator Replacement, 3 Sites	18.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	23.33	3.67	14.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	120.20
Mat-Su Borough	75	75	75	M	Wasilla Middle School Partial Roof Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	4.67	0.00	14.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	119.87
Mat-Su Borough	89	89	89	M	Talkeetna Elementary School Roof Replacement	9.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	26.24	3.33	14.00	2.00	0.00	5.00	107.77
Mat-Su Borough	90	90	90	M	Boiler and Boiler Control Upgrades, 6 Sites	6.00	11.87	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	19.33	1.67	14.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	107.08
Mat-Su Borough	92	92	92	M	Seismic Upgrades, 14 Sites	15.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	0.33	14.33	2.00	0.00	10.00	106.87
Mat-Su Borough	98	98	98	M	Nenana School Boiler Replacement	12.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	98.20
Nenana City	13	13	13	M	Nenana School Fire Suppression System Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	4.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	15.00	2.00	16.33	12.67	0.00	10.00	171.26
Nenana City	49	49	49	M	Deering K-12 School Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	13.33	5.00	0.33	14.67	5.00	0.00	10.00	140.59
Northwest Arctic Borough	2	2	2	C	Buckland K-12 School Boiler Replacement	30.00	13.08	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.62	11.39	19.03	23.48	10.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	25.00	50.00	26.33	21.33	11.00	5.00	6.67	318.95
Northwest Arctic Borough	23	23	23	M		27.00	6.60	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	15.50	0.33	27.33	13.67	0.00	0.00	162.06

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
FY2027 Capital Improvement Projects  
School Construction and Major Maintenance by Districts**

**Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative  
Final List**

School District	Feb 20 Rank	Dec 18 Rank	Nov 5 Rank	MM/SC	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Prior Design Use	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	O&M Rpts	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Existing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alternatives	Options	Total Project Points
Petersburg Borough	22	22	22	M	Petersburg Aquatic Center Sewer Line Repair	21.00	7.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	16.26	4.33	27.33	4.00	0.00	11.00	163.18
Petersburg Borough	25	25	25	M	Petersburg High/Middle School Security and Access Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	4.70	5.00	28.33	1.33	0.00	5.00	161.61
Petersburg Borough	43	43	43	M	Petersburg Gym Sewer Line Repair	27.00	3.02	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	27.67	3.67	0.00	5.33	142.73
Petersburg Borough	44	44	44	M	Peterburg Campus Security Upgrades	24.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	30.00	2.00	1.33	1.67	0.67	0.67	0.00	15.33	5.00	16.67	4.00	0.00	5.00	142.25
Pribilof Island	39	39	39	M	St. Paul K-12 School Exterior Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	3.00	1.67	2.67	1.67	2.00	0.00	27.00	3.00	12.00	4.00	0.00	6.00	144.99
Saint Marys City	72	72	72	M	St. Mary's Campus Renewal and Repairs	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	12.00	0.33	0.00	6.67	121.19
Sitka Borough	102	102	102	M	Blatchley Middle School Roof and Envelope Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	3.00	0.00	4.33	80.21
Southeast Island	27	27	27	M	Barry Craig Stewart Kasaan and Whale Pass Schools Renovation	24.00	13.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	50.00	4.00	12.00	6.00	0.00	2.00	158.56
Southeast Island	64	64	64	M	Thorne Bay K-12 School HVAC System Upgrade	30.00	10.65	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.00	0.00	14.00	2.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	130.09
Southeast Island	70	70	70	M	Port Alexander K-12 School Upgrades	21.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	18.00	0.00	12.00	5.00	0.00	2.33	125.47
Southeast Island	93	93	93	M	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System	27.00	10.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	1.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	15.33	0.67	0.00	0.00	106.09
Southeast Island	97	97	97	M	Thorne Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	18.00	9.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	6.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	2.33	98.32
Southwest Region	46	46	46	M	Twin Hills K-12 School Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	41.67	0.00	14.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	141.39
Southwest Region	52	52	52	M	Ekwoq K-12 School Renovation	27.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	8.33	27.33	5.00	15.67	5.00	0.00	3.33	136.06
Southwest Region	100	100	100	M	Aleknagik K-12 School Renovation	24.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	10.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	82.73
Valdez City	16	16	16	M	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Exterior Renovation	30.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.00	0.67	3.00	2.00	2.67	0.00	20.31	1.67	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	165.58
Valdez City	58	58	58	M	Herman Hutchens Elementary School Floor Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.00	0.67	3.00	2.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	0.00	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	134.60
Yakutat Borough	54	54	54	M	Yakutat Jr/Sr High School Envelope Replacement	30.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	26.27	1.33	13.67	2.67	0.00	6.67	135.64
Yukon Flats	57	57	57	M	Tsuk Taih K-12 School Renovation, Chalkyitsik	27.00	11.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	30.00	1.67	1.00	1.67	1.33	1.00	0.00	25.79	1.67	12.00	7.00	0.00	5.00	134.71
Yukon Flats	60	60	60	M	Cruikshank K-12 School Boiler Replacement, Beaver	30.00	14.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	1.33	1.67	2.00	0.67	1.33	5.00	4.00	1.00	30.00	3.00	0.00	6.67	133.52
Yukon-Koyukuk	6	6	6	C	Johnny Oldman K-12 School Replacement, Hughes	30.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	18.01	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	50.00	5.00	16.67	10.00	0.00	24.33	229.36
Yukon-Koyukuk	36	36	36	M	Tanana K-12 School Playground Replacement	24.00	15.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	13.68	3.33	15.33	1.33	0.00	5.00	148.03
Yukon-Koyukuk	55	55	55	M	Kaltag K-12 School Kitchen Upgrade	21.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	4.23	5.00	14.00	4.00	0.00	11.33	134.91
Yukon-Koyukuk	59	59	59	M	Kaltag and Koyukuk K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	27.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	5.33	1.67	15.33	7.33	0.00	6.67	133.68
Yupit	61	61	61	M	Tuluksak K-12 School Fuel Tank Replacement	30.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	15.00	5.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	9.33	133.45
Yupit	65	65	65	M	Akiak K-12 School Fire Alarm System Replacement	27.00	1.80	0.00	25.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	0.67	20.00	0.33	0.00	5.00	129.25



## CIP Grant Requests and Funding History FY17 to FY27

CIP Grant Requests											
	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027
Total Applications	127	131	105	86	120	125	113	118	116	105	124
Percent of Districts Applying	68%	70%	58%	51%	64%	57%	55%	55%	53%	60%	69%
# Projects Reusing Scores	27	67	39	24	40	55	41	34	62	30	50
Major Maintenance	98	107	84	72	102	108	97	97	95	83	103
MM Total \$ <sup>(*)</sup>	\$181,570,096	\$164,887,094	\$142,892,281	\$113,787,100	\$148,986,253	\$187,285,413	\$196,637,613	\$217,866,788	\$249,060,086	\$261,526,980	\$400,975,573
School Construction	18	15	11	11	14	17	13	17	19	19	14
SC Total \$ <sup>(*)</sup>	\$206,267,345	\$123,294,419	\$179,214,343	\$190,238,739	\$142,797,809	\$162,305,916	\$192,775,088	\$195,666,783	\$260,489,844	\$363,111,771	\$442,916,669

Notes:  
 (\*) Total \$ is State Share

School Construction and Major Maintenance Funding											
	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027
MM Grant Funded	\$0	\$7,851,952	\$32,534,280 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$7,365,723	\$1,896,395 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$0	\$49,376,976 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$19,566,487	\$62,761,729	\$23,579,597 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$0
SC Grant Funded	\$74,715,471 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$45,325,477 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$50,131,111 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$35,123,526 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$0	\$12,608,008 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$91,745,168 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$50,850,443 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$30,964,499 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$15,484,050 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$0
Percent Grant \$ Funded	19.3%	18.5%	25.7%	14.0%	0.6%	3.6%	36.2%	17.0%	18.4%	6.3%	0.0%
Percent Applications Funded	3.4%	16.4%	25.3%	3.6%	0.9%	1.6%	21.8%	5.3%	25.4%	8.8%	0.0%
Debt Projects	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:  
 Grant Projects Funded includes all reappropriated or reallocated funding, including grant funding reported in prior fiscal years, as of July 1, 2025  
<sup>(1)</sup> Includes AS 14.11.025 grants



# PM State-of-the-State

## Report of DEED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS OF 8/15/2025

District	Date of Last Visit	Year of Next Visit	Approved FAIS	Maintenance Management	Energy	Custodial	Training	R&R Schedule	Status	Maint. Program	Program Name	CIP Eligible
Alaska Gateway	4/11/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
<b>Aleutian Region</b>	7/19/2011	<b>2026</b>	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 of 6	W	MC*	No
Aleutians East	2/4/2025	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Anchorage	1/17/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Limble	Yes
<b>Annette Island</b>	2/12/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Bering Strait	8/19/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Bristol Bay Borough	5/6/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Chatham	4/27/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y <sup>P</sup>	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Chugach	1/20/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Copper River	4/13/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Cordova	2/18/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Craig City	11/15/2021	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Delta/Greely	4/4/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Denali Borough	9/19/2024	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
<b>Dillingham City</b>	4/6/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Fairbanks North Star Borough	3/24/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Web Help Desk	Yes
Galena City	3/20/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
<b>Haines Borough</b>	1/19/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
<b>Hoonah City</b>	4/28/2022	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Hydaburg City	11/17/2021	2027	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	5 of 6	W	MC*	No
Iditarod Area	4/15/2025	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
<b>Juneau</b>	5/17/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	L	OperationHero	Yes
Kake City	2/4/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Kashunamiut	11/12/2024	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Kenai Peninsula Borough	3/28/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
<b>Ketchikan Gateway Borough</b>	2/8/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Klawock City	11/16/2021	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Kodiak Island Borough	3/3/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Limble	Yes
Kuspuk	2/2/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Lake & Peninsula Borough	5/8/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Manager Plus	Yes
Lower Kuskokwim	3/31/2025	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Manager Plus	Yes
Lower Yukon	4/29/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Mat-Su Borough	2/1/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Team Dynamix	Yes
Nenana City	9/17/2024	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Nome	5/3/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
North Slope Borough	5/8/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
<b>Northwest Arctic Borough</b>	5/4/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Pelican City	11/15/2022	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	OperationHero	Yes
<b>Petersburg</b>	3/9/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Pribilof	9/3/2024	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Sitka	3/8/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Asset Essentials	Yes
Skagway	8/6/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Southeast Island	11/18/2022	2027	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
<b>Southwest Region</b>	4/7/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
St Mary's	5/1/2024	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Unalaska City	3/17/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Valdez City	4/25/2023	2028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	OperationHero	Yes
<b>Wrangell</b>	3/11/2021	<b>2026</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Yakutat	2/20/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Yukon Flats	11/20/2023	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes
Yukon-Koyukuk	11/15/2023	2029	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	Brightly	Yes
Yupitit	4/2/2025	2030	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 of 6	W	MC*	Yes

In Compliance 52 51 51 52 52 52 50 50

### Legend

- N = Not in compliance
- Y = In full compliance
- Y<sup>P</sup> = Provisional compliance
- FAIS = Fixed Asset Inventory System
- W = Web-based Computerized Maintenance Management System
- L = Local Area Network (LAN) Computerized Maintenance Management System
- \* = Use MC (Maintenance Connection) through SERRC Service Contract
- Bold** - Site visit pending

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

**SCHOOL CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING UNDER SB237**

*Excerpts from 2026 Report*

**Table 1 Grant Funding Summary by Fiscal Year**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<b>Participating Share Construction</b>	<b>Maintenance</b>	<b>Participating Share Maintenance</b>
FY2011	\$128,500,000	\$2,622,449	\$24,786,959	\$9,348,585
FY2012	\$61,910,901 *	\$1,263,488	\$25,854,691	\$1,537,425
FY2013	\$62,230,515	\$1,270,009	\$17,979,185	\$1,280,007
FY2014	\$60,619,572	\$1,237,133	\$22,991,057 *	\$2,642,573
FY2015	\$43,279,791	\$1,262,301	\$0	\$0
FY2016	\$43,237,400	\$10,809,350	\$2,623,689 *	\$53,545
FY2017	\$72,877,968	\$6,673,019	\$0	\$0
FY2018	\$47,010,097	\$2,621,272	\$0 *	\$0
FY2019	\$42,527,459	\$867,907	\$27,653,300 *	\$6,477,013
FY2020	\$20,082,467 *	\$409,846	\$7,365,723	\$3,966,158
FY2021	\$0	\$0	\$34,277 *	\$686
FY2022	\$12,608,008	\$256,028	\$0	\$0
FY2023	\$91,745,168	\$1,872,350	\$47,384,214 *	\$9,389,091
FY2024	\$50,850,443	\$1,037,764	\$19,566,487	\$3,000,419
FY2025	\$30,964,499	\$631,929	\$62,761,729	\$20,262,268
FY2026	\$13,817,383 *	\$281,987	\$15,079,610 *	\$4,860,385
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$782,261,671</b>	<b>\$33,116,832</b>	<b>\$274,080,921</b>	<b>\$62,801,847</b>

\*See endnote.

**Table 12 Total Funding Summary by Program**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Construction City/Borough</b>	<b>Construction REAA</b>	<b>Maintenance City/Borough</b>	<b>Maintenance REAA</b>
Grant	\$72,248,713	\$710,012,958	\$155,505,070	\$118,575,851
Debt	\$426,234,580	\$0	\$296,287,362	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$498,483,293</b>	<b>\$710,012,958</b>	<b>\$451,792,432</b>	<b>\$118,575,851</b>

**Table 13 Total Funding Summary by Fiscal Year and Program**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Construction City/Borough</b>	<b>Construction REAA</b>	<b>Maintenance City/Borough</b>	<b>Maintenance REAA</b>
FY2011 Grant	\$0	\$128,500,000	\$21,821,504	\$2,965,455
FY2011 Debt	\$500,000	\$0	\$91,151,551	\$0
FY2012 Grant	\$0	\$61,910,901 *	\$4,101,741	\$21,752,950
FY2012 Debt	\$316,064,997	\$0	\$83,915,625	\$0
FY2013 Grant	\$0	\$62,230,515	\$1,966,492	\$16,012,693
FY2013 Debt	\$66,473,304	\$0	\$12,051,696	\$0
FY2014 Grant	\$0	\$60,619,572	\$7,427,298	\$15,563,759 *
FY2014 Debt	\$36,839,182	\$0	\$102,172,193	\$0
FY2015 Grant	\$11,762,891	\$31,516,900	\$0	\$0
FY2015 Debt	\$6,357,097	\$0	\$6,996,297	\$0
FY2016 Grant	\$43,237,400	\$0	\$0	\$2,623,689 *
FY2016 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2017 Grant	\$10,010,000	\$62,867,968	\$0	\$0
FY2017 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2018 Grant	\$7,238,422	\$39,771,675	\$0 *	\$0 *
FY2018 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2019 Grant	\$0 *	\$42,527,459 *	\$15,378,459	\$12,274,841
FY2019 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2020 Grant	\$0	\$20,082,467 *	\$7,365,723	\$0
FY2020 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2021 Grant	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,277 *
FY2021 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0 *	\$0
FY2022 Grant	\$0	\$12,608,008	\$0	\$0
FY2022 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0 *	\$0
FY2023 Grant	\$0	\$91,745,168	\$30,719,355 *	\$16,664,859 *

FY2023 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2024 Grant	\$0	\$50,850,443	\$5,020,920	\$14,545,567
FY2024 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2025 Grant	\$0	\$30,964,499	\$49,969,885	\$12,791,844
FY2025 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY2026 Grant	\$0	\$13,817,383	\$11,733,693	\$3,345,917
FY2026 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$498,483,293</b>	<b>\$710,012,958</b>	<b>\$451,792,432</b>	<b>\$118,575,851</b>

*\*See endnote.*

*\*Grant projects with funds approved before 7/1/2010 show the amount less the reappropriated money so that this report accurately represents funding only during the stated reporting period.*

*\*\* Debt projects that were approved by the department after 7/1/2010, but funded with redirected funds from bonds authorized before 7/1/2010, were not included so that this report accurately represents funding only during the stated reporting period.*



To: Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
From: School Facilities  
Date: April 2, 2026

## FY2028 CIP APPLICATION BRIEFING

The department is bringing forward several potential application scoring revisions for consideration. The effects of these proposals on the FY2027 CIP School Construction Grant Fund and Major Maintenance Grant Fund Total Points Final lists can be found in Appendix A.

### *School Facilities Within Scope (Weighted Average Age)*

For the FY2027 application, the committee adjusted question 3b, the weighted average age scoring category, from 30 points to 15 points to reduce the relative scoring in the application. This change was reflective of the disconnect between age of construction and the true state of a facility that potentially includes extensive system renovations. The committee stated that that section 4 was better for awarding points for age on a system component level.

### **Facility Condition Index (FCI)**

The department is proposing to move to the next progression and replacing the facility age metric with the Facility Condition Index (FCI) and increasing the points back to the original 30. This change would provide a more accurate representation of the actual condition of school facilities, rather than relying solely on the age of the building.

The Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a commonly used facility management metric that compares the cost of needed repairs and system renewals to the replacement value of the facility. Within the CIP program materials, FCI is defined as:

$$\text{FCI} = \text{Cost of Current and Deferred Renewal} \div \text{Current Replacement Value.}$$

For the CIP process, the FCI value would be derived from the Renewal and Replacement (R&R) schedule provided by the district as part of its facility management program. The R&R schedule identifies building systems, expected service life, and associated system replacement costs based on a ratio of the facility replacement cost. These data allow the department and districts to estimate the cost of current and deferred renewal for each facility and calculate the corresponding FCI.

### Suggested scoring

FCI (proposed)	15-Point Calculation (Scenario 1)	30-Point Calculation (Scenario 2)
0-0.2	0	0
>0.2≥0.4	0 + 0.2 per 0.02	0 + 0.5 per 0.02
>0.4≥0.6	2 + 0.5 per 0.02	5 + 0.75 per 0.02
>0.6≤0.8	7 + 0.75 per 0.02	12.5 + 1.75 per 0.02
>0.8	15	30

### **Discontinue scoring for school facilities within scope**

Eliminating scoring for Question 3b was considered but is not recommended. Section 4 does not fully capture the overall condition of the facilities involved in the project, and Question 3b remains necessary for a comprehensive evaluation.

### ***Protection of Structure / Life Safety / Code Deficiencies***

#### **Maximum Score**

The department proposes to increase the maximum points in this category from 50 points to 70 points. This will allow for greater differentiation of projects as more projects seek to address multiple worsening facility conditions.

#### **Matrix Scores**

The department is proposing that the conditions categories for interior finishes: ceilings, floors, be scored at zero point but the costs would continue to be eligible for consideration in the score weighting. Alternatively, the conditions could be removed from the matrix.

Reducing or removing these conditions allows the category to focus on scoring more serious conditions affecting life safety and code deficiencies, which the department believes is necessary in the current state fiscal climate and statewide school facility conditions.

The committee previously asked the department to review the renewal and replacement life expectancy period for fire protection systems, which would affect scoring in this category. The department was not able to further review this topic, so will present information at a future meeting.

#### **Alternate Weighting**

The department is not proposing a modification to the method of weighting this scoring category for mixed scope projects. The method adopted for the FY2024 cycle appears to be continuing to work as desired, with no irregularities discovered.

### ***Requirements for Space to be Added or Replaced***

#### **Required for Renovations**

Part of capital planning for facility management is forecasting capital needs based on program and population changes. Most school districts statewide had been experiencing declining enrollment and as such many school facilities are overbuilt for the current and anticipated student populations. Currently, this section is only required for School Construction projects. Department staff propose requiring Section 5 to be completed for all CIP applications, including both School Construction and Major Maintenance projects. Requiring this information for all projects would provide additional context regarding how the facilities involved in the project are currently utilized within the relevant attendance area. This information would assist in determining whether the facilities associated with a proposed project are fully utilized, underutilized, or experiencing capacity constraints, and whether the proposed investment in those facilities is justified in light of current and projected ADM.

#### **State Participation Option**

With limited state resources available to be allocated for capital projects, the department is proposing that it will start assessing projects to a ‘right-sized’ facility square footage. Language is proposed to expand question 5g to allow a district with a major maintenance project to select between a smaller school construction with a smaller square footage, based on a determination of the Total Eligible SF, or state participation in a major maintenance project reduced by a ratio of “Total Eligible SF” to “Remaining Existing SF”. This allows for a local determination to fund the additional project cost.

This approach is similar to that used for state participation in swimming pools, where funding allocations are reduced by the amount a facility exceeds the department standards.

## ***Funding Equalizer***

### **Free and Reduced Lunch Data**

The department is proposing a new formula-driven 20 point scoring category for a “Funding Equalizer” be added to Section 8 (Additional Project Factors), as new question 8e, which would be based on the national school lunch program’s free and reduced meal counts (NSLP). The purpose of this category would be to boost applications for districts that may not have the resources to put into the capital planning process for condition surveys and design documents, etc. Prior evaluation of the application’s benefit to more developed or completed projects is in a briefing paper to the committee at its February 23, 2023 meeting; this paper identified a potential scoring spread of 28 points between a project developed with department-provided tools and a completed project.

The department evaluated several data sets, including full value determination, disparity, per pupil expenditures, and census poverty data, using NSLP counts appear to be the option that best fits the stated goal. For districts that do not participate in NSLP, the department will use the comparable information provided in school district E-Rate applications.

The department proposes that the NSLP percentage be multiplied by 20 and that districts with less than 50 percent free and reduced counts will not be eligible for scoring. Districts with 100 percent free and reduced counts will receive 20 points, districts with 50 percent free and reduced students will receive 10 points.

For comparison, the department looked at Census data from the [Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates Program](#), which produces single-year estimates of school-age children in poverty for school districts in the U.S.; the most recent data is from 2024. The department considered scoring districts above the ratio of the total estimated students in poverty to the total estimated student population. The NSLP data was deemed preferable because the data is already collected by the state, is based on actual survey responses versus estimates, and has less data lag.

See Appendix B for the calculations and proposed FY2028 scoring by district.

### ***Project Planning and Design***

The committee was previously presented with the option to remove question 6f, Design Development, from the application resulting in a reduction of 5 points. It may be appropriate to retain question 6f on the application if the funding equalizer is chosen.

### ***Cost Estimate***

The following changes have been considered for question 7a. Project Cost Estimate:

<b>Design Progress</b>	<b>Current</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Points</b>
Construction Level	27-30	4	Max 30	0
65% Design Development	23-26	4	Max 30	0
35% Schematic	18-22	5	24-30	7
Planning/Concept	12-17	6	15-23	9
Preliminary	6-11	6	6-14	9
Incomplete	0-5	5	0-5	5

It may be appropriate to keep question 7a as is if the funding equalizer is approved.

## ***FY2028 Proposed CIP Application Scoring Criteria***

The following table includes each scored question in the application and the statutory or regulatory reference, if any:

<b>Scored Application Question</b>	<b>Statute or Regulation</b>
3a. Priority assigned by the district. (30 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(1), 4 AAC 31.022(a)(1)
3b. School facilities within scope. (30 points possible) [Weighted FCI]	
4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety. (Up to 50 points)	AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(A), (C), (D) (project categories)
5e. Unhoused students. (80 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(B) (project category)
5h. Regional community facilities. (5 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(4), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(5)
5j. Project space utilization. (30 points possible)	4 AAC 31.022(c)(9)
6a. Condition/Component survey. (0 to 10 points possible)	
6b. Use of prior school design (10 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(7)
6c. Use of prior building system design (10 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(8)
6d-6e. Planning / Concept design – Design development (0, 10, 20 points possible)	
7a-7c. Cost estimate for total project cost. (30 points possible)	
8a. Emergency conditions. (50 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(1)
8b. Inadequacies of space. (40 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(F) (project category), AS 14.11.013(b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(4)
8c. Other options. (25 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(b)(6), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(6)
8d. Annual operating cost savings. (30 points possible)	AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(E) (project category) and (b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(3)
8e. District funding equalizer (20 points possible)	
8f. Prior funding. (30 points possible)	4 AAC 31.022(c)(7)
9a-9i. District preventive maintenance and facility management. (60 points possible)	AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and (4), 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2), 4 AAC 31.013

## ***Appendix A – Scoring Scenarios***

See the Excel spreadsheet included with the BRGR packet.

### **Question 3b. School facilities within scope**

- Scenario 1 – Replace weighted average age with weighted average FCI; max score is 15 points.
- Scenario 2 - Replace weighted average age with weighted average FCI; max score is 30 points.
- Scenario 3 – Remove scoring for question 3b.

### **Question 4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety**

- Scenario 1 – Increase maximum score from 50 to 70 points.

### **Question 6f. Design development – 65%**

- Scenario 1 – Remove five points for design development projects.

### **Question 7a. Project cost estimate**

- Scenario 1 – Remove points for design development and construction level projects.

### **Questions 6f. and 7a.**

- Scenario 1 – Combine 6f and 7a scenarios.

### **Question 8e. Funding equalizer**

- Scenario 1 – 10 to 20 points for districts that qualify.

### **All proposed changes**

- 3b. Scenario 1

### **All proposed changes**

- 3b. Scenario 2

### **All proposed changes**

- 3b. Scenario 3

## Appendix B - Funding Equalizer Proposed Data / Scoring

Proposed scoring based on National School Lunch Program free and reduced meal data.

District	NSLP %	% x 20	Proposed Scoring
Chatham	1.000	20.000	20.00
Dillingham City	1.000	20.000	20.00
Hydaburg City	1.000	20.000	20.00
Kashunamiut	1.000	20.000	20.00
Klawock City	1.000	20.000	20.00
Lower Yukon	1.000	20.000	20.00
Nome City	1.000	20.000	20.00
Saint Marys City	1.000	20.000	20.00
Yupitit	1.000	20.000	20.00
Alaska Gateway	0.998	19.965	19.97
Southwest Region	0.994	19.889	19.89
Iditarod Area	0.954	19.085	19.08
Northwest Arctic Borough	0.937	18.747	18.75
Bering Strait	0.937	18.735	18.73
Galena City	0.923	18.451	18.45
Lower Kuskokwim	0.920	18.395	18.39
Kake City	0.912	18.243	18.24
Copper River	0.898	17.951	17.95
Yukon-Koyukuk	0.897	17.945	17.94
Annette Island	0.876	17.523	17.52
Yukon Flats	0.859	17.177	17.18
Lake & Peninsula Borough	0.850	17.009	17.01
Kuspuk	0.839	16.774	16.77
Cordova City	0.778	15.568	15.57
Bristol Bay Borough	0.749	14.975	14.97
Southeast Island	0.740	14.803	14.80
Craig City	0.740	14.794	14.79
Nenana City	0.726	14.528	14.53
Aleutians East Borough	0.665	13.293	13.29
Pribilof Island	0.661	13.226	13.23
Hoonah City	0.650	13.008	13.01
Chugach	0.628	12.553	12.55
Pelican City	0.625	12.500	12.50
Petersburg Borough	0.572	11.450	11.45
Yakutat Borough	0.548	10.968	10.97
Haines Borough	0.548	10.952	10.95
Aleutian Region	0.500	10.000	10.00
Kodiak Island Borough	0.482	9.633	0.00
Anchorage	0.473	9.455	0.00
Wrangell Borough	0.450	8.992	0.00
Mat-Su Borough	0.438	8.770	0.00
Kenai Peninsula Borough	0.429	8.588	0.00
North Slope Borough	0.405	8.101	0.00
Ketchikan Borough	0.350	6.998	0.00
Fairbanks Borough	0.338	6.752	0.00
Sitka Borough	0.309	6.190	0.00
Delta/Greely	0.308	6.159	0.00
Valdez City	0.296	5.911	0.00
Juneau Borough	0.213	4.253	0.00
Denali Borough	0.179	3.571	0.00
Unalaska City	0.122	2.444	0.00
Skagway Borough	0.068	1.353	0.00

Alternate proposal using Census student poverty estimates.

District	Students in Poverty	Student Population	Ratio	Alternate (x40)
Southwest Region	303	629	0.482	19.27
Yupitit	188	436	0.431	17.25
St. Marys City	61	154	0.396	15.84
Kashunamiut	97	251	0.386	15.46
Lower Yukon	735	1904	0.386	15.44
Iditarod Area	84	224	0.375	15
Bering Strait	551	1681	0.328	13.11
Hydaburg City	21	65	0.323	12.92
Kuspuk	104	324	0.321	12.84
Northwest Arctic Borough	640	2014	0.318	12.71
Lower Kuskokwim	1197	3804	0.315	12.59
Chatham	43	139	0.309	12.37
Lake and Peninsula Borough	78	257	0.304	12.14
Yakutat Borough	34	119	0.286	11.43
Klawock City	34	122	0.279	11.15
Southeast Island	47	190	0.247	9.89
Kake City	27	111	0.243	9.73
Yukon-Koyukuk	92	426	0.216	8.64
Annette Island	61	287	0.213	8.5
Bristol Bay Borough	26	124	0.21	8.39
Dillingham City	89	425	0.209	8.38
Copper River	96	486	0.198	7.9
Wrangell	50	270	0.185	7.41
Nome	143	777	0.184	7.36
Pelican City	2	11	0.182	7.27
Nenana City	13	73	0.178	7.12
Yukon Flats	37	215	0.172	6.88
Alaska Gateway	78	466	0.167	6.7
Galena City	19	114	0.167	6.67
Hoonah City	19	126	0.151	6.03
North Slope Borough	294	1978	0.149	5.95
Chugach	11	74	0.149	5.95
Delta/Greely	137	930	0.147	5.89
Craig City	23	170	0.135	5.41
Aleutians East Borough	18	134	0.134	5.37
Haines Borough	32	242	0.132	5.29
Skagway	3	127	0.024	0
Unalaska City	9	267	0.034	0
Valdez City	39	648	0.06	0
Juneau Borough	331	4823	0.069	0
Kodiak Island Borough	155	2147	0.072	0
Fairbanks North Star Borough	1210	15647	0.077	0
Matanuska-Susitna Borough	1743	22303	0.078	0
Sitka Borough	94	1172	0.08	0
Cordova City	33	391	0.084	0
Petersburg Borough	46	523	0.088	0
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	185	2048	0.09	0
Anchorage	4744	49233	0.096	0
Denali Borough	22	225	0.098	0
Aleutian Region	2	20	0.1	0
Pribilof	7	65	0.108	0
Kenai Peninsula Borough	1138	10020	0.114	0
Total	15245	129411	0.118	

## Summary of Proposed Changes: FY2028 CIP Application & Instructions

Question	Application	Instructions	Guidelines for Raters; Eligibility Checklist; Scoring Forms	Magnitude of Change
Q3b.	Increase max points from 15 to 30. Add Facility Condition Index (FCI) and language on how it is to be derived.	Conforming language to application. Provided additional info on how to drive FCI.	Formula Driven Scoring Criteria: <i>Adjust total score and scoring criteria</i>	Major
Q3g.	Add requirement to identify funding sources for all completed work.	Additional information regarding the funding source requirement.	No Change	Minor
Q4a.	Increase maximum point value from 50 to 70 points. Remove point values for “Ceiling Finishes age >25yr”, “Wall Finishes age >25yr”, and “Floor Finishes >15yr”.	Modify point values to conform with the application.	Guidelines for Raters: <i>Modify point values to conform with application.</i> Evaluative Scoring Criteria: <i>Adjust total score</i>	Moderate
Sec. 5	Remove “to be added or replaced” from the section header. Change note to require that this section be filled out for all applications except for Major Maintenance projects replacing limited systems.	Conforming changes.	No change	Moderate
Q5b.	Add “new or replacement school construction” to question for clarification.	No change.	No change	Minor
Q5c.	Add “If this is a school construction project” for clarification.	Correct the date of the “Attendance area ADM & GSF Calculations”.	No change	Minor
Q5e.	No change.	Add “or renovating multiple systems” and modifications to clarify that the requirement is for ADM projections.	Eligibility Checklist: <i>New item K.</i>	Moderate
Q5f.	Add clarifying language for requirements of districts to justify ADM projections.	No change.	Eligibility Checklist: <i>New item K.</i>	Minor
Q5g.	Conform question to both major maintenance and school construction projects. Add language to provide options for project funding for underutilized facilities.	Conforming changes.	Eligibility Checklist: <i>New item K.</i>	Moderate

Question	Application	Instructions	Guidelines for Raters; Eligibility Checklist; Scoring Forms	Magnitude of Change
Q6f.	Remove “(0 or 5 points, all elements required for 5 points as applicable to the project)”	Remove “(0 or 5 points possible)”	Formula Driven Scoring Criteria: <i>Adjust total score and scoring criteria</i>	Moderate
Q8c.	Add clarifying statement to provide costs and cost differences for proposed project scopes.  Request districts to provide analysis comparing multi-system renovation and new construction for projects.	Add statement requesting documentation or justification on costs related to each option.  Add a clarifying statement regarding a new construction option for projected eligible gross square footage for major rehabilitation projects.	Guidelines for Raters: <i>New bullet point for renovation vs. new construction.</i> Eligibility Checklist: <i>New item K.</i>	Minor
Q8e. (new question)	Add district funding equalizer (up to 20 points).	Accompanying instructions.	Guidelines for Raters: <i>Add new section: “District Funding Equalizer”.</i> Formula Driven Scoring Criteria: <i>Add row: “1. District funding equalizer” with scoring criteria.</i>	Major
Q8f.	Change from “8e” to “8f” for “Prior funding.”	Conforming change.	No change	Minor
Q8g.	Change from “8f” to “8g” for “Participating share waiver.”	Conforming change.	No change	Minor
Appx. C	N/A	Remove (0 or 5 points possible) from “Phase IIB – Design Development”.	N/A	Minor



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

**FY2028**

**PREPARING & SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION**

For each funding request, submit a PDF file of the application and each supporting document to the department via the authorized online portal. The grant application deadline is September 1<sup>st</sup>.

When answering application questions, provide verifiable supporting documentation. Answers that cannot be verified will be considered unsubstantiated and may result in the department finding the application ineligible due to incompleteness.

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 request reuse of an application's score for one year after the application was filed; or, if the project was substantially complete at the time of the application, the district can request reuse of the application's score for up to five years after the application was filed.

For instructions on completing this application, please refer to the department's [Capital Improvement Project Application and Support webpage](http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/facilitiescip) (education.alaska.gov/facilities/facilitiescip).

**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

**SEC. 1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE**

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

- Grant Funding  Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

**1b. Primary purpose of project.** Choose only **one** category. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.<sup>1</sup>

**School Construction (AS 14.11.135(7)):**

- Health and life-safety (Category A)  
 Unhoused students (Category B)  
 Improve instructional program (Category F)

**Major Maintenance (AS 14.11.135(6)):**

- Protection of structure (Category C)<sup>2</sup>  
 Building code deficiencies (Category D)  
 Achieve operating cost savings (Category E)

**1c. Phases of project** to be covered by this funding request. Indicate **all** applicable phases:

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

**SEC. 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

**2c.** Has evidence of required insurance been submitted as required to the department *or* is evidence attached to this application?  yes  no

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

<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).

<sup>2</sup> AS 14.11.100(j)(4), authorizing debt reimbursement project needs, does not expressly allow a primary purpose of protection of structure.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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

(Supporting evidence must be outlined in the project description, question 3d. Reference AS 14.11.011(b)(3))

**2e.** Is the district’s preventive maintenance program certified by the department?  yes  no

## SEC. 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 within scope** (Up to ~~15~~ 30 points)

What buildings or building portion (i.e., original building or addition) will be included in the scope of work of the project? (Add additional rows as needed to include all affected buildings or building portions.)

*(The department will utilize GSF records to establish project points (up to 15) 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 education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm](http://DEED.Facilities.Database.education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm)).*

*[Facility Condition Index \(FCI\) available from Renewal and Replacement \(R&R\) form](#)*

DEED Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year Built	GSF	<a href="#">FCI</a>
TOTAL				

**3c. Facility status.** 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. For state-owned or state-leased facilities, the transition plan should describe how surplusd facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. See instructions.

**3d. Project description.** The project description and scope of work narratives are required elements of this application (Reference AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)). Ensure project aligns with selected funding category.

In the space below, 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
- Explain why this project is not preventive maintenance
- Other discussion describing project
- Other discussion pertaining to scope of work

**3e. Scope of work.** In the space below, provide a clear, detailed, and itemized 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)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

**3f. Project schedule.** Provide estimated or actual dates for the following project milestones.

Estimated receipt of funding date	_____
Contract with design team	_____
Begin design	_____
Design work 100% complete	_____
Project out to bid	_____
Begin construction	_____
Complete construction	_____

Provide additional information regarding the project schedule, if needed (including whether an alternative project delivery method is anticipated).

**3g.** Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete?  yes  no

If the answer is yes, attach documentation that establishes compliance with the department's requirements for bids and awards of construction contracts. (Reference 4 AAC 31.080)

Provide DEED Pre-CIP Number: \_\_\_\_\_

[Identify the funding source\(s\) used for all completed work.](#)

**3h.** 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 on the last page of the application.

**3i.** If the project is a multiple-school or districtwide project, provide justification for cost-effectiveness and how the district intends to award as a single contract.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

**3j. Project space utilization** (Up to 30 points)

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

**SEC. 4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY**

**4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety (Up to ~~70~~50 points)**

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and/or life safety conditions; attach supporting documentation. Check the box of the specific scoring conditions corrected by the scope of the project and where the supporting documentation is located in the attachments.

**NOTE:** Code violations documented and cited by the appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority may receive a 3 pt increase. See Guidelines for Raters.

**Structural**

Seismic - no restrictions (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper Floor Structure - PE eval (20 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Foundation/Floor - no PE eval (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vertical Structure – PE eval (20 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seismic - minimal restrictions (6 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof Structure - PE eval (24 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Upper Floor Structure - no PE eval (9 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic/Gravity Partial Closure (28 pts unless does not qualify for space, then 15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vertical Structure - no PE eval (9 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic/Gravity Full Closure (50 pts unless does not qualify for space, then 15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roof Structure - no PE eval (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Foundation/Floor – PE eval (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Seismic - moderate restriction (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Seismic or Seismic/Gravity, Foundation/Floor, Upper Floor Structure, Vertical Structure, and Roof Structure.

Provide description of structural-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

**Roof/Envelope**

Siding Failure, age <25yr (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	ASHRAE 90.1 Insulation (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Siding Finish (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Siding, age >25yr (12 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Doors, age >20yr (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Windows, age >30yrs (12 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roof, age >Warranty +5yr (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Siding Failure, age >25yr (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roof, age >Warranty +10yr (6 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof Leaks, WO >3/yr (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roof Leaks, WO <3/yr (8 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Doors w/Egress issues (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ASHRAE 90.1 Windows (8 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof Leaks affect space, with WOs (25 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Siding, Doors, and Roof. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year (“WO”), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions. Violations documented and cited by the appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority may receive a 3 pt increase. If condition is based on ASHRAE 90.1 code deficiency, provide existing R-value or code violation of system.

Provide description of roof or building envelope-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

## Architectural/Interior/ADA

ADA - 1 category (1 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Elevator Issues (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADA - 2 categories (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADA - 4 categories (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
DEC Sanitation (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Floor Finishes >15yr (4-0 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADA - 3 categories (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Elevator Violations (7 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ceiling Finishes age >25yr (3-0 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Building Egress (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wall Finishes age >25yr (3-0 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rated Assemblies (12 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points:  
ADA and Elevator.

Provide description of architectural, interior, or ADA-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

## Mechanical

Controls, DDC Deficiency (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heating, WO >3/yr (11 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mech. System, age >30yr (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ventilation, Codes (12 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventilation, WO <3/yr (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plumbing, Codes (12 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plumbing, WO <3/yr (6 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heating, Codes (13 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heating, WO <3/yr (7 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Boilers, 1 of 2 Non-op (13 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Controls, Pneumatic (8 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	HVAC age >40yr (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventilation, WO >3/yr (9 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Boilers, 2 of 3 Non-op (18 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plumbing, WO >3/yr (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mechanical System, WO >5/yr (21 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Heating Failure (25 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points:  
Boilers, Controls, Heating, Plumbing, and Ventilation. "Mechanical System" may be inclusive of Heating, Plumbing, or Ventilation with regard to age or work orders per year. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of mechanical-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

## Electrical

Lighting, age >25yr (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Egress/EM lights, WO >3/yr (8 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electrical, age >30yr (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intercom Issues, WO >3/yr (8 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Power, WO <3/yr (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lighting, Codes (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lighting, WO <3/yr (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Power, Codes (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Egress/EM lights, WO <3/yr (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intercom Failure (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Back-up Generator In-operable (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Electrical, age >40yr (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Power, WO >3/yr (7 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lighting, Levels < 50% of code (16 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lighting, WO >3/yr (7 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Electrical System, WO >5/yr (21 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Power Failure (25 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported Electrical System condition will be assigned points: Egress/EM Lights, Electrical, Intercom, Lighting, and Power. Max Intercom condition is Failure. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year (“WO”), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of electrical-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

## Fire Alarm/Sprinkler

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Fire Alarm, age >15yr (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>              | Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >40yr (10 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sprinkler, >30yr (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>                   | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >3/yr (15 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >30yr (5 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> | Fire Alarm Non-op, <3 floors (17 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>       |
| Sprinkler Coverage Gaps (5 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>            | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >5/yr (20 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| Fire Alarm, Non-addressable (6 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>        | Fire Alarm Non-op, >3 floors (25 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>       |
| Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >1/yr (8 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>     | Sprinkler Non-op (30 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>                   |

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Fire Alarm and Sprinkler. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year (“WO”), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of fire alarm or sprinkler-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

## Site

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Vehicle Surfaces (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>      | Power Issues (15 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>       |
| Walkways and Surfaces (4 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> | Wastewater Issues (15 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>  |
| Drainage Issues (6 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>       | Water Issues (16 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>       |
| Playground Code (12 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>      | Wastewater Failure (24 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Water Failure (25 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>      |

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Water and Wastewater.

Provide description of site-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

## UST/AST/HazMat

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| HazMat (all) Low Exposures (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>     | UST/AST Leak (7 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>                 |
| UST age >30yr (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>                  | UST/AST USCG/40 CFR Cite (10 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| AST age >40yr (5 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>                  | HazMat (all) Mod Exposures (10 pts) <input type="checkbox"/>  |
| Sewage Lagoon Failure/Exposure (5 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> | HazMat (all) High Exposures (22 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points:  
AST, HazMat, and UST.

Provide description of UST, AST, or HazMat-related conditions and specific references to  
title and page of support documents.

**SEC. 5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE ~~TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED~~**

**NOTE:** ~~If this project is classified as Major Maintenance (Category C, D, or E) and is not including any new space, skip section 5.~~ **All applications must complete this section unless classified as a Major Maintenance project and only replacing limited systems. ~~requesting new or replacement space, or classified as School Construction (Category A, B, or F), 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’s website at: Capital Improvement Project Application and Support webpage ([education.alaska.gov/facilities/facilitiescip](http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/facilitiescip)).

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

**5b.** Is there any new or replacement school construction work (other than  yes  no 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?

If the answer is yes, in the table below, identify the project and provide information about size, grades to be served, and student capacity.

Project Name	GSF	Grades	Student Capacity

**5c.** If this is a school construction project, ~~a~~ Are there school facilities within  yes  no the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project?

If the answer is yes, in the table below, identify the school and provide information about size, grades served, and student capacity.

School Name	GSF	Grades	Student Capacity

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

In lieu of data in the format above for questions 5b and 5c, we are providing detailed attachments.  yes  no

**5d.** What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility? \_\_\_\_\_

**5e. Unhoused students (Up to 80 points)**

In the table below, provide the attendance area’s current and projected ADM:

Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM			
School Year	K-6 ADM	7-12 ADM	Total ADM
2025-2026			
2026-2027			
2027-2028			
2028-2029			
2029-2030			
2030-2031			
2031-2032			
2032-2033			
2033-2034			
2034-2035			

**5f.** Were the ADM projections used by the district based on one of the department’s worksheets?  yes  no

Attach calculations and justifications [for the model used.](#)  
[Justification of five-year post-occupancy population projection must be provided for any model used.](#)

**5g.** Confirm space eligibility:

Total Existing SF \_\_\_\_\_  
 Remaining Existing SF \_\_\_\_\_  
 Total Eligible SF \_\_\_\_\_  
 Qualifies for \_\_\_\_\_ ~~additional~~-SF  
 Applying for \_\_\_\_\_ ~~additional~~-SF

[A major maintenance project may be determined to be in the state’s best interest to demolish existing building\(s\) and replace the facility with a smaller gross square footage school construction project after consideration of life cycle cost analysis and population projections. If this determination is made, the district can choose to instead accept a reduction of the state’s participation in the major maintenance project based on a ratio of “Total Eligible SF” to “Remaining Existing SF” \(above\). If applicable, select project option:](#)

- [School construction project based on Total Eligible SF](#)
- [Major maintenance project with reduced state participation](#)

**5h. Regional community facilities (Up to 5 points)**

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of meeting all, or part, of the project needs. 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 on the last page of the application.

5i. Are educational specifications attached?

yes     no

**SEC. 6: PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN**

**NOTE:** Reference Appendix B of the instructions for required elements. More developed design documents can be attached in lieu of previous documents.

**6a. Condition/Component survey (0 to 10 points)**

1. Is a facility or component condition survey attached?  yes  no

Document title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date prepared: \_\_\_\_\_

**6b. Use of prior school design (up to 10 points)**

1. Is the district proposing to use a previously department-approved school construction design for this project?  yes  no
2. If yes, in addition to the space eligibility analysis in Section 5, has the district attached design plans and a cost analysis that includes both design and construction costs demonstrating how the use will result in cost savings for the project?  yes  no

**6c. Use of building system design standard (up to 10 points; 2 points per qualified system)**

1. Is the district proposing to use one or more previously approved building system design standard for this project?  yes  no
2. If yes, provide supporting documentation on each specific system showing that the building system(s) conform to a published district or municipal building standard.

**6d. Planning/Concept design (0 or 10 points, all elements required for 10 points)**

1. Has an architectural or engineering consultant been selected (as required)?  yes  no
2. Are concept design studies/planning cost estimates attached?  yes  no
3. New construction projects: are educational specifications, site selection analysis, and student population projections attached (as required)?  yes  no

**6e. Schematic design - 35% (0 or 10 points, all elements required for 10 points as applicable to the project)**

1. Are complete schematic design documents attached? Schematic design documents include approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations, and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines. If the answer is no and project is complete, provide a justification for why documents are not needed.  yes  no

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

2. Is a schematic design level cost estimate attached?  yes  no

**6f. Design development - 65%** (~~0 or 5 points, all elements required for 5 points as applicable to the project~~)

1. Are design development documents attached? Design development documents include dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans. If the answer is no and the project is complete, provide justification as to why documents are not needed.  yes  no

2. Is a design development cost estimate attached?  yes  no

**6g. 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.

<u>Provider</u>	<u>Expertise</u>

**SEC. 7: COST ESTIMATE**

**Cost estimate for total project cost (Up to 30 points)**

**7a. Project cost estimate:** Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development’s current Cost Model edition or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is mandatory.

Percentages are based on construction cost. See Appendix D for additional information. If the project exceeds the recommended percentages, 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 7.1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

<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>	n/a				
Site Investigation <sup>2</sup>	n/a				
Seismic Hazard <sup>3</sup>	n/a				
Design Services <sup>4</sup>	6 - 10%				
Construction <sup>5</sup>	n/a				
Equipment & Technology <sup>2,6</sup>	up to 4%				
District Administrative Overhead <sup>7</sup>	up to 9%				
Art <sup>8</sup>	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>up to 130%</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; address need in the project description (Question 3d). Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the cost estimate discussion (Question 7c) and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
3. 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.
4. Include commissioning agent services only if necessary for completion of this project as defined by 4 AAC 31.080 (j).
5. Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
6. 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 (2016). Technology is included with Equipment.
7. Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project (for maximum indirect percentage based on project cost, see 4 AAC 31.023); this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost, reduced for CM percentage.
8. Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

<b>Table 7.2 CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE</b>						
<b>Construction Category</b>	<b>New Construction</b>			<b>Renovation</b>		
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>GSF</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>GSF</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>
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 is equal to Divisions (1.0+2.0) for new construction, and Division 11.00 for Renovation, otherwise, Base Construction is equal to the total construction cost less the costs that correspond with other cost categories in the table.
2. Explain in detail and justify special requirements in Question 7c.

**7b. Cost estimate source.** Identify and describe as needed the specific source of the costs provided in Table 7.1 (e.g., professional estimators, solicited vendor quotes, paid invoices).

**7c. Cost estimate discussion & justifications.** Identify and explain cost estimate assumptions, lump sums, and percentages in excess of the recommended percentages in Table 7.1. Provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding a recommended percentage.

**SEC. 8: ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS**

**Emergency conditions** are those that pose a high level of threat for building use by occupants.

**8a** Is this project an emergency? (Up to 50 points)  yes  no

Has the district submitted an insurance claim?  yes  no

If no, explain below.

If the project is an emergency, describe below in detail the nature, impact, and immediacy of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions.

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

<u>Category of Conditions</u>	<u>Applicable</u>
1. Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. (50 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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. (25-45 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 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. (5-25 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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. (5-45 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. (25-45 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 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 may have 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. (5-25 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>

**8b. Inadequacies of existing space** (Up to 40 points)

Describe how the inadequacies of the existing space impact mandated instructional programs or existing or proposed local programs and how the project will improve the existing facilities to support the instructional programs.

**8c. Other options** (Up to 25 points)

Describe, in addition to the proposed project, at least two or more viable and realistic options that have been considered in the planning and development of this project to address the best solution for the facility. [Recommended to include options' costs and cost difference to project scope.](#)

Major maintenance projects should include consideration of project design options, material or component options, phasing, cost comparisons, or other considerations. [Projects renovating multiple systems should provide a comparison to new construction at an eligible gross square footage.](#) New school construction or addition/replacement of space projects should include a discussion of existing building renovation versus new construction, acquisition or use of alternative facilities, a life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis, service area boundary changes where there are adjacent attendance areas, or other considerations.

**8d. 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.

**8e. District funding equalizer** (Up to 20 points)

[The department will utilize collected data regarding the number of students eligible for free and reduced priced meals, as obtained from the National School Lunch Program or from E-Rate applications. No data submittal is required with the CIP application.](#)

**8f. Prior funding** (Up to 30 points)

Provide AS 14.11 administered grants that have been appropriated by the legislature or allocated by the department for which additional funds are being requested.

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

DEED grant #: \_\_\_\_\_

**8fg.** Is the district applying for a waiver of participating share?  yes  no

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 F of the application instructions.)

**SEC. 9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT**

**District preventive maintenance and facility management (60 points possible)**

Ensure that documents related to the district’s maintenance and facility management program have been provided with district CIP submittals. 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; these are district eligibility attachments, only two copies are required regardless of the number of applications submitted by the district. Include the following documents:

- 9a.** Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9b.** Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9c.** PM/Corrective Maintenance Reports (Up to 10 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9d.** 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)
- 9e.** Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9f.** Energy Consumption Reports (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9g.** Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9h.** Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9i.** Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

**SEC. 10. DISTRICT CONTACT INFORMATION**

The department has the authority to determine a project’s eligibility, change a project’s primary purpose, and modify a project’s scope and budget. If a change is made, the department will notify the Superintendent or Chief School Administrator, the person responsible for facilities, and the person responsible for finances. Their name and email address are required in the table below.

The district may request the department include additional persons in the correspondence regarding changes to this project application.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>E-mail</u>
	Superintendent	
	Facilities	
	Finance	

**ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST**

Note all attachments included with the application. Each attachment must be provided as an electronic file in a portable document file (pdf) format.

**Project eligibility attachments:** Eligibility item is required on all projects.

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

**District eligibility attachments:**

- Preventive maintenance and facility management narratives and supplemental documents: sample work orders, custodial plan(s), training schedules and logs, renewal and replacement schedules (questions 9a, 9e, 9g-9i)
- Preventive maintenance reports (questions 9b, 9c, 9f)

**Project description attachments:** List all attachments referred to or noted in the application. Some items may not be applicable to a specific project.

- Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (question 3c)
- Alternative project delivery request or approval; solicitation documents (question 3f)
- For fully or partially completed projects: documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080, including solicitation documents (question 3g)
- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (question 3h)
- Condition support documents (*e.g., maintenance work orders, warranties, etc.*) (question 4a)
- Facility condition survey (question 6a)
- Published district building system design standard (question 6c)
- Facility appraisal (question 6d)
- Educational specification (question 5i, 6d)
- Concept design documentation (question 6d)
- Schematic design documentation (question 6e)
- Design development documentation (question 6f)
- Cost estimate worksheets (question 7a)
- Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e., Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*) (questions 4a, 8a)
- Cost/benefit analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- Life cycle cost analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- Value analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- Justification for waiver of participating share (question 8g)
- Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (question 5e)
- Enrollment projections and calculations (question 5e)
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_



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

**FY2028**

*These instructions support DEED Form #05-25-035  
Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement.*

**PREPARING & 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. The grant application deadline is September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**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 School, High School). 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. In addition, a district can submit a letter to request reuse of an application's score for one year after the application was filed; or, if the project was substantially complete at the time of the application, the district can request reuse of the application's score for up to five years after the application was filed.

**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.

**Authorizing signature:** The application must be signed by the appropriate official with an original or certified electronic signature. Unsigned applications cannot be accepted for ranking.

**Application packages should be submitted to:**  
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
Division of Finance & Support Services, Facilities via the online portal.  
To request access to the online portal, please complete the request form here:  
<https://education.alaska.gov/cip-folder-request>

**For further information contact:**  
eed.facilities@alaska.gov

## 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 (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1<sup>st</sup> is acceptable).

**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 in the appropriate column 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 A of these instructions for descriptions of categories and the limitations associated with grant 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 C 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 DEED Form 05-19-051. 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. For grant funding, the project must appear in the first year of the district's six-year plan.

### 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 the existence of a Fixed Asset Inventory System during its on-site Preventive Maintenance program review every five 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

<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

---

do not have an approved fixed asset inventory system, or a functioning fixed asset inventory system (i.e., cannot be audited) will be ineligible for grant funding under AS 14.11.011.

## 2c. 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.

District facility insurance data is required to be provided by each district to the department under AS 14.03.150 and 4 AAC 31.200. Insured replacement value will include all district facilities reported in the department's School Facility database:

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

**Note:** This information is used in calculating scores for question 9d. The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide.

## 2d. Capital improvement project.

AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request should be a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix F for an explanation of maintenance activities. Scope of work will be modified by the department during review of the application to remove items deemed to be preventive maintenance or custodial.

## 2e. Preventive maintenance program.

Under AS 14.11.011(b)(4), a district must have a certified preventive maintenance program to be eligible for funding. Initial notification of district certification is provided by June 1; final determination of a district maintenance program is issued August 15. For more information contact the department.

## 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. 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

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

30 points available for a district's #1 priority. Points drop off in increments of 3 for each corresponding drop in district priority ranking. If the application score is requested to be reused in a future year, the reused score will be adjusted based on a change in the project ranking on the associated future year's six-year plan.

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.

### 3b. School facilities within scope. (15-30 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. [Facility condition index \(FCI\) is the cost of current and deferred system renewal divided by the current replacement value of the facility. An FCI calculation is available on the renewal and replacement form template. If a district utilizes an alternate method for determining an FCI for a building or building portion, it may provide an explanation and back-up for the calculation. Department data will be used for calculations, if there is an error in the database, contact the department prior to September 1](#)

There are up to 15-30 points possible depending on the ~~age~~-FCI of the building. Facility number, name, year built, and size are available online at:

<http://education.alaska.edu/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

~~Department data will be used for calculations, if there is an error in the database, contact the department prior to September 1.~~

### 3c. Facility status.

The response to this question should be consistent with column III of the space utilization table in question 5i. Projects that will result in demolition or surplus of existing owned or leased facilities must include a detailed plan for the 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. Project description.

The project description should include: (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, and (3) a description of the project and what the project will accomplish. It should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show how the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state.

The description of project scope should include information that will allow the department to evaluate the criteria specified in AS 14.11.013, including conformance with the currently adopted ASHRAE 90.1 energy efficiency standard and the *Alaska School Design and Construction Standards* published by DEED and incorporated as Appendix B of these instructions; ensure project aligns with selected category.

It is helpful to identify the question number if you are providing detail to support another application question in the project description.

Question 2d: AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the funding request should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance (including routine maintenance) or custodial care. Refer to Appendix F of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

Question 3b: If the project impacts multiple facilities, the project description shall identify the facilities impacted and describe how each will be impacted. For facilities with both Original and Addition space, identify the discrete section(s) of the portion being impacted. For “districtwide” projects, a detailed description and scope is required for each facility.

Question 3c: Projects that will result in demolition or surplus of existing owned or leased facilities must include a detailed plan for the transition from existing facilities to replacement facilities.

Question 3h: 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 5c: If this project will (1) result in renovated or additional educational space, and (2) 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,
- current and projected student populations in each facility (school) affected by the project, and
- DEED gross square footage for each affected facility (school) in the attendance area.

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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

complete, and schematic design or design development documents are not attached, provide a justification for why documents are not needed.

Question 8c: When a new, renovation, new-in-lieu-of-renewal, or Category E project is proposed, the project description should include a brief discussion of the cost/benefit and life cycle cost principles which guided this project solution. The detailed cost/benefit analysis and life cycle cost analysis 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 and summarized, rather than reproduced in the project description.

### **3e. Scope of work.**

Describe the scope of work of the entire project. The scope of work should include: (1) work items to be completed and (2) work items already completed.

Project scope should be sufficiently defined to assure bidding a single contract. If proposing a “districtwide” project, applicant should provide justification in question 3i of how it is more cost-effective to combine multi-site (multi-community) projects.

It is helpful to identify the question number if you are providing detail to support another application question in the project description.

Question 3g: If project is complete or partial complete, identify which scope elements have been completed.

### **3f. Project schedule.**

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. Identify any additional project schedule milestones or special circumstances that are applicable to the project. Include any schedule changes anticipated if alternative delivery is considered for the project. An alternative project delivery method is required to be approved by the department. If an alternative project delivery method is proposed for the project (including in-house), provide completed request or department approval with application, including any bid documents, etc.

### **3g. Complete or partially completed project.**

Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. In question 3e, clearly identify which scope elements have been completed. 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 DEED 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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

not have prior approval from the department, the project's construction budget will be reduced [4 AAC 31.080(e)].

- For construction contracts under \$100,000, districts may use any competitive procurement method practicable. Provide an explanation of circumstances requiring selected procurement method with attachment.

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. Provide bid documents and bid tabulations as projects attachments.

If district has been working with the department for approval of project delivery method, design, and construction, provide the DEED recovery of funds project number in the space provided.

A district can submit for reimbursement of project costs for work completed up to 36 months prior to the initial submission of the application with a substantially identical scope. This can include costs in any phase: planning (e.g. condition survey), design, and construction. A district can submit for reimbursement of costs for site acquisition approved under 4 AAC 31.025 and incurred up to 120 months before the initial submission of the application with a substantially identical scope.

[Identify the fund source\(s\) used to procure the work completed. Potential sources could be district capital fund balance, municipal appropriation, municipal bond debt, federal or state grants, etc.](#)

### **3h. 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 C).

### **3i. Multiple-school or districtwide project.**

Explain how a multiple site project is cost effective and in the state's best interest and how the district will provide for a single contract in either design or construction. Provide justification of need for multiple contracts.

### 3j. Project space utilization. (30 points possible)

Table 3.1 Project Space Equation 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 3b as well as those shown in Table 7.2 of the cost estimate section. Report of demolition, including support facilities being partially or completely demolished, should be consistent with question 3c.

## 4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

### 4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety. (Up to ~~50~~70 points)

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions being addressed by the project scope in question 3e; attach supporting documentation. If 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.

Code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety-related categories:

Code Deficiency: Deficiencies related to building code conditions where there is no threat to life safety. This includes compliance with various current building and accessibility codes.

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.

Life Safety: Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions threatening the health and life safety of students, staff, and the public. For example, required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative posing a life safety risk.

**Note:** Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students may be viewed as a more critical project.

The project could contain a single severe condition or multiple moderate conditions. Multiple conditions will be rated collectively, but may not necessarily rank as high as a single severe condition. For projects, such as districtwide projects, that combine critical and non-critical work, points for the critical portion of the project will be weighted proportionally.

The scoring matrix for this category (ref. Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application) is reproduced in the application, and groups deficiencies into the following eight categories: Site, Structural, Roof/Envelope, Arch/Interior/ADA, Mechanical, Electrical, Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, and UST/AST/Hazmat. Identify the condition from the matrix and provide a relevant description of the conditions with references to supporting documentation. While

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

extensive, the discrepancies listed in the matrix may not be exhaustive. If a deficiency is not listed, note that in the description and use the listed deficiencies as a context for determining appropriate documentation. Note that only the highest supported scoring condition will be assigned points for a given issue corrected by the project scope.

As indicated in the matrix, code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions scoring incorporates ranges based on the established severity ranges of the conditions and upon the documentation provided to support the reported severity. Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, third party communications, maintenance work orders, 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 building or component condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

For matrix scores based on average number of work orders over time, include copies of the relevant work orders. Work order detail should match that required under 4 AAC 31.013(a)(1).

Supporting documentation elsewhere in the application can be summarized and referenced, rather than reproduced in the narrative. When citing information elsewhere in the application or application attachments, provide the specific location of the referenced information.

## 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.

### 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

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 "[20172026 Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations](#)" MS Excel worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. A link to this form and the "Attendance Areas" report can be found under at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>.

## 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. Unhoused students. (80 points possible)

All projects that are adding new space, ~~or~~ replacing existing space, [or renovating multiple systems](#) must complete Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM and provide copies of the student population projection methods used. ~~The d~~Department tools for determining projections and space eligibility ~~is the MS Excel workbook, "Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations"~~ can be found under "Space Guidelines" at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. ~~Include copies of the worksheets "ADM", "Current Capacity", and "Projected Capacity" with the application.~~ [The district may use other reasonable methods for projecting population.](#) The department may adjust the submitted ADMs and allowable space as necessary for corrections, [see also 5f below](#).

The points for this question 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%, then 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 five years post-occupancy is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 5% over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a capacity five years post-occupancy over 250%, the full 30 points will be awarded.

Scoring for projected unhoused due to facility loss by external environmental factors (reference question 5g) is scored at half points: If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 10% over 100% capacity will be awarded.

## 5f. ADM projection method.

Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 5.1. 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.

Inclusion of a charter school population housed in lease space due to terminate within two years may be included; include a copy of the lease as an attachment to the application. The

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (e.g., housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.

## **5g. Confirm space eligibility.**

Existing space is determined as all permanent facility gross square footage (GSF) within an attendance area as reported in the DEED School Facility Database; for attendance areas with multiple main schools serving a type of school (elementary, secondary, K-12, mixed grade) this will include more facilities than are reported in question 3b "school facilities within scope" or included in question 3j "project space utilization" (Table 5.2).

Utilize data from the ADM projections/GSF calculations workbook to complete this question. For "Total Existing SF", enter all GSF from permanent facilities serving the same school type within the attendance area. For "Remaining Existing SF", subtract any square footage that will be demolished or disposed of from the "Total Existing SF" and enter the remainder. For "Total Eligible SF", enter the total of the square footage calculation based on the school's average daily membership (ADM). For "Qualifies for additional SF", enter the amount of additional qualified square footage by subtracting the "Remaining Existing SF" from the "Total Eligible SF". For "Applying for additional SF", enter the amount of additional square footage that will be added in this. The amount of square footage that is applied for may be the same or less than the amount of the qualified square footage.

A district may submit a future unhoused projection based on an imminent loss of a facility due to certain external environmental factors like erosion. To support the projection, the district must provide credible evidence and documentation that the facility will be lost or unsafe for occupancy within two years. A district would also need to provide a specific plan for how it will accommodate students without the facility, should the facility become incapable of housing students, and address how the facility will be disposed of in the transition plan (question 3c).

[A major maintenance project may be determined to be in the state's best interest to demolish existing building\(s\) and replace the facility with a smaller gross square footage school construction project, as determined by the qualifying space eligibility, and after consideration of life cycle cost analysis and population projections. If this determination is made, the district can choose to instead accept a reduction of the state's participation in the major maintenance project based on a ratio of "Total Eligible SF" to "Remaining Existing SF".](#)

## **5h. 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 (e.g. 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.

Projects in Category F, which may not relate to providing alternate facilities for unhoused students, should describe existing community facilities (parking, sporting, or outdoor recreation areas) related to the project scope.

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 or providing the desired feature.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(4), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(5)

## 5i. Educational Specifications.

A district planning a project to add or reconfigure space is required to develop an educational specifications document and provide it to the department for review. [See AS 14.07.020(11), 4 AAC 31.010] For projects adding or reconfiguring space, an educational specification is a required planning document in Appendix C for planning/concept design points.

## 6. PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN

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

### 6a. Condition/Component survey. (0 to 10 points possible – refer to Rater Guidelines for scoring criteria)

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, energy efficiency, 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 may be completed by an architect, engineer, or personnel with documented expertise in a building system. For project scopes that are component or system renovations, a condition survey of the component or system is acceptable.

A facility condition survey is required for major rehabilitation projects to receive further planning and design points. Projects with scopes that warrant identification of in-depth examination of deteriorated systems will require a scope-specific facility or component condition survey to receive points beyond Phase I Planning/Concept Design. Condition surveys should be clearly identified and establish a specific date or date range when the survey occurred or was produced.

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. In addition, an energy audit, although useful and informative, will not receive condition survey points if the project's scope warrants additional facility condition survey data.

## **6b. Use of prior school design (10 points possible)**

Statutes require that the department shall encourage school districts to use previously approved school construction design if the use will result in a cost savings for the project. Provide the following information regarding plan availability and the costs to revise the plan to meet the needs of the current project:

- Complete documents of the proposed reused school plans.
- Evidence of ownership of proposed reused school plans.
- An analysis of the anticipated deviations and revisions from the proposed reused school plans along with an estimated cost of those deviations (+ or -).
- An estimate of the design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans along with an estimate of the cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design. If a district does not own the school plan proposed for reuse, estimate must include cost of purchasing design or of another arrangement.

Five measures are identified to determine the range of effectiveness in using a prior school design:

1. The district's ownership and legal ability to effectively use the prior design.
2. The age of the prior design.
3. The amount of change to the prior design anticipated to be needed in the current project.
4. The estimated cost savings in construction costs achieved by the reuse.
5. The estimated cost savings in design services achieved by the reuse.

Up to 10 points are available (2 points for each of the identified measures) for a project that reuses a department-approved school design. This point category is only applicable to school construction projects (primary purpose Category A, B, or F).

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(a)(4) and (b)(7)

## **6c. Use of prior building system design (10 points possible)**

Statutes require that the department shall encourage school districts to use previously approved building systems if the use will result in a cost savings for the project. Five building system categories are available for evaluation of prior design use: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power. A project application can receive points for capital renewal of: a complete system, a subsystem, or a component of system, once in each of these categories when evaluated against whether it is part of a published district or municipal facility standard that meets ASHRAE 90.1-2016 requirements; prior use of a system specification in a bid solicitation is not sufficient to meet the criteria.

The ASHRAE-compliant district or municipal standard must be provided with the application in order for the department to evaluate this criteria.

There are up to 10 points possible for a project that provides support for using a cost-effective building system standard; up to 2 points per qualified system category. This point category is not applicable to projects receiving scores for use of a prior school design.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(a)(4) and (b)(7)

## **6d. Planning / Concept design. (0 or 10 points possible)**

*Planning* work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix C of this document. At the planning phase, existing conditions may be assumed based on standard life expectancies and other industry norms. Condition/component surveys are only required for projects proposing major rehabilitation. Some projects may not require the services of an architect or engineer; typically these projects are limited in scope where drawings and extensive technical specifications are not necessary in order to issue an Invitation to Bid. Provide a justification in question 6e if no consultant was selected. Some projects do not require concept design or educational specifications. Reference Appendix C for projects which require these planning documents. The department's Program Demand Cost Model is acceptable as a planning/concept level cost estimate. There are 10 points possible for completed planning/concept design work.

If design has progressed further than planning/concept design, then schematic design (35%) design development (65%), or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of concept design documents.

A *facility appraisal* is an educational adequacy appraisal following the format or similar formats 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.

## **6e. Schematic design – 35%. (0 or 10 points possible)**

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

Project development to schematic design on most projects requires a condition/component survey to assess existing conditions. Condition/component surveys are required for projects proposing major rehabilitation and may be required for other projects if necessary to adequately support the scope of the proposed work.

Some projects may not require a schematic design in order to issue an Invitation to Bid. Typically these projects are limited in scope where drawings and extensive technical specifications are not necessary. Provide a justification if schematic design documents were not needed. The department's Program Demand Cost Model is not an acceptable Schematic level estimate.

If design has progressed further than schematic design (35%), then design development (65%) or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of schematic design documents.

## **6f. Design development – 65%. ~~(0 or 5 points possible)~~**

*Design development* work includes items listed under design development in Appendix C of this document. There are 5 points possible for completed design development work.

Project development to schematic design on most projects requires a condition/component survey to assess existing conditions. Condition/component surveys are required for projects proposing major rehabilitation and may be required for other projects if necessary to adequately support the scope of the proposed work.

Construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of design development documents.

## **6g. Planning / Design team.**

The application needs to identify the district's architectural or engineering (A/E) consultant for the Condition Survey, Planning, Schematic Design and Design Development work. Certain projects of limited scope may not require consultant selection to qualify for planning/concept level design point, but may be required for schematic design or design development levels, depending on project complexity. 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.

Identify any additional consultants hired for pre-construction work, including independent value analysis or commissioning agent, as required.

## **7. COST ESTIMATE**

### **Cost estimate for total project cost. (30 points possible)**

#### **7a. Project cost estimate.**

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 D 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 question 7c.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

## Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate.

In Table 7.1, 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 [AS 14.11.020(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 the project exceeds the recommended percentages, add a detailed justification in question 7c.

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 Peak Ground Acceleration information for various areas of the state available on the [department's CIP website](http://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html) (education.alaska.gov/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.

**Note:** Cost estimates are preferred in the DEED *CostFormat*. Alternative formats will not impact points assigned but could impact the project's eligible amount for cost estimate expenses. Although not required for a project application, cost estimates provided as a submittal for a project awarded a grant allocation will need to conform to the DEED *CostFormat*.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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

## **7b. Cost estimate source.**

Identify the source of the cost estimate. A cost estimate could be from a professional design or estimating firm, vendor quotes, actual invoices, or based on the documented costs of a similar project in the district.

## **7c. Cost estimate discussion and justifications.**

Provide sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is incorporated into Tables 7.1 and 7.2, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. Please refer to Appendix D for guidelines covering project cost estimate percentages for factored cost items. Provide justification for any lump-sum elements used in the cost estimate, including site work and utilities. If the project exceeds a recommended percentage for a specific category or if the project is requesting more than 30% in additional percentage costs, provide a detailed justification. The project scope and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.

Identify attachments with 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 project costs.

## **8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS**

### **8a. Emergency conditions. (50 points possible)**

Emergencies are conditions that pose a high level of threat for building use by occupants. An emergency exists when students are currently unhoused due to the loss of the facility, or damage to the facility 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.

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 preventive 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 the leaking is stopped with routine maintenance would not constitute an emergency. A roof that is leaking, where 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.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

Describe in detail the nature, impact, and immediacy of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions. At a minimum, include the following:

- 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.

Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, photos, third party communications, insurance claims, 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 emergency condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

The emergency descriptions with check boxes contained in question 8a 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 building condition box without a description of the emergency will receive no points.

The matrix below incorporates the emergency conditions categories listed in the application with supporting examples.

### Building

Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. Example: A flood or fire event has destroyed or left the building so structurally compromised that the building must be demolished.

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 came off in a severe wind storm with water damage to interior finishes.

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 specified safety standards and the building will need to be made current with the standards within the next 90 days. Documentation substantiating the order needs to be supplied.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

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 leaked over a classroom causing structural damage to the walls, which restricts the use of the room until the repairs are made.

### Components or Systems

A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. Example: The heating plant has completely failed leaving the building unusable to the student population and susceptible to freezing and further damage.

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.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(1)

### **8b. Inadequacies of space. (40 points possible)**

Describe how the project will improve existing facilities to support the instructional program. The response should address how the inadequacies of the facility impact the instructional program and whether that instructional program is a mandatory, existing local, or a proposed new local program. Types of inadequacies addressed may include the quality of space, amount of space, or configuration of the space.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(4)

### **8c. Other options. (25 points possible)**

In an effort to support the project submitted as the best possible, districts should consider a full range of options during planning and project development. [Provide documentation or justification on costing that was developed during consideration of the options; application write-up should include summary of option cost.](#)

- A cost/benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, or other evaluative processes used by the district in reaching its design solution should be included. See also Item I, Project Eligibility Checklist, which requires a life cycle cost analysis, a cost benefit analysis, or any other quantifiable analysis, when needed, to demonstrate that the project is in the best interest of the district and the state.
- A project that proposes component replacement should discuss the merits of alternative products, material options, construction methods, alternative design, or other solutions to the problem as applicable.
- A project that proposes roof replacement should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

- A project that includes major rehabilitation or renovation to multiple systems should provide and discuss an option to construct a new facility [at the attendance area's projected eligible gross square footage](#) in lieu of the proposed scope.
- If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts may consider options such as double shifting, 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.
- 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.

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 documented comprehensive discussion on [appropriateness, adequacy, and cost of](#) the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(6), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(6)

### **8d. Annual operating cost savings. (30 points possible)**

Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. Explain and document ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. This analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis. 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. Provide benchmark values such as fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, and historical record of problems to be addressed by this project.

For new facilities, discuss design choices that will provide periodic and long-term savings in the operation and maintenance of the facility. Although the addition of square footage may 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. Include cost benefit analyses that were accomplished on building systems and materials.

Up to 30 points are possible based on the projected cost savings payback with a full and complete description.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(3)

### **8e. [District funding equalizer. \(Up to 20 points\)](#)**

[Scoring of this question will be based on data collected by the department regarding the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced priced meals, as obtained from the](#)

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

[National School Lunch Program or from a district's E-Rate application. No submittal is required with the CIP application.](#)

## **8f. Prior funding. (30 points possible)**

Prior state funding refers to **grant funds appropriated by the legislature to the department and administered under AS 14.11**. Any amounts noted here should also be included in Table 7.1 of the Cost Estimate, question 7a. 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. There are 15 points available if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11, the project has gone out to bid, and the district is seeking supplemental funds due to increases in construction bid, whether the district has awarded the bid or not.

## **8fg. Participating share waiver.**

Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix G 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.

## **9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT**

### **District preventive maintenance and facility management. (60 points possible)**

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with its application submittals 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 F 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 nine separate evaluations. 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 evaluation 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 Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application for additional information on scoring.

Up to 60 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

Only one set should be provided by the district, regardless of the number of submitted applications.

## **Maintenance Management**

### **9a. Maintenance management narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)**

Provide a narrative description of the effectiveness of your work order-based maintenance management system along with supporting documents. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- A narrative fully describes the maintenance management (MM) program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom; how component work order history and trends are used.
- Provides sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials. Work orders provided as part of application support for question 4a may be used by raters to assess this narrative.
- Provides sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance.
- Provides sample routine or corrective work orders showing progression of scheduling from initial response to completion or deferral.
- Provides a component report for a minimum of 10% of main school facilities showing the date of installation and date of scheduled renewal or replacement; includes components from each building system listed in DEED's R&R schedule.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

### **9b. 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. Recommended to review management reports to ensure that the reports make sense – internally consistent and reflective of work performed. Discuss discrepancies in narrative, Question 9a.

### **9c. 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.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

*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.

## **9d. 5-year average expenditure for maintenance (Formula-Driven) (5 points available)**

Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last five years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded.) 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, 2018 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Fund 100 General 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.

The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide. Insured value will include all district facilities reported in the department's facility database:

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

No information need be submitted with the application for this question.

## **Energy Management**

### **9e. Energy management narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)**

Provide a narrative description of the district's energy management program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Energy Management program including all of the following energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, benchmarking, energy audits and assessments, and implementation/execution of energy efficiency measures (EEMs).
- Provide data showing the program tracks energy by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility over the prior five years-by energy type.
- Provides an energy management guideline or manual, which is clearly identified as being issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items above.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

- Provides a report showing a five-year history of implemented EEMs. Provides a complete set of energy consumption records for question 9f.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

### **9f. Energy consumption reports (Formula-Driven) (5 points available)**

*Item A:* Provide site-specific reports that compares monthly consumption for energy and utilities for all main schools over the previous 5 years.

These reports support the district's ability to manage energy use and establish the ability to evaluate usage trends over time in support of building performance.

### **Custodial Program**

### **9g. Custodial narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)**

Provide a narrative description of the district's custodial program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, and performance verification/quality control.
- Provides custodial program guideline or manual, which is clearly identified as being issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items above.
- Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on the industry practice. Lists staffing requirements for the facility based on these metrics and industry standards for productivity.
- Provides a report which tabulates the preceding information (types and quantities of information, etc.) for all main schools in the district, including staffing requirements. OR Provides no less than two facility examples each year of submission with no repeats within a five-year period. If the district operates fewer than 10 schools, provided one-third of all facilities each year.
- Provides at least 5 work orders generated by the custodial program in the previous 12 months.
- Provides completed sets of quality control and inspection checklists for no less than two facilities for the previous fiscal year period.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

### **Maintenance Training**

### **9h. Maintenance training narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)**

Provide a narrative description of the district's training program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

- Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, training scheduling and tracking, and measurement of program effectiveness.
- Identifies individual training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported, identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis.
- Provides a sample analysis of job functions (e.g., driving, work order management, etc.) and required building system knowledge (e.g., boiler tuning, lock-out/tag-out, etc.) for at least one job classification.
- Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type.
- Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual.
- Provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the training program which, at a minimum includes data on scheduled versus completed training.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

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

#### **9i. Capital planning narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)**

Provide a narrative description of the district's capital planning program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification (condition assessments, user input and maintenance work order history/trends, etc.), development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans, identification of capital project resources and funding.
- Provides capital planning report issued/updated within the past 12 months and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan and includes capital projects programmed from all fund sources, local, state, and federal.
- Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a facility condition assessment not older than five years. Where FCI equals the cost of current and deferred renewal divided by the current replacement value.
- Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district.
- Provides a condition assessment for every project requesting state-aid in the first year of the 6-yr CIP plan.
- Provides a districtwide trend for combined FCI for a minimum of five prior years and tracks districtwide capital expenditures for main schools for a minimum of five prior years.

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

## 10. DISTRICT CONTACT INFORMATION

The district must provide the names and e-mails for the following persons:

(1) Superintendent or Chief School Administrator, (2) the person responsible for facilities, and (3) the person responsible for finances. . The department will include these individuals in correspondence regarding changes made to the project application within the department's authority to determine a project eligibility, change a project's primary purpose, and modification to a project's scope and budget. This includes any notification at the time the initial rankings are published and any determination based on district requests for reconsideration.

Additional individuals may be included in addition to those above.

## 11. ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

### **Eligibility and project description attachments.**

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). The eligibility and project description attachments checklist is provided to identify required materials and additional materials that are referenced in support of the project. The eligibility attachments are required for all projects. Projects with missing eligibility attachments will not be ranked. Check to see that your application is complete and indicate additional attachments the department should be referencing while evaluating the project.

**APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2023

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>1, 2</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 the seismic design of structure is inadequate; that the 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)
  
- 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 \$50,000. 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

---

<sup>1</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>2</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.

APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee

April 20, 2023

systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$50,000. An example could be making all corridors one-hour rated. Making one or two toilet stalls accessible would not fit this category. Replacement or rehabilitation of elementary playground equipment or fall protection surfacing that corrects a code deficiency would 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.

- 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.
- 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 that are not correcting elementary playground equipment or fall protection surfacing code deficiencies.
- 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.)

**APPENDIX B: REGIONALLY BASED MODEL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee

April 20, 2022

AS 14.11.014(b) requires the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review (BRGR) Committee to “(3) develop criteria for construction of schools in the state; criteria developed under this paragraph must include requirements intended to achieve cost-effective school construction.” These standards and criteria are considered by the department in its development and updating of regionally based model school construction standards that describe acceptable building systems and anticipated costs and establish school design ratios to achieve efficient and cost-effective school construction under AS 14.1.017(d). The department must consider these construction standards when evaluating applications.

The BRGR Committee has developed, reviewed, and approved the construction standards published by the department as the Alaska School Design & Construction Standards, dated April 20, 2022, for use evaluating CIP applications beginning with FY2024, with exceptions for projects completed prior to September 1, 2023, projects eligible for reuse of scores, and projects scoring 20 points or more in planning and design (combined scoring for questions 6d, 6e, 6f) prior to September 1, 2023.

---

**APPENDIX C: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES**  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2023

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 scope dictates) in order for projects to receive planning, schematic design and/or design development points. Required documents must be submitted by September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**CONDITION/COMPONENT SURVEY (0 to 10 points possible)**

**PHASE I - PLANNING/CONCEPT DESIGN (0 or 10 points possible)**

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (4 AAC 31.065) - **(Required if necessary to accomplish scope of project)**
2. Prepare a school facility appraisal (optional)
3. Include a condition/component survey as referenced above - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation<sup>1</sup>)**
4. Identify need category of project - **(Required)**
5. Verify student populations and trends - **(Required for new facilities and additions to existing facilities)**
6. Complete education specifications (4 AAC 31.010) - **(Required for new facilities, additions, and for projects that reconfigure or repurpose existing space)**
7. Complete concept design studies - **(Required for new facilities, additions, and for projects that reconfigure or repurpose existing space)**
8. Complete planning cost estimate – **(Required)**
9. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **(Required for new facilities)**

**PHASE IIA - SCHEMATIC DESIGN – 35% (0 or 10 points possible)**

1. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4 AAC 31.025) - **(Required for new facilities)**
2. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - **(Required for new facilities)**
3. Accomplish site survey and perform preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical) - **(Required for new facilities)**
4. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - **(Required for new facilities)**
5. Complete schematic design documents including development of approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - **(Required if necessary to adequately scope and complete the project)**
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**
7. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation<sup>1</sup> or is necessary to adequately scope and complete the project.)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Under 4 AAC 31.900(7): “rehabilitation” means adapting an existing facility to improve the opportunity to provide a contemporary educational program; and includes major remodeling, repair, renovation, and modernization with related capital equipment.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX C: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2023

---

**PHASE IIB - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT – 65% (~~0 or 5 points possible~~)**

1. Complete required elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **(Required)**
2. Review and confirm planning (4 AAC 31.030)
3. Select commissioning agent (4 AAC 31.065; 4 AAC 31.080) - **(Required for new facilities or additions over 5000GSF, or rehabilitation of facility over 10,000GSF)**
4. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation<sup>1</sup> or is necessary to adequately scope and complete the project.)**
5. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **(Required for new facilities)**
6. Complete design development documents, including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans - **(Required if necessary to adequately scope and complete the project)**
7. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
8. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**
9. Commissioning plan
10. Energy consumption and cost report
11. Value analysis report

**PHASE III - CONSTRUCTION**

1. Complete required elements of planning and design not previously completed - **(Required)**
2. Prepare final cost estimate - **(Required)**
3. Complete final contract documents and legal review of construction documents (4 AAC 31.040)
4. Advertising, bidding and contract award (4 AAC 31.080) - **(Required for contracts over \$100,000)**
5. Submit signed construction contract
6. Construct project
7. Procure furniture, fixtures, and equipment, if applicable
8. Substantial completion
9. Commissioning report
10. Final completion and move-in
11. Post occupancy survey
12. Obtain project audit/close out

**APPENDIX D: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee

April 14, 2020

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, and 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, complexity of scope, and scale 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 DEED's *Guidelines 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: 0-4% of construction cost or between \$2,300 - \$3,800 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. The maximum for non-project specific indirect administrative costs is 3%, as defined in regulation [4 AAC 31.023(c)(7)]. In-house construction management should be included as part of this line item. The total of in-house construction

---

APPENDIX D: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 14, 2020

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 3,000 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, 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%

**APPENDIX E: TYPE OF SPACE ADDED OR IMPROVED**  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2022

Category A - Instructional or Resource

General Use Classrooms  
Pre-K and Kindergarten  
Elementary  
Secondary  
Special Education  
Art  
Science  
Bi-Cultural/Bilingual  
Consumer Education  
Computer/Technology Lab  
Music/Drama  
Career and Technical Education  
Library/Media Center  
Gymnasium

Category B - Support Teaching

Teacher Workroom/Office  
Teacher Breakroom  
Counseling/Testing  
Educational Resource Storage  
Quiet Room

Category C - General Support

Administration  
Conference Room  
Parent/Community Schools  
Nurse/Clinic  
Cafeteria  
Kitchen/Food Service  
Student Store  
Fitness Room  
Locker Room/Showers  
Student Commons  
Multipurpose Room  
Auditorium (& Stage)  
Pool

Category D - Supplementary

Corridors/Vestibules/Entries  
Stairs/Elevators  
Restrooms/Toilets  
Custodial  
Supply/Food Storage  
Refer/Freezer  
Maintenance/Receiving  
Mechanical/Electrical  
Telecom/Server Room

**APPENDIX F: DEFINITIONS OF MAINTENANCE**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 20, 2022

Building System(s)

An assembly of components created to perform specific functions in a facility (ref. DEED *CostFormat* for descriptions of 11 standard building systems).

Capital Renewal or Replacement

A scheduled and anticipated systematic upgrading or replacement of a building system or component, anticipated based on life-expectancy, to establish its ability to function for a new life cycle—typically at least five years.

Commissioning

A systematic process of testing buildings systems to ensure that a building performs in accordance with the design intent, contract documents, and the owner's operational needs. Retro-commissioning is commissioning of building systems that occurs on a facility that has never been commissioned, or occurs after an initial commissioning, to recalibrate building performance to ensure optimal systems performance.

Component

An item within a building system that provides a function distinct from other elements in that system.

Corrective Maintenance

Unscheduled maintenance or repair in response to system or component failures that are accomplished at an operational level.

Custodial Care

The day to day and periodic cleaning of building surfaces and fixtures needed to maintain a facility in safe, clean, and orderly condition; includes the replacement of disposable supplies and building items.

Deferred Maintenance

Maintenance or capital renewal that is postponed for lack of funds, resources, or other reasons.

Energy Audit and Assessment

An assessment of a building that review current energy consumption and identifies energy efficiency measures that you can conduct to make the building more energy efficient.

Energy Benchmarking

Measuring building energy performance against its own past performance or against other buildings with a similar function/use.

Energy Consumption Monitoring

Measuring, recording, and tracking use of energy utilities by a building. Required to be done on a monthly basis.

Energy Efficiency Measures

Upgrades, retrofits, or repairs of systems or software or a practice that, when implemented, results in reduced energy use while maintaining the same or higher level of service.

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

### Major Maintenance

Facility renewal that requires major repair or rehabilitation to protect the structure, correct building code deficiencies, or achieve an operating cost savings, and shall exceed \$50,000 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.

### Routine Maintenance

Light maintenance and inspection tasks performed at regular intervals (daily, weekly, monthly, etc.). Differentiated from preventive maintenance by level of complexity, specialized skill, and duration of effort.

**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.



## **Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application**

### **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 its 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.

### **Basis for Rating Applications**

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 and is identified as an attachment to an application. 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 person'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.

### **Code deficiencies / Protection of structure / Life safety**

(Application Question 4a; Points possible: ~~50~~70)

- Points will be assigned for code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions when the application documents the deficiency, the need for correction, and how the project corrects the deficiency. A condition may only receive points in one scoring condition area.
- Simply identifying a condition in the application will not necessarily generate points. A well-described and documented condition that provides for full evaluation and point awards will include specificity, with attached documentation to support the narrative.
- Age of building system is considered based on the calendar year in which the project would receive funding.
- A project can address a single condition or multiple conditions. Evaluate the severity of each condition. Incremental point adjustments from those provided in the below matrix may be provided for the age of the system, severity, the nature of the item, and effect on the school facility.
- A 3-point increase should be provided if a code deficiency is documented and cited by an appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority. The most common conditions are noted with an asterisk (“\*”) in the matrices.
- Does the project scope combine severe and non-severe or critical and non-critical conditions? Inclusion of unrelated non-severe or non-critical conditions in a project will reduce the overall score of the project based on a percentage of project cost.
- Points for mixed-conditions can total more than the possible points. Combined points are weighted using a ratio of construction cost for correcting scored conditions to the total requested construction cost of the project except for any code condition where the percentage of its cost to the average of cost of all conditions is less than half of the percentage of its points to the average of all condition points. In that case, the weighting is shifted to the percentage of the condition cost to the total project cost increased by a percentage of condition points to total condition points. In no case will less than 0.5 point be assigned to a condition [with the exception of Interior Ceiling, Wall, and Floor Finishes that are scored at 0 points but for which the cost of correction can be included in the construction cost for corrected score conditions](#).
- Per 4 AAC 31.022(c)(8), scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted.

Points will be assigned using the following suggested guidelines.

<b>Structural</b> Condition Issue	Pts
Seismic - no restrictions	3
Foundation/Floor - no PE	4
Seismic - minimal restrictions	6
Upper Floor Structure - no PE	9
Vertical Structure - no PE	9
Roof Structure - no PE	10
Foundation/Floor - PE	15
Seismic - moderate restriction	15
Upper Floor Structure - PE	20
Vertical Structure - PE	20
Roof Structure - PE	24
Seismic/Gravity Partial Closure <sup>1</sup>	28
Seismic/Gravity Full Closure <sup>1</sup>	50

<b>Roof/Envelope</b> Condition Issue	Pts
Siding Failure, age <25yr	2
Siding Finish	2
Doors, age >20yr	3
Roof, age >Warranty +5yr <sup>3</sup>	3
Roof, age >Warranty +10yr <sup>3</sup>	6
Roof Leaks WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	8
ASHRAE 90.1 Windows <sup>4</sup>	8*
ASHRAE 90.1 Insulation <sup>4</sup>	10*
Siding Material, age >25yr	12
Windows, age >30yrs	12
Siding Failure, age >25yr	15
Roof Leaks, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	15
Doors w/ Egress issues	15*
Roof Leaks affect space, w/ WO documentation	25

<b>Arch/Interior/ADA</b> Condition Issue	Pts
ADA - 1 category	1
ADA - 2 categories	2
DEC Sanitation	2
ADA - 3 categories	3
Ceiling Finishes age >25yr	<del>3</del> 0
Wall Finishes age >25yr	<del>3</del> 0
Elevator Issues	3
ADA - 4+ categories	4
Floor Finishes >15yr	<del>4</del> 0
Elevator Violations	7
Building Egress	10*
Rated Assemblies	12*

<b>Mechanical</b> Condition Issue	Pts
Controls, DDC Deficiency	3
Mech. System, age >30yr	4
Ventilation, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	5
Plumbing, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	6
Heating, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	7
Controls, Pneumatic	8
Ventilation, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	9
Plumbing, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	10
Heating, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	11
Ventilation, Codes	12*
Plumbing, Codes	12*
Heating, Codes	13*
Boilers, 1 of 2 Non-op	13
HVAC age >40yr	15
Boilers, 2 of 3 Non-op	18
Mechanical System, WO >5/yr <sup>2</sup>	21
Heating Failure	25

<b>Electrical</b> Condition Issue	Pts
Lighting, age >25yr	2
Electrical age >30yr	4
Power, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	4
Lighting, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	4
Back-up Generator Inoperable	5
Egress/EM lights, WO <3/yr <sup>2</sup>	5
Power, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	7
Lighting, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	7
Egress/EM lights, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	8
Intercom Issues, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	8
Lighting, Codes	10*
Power, Codes	10*
Intercom Failure	10
Electrical, age >40yr	15
Lighting Levels, <50% of code	16
Electrical System, WO >5/yr <sup>2</sup>	21
Power Failure	25

<b>Fire Alarm/Sprinkler</b> Condition Issue	Pts
Fire Alarm age >15yr	2
Sprinkler >30yr	2
Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >30yr	5
Sprinkler Coverage Gaps	5*
FA Non-addressable	6*
FA/Sprinkler, WO >1/yr <sup>2</sup>	8
Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >40yr	10
FA/Sprinkler, WO >3/yr <sup>2</sup>	15
Fire Alarm Non-op, <3 floors	17
FA/Sprinkler, WO >5/yr <sup>2</sup>	20
Fire Alarm Non-op, >3 floors	25
Sprinkler Non-op	30

Site Condition Issue	Pts
Vehicle Surfaces	3
Walkways and Surfaces	4
Drainage Issues	6
Playground Code	12
Power Issues	15*
Wastewater Issues	15*
Water Issues	16*
Wastewater Failure	24
Water Failure	25

UST/AST/HazMat Condition Issue	Pts
HazMat (all) Low Exposures	3*
UST, age >30yr	2
AST, age >40yr	5
Sewage Lagoon Failure/ Exposure	5
UST/AST Leak	7
UST/AST USCG/40 CFR Cite	10
HazMat (all) Mod Exposures	10*
HazMat (all) High Exposures	22*

**Definitions:**

PE = documented by a Professional Engineer  
 No PE = not documented by a Professional Engineer  
 WO = Work Orders provided w/ application

**Notes:**

- <sup>1</sup> If district does not qualify for space, points limited to 15.
- <sup>2</sup> Average of prior 3 years, provide work orders. See application instructions.
- <sup>3</sup> Provide copy of roof warranty.
- <sup>4</sup> Provide existing R-value or code violation of system.

**Regional community facilities**

(Application Question 5h; Points possible: 5)

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

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc. The narrative discussion is documented with photos, maps, facility profiles, etc.	5 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc.	4 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided.	3 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified.	2 points
A community inventory is provided.	1 point
Question has not been answered	0 points

## Cost estimate for total project cost

(Application Questions 7a - 7c; Points possible: 0-30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- 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?).
- Check for double entries, including factored items, cost after adjustment for geographic factor, and percentages and justification (with backup) when percentages exceed DEED guidelines.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate including lump sum or actual construction costs.
- 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.
- Completed project costs are supported by competitive selection documentation, and DEED-approval of in-house labor or an alternative procurement method, as needed.

Points reflect the reasonableness and completeness evaluation and will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<del>The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on construction document level cost estimate, bid tabulations, or actual invoices.</del>	<del>27-30</del> points
<del>The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 65% design development level specifications and drawings.</del>	<del>23-26</del> points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 35% schematic design level documents.	<del>18-22</del> <u>24-30</u> points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on concept design level documents. The DEED demand cost model is acceptable as a planning/ concept level cost estimate.	<del>12-17</del> <u>15-23</u> points
The cost estimate is not adequately developed to support concept level costs. Components may not be present to confirm scope of work, reasonableness and completeness or other elements. Project may be at an early preliminary stage.	6-1 <u>4</u> points
Construction costs are not supported or many cost elements are missing.	1-5 points

## Emergency conditions

(Application Question 8a; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency, points will not be awarded.
- Consider the ranking of the project on the district six-year plan.
- Consider the "level of threat" to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider the "impact" on the use of the facility due to the emergency condition.
- Consider the "immediacy" of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the level of description and documentation provided.
- Consider whether the description provided is congruent with other application elements.
- Does the project scope include non-emergency conditions? Scoring of mixed-scope projects, which address both emergency and non-emergency conditions, should be weighted based on the amount of emergency work that is included in the project.
- Nothing in this scoring element should restrict a system with premature failures from being assigned points when the conditions for assigning points in that category are met.

Points will be assigned in increments according to the level of threat using the following suggested guidelines. High threat emergency projects with high emergency points are infrequent.

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the loss of the building, and that the students are currently unhoused.	50 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. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	25-45 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. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation from the local or state official providing the date when the repairs need to be completed. The documentation addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	5-25 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. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy for the emergency, the circumstances surrounding the damaged portion of the building, and the portion of the building that is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the failure, and that the students are currently unhoused.	25-45 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 may have 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. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the high probability of the failure and documents the requirement to restrict use of the building until corrected.	5-25 points

**Inadequacies of Existing Space**

(Application Question 8b; Points possible: 40)

- Scoring is based on the described and documented inability of existing space to adequately serve the instructional program. Points are not awarded for code violations.
- Consider the adequacy of the space in terms of both form and function, crowding, and upgrades to space that support the instructional program.
- Balance consideration of educational adequacy of physical arrangement versus functional factors.
- Scoring should take into consideration whether the inadequate space is for a mandatory instructional program or a new or existing local program.
- Does the project include improvements to functionally adequate space? Scoring of projects with functionally adequate space and inadequate space should weight the amount of work improving inadequate space that is included in the project.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The existing space as described and documented is significantly inadequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility is severely overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	25-40 points
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility is moderately overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	11-24 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility has minor or no overcrowding, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space.	1-10 points
A major maintenance project that describes and documents the inadequacy of the existing space that is an additional condition being addressed in the project.	0-5 points

**Other options**

(Application Question 8c; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed. Does the discussion provide alternatives and details that support a strong vetting of the project options?
- Consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other. Does the comparison of options support the project chosen?
- 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.
- Consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For installed mechanical equipment, was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new?
- For over-crowding, was double shifting or other alternatives considered?
- [For multi-system replacement or substantial renovation projects was new construction considered as an option?](#)

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Were the options considered viable alternatives? The options are fully described viable options that are supported by a life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefits analysis that compare the cost of the options; an explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	21-25 points
The options are fully described viable options that include cost comparisons between options. An explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option; however, no life cycle cost analysis is included. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	11-20 points
A description is included for each option; however, the options are not supported with additional documentation or cost analysis. The options contain the proposed project and at least one other viable option.	1-10 points

### Annual operating cost savings

(Application question 8d; 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.
- 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.
- 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).

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of 10 years or less.	21-30 points
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of between 10 and 20 years.	11-20 points
A summary analysis that includes a projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The projected operational cost savings documents efforts to contain or reduce operating costs and has a payback that exceeds 20 years.	6-10 points
Stated opinion regarding estimated cost savings that could be achieved with the project.	1-5 points

**District preventive maintenance and facilities management**  
 (Application Questions 9a, 9e-9h; Points possible: 25 evaluative)

**Maintenance Management Narrative**

(Application Question 9a; Points possible: 5)

- Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine?
- How well does the program work for each individual school?
- Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil? (Note: components as used here and below may also be referred to as ‘equipment’.)
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the maintenance management (MM) program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom; how component work order history and trends are used.</p> <p>Provides sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials.</p> <p>Provides sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance.</p> <p>Provides sample corrective work orders showing progression of scheduling from initial response to completion or deferral.</p> <p>Provides a component report for a minimum of 10% of main school facilities showing the date of installation and date of scheduled renewal or replacement; includes components from each building system listed in DEED’s R&amp;R schedule.</p>	5 points
<p>Narrative describes the MM program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials (where applicable). Sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance.</p>	4 points
<p>Narrative describes the MM program and all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification, tracking and completion; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor on those work orders, and cost of materials on at least one corrective work order.</p>	3 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Minimal narrative that partially describes the MM program but not all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing some, but not all of the types: PM, routine maintenance and corrective work.	2 points
Minimal narrative that partially describes the MM program but not all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification; how work orders are initiated and by whom. No sample work orders.	1 point
No narrative or an abbreviated narrative that provides no information of how the maintenance management program works. No sample work orders.	0 points

**Energy Management Narrative**

(Application Question 9e; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities?
- Is a comprehensive set of methods being used?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?
- Is there a method for evaluating existing facilities’ need for commissioning?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, benchmarking, energy audits and assessments, and implementation/execution of energy efficiency measures (EEMs).</p> <p>Provides data showing that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility over the prior five years—by energy type.</p> <p>Provides an energy management guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above.</p> <p>Provides a report showing a five-year history of implemented EEMs. Provides a complete set of energy consumption records (Application Q.9f).</p>	5 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, and examples of energy efficiency projects or initiatives.</p> <p>Provides data showing that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type.</p> <p>Provides an energy management guideline or manual, issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items.</p> <p>Application includes the complete set of energy records was provided for Q.9f.</p>	4 points
<p>Narrative describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring. Shows that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type.</p> <p>Provides an energy management guideline or manual covering the items above.</p> <p>Provides a complete set of energy consumption records (Application Q.9f).</p>	3 points
<p>Narrative has useful description of the Energy Management program including some of the following: program structure, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring. Shows that the program tracks energy usage by facility (not by campus) and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type.</p> <p>A complete set of energy records is not provided (Application Q.9f).</p>	2 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Energy Management program but is not complete; a complete set of energy records is not provided (Q.9f).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No narrative, but complete set of energy records was provided (Q9.f).</p>	1 point
<p>No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Energy Management program. No energy records are provided (Q.9f).</p>	0 points

## Custodial Narrative

(Application Question 9f; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district’s custodial program complete?
- Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice?
- Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is the written custodial plan(s) attached?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, and performance verification/quality control.</p> <p>Provides custodial program guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above.</p> <p>Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on industry practice. Lists staffing requirements for the facility based on these metrics and industry standards for productivity.</p> <p>Provides a report which tabulates the preceding information (types and quantities of information, etc.) for all main schools in the district, including staffing requirements. OR Provides no less than two facility examples each year of submission with no repeats within a five-year period. If the district operates fewer than 10 schools, provided one-third of all facilities each year.</p> <p>Provide at least 5 work orders generated by the custodial program in the previous 12 months.</p> <p>Provides completed sets of quality control and inspection checklists for no less than two facilities for the previous fiscal year period.</p>	5 points
<p>Narrative describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, performance verification/quality control.</p> <p>Provides custodial program guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above.</p> <p>Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and that list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on industry practice; provides no less than two facility examples of the facility-specific information.</p> <p>Provides samples of quality control and inspection checklists.</p>	4 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative describes the Custodial program including all of the following: district custodial policy, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, and adopted custodial standards.</p> <p>Provides custodial program guideline or manual that is general in nature and not site specific.</p>	3 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Custodial program including some of the following: district custodial policy, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, and adopted custodial standards.</p>	2 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Custodial program but is not complete.</p>	1 point
<p>No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Custodial program. No written custodial program guideline or manual.</p>	0 points

### Maintenance Training Narrative

(Application Question 9g; Points possible: 5)

- Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff?
- Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems?
- Are training schedules attached?
- How is Training Recorded?
- How is effectiveness measured?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, training scheduling and tracking, and measurement of program effectiveness.</p> <p>Identifies individual training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported; identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis.</p> <p>Provides a sample analysis of job functions (e.g., driving, work order management, etc.) and required building system knowledge (e.g., boiler tuning, lock-out/tag-out, etc.) for at least one job classification.</p> <p>Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type.</p> <p>Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual.</p> <p>Provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the training program which, at a minimum includes data on scheduled versus completed training.</p>	5 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, and training scheduling and tracking.</p> <p>Identifies training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported, identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis.</p> <p>Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type.</p> <p>Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual.</p>	4 points
<p>Narrative describes the Training program including some of the following: training policy, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, and training scheduling and tracking.</p> <p>Provides a training plan for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and/ or type.</p> <p>Provides a log of completed training but not by individual.</p>	3 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Training program but is not complete.</p> <p>Provides training logs that show minimal maintenance or custodial training, primarily HR/OSHA training.</p>	2 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Training program but is not complete.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Training logs with no actual maintenance or custodial training. Only HR/OSHA training.</p> <p>*Training Logs with only HR/OSHA training can never exceed 1 point.</p>	1 point
<p>No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Training program. No training logs</p>	0 points

## Capital Planning Narrative

(Application Question 9h; Points possible: 5)

- Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs?
- Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?
- Does the system involve building occupants and users?
- Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?
- Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?
- Does review of projects on six-year plan show evidence of use of capital planning process, including renewal and replacement scheduled.

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative fully describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification (condition assessments, user input, maintenance work order history/trends, etc.), development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans, and identification of capital project resources and funding.</p> <p>Provides capital planning report issued/updated within the past 12 months and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan and includes capital projects programmed from all fund sources, local, state, and federal.</p> <p>Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a facility condition assessment not older than five years where FCI has the following formula.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px auto; width: fit-content;"> <math display="block">\text{FCI} = \frac{\text{Cost of Current and Deferred Renewal}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}</math> </div> <p>Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district.</p> <p>Provides a condition assessment for every project requesting state-aid in the first year of the 6-yr CIP plan.</p> <p>Provides a districtwide trend for combined FCI for a minimum of five prior years and tracks districtwide capital expenditures for main schools for a minimum of five prior years.</p>	<p>5 points</p>

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
<p>Narrative describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy , capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification based on condition assessments, and development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans.</p> <p>Provides capital planning report and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan.</p> <p>Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a current DEED Renewal &amp; Replacement Schedule, where FCI has the following formula.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;"> <math display="block">FCI = \frac{\text{Cost of Current and Deferred Renewal}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}</math> </div> <p>Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district.</p>	4 points
<p>Narrative describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal, development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans.</p> <p>Provides a 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan.</p>	3 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Capital Planning program but is not complete.</p> <p>Provides R&amp;R documents for all facilities in which state-aid for CIP is listed in the 6-yr plan.</p>	2 points
<p>Narrative has some useful description of the Capital Planning program but is not complete; R&amp;R documents not provided for all required facilities.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No narrative, but provides R&amp;R documents for all required facilities.</p>	1 point
<p>No narrative or abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Capital Planning program. Lacks R&amp;R documents for all required facilities.</p>	0 points

## **Formula-Driven Guidelines**

### **District Funding Equalizer**

(Application Question 8e; Points possible: 20)

- Scoring of this question will be based on data collected by the department regarding the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced priced meals, as obtained from the National School Lunch Program or from a district’s E-Rate application.

<b><u>Scoring Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Points</u></b>
<u>100% NSLP or E-Rate Participation</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>50% to 100%</u>	<u>% x 20</u>
<u>Less than 50%</u>	<u>0</u>

### **Condition/Component survey**

(Application question 6a; Points possible: 0-10 – non-evaluative)

- Condition/component survey age is relative to the earlier of either the application submittal deadline or the project’s substantial completion.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

<b>Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>
Condition/component survey is a comprehensive product that informs the project. It includes a full description of existing systems, including code deficiencies, and provides recommendations for upgrades related to all deficiencies described. Costs associated with each deficiency and upgrades are provided as applicable. Supplements may be included such as special inspections, engineering calculations, photographs, drawings, etc. Floor plans, with building area designations and room identifications, are encouraged. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural engineered systems, may have been completed by an architect, engineer, or persons with documented expertise in a building system. It is less than 6 years old.	10 points
Condition/component survey contains many of the required elements as listed above, but not all. It is less than 10 years old.	8 points
Condition/component survey informs the project. Supplements such as special inspections, engineering calculations and drawings that would further document conditions justifying the project are not provided or documentation is not substantial. It is less than 10 years old.	5 points
Condition/component survey is more than 10 years old, but may still contain some relevant building information pertaining to the project.	3 points
Condition/component survey has not been submitted or does not inform the project.	0 points

### Use of prior school design

(Application Question 6b; Points possible: 10)

- Are complete documents of the proposed reused school plans provided?
- Is evidence of ownership of proposed reused school plans provided?
- Has an analysis been done of the anticipated deviations and revisions from the proposed reused school plan been accomplished? Is an estimated cost of those deviations (+ or -) been computed?
- Have design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans been estimated along with an estimated cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
1. The district or municipality owns the reused school plans. 2. The reused school plans are less than 5 years old or have been updated within the prior 5 years. 3. A supported estimate of planned deviations from the reused school plans is less than 1% of the estimated cost of construction. 4. A supported estimate of construction cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of construction costs of a new school plan alternative. 5. A supported estimate of design cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of design services costs of a new school plan alternative.	10 points
Any four of the above factors are achieved.	8 points
Any three of the above factors are achieved.	6 points
Any two of the above factors are achieved.	4 points
Any one of the above factors is achieved.	2 points
None of the above factors are achieved.	0 points

### Use of prior building system design

(Application Question 6c; Points possible: 10)

- Up to two points are available for capital renewal of a complete system, a subsystem, or a component renewal in each of the following systems: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power.
- Has evidence been provided that the identified building system is part of a written standard that meets ASHRAE 90.1-2016 prescriptive requirements?
- This point category is not applicable to projects receiving scores for use of a prior school design.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
The reused building system design is part of a provided written municipal or school district building system standard.	2 points

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

Date:

District:

Project:

Is the project eligible based on below checklist?    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.

Item	Primary Application Question(s)	Eligibility Item Description	Yes	No
A	All	The application is complete and all questions are fully answered – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)		
B	2a	The district’s CIP-6 year plan has been submitted – AS 14.11.011(b)(1) Project is identified in the current CIP year of the plan.		
C	2b	The district has an auditable fixed asset inventory system – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)		
D	2c	Evidence of replacement cost property insurance – AS 14.11.011(b)(2)		
E	8g-f	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	2d & 3d	Evidence that project should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance or custodial care – AS 14.11.011(b)(3)		
G	3d & 3e	Evidence that project meets the criteria of one of the A-F categories – AS 14.11.013 (a)(1)		
H	3d,3e, 3f, 4a, & Sec. 7	A detailed scope of work, project budget, and documentation of need – AS 14.11.011 (b)(1)		
I	3e, Sec. 7, & 8c	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, as needed, 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	5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, & 5g	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)		
<u>K</u>	<u>5e, 5f, 5g, &amp; 8c</u>	<u>For projects involving multi-system replacement or substantial renovation, documentation demonstrates that alternatives were evaluated, including renovation versus new construction of smaller facilities – AS 14.11.013(c)(1) &amp; (c)(3)(C)</u>		
<u>LK</u>	3d, 4a, 5h, 8b, & 8c	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)		
<u>ML</u>	5h & 8c	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)		
<u>NM</u>	2e & Sec. 9	DEED 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)		
<u>ON</u>	All	Adequate documentation supporting the project request – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1)		

**Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
Capital Improvement Project Application  
Formula-Driven Rating Form**

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fund: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rater: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
CIP ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Category: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

Formula Driven Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
<b>1. District funding equalizer (Question 8e)</b> <u>Percentage of free/reduced meals: if &lt;50%, 0; if &gt;50% then percentage times 20</u>	<u>/20</u>	<u>/20</u>
<b>2. Preventive maintenance program (Questions 9b - 9d, 9f)</b>		
A. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters (9b) 15 points	<u>/15</u>	<u>/15</u>
B. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters (9c) 10 points	<u>/10</u>	<u>/10</u>
C. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. (9d) 5 points If % < 4, then (% x 1.25); If % > 4, then 5	<u>/5</u>	<u>/5</u>
D. Energy consumption reports (9f) 5 points	<u>/5</u>	<u>/5</u>
<b>23. District ranking (Question 3a)</b> Only eligible project requests are used to calculate ranking points Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less	<u>/30</u>	<u>/30</u>
<b>34. Weighted average age of facility FCI (Question 3b)</b>	<u>/1530</u>	<u>/1530</u>
A. <del>0-10 years = 0-0.2 FCI = 0 points</del>		
B. <del>&gt;10 ≤ 20 years = .2 / year in excess of 10 years</del> >0.2 > 0.4 FCI = 0 + 0.5 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.2 FCI		
C. <del>&gt;20 ≤ 30 years = 2 + 0.5 per year in excess of 20 years</del> >0.4 ≥ 0.6 FCI = 5 + 0.75 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.4 FCI		
D. <del>&gt;30 ≤ 40 years = 7 + 0.8 per year in excess of 30 years</del> >0.6 ≥ 0.8 FCI = 12.5 + 1.75 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.6 FCI		
E. <del>&gt;40 years = 15 points</del> >0.8 FCI = 30 points		
<b>45. Condition/Component Survey (Question 6a)</b> Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points	<u>/10</u>	<u>/10</u>
<b>56. Use of Prior Design Plans or Buildings System Design (Questions 6b-6c)</b>		
A. Prior Design Plan (school construction only) (6b) = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 points OR		
B. District standard = Two points each system: Building Envelope, Plumbing, HVAC, Lighting, Power	<u>/10</u>	<u>/10</u>
<b>67. Planning &amp; design phase has been completed (Question 6d-6g and Appendix B)</b>	<u>/205</u>	<u>/205</u>
A. All required elements of planning = 10 points		
B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points		
<del>C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points</del>		
<b>78. Prior AS 14.11 funding for this project (Questions 8e &amp; 7a)</b> Phased funding = 30 points, Supplemental funding = 15 points, No previous funding = 0 points	<u>/30</u>	<u>/30</u>
<b>89. Unhoused students today (Questions 5a-5g)</b>	<u>/50</u>	<u>N/A</u>
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points		
<b>910. Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy) (Questions 5a-5g)</b> Unhoused due to loss of eligible square footage based on external environmental factors is scored at half of the points identified.	<u>/30</u>	<u>N/A</u>
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points		

Formula Driven Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
<b>1011. Type of space added or improved</b> (Question 3j) A. Instructional or resource 30 points B. Support teaching 25 points C. Food service, recreational, and general support 15 points D. Supplemental 10 points	<u>      </u> /30	<u>      </u> N/A
<b>Formula-Driven</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	
	/265	/155

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fund: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Rater: \_\_\_\_\_ CIP ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Category: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluative Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
<b>1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program</b> (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Narrative (9a)	<u>      </u> /5	<u>      </u> /5
B. Energy Management Narrative (9e)	<u>      </u> /5	<u>      </u> /5
C. Custodial Narrative (9g)	<u>      </u> /5	<u>      </u> /5
D. Maintenance Training Narrative (9h)	<u>      </u> /5	<u>      </u> /5
E. Capital Planning Narrative (9i)	<u>      </u> /5	<u>      </u> /5
<b>2. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions</b> (Question 4a)	<u>      </u> /570	<u>      </u> /570
<b>3. Reasonableness &amp; completeness of cost or cost estimate</b> (Questions 7a-7c)	<u>      </u> /30	<u>      </u> /30
<b>4. Emergency conditions</b> (Question 8a) Did application check "yes"? <input type="checkbox"/> Did discussion support emergency status? <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>      </u> /50	<u>      </u> /50
<b>5. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs</b> (Question 8b)	<u>      </u> /40	<u>      </u> /5+
<b>6. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project</b> (Question 8c)	<u>      </u> /25	<u>      </u> /25

<b>7. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings</b> (Question 8d)	<u>      /30</u>	<u>      /30</u>
<b>8. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project</b> (Question 5g)	<u>      /5</u>	<u>  N/A  </u>
<b>Evaluative</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	
	<b>/255</b>	<b>/215</b>



March 30, 2026

Alaska Dept. of Education and Early Development  
Division of School Finance and Facilities  
801 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Attn: Michael Butikofer, Facilities Manager

Re: Program Demand Cost Model - Model School Summary of Proposed Changes

Dear Mr. Butikofer,

Attached please find our summary of changes to the Model School Escalation Study. The first item acknowledges the DEED requested modification #1. Other items are updates to pricing or information on trends. After review should you have questions, require additional information, or have suggestions, we would be pleased to discuss them.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick Peshel', written in a cursive style.

Rick Peshel, Estimator



1. HMS recognizes that DEED requested modification #1, a correction to the GACF of the Kenai Peninsula Borough – Homer Area was successfully made by DEED and now shows the appropriate percentage.
2. Material prices have remained highly volatile over the past year, driven by tariffs, production constraints, extended lead times, and sustained demand. Increases have been observed across most sectors, with the most significant impact in metals. Steel, aluminum, and copper have risen approximately 20-40%, influenced in part by tariffs reaching up to 50%, with these costs ultimately carried through contractor pricing. Steel procurement and delivery challenges continue to compound these pressures. Mechanical and electrical components have also experienced notable increases, with pricing often quote dependent and, in some cases, only guaranteed for short durations. Finish materials have risen more moderately, averaging approximately 3.5%. Equipment costs for the Model School have increased significantly due to the observation that commercial grade systems capable of supporting a student and staff population are required. Overall, material costs for the Model School have increased just under 5%, with the expectation that further review of mechanical systems and structural components may push this figure higher.
3. Over the past year, labor cost growth continues to rise but at a moderated rate, increasing approximately 3.4% over the past year. Union and skilled labor rates have outpaced non-union labor, largely driven by negotiated agreements and sustained demand for specialized trades. Additional upward pressure on labor costs is being driven by a reduced bidder pool, as contractors have ample work availability, along with ongoing shortages of skilled labor across multiple disciplines. Accelerated project delivery methods are further contributing to increased costs by driving premium time and reduced schedule flexibility.
4. Recent industry data from the Associated General Contractors (AGC) indicates continued strain in the construction labor market and a dampened future outlook. The declining overall confidence in labor coupled with 39% of firms reporting larger backlogs year-over-year, signals a sustained demand in work with a labor force that cannot keep up. Labor availability is believed to remain a significant challenge for contractors, with over 80% of firms reporting difficulty finding qualified hourly craft and salaried workers. These hiring challenges are further compounded by factors such as increased immigration enforcement, funding uncertainty, and extended construction timelines.



5. Tariffs have emerged as one of the primary drivers of construction cost escalation this year. Ongoing volatility in their implementation, scope, and magnitude has increased perceived risk across the contracting community, with these risks ultimately being passed through to owners. Key materials including structural steel, copper piping, and electrical wiring continue to experience upward pricing pressure. These impacts, once uncertain, have now materially affected the construction industry and are expected to persist as long as market conditions remain characterized by uncertainty, elevated risk, and an imbalance between strong demand and constrained material and labor supply.

STATE OF ALASKA  
ESCALATION COST STUDY

MODEL SCHOOL BUILDING  
SUMMARY COST COMPARISON REPORT

APRIL 2026



STATE OF ALASKA ESCALATION COST STUDY - SUMMARY COST COMPARISON REPORT  
 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA (BASE)  
 APRIL 2026



HMS Project No.: 26013

**SUMMARY COST COMPARISON**

	<i>2025 Total</i>	<i>2026 Total</i>	<i>Delta</i>	<i>Comments</i>
01 - SITE	\$ 2,014,541	\$ 2,231,404	10.76%	Increased material costs
02 - SUBSTRUCTURE	1,078,303	1,109,606	2.90%	Increased material costs
03 - SUPERSTRUCTURE	3,751,300	3,812,262	1.63%	Increased metals and materials costs
04 - EXTERIOR CLOSURE	1,670,581	1,816,683	8.75%	Increased material costs
05 - ROOF SYSTEMS	1,899,692	2,069,406	8.93%	Increased material costs
06 - INTERIORS	2,701,020	2,794,514	3.46%	Increased finishes and material costs
07 - CONVEYORS	0	0	N/A	
08 - MECHANICAL	3,747,026	3,797,799	1.36%	Increased material costs
09 - ELECTRICAL	1,981,190	2,062,016	4.08%	Increased material costs
10 - EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS	144,095	220,871	53.28%	Increased material costs for commercial equip.
11 - SPECIAL CONDITIONS	0	0	N/A	
<i>SUBTOTAL:</i>	<i>\$ 18,987,748</i>	<i>\$ 19,914,561</i>	<i>4.88%</i>	
12 - GENERAL CONDITIONS	4,147,474	4,359,663	5.12%	
<i>SUBTOTAL:</i>	<i>\$ 23,135,222</i>	<i>\$ 24,274,224</i>	<i>4.92%</i>	
13 - CONTINGENCIES	2,313,522	2,427,422	4.92%	
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST:</b>	<b>\$ 25,448,744</b>	<b>\$ 26,701,646</b>	<b>4.92%</b>	
<i>COST PER SQUARE FOOT:</i>	<i>\$ 614.70 /SF</i>	<i>\$ 644.97 /SF</i>		
<i>GROSS FLOOR AREA:</i>	<i>41,400 SF</i>	<i>41,400 SF</i>		

Note: State of Alaska Labor rates for April 2026 have not yet been released.

STATE OF ALASKA  
DRAFT ESCALATION COST STUDY

MODEL SCHOOL BUILDING  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA (BASE)

APRIL 2026



HMS Project No.: 26013

## ***MODIFICATIONS BASED ON THE FOLLOWING***

### **LABOR RATES**

A.S. Title 36 Minimum Rates of Pay for Laborers and Mechanics, Pamphlet No. 600, Issue 50, effective April 1, 2025.

### **SBS RATES**

Price List February 2026.

### **PLUMBING PIPING**

Ferguson, February 2026; RSMeans 2026; Google product searches.

### **CONCRETE**

Anchorage Sand & Gravel, Spring 2026 based on standard 4,000 lb., 5 1/2 sack mix, 4,000 psi design strength, no air entrainment.

### **ELECTRICAL WIRE/CONDUIT**

Crescent Electric and North Coast Electric, February 2026.

Light fixture pricing is based on review of recent lighting quotes, RSMeans 2026, and Google product searches.

### **STRUCTURAL STEEL**

Steel Fab of Anchorage, Alaska, March 2026.

Bar Joists and Metal Deck, Andy Milner Company, March 2026.

HMS Project No.: 26013

**ALASKAN CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION INDEX**

<i>Base Year 1980</i>	<i>Estimated Basis for Calculations</i>	<i>100.00</i>
1980	\$ 1,038,604	100.00
1981	1,084,425	104.40
1982	1,125,068	107.70
1983	1,200,180	115.60
1984	1,231,503	118.60
1985	1,222,949	117.70
1986	1,261,102	121.40
1987	1,277,361	123.00
1988	1,296,492	124.80
1989	1,312,471	126.40
1990	1,368,466	131.80
1991	1,394,828	134.30
1992	1,441,972	138.80
1993	1,488,141	143.30
1994	1,499,924	144.40
1995	1,488,894	143.40
1996	1,518,343	146.20
1997*	5,895,775	146.70
1998*	6,038,745	149.12
1999*	6,146,839	150.96
2000*	6,243,856	152.60
2001*	6,357,677	154.53
2002*	6,829,911	162.54
2003*	7,053,768	166.34
2004*	7,999,739	176.57
2005*	8,719,586	188.55
2006*	9,629,545	198.41
2007*	10,306,665	205.73
2008**	12,742,474	208.59
2009**	12,865,338	209.55

HMS Project No.: 26013

**ALASKAN CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION INDEX**

<i>Base Year 1980</i>	<i>Estimated Basis for Calculations</i>	<i>100.00</i>
2010**	\$ 13,228,267	212.38
2011**	13,742,935	216.27
2012**	14,073,498	218.67
2013**	14,664,252	222.87
2014**	15,245,384	223.78
2015**	15,470,256	228.32
2016**	15,414,300	227.96
2017**	15,714,707	229.91
2018***	16,696,141	236.16
2019***	16,932,962	237.58
2020***	17,255,758	239.49
2021***	18,537,450	246.92
2022	21,343,029	262.23
2023	22,276,520	266.60
2024	24,147,110	275.00
2025	25,448,744	280.39
2026	26,701,646	285.31

\* These are a representative project which was updated in 1997 through 2007 to reflect, at that time, changes for a representative project including technological developments.

\*\* Improved school including current IT electrical installation, steel structure and other improvements.

\*\*\* Improved school including incorporation of ASHRAE 90.1 envelope requirements.

HMS Project No.: 26013

**MODEL SCHOOL ESCALATION COST SUMMARY**

	<i>Material</i>	<i>Labor</i>	<i>Total</i>
01 - SITE	\$ 1,561,627	\$ 669,777	\$ 2,231,404
02 - SUBSTRUCTURE	532,828	576,778	1,109,606
03 - SUPERSTRUCTURE	3,119,860	692,402	3,812,262
04 - EXTERIOR CLOSURE	1,174,868	641,815	1,816,683
05 - ROOF SYSTEMS	1,276,803	792,603	2,069,406
06 - INTERIORS	1,738,885	1,055,629	2,794,514
07 - CONVEYORS	0	0	0
08 - MECHANICAL	2,527,918	1,269,881	3,797,799
09 - ELECTRICAL	1,107,905	954,111	2,062,016
10 - EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS	195,646	25,225	220,871
11 - SPECIAL CONDITIONS	0	0	0
<i>SUBTOTAL:</i>	<i>\$ 13,236,340</i>	<i>\$ 6,678,221</i>	<i>\$ 19,914,561</i>
12 - GENERAL CONDITIONS			4,359,663
<i>SUBTOTAL:</i>			<i>\$ 24,274,224</i>
13 - CONTINGENCIES			2,427,422
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST:</b>			<b>\$ 26,701,646</b>
<i>COST PER SQUARE FOOT:</i>			<i>\$ 644.97 /SF</i>
<i>GROSS FLOOR AREA:</i>			<i>41,400 SF</i>

HMS Project No.: 26013

**ELEMENTAL SUMMARY**

<i>Code and Building System</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Labor</i>	<i>Total Material/Labor</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Cost per Unit</i>	<i>Cost per GSF</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>01 - SITE</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>ACRE</b>				<b>\$ 2,231,404</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>\$ 53.90</b>	<b>8.36%</b>
011 - Reserved	0	0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	0.00%
012 - Site Preparation	3.44	AC	826,829	435,323	1,262,152		366,904.65	30.49	4.73%
013 - Site Improvements	77,200	SISF	502,270	161,376	663,646		8.60	16.03	2.49%
014 - Site Structures	0	STSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
015 - Civil/Mechanical Utilities	490	CMLF	177,585	32,240	209,825		428.21	5.07	0.79%
016 - Site Electrical	1,002	SELF	54,943	40,838	95,781		95.59	2.31	0.36%
017 - Off-Site Work	0	OWLS	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>02 - SUBSTRUCTURE</b>	<b>40,400</b>	<b>TFSF</b>				<b>\$ 1,109,606</b>	<b>\$ 27.47</b>	<b>\$ 26.80</b>	<b>4.16%</b>
021 - Standard Foundations and Basements	40,400	FASF	\$ 286,385	\$ 393,066	\$ 679,451		\$ 16.82	\$ 16.41	2.54%
022 - Slab on Grade	40,400	SLSF	246,443	183,712	430,155		10.65	10.39	1.61%
023 - Reserved	0	0	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
024 - Special Foundations	0	SFSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>03 - SUPERSTRUCTURE</b>	<b>45,170</b>	<b>SSF</b>				<b>\$ 3,812,262</b>	<b>\$ 84.40</b>	<b>\$ 92.08</b>	<b>14.28%</b>
031 - Floor Structure	1,000	FSSF	\$ 96,838	\$ 25,903	\$ 122,741		\$ 122.74	\$ 2.96	0.46%
032 - Roof Structure	44,170	RSSF	3,023,022	666,499	3,689,521		83.53	89.12	13.82%
033 - Stairs	0	FLT	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>04 - EXTERIOR CLOSURE</b>	<b>27,165</b>	<b>ECSF</b>				<b>\$ 1,816,683</b>	<b>\$ 66.88</b>	<b>\$ 43.88</b>	<b>6.80%</b>
041 - Exterior Walls and Soffits	23,665	EWSF	\$ 732,944	\$ 560,240	\$ 1,293,184		\$ 54.65	\$ 31.24	4.84%
042 - Exterior Glazing	3,500	EGSF	352,539	72,311	424,850		121.39	10.26	1.59%
043 - Exterior Doors	14	EDLF	89,385	9,264	98,649		7,046.36	2.38	0.37%
044 - Exterior Accessories	0	EASF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>05 - ROOF SYSTEMS</b>	<b>44,170</b>	<b>RSF</b>				<b>\$ 2,069,406</b>	<b>\$ 46.85</b>	<b>\$ 49.99</b>	<b>7.75%</b>
051 - Pitched Roof	44,170	PRSF	\$ 1,276,803	\$ 792,603	\$ 2,069,406		\$ 46.85	\$ 49.99	7.75%
052 - Flat Roof	0	FRSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
053 - Roof Accessories	0	RASF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%

HMS Project No.: 26013

**ELEMENTAL SUMMARY**

<i>Code and Building System</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Labor</i>	<i>Total Material/Labor</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Cost per Unit</i>	<i>Cost per GSF</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>06 - INTERIORS</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>PSF</b>				<b>\$ 2,794,514</b>	<b>\$ 56.45</b>	<b>\$ 67.50</b>	<b>10.47%</b>
061 - Partitions and Soffits	49,500	PSSF	\$ 252,097	\$ 350,719	\$ 602,816		\$ 12.18	\$ 14.56	2.26%
062 - Special Partitions	0	SPSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
063 - Interior Openings	79	IOEA	304,020	65,756	369,776		4,680.71	8.93	1.38%
064 - Special Floors	0	RFSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
065 - Interior Finishes	190,540	IFSF	742,184	513,548	1,255,732		6.59	30.33	4.70%
066 - Specialties	2,255	SGSF	440,584	125,606	566,190		251.08	13.68	2.12%
<b>07 - CONVEYORS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>CEA</b>				<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
071 - Passenger Conveyors	0	STOP	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	0.00%
072 - Material Handling Systems	0	MHEA	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>08 - MECHANICAL</b>	<b>8,065</b>	<b>MPLF</b>				<b>\$ 3,797,799</b>	<b>\$ 470.90</b>	<b>\$ 91.73</b>	<b>14.22%</b>
081 - Plumbing	85	PFXT	\$ 187,645	\$ 182,554	\$ 370,199		\$ 4,355.28	\$ 8.94	1.39%
082 - HVAC	68,950	CFM	1,915,038	687,109	2,602,147		37.74	62.85	9.75%
083 - Integrated Automation	160	IAEA	277,759	255,442	533,201		3,332.51	12.88	2.00%
084 - Fire Protection	41,400	FPSF	128,070	138,374	266,444		6.44	6.44	1.00%
085 - Special Mechanical Systems	4	SMPT	19,406	6,402	25,808		6,452.00	0.62	0.10%
<b>09 - ELECTRICAL</b>	<b>2,200</b>	<b>TAMP</b>				<b>\$ 2,062,016</b>	<b>\$ 937.28</b>	<b>\$ 49.81</b>	<b>7.72%</b>
091 - Service and Distribution	1,600	SAMP	\$ 80,490	\$ 42,100	\$ 122,590		\$ 76.62	\$ 2.96	0.46%
092 - Lighting	732	LFXT	351,487	309,887	661,374		903.52	15.98	2.48%
093 - Power	461	PDEA	105,604	167,504	273,108		592.43	6.60	1.02%
094 - Special Systems	8	SEPT	406,055	396,750	802,805		100,350.63	19.39	3.01%
095 - Other Electrical Systems	600	EAMP	164,269	37,870	202,139		336.90	4.88	0.76%
<b>10 - EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>EFEA</b>				<b>\$ 220,871</b>	<b>\$ 1,247.86</b>	<b>\$ 5.34</b>	<b>0.83%</b>
101 - Equipment	65	EQEA	\$ 193,606	\$ 24,624	\$ 218,230		\$ 3,357.38	\$ 5.27	0.82%
102 - Furnishings	112	FUEA	2,040	601	2,641		23.58	0.06	0.01%
<b>11 - SPECIAL CONDITIONS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>SSF</b>				<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
111 - Special Construction	0	SCSF	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	0.00%
112 - Special Demolition	0	SCSF	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
113 - Special Site Conditions	0	EWCY	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>SUBTOTAL DIRECT COST:</b>	<b>41,400</b>	<b>GSF</b>	<b>\$ 13,236,340</b>	<b>\$ 6,678,221</b>	<b>\$ 19,914,561</b>	<b>\$ 19,914,561</b>	<b>\$ 481.03</b>	<b>\$ 481.03</b>	<b>74.58%</b>

HMS Project No.: 26013

**ELEMENTAL SUMMARY**

<i>Code and Building System</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Labor</i>	<i>Total Material/Labor</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Cost per Unit</i>	<i>Cost per GSF</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>12 - GENERAL CONDITIONS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>MOS</b>				<b>\$ 4,359,663</b>	<b>\$ 311,405</b>	<b>\$ 105.31</b>	<b>16.33%</b>
121 - Mobilization/Demobilization	50	TONS	\$ 63,875	\$ 27,192	\$ 91,067		\$ 1,821.34	\$ 2.20	0.34%
122 - Site Staff	14	MOS	25,000	507,100	532,100		38,007.14	12.85	1.99%
123 - Temporary Construction	14	MOS	91,640	51,500	143,140		10,224.29	3.46	0.54%
124 - Equipment and Tools	14	MOS	121,870	63,448	185,318		13,237.00	4.48	0.69%
125 - Miscellaneous	14	MOS	86,000	50,099	136,099		9,721.36	3.29	0.51%
126 - Labor Employment Costs	0	DAYS	0	0	0		0.00	0.00	0.00%
127 - Mark-Ups	14.95%	MU%			3,271,939		N/A	79.03	12.25%
<b>SUBTOTAL PROJECT COSTS:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>MOS</b>				<b>\$ 4,359,663</b>	<b>\$ 311,405</b>	<b>\$ 105.31</b>	<b>16.33%</b>
<b>13 - CONTINGENCIES</b>	<b>10.00%</b>	<b>TC%</b>				<b>\$ 2,427,422</b>		<b>\$ 58.63</b>	<b>9.09%</b>
131 - Estimator's Contingency	10.00%	EST			\$ 2,427,422		N/A	\$ 58.63	9.09%
132 - Escalation Contingency	0.00%	ESC			0		N/A	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST:</b>	<b>41,400</b>	<b>GSF</b>				<b>\$ 26,701,646</b>		<b>\$ 644.97</b>	<b>100%</b>

**BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPPORT PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE ADMINISTRATION**  
**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**  
March 25, 2026

**Mission Statement**

Assist the department in providing support from the Preventative Maintenance Administration to the local districts.

**Current Members**

Kevin Lyon [KLyon@KPBSD.k12.ak.us](mailto:KLyon@KPBSD.k12.ak.us) (chair)

Douglas Hayman [DHayman@KPBSD.k12.ak.us](mailto:DHayman@KPBSD.k12.ak.us)

~~Wheeler, Don A (EED) [don.wheeler@alaska.gov](mailto:don.wheeler@alaska.gov) (DEED)~~ Vacant

Damian Hill [damianhill@lpsd.com](mailto:damianhill@lpsd.com)

Bryan Morgan [bryan\\_morgan@lksd.org](mailto:bryan_morgan@lksd.org)

Representative Rebecca Schwanke, (LEG) [Rep.Rebecca.Schwanke@akleg.gov](mailto:Rep.Rebecca.Schwanke@akleg.gov)

Katrina Church-Chmielowski (LEG) [Katrina.Church-Chmielowski@akleg.gov](mailto:Katrina.Church-Chmielowski@akleg.gov)

**Status Update**

Meeting dates of December 8<sup>th</sup>, January 12<sup>th</sup>, February 9<sup>th</sup> and March 9<sup>th</sup>, participation on the subcommittee has varied by the meeting.

**Task Status**

*On April 10, 2025 the BRGR initiated the formation of a subcommittee focused on School District Support for Preventive Maintenance Administration. This subcommittee would identify common challenges districts face in developing and maintaining effective preventive maintenance (PM) programs, especially in rural and resource-limited areas. It would provide recommendations to the department for possible development of tools and training to streamline compliance with statutory PM requirements, promote best practices, and support long-term facility stewardship.*

*The goal is to strengthen district capacity, reduce deferred maintenance, and ensure Alaska's school facilities are safe, efficient, and sustainable.*

**Sub Tasks:**

1. Preventative maintenance video training library. –
  - a. Access from DEED site. – **Status:** not yet set up due to department staffing.
  - b. Reviewed for accuracy. – **Status:** on hold up due to department staffing
  - c. Create new videos – **Status:** continuing to gather and create video content.
2. Support teams – larger and regional district teams.
  - a. How to assign
  - b. Group size

- c. Funding
  - d. Alaska Good School Maintenance
  - e. AVTEC Programs
  - f. Generalist vs Specialist – need in rural districts
3. State implementation of centralized CMMS. – **Status:** continuing to follow RFI process and potential State funding, discussion on standardizing for districts.
  4. Legislative funding for Department. Building Specialist(s), CMMS system
  5. Define realistic percentage to be spent on major maintenance in current fiscal climate.

**Schedule** committee is continuing to meet monthly with the next meeting scheduled for April 13, 2025.

---

## Funding for Applications and Design Efforts BRIEFING PAPER

---

**By:** Alex Watts

Facilities Review Assistant

**Phone:** 269-3584

**For:** Bond Reimbursement & Grant  
Review Committee

**Date:** March 4, 2026

**File:** G:\SF

Facilities\BR\_GRCom\Subcommittee  
Work\CIP\_Admin Subcommittee  
FY26\ Briefing-Discussion  
Paper.docx

**Subject:** Funding for applications and design  
efforts through the establishment of  
a fund for this purpose

### Background

Since its creation in 1993, the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee (BRGR) has carried a statutory responsibility to develop criteria for construction of schools in the state (AS 14.11.014(b)(3)).

In 2025, a capital improvement project administration subcommittee was established to investigate methods for increasing the quality of applications received to the department for review under AS 14.11.013. The goal is to increase resources to districts so that they may develop higher quality applications that more closely reflect the actual conditions and budgets required to complete their capital improvement projects.

### Discussion

The following questions that need to be addressed are:

- 1) What are the needs of school districts with less resources to complete a quality application?
- 2) How can the department meet these needs?

Since CIP applications carry the same requirements regardless of a district's staffing size, experience, and resources; a disparity between larger districts and smaller districts becomes apparent. Currently condition assessments, design, estimating, and the labor/consultant to provide CIP applications are a reimbursable expense when the project is funded. These are not costs that every district has the capacity to carry without a guarantee of reimbursement.

The subcommittee proposes that a fund for grants under AS 14.11.007 major maintenance grant fund be established. Make a sub-fund available for REAAs and Small municipality school districts under AS 14.11.030, this would limit the availability to only REAAs and small municipal districts. These funds would be used to start CIP applications and design elements of projects including condition surveys, cost estimates, and schematic design documents. This fund

is proposed to be a revolving fund where if a project is funded through AS14.11.030, the money could be reimbursed back into this proposed fund and be made available for future applications and design efforts. Any money taken from the major maintenance fund or the REAA small municipal fund is money not available for projects that are ready and needed by the state's schools. Money provided should be separate from the money made available for projects.

## **Considerations**

Lack of adequate funding of the major maintenance fund. This year only the top three projects were funded. This amount does not adequately address the need. The minimum amount of investment needed is 3% of the replacement value. Inadequate funding not only adds to the total amount of deferred maintenance and the overall poor quality of the facility but also is a disincentive to applying for funding. CIP applications, condition assessments, designs, and estimates have a relatively short lifespan of usefulness. If a district invests in application and design work without having a reasonable expectation for eventual funding, then districts will not wish to invest in the process.