



FY2022 Application Cycle

2020 Capital Improvement
Project Workshop

Department of Education & Early Development

Acronyms and Abbreviations

- BRGR – Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee
- CIP – Capital Improvement Project
- FAIS – Fixed Asset Inventory System
- FY – Fiscal Year (Budget Year)
- PM – Preventive Maintenance
- WO – Work Orders

Presentation Overview

- CIP Overview & Eligibility
- Recent Application Changes
- Application Content & Scoring
- Final Tips and Hints

Why have a CIP process?

- Required by statute
- Establishes a statewide spectrum of need
- Prioritizes statewide needs
- Provides a vehicle to seek funding

Types of CIP Applications

- Grant

- Annual submission deadline, Sept. 1
- Application or Re-use
- Panel of department reviewers scores each application
- Priority lists are produced

- Debt Reimbursement

- Program has been suspended until July 1, 2025.
- Projects voter-approved after July 1, 2025 will be reviewed for eligibility.
- Statute includes provisions for ranking, but seldom used

Project Eligibility Requirements

- Must be a capital project
 - Not maintenance
 - Over \$50,000 (total project)
- Must be education-related
 - Supports an education program
 - Work occurs on an eligible facility
- Must be a project, not a study

BRGR Committee Application Approval

- Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review (BRGR) Committee (AS 14.11.014)
 - Tasked with establishing a form for grant applications and a method of ranking grant projects
- Current application approved at April 14, 2020 meeting
 - All meetings open to public and public comment is welcomed

CIP Application Changes for FY2022

- Minor edits to Code/Life/Protection of Struct. Matrix; change to calculation of condition point weighting.
- Reminders to include alternative delivery requests and bid documents, if applicable
- Reference to indirect cost maximum set in 4 AAC 31.023 for cost estimating
- Language ensuring premature system failure can be scored as emergency
- (*Upcoming* – DEED and BRGR want your input on PM rater matrices for FY23 application cycle)

CIP Application Changes from FY2021

- Minimum project value \$50,000
- Added new scoring categories for use of previously approved design (school & systems)
- Additional reuse years for completed projects
- Guidance on 'districtwide' projects
- Scoring matrix for Code/Life/Protection of Struct.
- Energy usage reports
- Department pre-CIP project reviews

CIP Review Emphases for FY2022

- Procurement scrutiny for completed projects
- Tighter scoping of 'districtwide' projects
- Matrix scoring for Code/Life/Protection of Struct.
- Maintenance Management
 - Training
 - Energy management

FY2022 Application

- Limit 10 applications + 10 re-use of scores
- Consistent with 6-year plan
- 9 sections, 52 questions
 - Cover page & Certifications
 - Sections 1 – 2: screening and eligibility
 - Sections 3 – 8: project related
 - Section 9: PM
 - Attachments checklist

Scoring Elements: Basic

- PM, narratives (25)
 - PM, reports (30)
 - PM, Expenditures (5)
 - Weighted Avg. Age (30)
 - Condition Survey (10)
 - Planning/Design (35)
 - Cost Estimate (30)
 - Options (25)
 - Alternative Facilities (5)
- Total 180 points available
 - All projects able to achieve

Scoring Elements: Specific Conditions

- Life Safety/Code Deficiencies (50)
- Operational Cost Savings (30)
- Inadequacies of Existing Space (40)
- Unhoused Students (80)
- Type of Space (30)
- Total 230 points available
- Typical for a project to score high in only one scoring element

Scoring Elements: Selective Bumps

- District Ranking (30)
- Emergency (50)
- Prior AS 14.11 Funding (30)
- Total 110 points available
- Used to “bump” score to increase chance of funding

FY 2022 Application Grant Scoring

Formula Driven (points)

- 11 scoring elements, 290 possible points
- Calculated based on information submitted in the CIP application

Evaluative Driven (points)

- 8 scoring elements, 255 possible points
- Independently scored by three raters
- Scores based on information submitted in the CIP application

FY 2022 Application Grant Scoring

Formula Driven (points)

- Q.3a District Priority (30)
- Q.3b Weighted Average Age (30)
- Q.5e Unhoused Students Today (50)
Unhoused Post Occupancy (30)
- Q.5j Type of Space (30)
- Q.6a Condition Survey (10)
- Q.6 Planning and Design (25)
- Q.6b Re-use of previous design (10)
- Q.6c Building system standards (10)
- Q.8e Previous AS 14.11 (30)
- Q.9 Maintenance Reports (30)
- Q9. Maintenance Expenditures (5)

Evaluative Driven (points)

- Q.4a Life Safety Conditions (50)
- Q.5h Alternative Facilities (5)
- Q.7 Cost Estimate (30)
- Q.8a Emergency (50)
- Q.8b Inadequacy of Space (40)
- Q.8c Options (25)
- Q.8d Operational Cost Savings (30)
- Q9. PM Narratives (25)



Cover Page

Preparing and Submitting the Application

Preparing & Submitting Application

- Reminders:
 - 1 Original and 3 Copies of application
 - 2 Attachment sets (1 original, 1 copy – can be PDF/electronic)
 - Timely submission (Grant postmarked by Sept. 1)
 - Application information is full and complete
 - Number of applications 10
 - Re-use of scores
- Project identifying information
- Superintendent certification



Category of Funding and Project Type

Section 1

Category and Type

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.¹

Grant Funding Categories per AS 14.11.013(a)(1)	Debt Funding Categories per AS 14.11.100(j)(4)
School Construction: <input type="checkbox"/> Health and life-safety (Category A) <input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students (Category B) <input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program (Category F)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students <input type="checkbox"/> Health and safety or building code deficiencies <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings <input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program
Major Maintenance: <input type="checkbox"/> Protection of structure (Category C) <input type="checkbox"/> Building code deficiencies (Category D) <input type="checkbox"/> 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)

- Question 1a – Type of funding requested
 - Grant (or Debt after July 1, 2025)
- Question 1b – Primary purpose
 - For descriptions of the available grant categories see Appendix A in the instructions
 - School Construction: new construction, additions, or major renovation projects in which the primary purpose is not protection of structure, code compliance, or operating cost savings
 - Major Maintenance: project in which the primary purpose involves renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components
- Question 1c – Phases of Project
 - For descriptions of phases, see Appendix C in the instructions



Eligibility Requirements to Submit an Application

Section 2

District Eligibility Requirements

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. Is evidence of required insurance attached to this application *or* has evidence been submitted as required to the department? yes no
- 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
- 2f. Districtwide replacement cost insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

- District information; not directly related to project
- Any "no" response means district is ineligible for CIP application review

Eligibility Questions

- Q.2a – Board-approved Six-Year Plan
 - Provide a complete six-year plan that includes the current year (project or projects submitted for funding) as well as anticipated CIP projects in years 2 through 6
 - Reviewed in conjunction with PM capital planning narrative
- Q.2b – Fixed Asset Inventory System (FAIS)
 - Revised as part of the 5-year preventive maintenance site visit
- Q.2c – Property Insurance
 - District property insurance information submitted annually by July 15
- Q.2d – Capital Project
 - Project is a capital improvement project vs. preventive maintenance (cost must also exceed \$50,000, ref. 4AAC 31.900(21))
- Q.2e – Preventive Maintenance Program Certification
 - Notification of certification provide by June 1; final determination by August 15
- Q.2f – Property Insurance
 - Districtwide replacement cost property insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values



Project Information

Section 3

District Priority

- Q.3a - District Priority
 - The unique number given to each project in a priority sequence approved by the district school board
 - DEED will not accept two projects with the same ranking
 - Formula-driven with ten award levels:
 - 30 points for number one priority project
 - 3 points for number ten priority project
- Q.3b – School Facilities
 - Identify facilities or specific portions of facilities in project scope
 - Data corresponds to DEED School Facility Database

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 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 30) in the "Weighted Average Age of Facilities" scoring element. For facility number, name, year, and size information on record, refer to the [DEED Facilities Database](http://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm) (education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm).

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

Weighted Average Age – Facility Database

School Facility Information

School Facility List for Building List for Kake Elementary School

Facility Number	Facility	Building Type	Category	Gross Square Footage	Year Constructed	Comments
23001001	Kake Elementary School	Permanent	Original	10,396	1996	The old elementary building (1951) transferred to City of Kake.
23001001	Kake Elementary School	Permanent	Addition	7,004	2004	
23001001	Kake Elementary School	Permanent	Addition	256	2011	Fan room; excludes approx. 90 gsf of utility distribution space
			Total GSF	17,656		

Building GSF ratio to Total GSF determines weighting for age

Building Year Constructed, converted to age, is adjusted by percentage of building GSF to Total GSF

Weighted Average Age – Scoring

- Formula-driven with multiple award levels with four tiers
 - A. 0-10 years = 0 points
 - B. $> 10 \leq 20$ years = 0-5 points available
 - C. $> 20 \leq 30$ years = 5.75 – 12.5 points available
 - D. $> 30 < 40$ years = 14.25 – 28.25 points available
 - E. ≥ 40 years = 30 points

Weighted Average Age – Calculation

- Example of Point Computation:

GSF Ratio	Convert to Age	Age * % = Weighted Age
10,396 = 59%	1996 = 24 yrs	$24 * 59\% = 14.16$
7,004 = 40%	2004 = 16 yrs	$16 * 40\% = 6.40$
<u>256 = 1%</u>	2011 = 9 yrs	$9 * 1\% = \underline{0.09}$
17,656 = 100%		20.65 avg. age

Average age: 20.65 years (5 + .75 per year in excess of 20 years)

-20.00 years

0.65

x .75

5 +.49 points for weighted average age

Q.3c Facility Status Change

- Facility Status Change
 - Quick reference
 - Should match Project Scope (Q.3d)
 - Transition plan for demolition/surplus

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 ~~surplused~~ other

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

Q.3d Project Description and Scope of Work

- One of the most informative sections
- Reminder: fully support scope with supporting documents like a condition survey
- Department has authority to modify and reduce project for cost-effective construction
 - Non-justified scope items
 - Maintenance items

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

Project description

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

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)
- Other discussion pertaining to scope of work

Project Description vs. Scope of Work

- Difference between Project Description and Scope of Work
 - Description speaks more generally to conditions and reason for project
 - Scope is specific to the work being completed by the project

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

Project description

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

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)
- Other discussion pertaining to scope of work

Project Schedule

- Schedule is estimate for planning purposes or actual for completed project
 - Does not need to be day specific
- Insert additional lines as needed
- Describe how alternative project delivery will affect the schedule
- Alternative Project Delivery Requests for DEED approval should accompany application

3e. 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).

Completed Scope

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

If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with the department's requirements for bids and awards of construction contracts. (Reference 4 AAC 31.080)

Provide DEED recovery of funds project number: # _____

- Attach bid solicitation documents and bid tabulation
- Attach construction contract and change orders
- Districts can work with DEED prior to submitting application to ensure process is followed and project is eligible
- Completed projects do not receive escalation with re-use
- Projects substantially complete on application submittal may submit re-use request for 5 years

Additional Project Information

- If project needs new site, site selection analysis available from DEED publication
- Districtwide projects are discouraged unless cost savings is achieved and a single design and construction contracts are anticipated

3g. Will this project require acquisition of additional land or utilization of a new school site? yes no

If the answer is yes, attach site description or site requirements. If a new site has been identified, attach the site selection analysis used to select the new site. Note the attachment on the last page of the application.

3h. 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.



Code Deficiency/ Protection of Structure/ Life Safety

Section 4

Life Safety Conditions

- Evaluative scoring; 50 point maximum
- Applicant indicates desired scoring items
- Point assignment considerations:
 - Application documents deficiency
 - Application documents need for correction
 - Application explains how the project corrects deficiency
 - Are critical and non-critical conditions combined?
 - Scoring is weighted in the case of mixed scope projects

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

4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety (Up to 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.

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"/> | | |

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"/> |
| Door, age >20yr (3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Windows, age >20yrs (12 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Roof, age >Warranty +5 (3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Siding Failure, age <30yr (15 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Roof, age Warranty +10 (6 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Roof Leaks, avg WO >3/yr (15 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Roof Leaks - avg 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 (25 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

NOTE: If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("avg WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.
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.

Architectural/Interior/ADA

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ADA - 1 issue (1 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Elevator Code Deficiencies | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ADA - 2 issues (2 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | ADA - 4 issues (4 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| DEC Sanitation (2 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Floor Finishes >15yr (4 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ADA - 3 issues (3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Building Egress (10 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ceiling Finishes age >25yr (3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rated Assemblies (12 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wall Finishes age >25yr (3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Codes + Arch (each system) (+3 pts) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Condition Support

- Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical:
 - Condition survey
 - Photographic documentation
 - Third party communications/reports
 - Work orders
- Documentation should be objective, specific, and verifiable



Requirements For Space To Be Added Or Replaced

Section 5

Attendance Area and Average Daily Membership

- Annually, the department publishes a current attendance area list by April 1
- Capacity calculations are based on the attendance area where the project will be constructed
- ADM is based on October count, does not include correspondence

Questions 5a – 5b

- Q.5a - Enter the grade levels housed by the proposed project facility
- Q.5b - Identify any work (other than the project in the application) that is taking place in the attendance area impacted by the proposed project

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 to 5j. **All applications 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: Education.Alaska.Gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html

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

5b. Is there any work (other than this project) within the attendance area that yes no 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

Questions 5c – 5d

- Q.5c - Identify any schools that house students in the same grade levels as in the requested project
- Q.5d – Identify the anticipated date of occupancy for the project (attach a schedule if available, or as referenced in Q.3e)

5c. Are there school facilities within the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project? yes no

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

School Name	GSF	Grades	Student Capacity

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? _____

Question 5e Percent Capacity

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
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			
2022-2023			
2023-2024			
2024-2025			
2025-2026			
2026-2027			
2027-2028			
2028-2029			

- Formula-driven scoring, 80 points total
- This element assesses the capacity of current/ funded school space to house students at current ADMs
- Projections can be from DEED projection worksheets or from other district sources

Percent Capacity Today

- Formula-driven scoring, 50 points
- This element assesses the capacity of current/ funded school space to house students at current ADMs
- Students in leased charter schools, counted if lease terminates within 2 years and need new space
- Point assignments:
 - A. 100% of capacity = 0 points
 - B. >100% of capacity = 1 point for each 3% of excess capacity
 - C. 250% of capacity = 50 points

Percent Capacity 5 year Post-Occupancy

- Formula-driven scoring, 30 points
- This element assesses the capacity of current/ funded school space to house students at projected ADMs
- Point assignments:
 - A. 100% of capacity = 0 points
 - B. >100% of capacity = 1 Point for each 5% of excess capacity
 - C. 250% of capacity = 30 points

Projection Worksheets and Qualifying Space

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

5g. Confirm space eligibility: Qualifies for _____ additional SF
Applying for _____ additional SF

- Worksheets do not have to be the department's; district may provide alternative method and projection justifications
- "Allowable Gross Square Footage" from worksheets provides additional qualifying square footage

ADM Projection Comparison

ADM Year: **2019**
 School District: **Very Cold**
 School Name: **Very Cold School**
 Project Number: **21-xxx**
 School Type: **K-12**
 Attendance Area: **Very Cold**



Historical Attendance Area ADM by Fiscal Year

Fiscal Year	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Average Annual ADM Change	Overall ADM Growth
Attendance Area Total ADM	98.35	106.10	108.25	105.30	100.50	109.85	109.35	107.95	110.80	1.60%	12.66%

Future School ADM Projections by School Year

Projection Type	Current School Year ADM	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	2026-2027	Average Annual ADM Change	Overall ADM Growth
District's K-6 Projection	58.75	59.69	60.65	61.62	62.61	63.61	64.64	65.67	66.73	1.60%	13.57%
District's 7-12 Projection	52.05	52.88	53.73	54.59	55.47	56.36	57.26	58.18	59.12	1.60%	13.57%
DEED's K-6 Projection	58.75	59.69	60.65	61.62	62.61	63.61	64.64	65.67	66.73	1.60%	13.57%
DEED's 7-12 Projection	52.05	52.88	53.73	54.59	55.47	56.36	57.26	58.18	59.12	1.60%	13.57%

Note: If District projection numbers match DEED projection, numbers were not provided by the school district.

Printed: 5/13/2019

File Name: FY21 ADM-SF_wSec+6_Sample_Very Cold

Worksheet: ADM

Allowable Gross Square Footage



District:	Very Cold
School:	Very Cold School
Project Number:	21-xxx
School Type:	K-12
Projected ADM (K-6):	66.73
Projected ADM (7-12):	59.12
Existing DEED designated GSF	19,044 SF
Existing GSF To Remain:	19,044 SF
Additional GSF Requested:	0 SF
Total GSF Proposed:	19,044 SF
Eligible Base GSF:	17,361 SF
Eligible Supplemental GSF:	14,712 SF
Total GSF Eligible:	32,072 SF
Additional GSF Allowable:	13,028 SF
Additional GSF Reduction:	No Reduction
4 AAC 31.020(e)(2) Additional GSF Allowances	
Allowance for Covered Exterior Areas:	3,000 SF
Allowance for Water/Sewer Storage & Treatment:	952 SF

ADM Projection: Current & Projected Capacity

Current Capacity and Unhoused

District: Lower Kuskokwim
 School: Very Cold School
 Project Number: 21-xxx
 School Type: K-12

Current ADM (K-6):	58.75
Current ADM (7-12):	52.05
Existing GSF:	19,044 SF
Existing GSF Elementary Capacity:	34.29
Existing GSF Secondary Capacity:	30.38
Existing Base GSF:	8,923 SF
Existing Supplemental GSF:	10,121 SF
Existing GSF Serving Total ADM:	19,044 SF
Unhoused Students:	46.12
Current Percent Capacity:	171.31%



Projected Capacity and Unhoused

District: Lower Kuskokwim
 School: Very Cold School
 Project Number: 21-xxx
 School Type: K-12

Projected ADM (K-6):	66.73
Projected ADM (7-12):	59.12
Existing GSF:	19,044 SF
Existing GSF Elementary Capacity:	34.29
Existing GSF Secondary Capacity:	30.38
Existing Base GSF:	8,923 SF
Existing Supplemental GSF:	10,121 SF
Existing GSF Serving Total ADM:	19,044 SF
Unhoused Students:	61.16
Projected Percent Capacity:	194.56%



Question 5h Alternative Community Facilities

- Evaluative Scoring, 5 points
- **Only scored for School Construction projects**
- Discuss alternatives considered for meeting project objectives

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Community inventory/rationale analysis/documentation	5 points
Community inventory/rationale with economic analysis	4 points
Community inventory/brief rationale provided	3 points
Community inventory/alternative facilities identified	2 points
Community inventory listed	1 point
Question not answered	0 points

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

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.

Question 5i Educational Specifications

5i. Are educational specifications attached?

yes no

- Required for most Construction projects
 - New facilities, additions, and for projects that reconfigure or repurpose existing space
- Note: projects that require an Ed. Spec. have a Percent for Art line in the project budget

Question 5j Type of Space Added/Improved

- Formula-driven scoring, 30 points
- Use Appendix D to application instructions for space categories:
 - Four Space Types
 - Instructional or resource 30 pts
 - Support teaching 25 pts
 - Food service, recreational, gen. support 15 pts
 - Supplemental 10 pts
 - 30 points maximum; scoring is weighted for space combinations;
- School Construction projects only; categories A, B, or F
 - It is helpful information for projects that are major rehabilitations, although no formula-driven points are awarded for completion.

Table 5.2 Project Space Equation

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

ALL PROJECTS CONTINUE FROM THIS POINT

5j. 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.

Table 5.2 PROJECT SPACE EQUATION						
	A	I	II	III	IV	B
Space Utilization	Existing Space	Space to remain "as is"	Space to be Renovated	Space to be Demolished	New Space	Total Space upon Completion
Elem. Instructional/Resource						
Sec. Instructional/Resource						
Support Teaching						
General Support						
Supplementary						
Total School Space						

- Tell us what space you have:
 - How space is allocated by use (ref. Appendix D)
 - Totals from questions #3b and #7a should match
- What space is being renovated
- What new space is being built
- What space is to be demolished or surplus
- The amount of space to remain "as-is" column, *plus* the amount of space to be renovated, *minus* existing space to be abandoned or demolished, *plus* the new or additional space, *equals* total space when project is completed.



Project Planning and Design

Section 6

Question 6a Condition Survey

- Formula-driven scoring, 10 Points
- Condition/Component Survey
 - A technical survey of facilities and buildings to determine compliance with standards and codes for safety, maintenance, repair and operation;
 - This report follows any accepted format
 - Survey may be completed by architect, engineer, or persons with documented expertise (report expertise in Q6g - Planning/Design Team).

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

1. Is a facility or component condition survey attached?

yes no

Document title: _____

Date prepared: _____

Condition Survey Scoring

Criteria	Points
Comprehensive survey that informs the project and includes a full description of existing systems and code deficiencies. Recommendations and costs to renovate are included along with supplemental information such as special inspections, photographs, drawings, and engineering calculations as applicable. It is less than 6 years old.	10
Many of the elements listed above; less than 10 years old.	8
Survey informs the project, but supplements that would further document conditions are not provided or not substantial; it is less than 10 years old.	5
Survey is more than 10 years old, but may still contain relevant information.	3
Survey not submitted or does not inform project.	0

Question 6b Previously Approved Design

- Formula-driven scoring, 10 points
- Use of prior department-approved school design
 - 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 -)
 - Estimate the design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans with an estimate of the cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design. If a district does not include cost of own the school plan proposed for reuse, estimate must purchasing design or of another arrangement

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

1. Is the district proposing to use a previously department-approved 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

Question 6c Building System Standards

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 information on each specific system showing that the building system(s) conform to a published district or municipal building standard.

- Formula-driven scoring, 10 points
- Use of district building system standards approved by district or municipality for: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power.
 - Provide approved published system design standard document from district or municipality
 - Standard must be ASHRAE 90.1 compliant
 - Provide explanation of how design standard is being used in project scope

Questions 6d – 6f Planning and Design

- Formula-driven scoring, 25 points
- Planning & design points: 3 award levels
 - A. Planning/Concept Design complete 10 pts
 - B. Design:35% (schematic design) complete 20 pts
 - C. Design:65% (design development) complete 25 pts
- Need for design phase is determined by DEED
- Deliverables are identified in Appendix B of Instructions

Questions 6d – 6f Planning and Design

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.

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
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 project is complete, provide justification as to why documents are not needed. yes no
2. Is a design development cost estimate attached? yes no

Question 6g Planning/Design Team

- Professional design team or personnel with “expertise”
 - Identify team/individual that performed condition survey and design
 - Provide expertise justification, if needed

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>
_____	_____
_____	_____



Cost Estimate

Section 7

Cost Estimate – Section 7

- Evaluative scoring, 30 points
- Scoring covers the full range of possible projects
- Scoring considers reasonableness and completeness
 - Does the estimate match the scope?
 - What is the source of the cost information? (Q.7b)
 - Are lump sums described and supported? (Q. 7c)
 - If necessary, are additive percentages explained?

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 C 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.

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.

Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate

Table 7.1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE					
Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	I Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant ¹	2 - 4%				
Land ²	n/a				
Site Investigation ²	n/a				
Seismic Hazard ³	n/a				
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction ⁴	n/a				
Equipment & Technology ^{2,5}	up to 4%				
District Administrative Overhead ⁶	up to 9%				
Art ⁷	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
Project Total	up to 130%				

- Estimate/scope can be modified by DEED, subject to reconsideration

- If completed project, provide actuals, even if above “max %” (justify in Q.7c)

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. Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
5. Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department’s publication, *Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases* for calculation methodology (2016). Technology is included with Equipment.
6. 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.
7. Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).

Table 7.2 Construction Cost Estimate

- Construction only, no 'project adders'

Table 7.2 CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE						
Construction Category	New Construction			Renovation		
	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction ¹						
Special Requirements ²		n/a			n/a	
Sitework and Utilities		n/a			n/a	
General Requirements		n/a			n/a	
Geographic Cost Factor		n/a			n/a	
Size/Dollar Adj. Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
Construction Total						

1. If using the Cost Model, Base Construction 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.

Cost Estimate Reasonableness

Project Cost - “Reasonableness Evaluation”

- Reasonable is judged by standards (DEED cost model, national estimating standards, Alaskan experience)
- The more information provided, the easier it is to evaluate “reasonableness”
- Identifying sources is important (just filling out the cost table does not provide confidence that the costs are reasonable)

Cost Estimate Scoring

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Reasonable/matches scope/complete/construction document level	27-30 points
Reasonable/matches scope/complete/65% document level	23-26 points
Reasonable/matches scope/complete/35% document level	18-22 points
Reasonable/matches scope/complete/concept level/DEED cost model	12-17 points
Some costs not supported/a few scope items missing	6-11 points
Costs not supported/many scope items missing	1-5 points



Additional Project Factors

Section 8

Question 8a Emergency

- Evaluative Scoring, 50 points
- Scored only if a district declares an emergency
- Evaluation and score based on information provided in application
- Emergency must be clearly identified and described in the project description
- Scoring weighted if project includes non-emergency scope

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.

Emergency Scoring

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Building destroyed and must be replaced; students are currently unhoused	50 points
Building unsafe; immediate repairs required; students are currently unhoused	25-45 points
Building occupied; building official has issued an order to repair	5-25 points
A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement in order to use for educational purposes	5-45 points
Major building component/system completely failed and requires replacement; facility is unusable until replaced	25-45 points
Major building component/system has a high probability of failure	5-25 points

Identif



Some emergencies are easy to identify, especially with proper documentation.

Question 8b Evaluation of Existing Space

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.

- Evaluative Scoring
- Up to 40 total points available
 - A. Mandated Programs (up to 40 points)
 - B. Existing Local Programs (up to 20 points)
 - C. New Local Programs (up to 15 points)
- Considers both physical and functional aspects
- Considers how the space meets instructional program needs
- Considers balance of program types
- Scoring is weighted for mixed scope projects

Existing Space Scoring

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Existing space significantly inadequate to meet state mandated instructional programs; severe overcrowding	25-40 points
Existing space not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local programs; moderate overcrowding	11-24 points
Existing space not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local programs; minor or no overcrowding	1-10 points
Existing inadequate space being addressed by major maintenance project	0-5 points

Question 8c Other Options

- Evaluative Scoring, 25 point maximum
- Different than alternative facilities
- Looking for cost analyses of options (LCCA)
- Options should be viable (realistic)
- Reference AS 14.11.013(b)(6)

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.

Major maintenance projects should include consideration of project design options, material or component options, phasing, cost comparisons, or other considerations.

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.

Other Project Options

Project Options

- Describe two or more options to this project that have been considered
 - If project proposes to add new or additional space, districts must consider service area boundary changes
 - Life cycle and cost/benefit analysis are important factors
 - Discuss project execution options (phasing, in-house vs. contracted construction)

Project Options Pitfalls

Project Options

- Answers are often too brief.
Example of a school replacement project:
 - Common (inadequate) responses to question
 - Do nothing
 - There are no other options
 - Better/viable options might be:
 - Looked at double shifting, or schedule adjustments
 - Looked at providing temporary portables
 - Performed a LCCA and C/B analysis to determine most cost-effective solution

Other Options Scoring

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Fully described options supported by life-cycle/cost benefits analyses; preferred option supported by explanation and documentation; at least 3 options, including proposed project	21-25 points
Fully described options without life-cycle/cost benefits analyses; preferred option supported by explanation and documentation; at least 3 options, including proposed project	11-20 points
A description of each option; no additional documentation or cost analysis; at least 2 options, including proposed project	1-10 points

Question 8d Project Cost vs. Annual Cost Savings

- Evaluative scoring, 30 point maximum
- District provides information for evaluation
- Cost/benefit perspective is important
- Credit given for numerical analysis, not opinion
- Applies to all projects
- Consider operational cost impacts of the project

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.

Project Cost vs. Annual Cost Savings Scoring

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Detailed projected operational cost savings; projected savings will result in a payback of 10 years or less	21-30 points
Detailed projected operational cost savings; projected savings will result in a payback of 10 – 20 years	11-20 points
Summary analysis of projected operational cost savings; savings will result in a payback exceeding 20 years	6-10 points
Stated opinion regarding estimated cost savings	1-5 points

Question 8e Prior AS 14.11 Funding

- Formula-driven scoring, 30 points
- Points are awarded if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11 and the project was intentionally short funded by the legislature.
- DEED will confirm by referencing reported grant number and amount from Table 7.1, Column 1.

Previous Funding = 30 points

No Previous funding = 0 points

8e. Phased funding (Up to 30 points)

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

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

DEED grant #: _____

Question 8f Waiver of Participating Share

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

Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 are eligible to apply for a waiver of participating share. REAA's are not eligible to request a waiver of participating share.

(If the district is applying for a waiver, attach justification. Refer to AS 14.11.008(d) and Appendix F of the application instructions.)

- Municipal districts only
- Very rarely granted
- Considerations:
 - District has 3 year before and after a grant to meet participating share
 - Districts may request consideration of in-kind contributions of labor, materials, or equipment.



Preventive Maintenance

Section 9

Question 9a Maintenance Management Narrative

- Formula-driven scoring, 5 points
- Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine? If so, how?
- Specific examples from each school
- Does the narrative specify how the program addresses all building components: mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil?
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?
- Is the quality of the PM program reflected in the maintenance management reports?

Question 9b- “Labor” Reports

- Formula-driven scoring, 15 points
- Item A: Districtwide report that shows total maintenance labor hours on work-orders by type of work vs. labor hours available for previous 12 months (5 pts)
- Item B: Districtwide report of scheduled and completed work-orders by month for previous 12 months (5 pts)
- Item C: Districtwide report of incomplete work-orders sorted by age and status for previous 12 months (5 pts)

Question 9c “Activities” Reports

- Formula-driven scoring, 10 points
- “Activities” Reports
 - Item A: Districtwide report comparing scheduled (preventive) maintenance work-order hours to unscheduled maintenance work-order hours by month for previous 12 months (5 pts)
 - Item B: Districtwide report of monthly trend data for unscheduled work-orders of hours and numbers of work-orders by month for the previous 12 months (5 pts)

Question 9d Average Expenditure for Maintenance

- Formula-Driven Scoring, 5 points
- Are there sufficient resources programmed to keep the district's facilities maintained? Data from DEED databases
 - 5-year average maintenance expenditure (from district audits)
 - 5-year average replacement value (from project insurance)
 - Ratio of maintenance expenditures to replacement value multiplied by 1.25 = up to 5 points

Question 9e Energy Management Narrative

- Evaluative Scoring, 5 points
- 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 quantifiable results?
- Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage? (energy data reports)
- Is there a method for evaluating existing facilities' need for commissioning?

Question 9f Energy usage reports

- Formula-driven scoring, 5 points
- Item A: Provide site-specific reports that compares monthly consumption for energy and utilities for all main schools over the previous 5 years

Question 9 of Custodial Narrative

- Evaluative Scoring, 5 points
- Is the district's custodial program complete? Is it districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving quantifiable results?
- 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?

Question 9g Maintenance Training Narrative

- Evaluative Scoring, 5 points
- Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance *and* custodial staff?
 - Training is to include supervisors and managers
- Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems and are training schedules attached?
- How is training recorded and effectiveness measured?

Question 9h- Capital Planning Narrative

- Evaluative scoring, 5 points
- Renewal and replacement schedules provided? Comprehensive and verifiable?
- Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs? Is it site verified?
- Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?
- Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?



Final Reminders

Scoring Issues: Formula-Driven

- Primary purpose (question 1b) should be the same on the application and the six-year plan
- Rank of project (question 3a) should be the same on the application and the six-year plan
- Facility information should correspond to info in DEED's facility database (i.e. facility #, GSF, year built)

Scoring Issues: Evaluative

- Update preventive maintenance narratives; dated information doesn't provide confidence that program is effective.
- Discuss data in maintenance reports—what do the numbers say about the district's maintenance management program? Explain the numbers (e.g. why are there so many unreported maintenance hours?)
- Facts and figures score better than unsupported narrative.

Application Issues

- Instructions, Appendices, & Rater's Guide:
 - **Read through the instructions, appendices, and rater's guide before filling out the application**
 - Important for a complete understanding of the process
 - Provide both instruction and direction
 - Definitions in the Appendices 'A' (category of project), 'C' (project budget categories), and 'E' (maintenance components) are good resources

Application Reminders

- Indicate when projects are complete and being submitted for reimbursement.
- Project scope – provide a *full* explanation of the project (work requested in the application).
- Be consistent – make sure all of the pieces of the application address the same scope of work.
- Use of photographs and drawings and quantitative measurements are very beneficial.

Application Suggestion

- Before submitting, have someone who is not familiar with the project read your application:
 - Does the project description make sense? Is the application reasonable and complete?
 - Are all of the items required for eligibility included?
 - Are the applications and attachments organized and clearly labeled?
 - Is it signed by the Superintendent or Chief School Administrator?

Thank You!

Contact the Facilities section if you have further questions;
we are here to assist you.

Tim Mearig, Technical Engineer/Architect I – 465-6906

Larry Morris, Architect Assistant – 465-1858

Wayne Marquis, Building Management Specialist – 465-2890

Sharol Roys, School Finance Specialist II – 465-6470

Lori Weed, School Finance Specialist II – 465-2785