

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

September 9, 2014 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

September 10, 2014 8:30 am to 4:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3rd Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

Chair: Elizabeth Nudelman
Tuesday, September 9th

8:30 – 8:45 AM **Committee Preparation, Arrival, Packet Review**

8:45 – 9:00 AM **Call to Order, Roll Call
Review and Approval of Agenda
Public Comment**

9:00 – 11:00 AM **Review FY 2017 CIP Packet (Application, Instructions, Rater's Guidelines)
Sections: Introduction, Sec. 1 (Funding), Sec. 2 (Eligibility),
Sec. 3 (Project Info)**

11:00 – 11:15 AM **BREAK**

11:15 – 1:30 PM **Review FY 2017 CIP Packet
Sections: (cont) Sec. 3 (Project Info)**

1:30 – 2:45 PM **LUNCH**

2:45 – 3:15 PM **Approval of Minutes
Department Briefing**

- Debt Reimbursement Funding Status
- PM State of the State Update

3:15 – 3:30 PM **BREAK**

3:30– 4:15 PM **Review FY 2017 CIP Packet
Sections: Sec. 4 (Life Safety), Sec. 5 (Space Requirements), Sec. 6
(Planning), Sec. 7 (Cost Estimate)**

4:15 – 4:30 PM **Public Comment**

4:30 PM **RECESS**

To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 64701 and the # key.

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

September 9, 2014 8:30 am to 4:30 pm

September 10, 2014 8:30 am to 4:00 pm

Talking Book Library

Post Office Mall, Lower Level

344 West 3rd Avenue

Anchorage, Alaska

Chair: Elizabeth Nudelman

**Wednesday, September
10th**

8:30 – 8:35 AM	Call to Order, Roll Call
8:35 – 8:50 AM	Public Comment
8:50 – 10:15 AM	Review FY 2017 CIP Packet Sections: Sec. 8 (Add'l Elements)
10:15 – 10:30 AM	BREAK
10:30 – 11:35 AM	Review FY 2017 CIP Packet Sections: (cont) Sec. 8 (Add'l Elements), Sec. 9 (PM), Attachments
11:35 – 11:50 PM	Public Comment
11:50 – 1:00 PM	LUNCH
1:00 – 2:45 PM	Review FY 2017 CIP Application Sections: Instructions, Appendices, Rating Forms
2:45 – 3:00 PM	BREAK
3:00 - 3:05 PM	Action Item: Approve FY 2017 CIP Application Packet
3:05 – 3:10 PM	Set Date for Next Meeting
3:10 – 4:00 PM	Committee Comment
4:00 PM	ADJOURN

To listen to the meeting, or comment during the periods noted above, please call 1-800-315-6338 and enter code 64701 and the # key.

BR & GR March 5 & 6, 2014
Anchorage – Talking Book Library
MEETING MINUTES – FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Committee Members Present

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

Staff

Kimberly Andrews
Elwin Blackwell
Wayne Marquis
Courtney Preziosi

Additional Participants

Kevin Lyon (Kenai)
Don Hiley (SERRC)
Larry Morris (FNSB) via telephone
Don Carney (Mat Su)
Blair Alden (Lower Kuskokwim)
Dave Norum (FNSB)
Kathy Christy

MARCH 5th**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL AT 8:40AM****REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA**

Agenda reviewed and approved.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes approved as submitted.

STAFF BRIEFING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

BREAK

FY2016 CIP APPLICATION DISCUSSION

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

Elizabeth reviewed the Project Cost Estimate, question 18 on page 43, as this was an item put on the discussion list. *Kim* explained that question 18 is an embedded excel spreadsheet in the application. The writer enters the construction amount and the other percentages are based off the construction line item. *Kim* stated that inputting accurate information and justification is really important. Page 57 of the packet indicates when added detail justification is necessary. *Kim* reiterated that CM by consultant is set in statute.

Bob asked if the department sees projects usually coming close to the 10% in design services. *Kim* answered that to make that broad generalization would be hard. *Carl* added that when

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

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

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

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

Elizabeth said that the department can do some research into commissioning. She expressed concern that she doesn't want to overcommit the department, but there can be a small project that goes into coming up with basic data from current projects. *Elizabeth* said the department can come back with Construction Management percentages of a few closed projects. *Kim* asked the committee to bear in mind that some of the projects are not current. *Kim* said a lot of the projects that are closing out now are 2010 or 2011 construction projects. *Elizabeth* said that the department can pick 15 projects or so and ask a question or two about commissioning. The committee agreed that was a good number. *Mark*

suggested picking larger school renovation or construction projects. *Kim* mentioned that some of these projects will require the department to contact the district regarding what their commissioning costs were, as sometimes that is not stated in the closeout worksheet. *Bob* said that the statistics that should be shown is the cost of commissioning, what line item it was put on, and, if commissioning wasn't done, why not? *Don Carney* suggested using the tool "Survey Monkey" in order to gather data for this research project. He thinks it will broaden the information base beyond just 15 projects.

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

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

LUNCH BREAK

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

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

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

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

would affect scoring and placement on the list. Trying to minimize the 'up to interpretation' portions as much as possible.

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

Doug expressed concern that the changes from the prior draft to the current one are more than minor, from his reading of the tracked changes documents, headings and point values have changed in the project planning section. *Elizabeth* responded that the department went back to the drawing board

for planning and the committee can work from previous application wording. *Kim* noted the department tried to compare it back to the appendix.

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

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

BREAK

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

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

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

Carl asked whether a condition survey can be submitted by someone other than a licensed professional. *Elizabeth* said that *Kim* and *Elwin* will answer that question as to what the department currently does and then discuss if that needs to be changed. *Kim* responded that there are two issues, rating the life safety points and the points for condition survey. *Kim* stated that currently the condition survey does need to be done by a professional and the condition survey cannot be over 4 years old. *Elwin* agreed that it does need to be done by a licensed professional. *Kim* said that this is stated in the instructions on page 54 of the packet. *Mark* added that the instructions do state that members familiar with the building may do portions of the condition survey. *Kim* explained that awarding the points is at the discretion of the Facility Manager at the Department and that the five points for the condition survey are not rated, it's a yes or no question.

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

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

Elizabeth reiterated what *Mary* had suggested: question 5A (referencing the tracked changes Draft 2 version distributed at this meeting) should cover facility condition, educational adequacy, facility

appraisal, energy, and seismic. *Carl* added it should be stated that those are “potential” components. *Kim* walked through the proposed changes: part 1 of the question would be facility or component report, check yes and 5 points are awarded. She went on to 5A part 2, which is up to the rater’s judgment. *Kim* said that the documents previously discussed are not listed out in part 2. *Mark* suggested an “N/A” check box. *Mary* asked if question 5A and 5B were the equivalent of Phase I and II on page 122. *Kim* suggested that the title “Analysis” be changed to “Concept Design”. *Mark* suggested renaming 5A to “Pre-Planning” and 5B to “Concept Design” if it made sense to the raters.

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

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

MARCH 6th**CALL TO ORDER**

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

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

2017 CIP APPLICATION REVIEW

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

Elwin said under the current system a completed project would be awarded the Concept, Schematic, and Design points. He also added that under the current system, a district would only receive

condition survey points if they actually have the condition survey. *Kim* added that most of the smaller completed projects do not have the condition survey.

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

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

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

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

BREAK

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

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

Elizabeth moved onto the Emergency question on page 95. *Elizabeth* explained that the Instructions for this question on page 113 will need some changes if allowed by the committee. *Mary* mentioned that question 9 allows for Emergency points where they would have already received emergency points under the Code Deficiencies/Life Safety question. *Elwin* explained that if a project needs to be funded because it is an absolute emergency, they will need these points as well. Since there is no emergency funding, districts rely on this process and they really need those points. *Mary* asked if the writer has to do a narrative for both sections. *Kim* answered yes, but the instructions for the

Emergency questions ask the writer to key in on really specific items. *Carl* added that if he was writing an emergency application, he wouldn't mind reiterating on both sections because the more explanation there is the more the rater understands the emergency.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

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

FUTURE MEETING DATE

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

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

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

CLOSING COMMENTS

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

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

MEETING ADJOURNED

By: Facilities Staff**Date:** September 9, 2014**Phone:** 465-6906**File:****For:** Bond Reimbursement and Grant
Review Committee**Subject:** EED Facilities Overview

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB 237)

The updated debt tracking report under SB237 starting July 1, 2010 is included in the committee packet. The total amount of bond authorization requested under SB 237 is \$818,508,246. The total amount approved by the department is \$775,845,813; the amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$716,798,734.

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 70% - \$548,459,855

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 60% - \$168,338,879

Preventative Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report (attached) was updated on August 15, 2014. To date, 50 of 53 school districts have certified preventive maintenance programs. The Iditarod Area, Aleutian Region and Pribilof Islands are not currently certified.

During FY14, site visits were conducted in the following school districts:

- Bering Strait
- Bristol Bay Borough
- Iditarod Area
- Lake & Peninsula
- Lower Kuskokwim
- Lower Yukon
- Skagway City
- St Mary's
- Yukon Flats
- Yukon Koyukuk

In FY15, DEED anticipates conducting site visits in the following school districts:

- Yupiit
- Kashunamiut
- Kodiak Island

Staff Briefing
Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting
09/09/14

- Aleutians East
- Unalaska City
- Yakutat City
- Cordova City
- Denali Borough
- Nenana City
- Kuspuks
- Pribilof Island
- Kake City

By June 1, 2015, visited school districts will receive a preliminary notice to establish preventive maintenance certification. School districts which cannot demonstrate full compliance by August 1, 2015, will not be eligible to apply for FY17 CIP grant funding.

Other/Research

Facilities staff is conducting research, as requested, regarding project costs and percentages.

Staffing Update

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

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

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Anchorage										
		Districtwide Design Projects	1/26/2011	\$5,100,000	\$0	\$5,100,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 4/5/11
		Service High School Addition and Renewal	2/1/2011	\$38,000,000	\$0	\$38,000,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 4/5/11
		Districtwide Building Life Extension Projects	1/26/2011	\$11,765,000	\$0	\$11,225,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 4/5/11
	DR-11-108	Career and Vocational Education Upgrades	1/26/2011	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-128	Building Life Extension Projects	3/23/2012	\$22,730,000	\$22,730,000	\$22,730,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-129	Career Technology Education Upgrades	3/23/2012	\$8,425,000	\$8,475,000	\$8,425,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-130	Career Technology Education Additions and Chugiak HS Control Room Replacement	3/23/2012	\$15,390,000	\$15,340,000	\$15,390,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-131	Design Projects; Girdwood K-8 Airport Hts Elem	3/23/2012	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-106	Districtwide Building Life Extension Projects	3/19/2013	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	\$10,650,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-107	Bartlett HS Cafeteria/Kitchen Renovations	3/19/2013	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-108	District wide Planning and Design Projects- 9 Schools (Anchorage and JBER)	3/19/2013	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-13-109	Aurora Elementary School Gym Addition	3/19/2013	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-110	Girdwood K-8 School Construction	3/19/2013	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-108	4 School Component Renewal, Design and Construction (Bayshore, Eagle River, Huffman, Susitna Elementary Schools)	10/4/2013	\$19,910,000	\$19,910,000	\$19,910,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-109	4 School Planning and Design (Gladys Wood, O'Malley, Turnagain Elementary Schools and Gruening Middle School)	10/4/2013	\$5,950,000	\$5,950,000	\$5,950,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-110	Airport Heights Elementary School Addition and Renovation	10/4/2013	\$22,800,000	\$22,800,000	\$22,800,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-111	3 School Parking and Site Improvements Design and Construction (Wonder Park Elementary, Romig Middle School, West High School)	10/4/2013	\$5,300,000	\$5,300,000	\$5,300,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-14-112	Districtwide Emergent Projects 12/12/2013		\$3,325,000	\$3,325,000	\$3,325,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Anchorage Totals:				\$233,420,000	\$178,555,000	\$232,880,000				
Cordova										
	DR-11-107	Cordova Jr/Sr HS ILP Building Project	4/6/2011	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	60%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Cordova Totals:				\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000				
Fairbanks										
	DR-12-102	North Pole Middle School Roof Replacement	7/15/2011	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	\$3,890,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-103	North Pole Vocational Wing Renovation	7/15/2011	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	\$3,740,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-104	Ryan Renovation Phase II	7/15/2011	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	voters approved \$9,900,000 for Ryan Phase II
	DR-12-105	Salcha Roof and Envelope Upgrades	7/15/2011	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	\$1,140,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-106	Wood River Gym Upgrades	7/15/2011	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	voters approved \$10,390,000 for 4 projects
	DR-14-102	Ryan Middle School Replacement	7/15/2013	\$37,150,000	\$37,150,000	\$37,150,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-103	Tanana MS Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$4,751,747	\$4,751,747	\$4,751,747	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-104	University Park Elementary Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$3,912,133	\$3,912,133	\$3,912,133	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-14-105	Ticasuk Brown Elementary Roof Replacement and Exterior Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$3,905,246	\$3,905,246	\$3,905,246	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-106	North Pole MS Mechanical and Energy Efficiency Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$6,033,410	\$6,033,410	\$6,033,410	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-107	Two Rivers Elementary Classroom Upgrades	7/15/2013	\$797,464	\$797,464	\$797,464	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Fairbanks Totals:				\$76,840,000	\$76,840,000	\$76,840,000				
Haines										
		Haines High School Air Handler Replacement	7/22/2014	\$412,367		\$412,367	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Haines Vocational Education Building Mechanical Upgrades	7/22/2014	\$1,711,027		\$1,711,027	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	7/22/2014	\$783,938		\$783,938	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Haines High School Roof Replacement	7/22/2014	\$1,814,747		\$1,814,747	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Haines Totals:				\$4,722,079		\$4,722,079				
Juneau City Borough										
	DR-11-101	Auke Bay Elementary School Renovation Project	9/3/2010	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amended 12-17-11 for additional voter approved amount of \$1,400,000
	DR-11-200	Auke Bay Elementary Ground Source Heat Pump	12/17/2011	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	amends DR-11-101
	DR-12-101	Adair-Kennedy Synthetic Turf Replacement Project	8/2/2011	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	\$1,191,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Juneau City Borough Totals:				\$21,291,000	\$21,291,000	\$21,291,000				

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Kenai Peninsula										
	DR-11-100	Districtwide Roofing Project	7/16/2010	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	\$16,866,500	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-100	Homer High School Turf Upgrade	7/8/2013	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	\$1,991,718	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-101	Roof Replacement - 10 Schools	7/8/2013	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	\$20,995,282	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Kenai Peninsula Totals:				\$39,853,500	\$39,853,500	\$39,853,500				
Ketchikan										
	DR-11-106	Ketchikan High School Roof Replacement	12/22/2010	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-100	Districtwide Major Maintenance	9/10/2012	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	\$2,506,323	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Voters approved \$5,500,000 for five projects.

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-13-101	Schoenbar Middle School Field Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$232,000	\$232,000	\$232,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-102	Fawn Mountain Elementary Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	\$1,169,696	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-103	Districtwide Site Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$228,728	\$228,728	\$228,728	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-104	Smithers Pool Demolition	9/10/2012	\$2,374,020	\$1,363,253	\$1,363,253	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Add'l \$221,759 of redirected funds from DR-10-100; Reduced \$10,767 b/c of voter apvl
	DR-13-105	Valley Park Bus Pullout	9/10/2012	\$314,775	\$0	\$0	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Funds are redirected from DR-10-100
Ketchikan Totals:				\$10,225,542	\$8,900,000	\$8,900,000				

Kodiak Island

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-100	Kodiak High School Renovation/Addition	2/1/2012	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	project agreement uses \$68,679,814 of the approved amount
Kodiak Island Totals:				\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000	\$76,310,000				
Lake & Peninsula										
	DR-13-111	Tanalian School Addition and Renovation	4/18/2013	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-13-112	Newhalen Kitchen and Gym Remodel and Expansion	4/18/2013	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-14-113	Districtwide Energy Upgrades	6/9/2014	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Lake & Peninsula Totals:				\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000				
Mat-Su Borough										

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-11-102	Fire Alarm System Replacement, 10 Schools	11/17/2010	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	\$3,410,038	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-11-103	Roof Replacement, 7 Schools and Administration Building	11/17/2010	\$26,956,050	\$26,956,050	\$26,956,050	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-11-104	Flooring Replacement, 8 Schools	11/17/2010	\$3,118,963	\$3,118,963	\$3,118,963	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-11-105	ADA Parking and Access, 3 Schools	11/17/2010	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-107	Big Lake Elementary School Renovation	2/29/2012	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-108	Palmer High School Renovation	2/29/2012	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-109	Palmer HS/Houston HS Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-110	Wasilla HS/Houston HS Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-111	Fire Alarm Replacecment, 3 Schools	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-112	Restroom Renovation, 6 Schools	2/29/2012	\$863,000	\$863,000	\$863,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-113	Flooring Replacement, 7-Schools	2/29/2012	\$685,000	\$685,000	\$685,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-114	New Knik Area Middle/High School	2/29/2012	\$65,455,000	\$65,455,000	\$65,455,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-115	Valley Pathways School	2/29/2012	\$22,515,000	\$22,515,000	\$22,515,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-116	Mat-Su Day School	2/29/2012	\$12,426,000	\$12,426,000	\$12,426,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-117	Mat-Su Career & Tech HS Addition	2/29/2012	\$16,150,000	\$16,150,000	\$16,150,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-118	Iditarod Elementary School Replacement	2/29/2012	\$25,214,000	\$25,214,000	\$25,214,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-119	New Knik Area Elementary School	2/29/2012	\$26,529,000	\$26,529,000	\$26,529,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-120	Districtwide Energy Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$3,162,000	\$3,162,000	\$3,162,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-121	Districtwide Physical Education Improvements	2/29/2012	\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-122	Districtwide HVAC Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-123	Emergency Power Generators & Switch Gear, 9-Schools	2/29/2012	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-124	Houston HS Exterior Envelope Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-125	Houston MS/Palmer MS Locker Replacement	2/29/2012	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-126	Districtwide ADA Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-12-127	Athletic Field Improvements	2/29/2012	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	\$6,461,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Mat-Su Borough Totals:				\$247,830,051	\$247,830,051	\$247,830,051				
North Slope Borough										
		Barrow HS Generator and Transfer Switch Upgrade		\$1,852,000	\$0	\$0	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Kali School Major Facility Renovation		\$8,615,000	\$0	\$0	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Kaveolook School Gymnasium Addition		\$8,692,098	\$0	\$0	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Nunamiut School Renovation		\$9,092,000	\$0	\$0	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		Tikigaq Renovation and Gymnasium Addition		\$12,065,399	\$0	\$0	0% <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	DR-12-132	Nuiqsut Trapper School Renovation	6/28/2012	\$5,587,194	\$5,815,000	\$5,815,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	\$750,000 approved in 10/7/08 election; \$5,065,000 approved in 10/6/09 election	
	DR-12-133	Tikigaq School Gym and Locker Room Renovation	6/28/2012	\$1,808,200	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	70% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
North Slope Borough Totals:				\$47,711,891	\$6,915,000	\$6,915,000				
Valdez City										
	DR-12-134	George H. Gilson Junior High School Replacement	6/28/2012	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	60% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Valdez City Totals:				\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183	\$39,804,183				

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Approved Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Approved</i>	<i>Voter Approved</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Grand Totals:				\$818,508,246	\$716,798,734	\$775,845,813				
Total of Projects Both Voter and EED Approved:				\$716,798,734						
<i>(This is a total of the EED Approved Amount.)</i>										



PM State-of-the-State

Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS OF 08/15/2014

District	Date of Last Visit	*Year of Next Visit	Approved FAIS	Maintenance Management	Energy	Custodial	Training	R&R Schedule	Maint. Program	Status	Program Name	CIP Eligible	Certification Pending
Alaska Gateway	4/4/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Aleutian Region	8/31/2005	2016	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	4 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
Aleutians East	10/8/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Anchorage	4/1/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
Annette Island	3/17/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Bering Strait	3/19/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	Yes
Bristol Bay Borough	4/14/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chatham	2/16/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chugach	4/3/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Copper River	4/2/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Cordova	11/16/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Craig City	2/28/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Delta/Greely	4/6/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Denali Borough	12/7/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Dillingham City	4/10/2006	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Fairbanks	5/7/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	JD Edwards	Yes	No
Galena	5/8/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Haines	11/3/2010	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Hoonah City	3/21/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Hydaburg City	3/1/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	MPulse	Yes	No
Iditarod Area	3/14/2014	2019	N	N	N	Y	N	N	I	1 of 5	School Dude	No	Yes
Juneau	11/10/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	TMA	Yes	No
Kake City	5/5/2010	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kashunamiut	8/27/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kenai Peninsula	2/26/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Ketchikan	3/15/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Klawock City	2/29/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kodiak Island	1/10/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Kuspuk	1/11/2010	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Lake & Peninsula	4/16/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Manager Plus	Yes	No
Lower Kuskokwim	1/21/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	D	Yes	No
Lower Yukon	1/23/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Mat-Su Borough	4/25/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Nenana City	12/14/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Nome City	5/22/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
North Slope Borough	5/21/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	WorkTracker	Yes	No
Northwest Arctic	12/7/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Pelican City	2/14/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Petersburg City	3/30/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No



PM State-of-the-State

Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS OF 08/15/2014

District	Date of Last Visit	*Year of Next Visit	Approved FAIS	Maintenance Management	Energy	Custodial	Training	R&R Schedule	Maint. Program	Status	Program Name	CIP Eligible	Certification Pending
Pribilof Island	4/5/2010	2015	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	S	3 of 5	Maximo*	No	Yes
Sitka City Borough	2/2/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Skagway City	5/5/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	MC	Yes	No
Southeast Island	5/8/2012	2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	MPulse	Yes	No
Southwest Region	2/17/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
St Mary's	1/27/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Tanana City	5/9/2013	2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Unalaska City	10/12/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Valdez City	3/14/2013	2018	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Wrangell City	3/31/2011	2016	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yakutat City	11/9/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yukon Flats	3/11/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yukon-Koyukuk	3/7/2014	2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yupitit	8/24/2009	2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No

In Compliance

50

50

52

53

51

52

50

50

Legend

N = Not in compliance

I = Commercial IMMS

Y = In full compliance

C = Commercial CMMS

NP = Not participating

D = In-house District Program

U = Undecided

* = Use Maximo through SERCC Service Contract

S = SERRC supported

Bold - Site visit pending

FAIS = Fixed Asset Inventory System

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

Proposed Question #:	Maximum Points	Current Question #:	Maximum Points	Item
Cover		32		Certification by Chief School Official
01-a		01		Type of Funding: Grant or Debt
01-b		02-a		Primary purpose
01-c		02-b		Phases of project
02-a		03		Six-year plan
02-b		04		Fixed asset inventory system
02-c		05		Insurance
02-d		06-a		CIP not maintenance project
02-e		n/a		Preventive Maintenance for eligibility
02-f		07-b		Replacement cost insurance
03-a	30	12	30	District Priority
03-b	30	09	30	Facilities' age
03-c		08		Change in status of facilities
03-d		13 & 17		Project description/facilities impacted
03-e		02-c		Work completed?
03-f		15		Additional land
04-a	50	17	50	Code Deficiencies/Protection of Structure/Life Safety
05-a		19		Grade levels housed
05-b		20		Other work in attendance area
05-c		21		School facilities information
05-d		22		Anticipated occupancy date
05-e	80	23	80	Housing unhoused students (School Construction Only)
05-f		24		ADM projection method
05-g	5	27	5	Alternate facilities available (School Construction Only)
05-h	30	25	30	Type of space added or created (School Construction Only)
06-a	10	16	5	Condition/Component Survey
06-b	10	16	10	Concept Design
06-c	10	16	10	Schematic Design 35%
06-d	5	16	10	Design Development 65%
06-e		16		Designer/Design Team
07-a	30	18	30	Cost Estimate
08-a	50	14	50	Emergency conditions
08-b	40	26	40	Inadequacies of existing space
08-c	25	28	25	Other options
08-d	30	29	30	Operational cost savings of project
08-e	30	10	30	Previous phased funding
08-f		11		Waiver of participating share
09-a	5	30	5	Maintenance management narrative
09-b	15	30	15	Maintenance labor reports
09-c	10	30	10	PM/Corrective maintenance reports
09-d	5	30 & 7-a	5	Expenditure on maintenance - 5 year average
09-e	5	30	5	Energy management narrative
09-f	5	30	5	Custodial narrative
09-g	5	30	5	Maintenance training narrative
09-h	5	30	5	Capital planning narrative
Last page		31		Attachments checklist
n/a		06-b		Adequate documentation removed from FY2017
n/a		16	5	Facility appraisal removed for FY2017
Total	520		525	



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

FY2017

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION

For each funding request submit **one original** and **three complete copies of this application** and **two copies of each attachment**, it is helpful for one attachment copy to be provided in a portable document file (pdf) format. The grant application deadline is September 1st.

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.

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

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

School District: _____

Community: _____

School Name: _____

Project Name: _____

CERTIFICATION

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

Superintendent or Chief School Administrator

Date

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE

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

- Grant Funding Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

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)
<p>School Construction:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Health and life-safety (Category A)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students (Category B)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program (Category F)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Health and safety or building code deficiencies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program</p>
<p>Major Maintenance:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Protection of structure (Category C)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Building code deficiencies (Category D)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings (Category E)</p>	

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

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

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

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

2a. Has a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) been approved by the district school board? yes no

(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b), and 4 AAC 31.011(c); attach a copy of the 6-year plan.)

2b. Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system? yes no

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

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.

3. PROJECT INFORMATION

3a. Priority assigned by the district (Up to 30 points) What is the rank of this project under the district’s six-year Capital Improvement Plan? Rank: _____

3b. School facilities and their condition (Up to 30 points) What buildings or building portion (i.e. original building or addition) will be included in the scope of work of the project?

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

Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year	GSF
TOTAL GSF			0

3c. 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. A transition plan should describe how surplusd state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. See instructions.

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

Project description

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

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

Scope of work

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

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

Cost estimate discussion

At a minimum, include the following:

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

3e. 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)

3f. 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

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 life safety conditions; attach supporting documentation.

Categorize the issues described and explained above by checking the box that reflects the primary issue related to the building condition(s).

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

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

Life Safety: Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions threatening the health and life safety of students, staff, and the public, and building code conditions impacting health and life safety. (0 to 35 points)

Building Failure: Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students. (35 to 50 points)

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 5i. **All applications requesting new or replacement space must provide the information requested in this section.** For the purposes of this section, gross square footage is calculated in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020(e). Worksheets to be completed are available at the department’s website at: <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

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

5b. Is there any work (other than this project) within the attendance area that has been approved by local voters, or has been funded, or is in progress that houses any student grade levels included in the proposed project? yes no
(If the answer is yes, provide information below about size, student capacity, and grades to be served in the table below.)

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

5c. Are there school facilities within the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project? yes no
(If the answer is yes, provide information below about size, student capacity, and grades served in the table below.)

School Name	GSF	Grades	Capacity
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

In lieu of data in the format above for questions 5b and 5c, <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no we are providing detailed attachments.
--

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
2012-2013			
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			

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

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

List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of housing students. Identify the facility by name, its condition, and provide the distance from current school. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, note the attachment on the last page of the application.

5i. 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						

6. PROJECT PLANNING

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

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

6b. 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

6c. 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. yes no

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

6d. 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. yes no
- 2. Is a design development cost estimate attached? yes no

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

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

7. COST ESTIMATE

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

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

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					
Site Investigation ²					
Seismic Hazard ³					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction ⁴					
Equipment & Technology ^{2,5}	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead ⁶	up to 9%				
Art ⁷	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
Project Total					

1. Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: \$0-\$500,000 – 4%; 500,001- \$5,000,000 – 3%; over \$5,000,000 – 2%).
2. Include only if necessary for completion of this project. Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the Project Description (Question 3d), 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 (2005). The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate (from the base year of 2005) added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
6. Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project; this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost.
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 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 = Divisions (1.0+2.0) for new construction, and Division 11.00 for Renovation, otherwise, Base Construction = the total construction cost less the costs that correspond with other cost categories in the table.
2. Explain in detail and justify special requirements.

DRAFT

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT ELEMENTS

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).

Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. (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. (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. (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. (5-45 points)

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)

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. (5-25 points)

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.

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.

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. Phased funding (Up to 30 points)

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

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

EED grant #: _____

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 E of the application instructions.)

9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

District preventive maintenance and facility management (55 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.

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.** Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9g.** Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9h.** Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

Note all attachments included with the application.

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

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

District eligibility attachments: Submit two copies, regardless of number of project applications.

- Preventive maintenance and facility management narratives (questions 9a, 9e-9h)
 Preventive maintenance reports (questions 9b, 9c)

Project description attachments: List all attachments referred to or noted in the application. Some items may not be applicable to a specific project. Submit two copies of each attachment with application

- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (question 3g)
 Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (question 3c)
 Facility condition survey (question 6a)
 Facility appraisal (question 6b)
 Educational specification (question 6b)
 Concept design documentation (question 6b)
 Schematic design documentation (question 6c)
 Design development documentation (question 6d)
 Cost estimate worksheets (question 7a)
 Budget variance justification (question 7a)
 Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e.*, *Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*) (questions 4a, 8a)
 Cost/benefit analysis (question 8d)
 Life cycle cost analysis (question 8d)
 Value analysis provided (question 8d)
 Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (question 5e)
 Enrollment projections and calculations (question 5e)
 Justification for waiver of participating share (question 8f)
 For fully or partially completed projects: documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 (question 3f)
 Other: _____

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



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

FY2017

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

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

Answer all questions: Each question on the application form must be answered in order for the application to be considered complete. **Only complete applications will be accepted.**

Incomplete applications will be considered ineligible and returned unranked. If a question is not applicable, please note as NA. The department has the authority to reject applications due to incomplete information or documentation provided by the district. The grant application deadline is September 1st.

Project name to be accurate and consistent: The project name on the first page of the application should be consistent with project titles approved by the district school board and submitted with the six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The project name should begin with the name of the school and type of school (ex: K-12). Multi-school projects should list the schools that are part of the scope unless the work is districtwide at most or all school sites in the district.

Limited to ten applications: The department will only score up to ten individual project applications from each district during a single rating period. In addition, a district can submit a letter to request reuse of an application's score for one year 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 1st deadline.

CERTIFICATION:

Authorizing signature: The application must be signed by the appropriate official. Unsigned applications cannot be accepted for ranking.

Application packages should be submitted to:
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Division of School Finance, Facilities
801 W. 10th Street, Suite 200
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

For further information contact:
School Facilities Manager

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

1a. Type of funding requested. Check **one** box to indicate which type of state aid is being requested.

Grant Funding: applications are submitted to the department by September 1st of each year, or on a date at the beginning of September designated by the department in the event that the 1st falls on a weekend or holiday.

Aid for Debt Retirement: applications can be submitted at any time during the year if there is an authorized debt program in effect. To verify if there is an authorized debt program in effect, contact the department.

1b. Primary purpose. Based on whether the application is for grant funding or aid for debt retirement, 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.¹

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

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

2a. District six-year plan. Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-15-XXX. The project requested in the application must appear on the district's six-year plan in order to be considered for either grant funding or debt reimbursement.

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

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)

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.

- 2d. Capital improvement project.** AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request is for a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix E for an explanation of maintenance activities.
- 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. For more information contact the department.
- 2f. Insurance.** The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2012 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. *[Note: This information is used in calculating scores for question 9d.]*

3. PROJECT INFORMATION:

- 3a. Priority assigned by the district. (30 points possible)** The district ranking of each project application must be a unique number approved by the district school board and must place each discrete project in priority sequence. The project having the highest priority should receive a ranking of one, and each additional project application of lower priority should be assigned a unique number in priority order. The department will accept only one project with a district ranking of priority one. The ranking of each application should be consistent with the board-approved six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(2). Both major maintenance projects and school construction projects should be combined into a single six-year plan. There are up to 30 points available for a district's #1 priority. Points drop off in increments of 3 for each corresponding drop in district priority ranking.

The district should provide a listing of *projects anticipated for the full six years* of the district's six-year plan, not just the first year of the plan.

- 3b. School facilities and their condition. (30 points possible)** This question requests information on the year the facility was constructed and size of each element of the facility to establish the weighted average age of facilities score. If a project's scope of work is limited to a portion of a building (i.e., the original or a specific addition), the age of *that building portion* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point calculation. If the project's scope of work expands to multiple portions of a building, the ages of *all building portions receiving work* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

calculation. *Year built* refers to the year the original facility and any additions were completed or were first occupied for educational purposes. If a date of construction is not available, use an estimate indicated by an (*). *Gross square footage (GSF)* of each addition should be the amount of space added to the original facility. *Total size* should equal the total square footage of the existing facility. There are up to 30 points possible depending on the age of the building. Facility number, name, year built, and size are available online at:

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

Department data will be used for calculations, if there is an error in the database, contact the department.

3c. Facility status. The response to this question should be consistent with the space utilization table in question 5h. Projects that will result in demolition or surplus of existing state-owned or state-leased facilities should include a detailed plan for transition from existing facilities to replacement facilities. If a facility is to be demolished or surplus, the project must provide for the abatement of all hazardous materials as part of the project scope. The transition plan should describe how surplus state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. The detailed plan for demolishing or surplus state-owned or -leased properties should incorporate a draft of the department's Form 05-96-007, Excess Building. For the CIP process, furnish building data and general information; signatures and board resolutions may be excluded.

3d. Project description/Scope of work. Describe the scope of work of the entire project. The project description/scope of work should include (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, (3) a description of the scope of the project and what the project will accomplish, and (4) information or detail related to the project's cost. If the construction of a new school is proposed, describe any code issues at existing facilities in the attendance area that will be relieved by the project. The scope should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state. It is helpful to identify the question number if you are providing detail to support another application question in the project description.

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

Question 2e: AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the project is a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance, routine maintenance, or custodial care. Refer to Appendix E 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. This applies to district wide projects as well as projects adding space. For projects adding space, use this question to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Question 3c: The detailed plan for demolishing or surplusizing state-owned or leased properties should incorporate a draft of the department's Form 05-96-007, Excess Building. For the CIP process, furnish building data and general information; signatures and board resolutions may be excluded.

Question 3f: 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 (1) will result in renovated or additional educational space, and (2) will serve students of the same grade levels currently housed or projected to be housed in other schools, the project description should indicate:

- the attendance areas that will be impacted (i.e. will contribute students) by this project,
- the current and projected student populations in each facility (school) affected by the project, and
- the EED gross square footage for each affected facility (school) in the attendance area.

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.

Question 7a. Cost Estimate Support: The project description shall include sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is to be incorporated into Tables 7.1 and 7.2 of question 7a, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. This is especially true for lump-sum elements used in the department's cost model in site work and utilities. The project description and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.

Question 8c: When a new, renovation, new-in-lieu-of-renewal, or Category E project is proposed, the project description shall include a **detailed cost/benefit analysis and a life cycle cost analysis**. These documents shall provide data documenting conditions that justify the project [AS 14.11.011(b)(1)]. If these documents are attached, they can be referenced summarized and rather than reproduced in the project description.

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

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

- Competitive sealed bids must be used unless alternative procurement has been previously approved by the department.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Projects under \$100,000 can be constructed with district employees if prior approval is received from the department. For projects that utilized in-house labor, attach the EED approval of the use of in-house labor [4 AAC 31.080(a)]. If a project utilized in-house labor, or was constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project will not be scored.
- For construction contracts under \$100,000, districts may use any competitive procurement method practicable.

For projects with contracted construction services, attach construction and bid documents utilized to bid the work, advertising information, bid tabulation, construction contract, and performance and payment bonds for contracts exceeding \$100,000. Projects shall be advertised three times beginning a minimum of 21 days before bid opening. The bid protest period shall be at least 10 days. Construction awards must NOT include provisions for local hire.

3f. 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 B).

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 life safety conditions being addressed by the project scope in question 3d; attach supporting documentation.

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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.

Building Failure: Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, projection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students.

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. Examples of specific code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions that may be present include, but are not limited to:

Fire Protection: fire-resistant materials and construction, interior finishes, fire protection systems;

Occupant Needs: means of egress, accessibility (ADA), interior environment (asbestos/hazmat);

Building Envelope: energy conservation (windows/doors), exterior wall coverings (siding), roofs and roof structures;

Structural Systems: structural loads, foundations, seismic;

Building Services: mechanical systems (heating and ventilation systems), plumbing systems, electrical wiring, equipment, and systems;

Building Support: septic system, standby generator, fuel tanks, water/waste water treatment (includes water tanks), other.

Projects with code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions will be assessed based on the severity 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, 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.

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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 area serving elementary students are to be listed. If the project includes any secondary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving secondary students are to be listed. For each school listed include its size, the grades served, and the school's total student capacity. Use the department's GSF Capacity MS Excel worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. A link to this form can be found under "Space Guidelines" at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. Please note that the Capacity Worksheet has been revised to reflect the regulatory changes to 4 AAC 31.020.
- 5d. Date of anticipated occupancy.** The date provided here should be the anticipated date the facility will be occupied. This will be the starting point for looking at five-year post-occupancy population projections. If a project schedule is available it should be provided to substantiate the projected date.
- 5e. Unhoused students (80 points possible)** All projects that are adding new space or replacing existing space must complete Table 5.1. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM and worksheets in the department's MS Excel workbook, "XXX GSF calculations" found under "Space Guidelines" at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. [These worksheets are the tools for determining space eligibility.](#)

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

The points for 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% than one point for every 3% percent over

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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.

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

5g. Confirm space eligibility. The amount of additional qualified square footage from the GSF calculations workbook should be entered on "qualifies for additional SF" line. The amount of additional square footage that will be added in this project should be entered on the "applying for additional SF" line. The amount of square footage that is applied for may be the same or less than the amount of the qualified square footage.

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 (i.e. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project. There are up to 5 points available for an adequate description showing that the district has considered alternatives to the proposed project for housing unhoused students.

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

5i. Project space utilization. (30 points possible) Table 5.2 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. The worksheet at Appendix D lists types of school space that fit in each category. There are up to 30 points possible on the school construction list for the type of space being constructed.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

6. PROJECT PLANNING:

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, 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 optional; however, a facility condition survey document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request. 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.

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

6b. Planning / concept design (0 or 10 points possible) *Planning* work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix B of this document. The department’s Program Demand Cost Model is acceptable as a planning/concept level cost estimate. 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. There are 10 points possible for completed planning work.

6c. Schematic design – 35% (0 or 10 points possible) *Schematic design* work includes the items listed under schematic design in Appendix B of this document. There are 10 points possible for completed schematic design work.

6d. Design development – 65% (0 or 5 points possible) *Design development* work includes items listed under design development in Appendix B of this document. There are 5 points possible for completed design development work.

6e. Planning 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. 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

licensed roofing contractor, or a maintenance person with X years as the lead mechanical custodian for the district.

7. COST ESTIMATE

7a. Cost estimate for total project cost. (30 points possible) For all applications, including those for planning and design, cost estimates should be based on the district's most recent information and should address the project being requested. Refer to Appendix C for descriptions of elements of the total project cost. The cost estimate should be of sufficient detail that its reasonableness can be evaluated. If a project is projected to cost significantly more than would be predicted by the Department's current Program Demand Cost Model, provide attachments justifying the higher cost. If there are special requirements, a detailed explanation and justification should be provided in the project description/scope of work.

Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate. In Table 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 [AS14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, please add a detailed justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 30% in additional percentage costs.

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT ELEMENTS

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.

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 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.

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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.

- A cost/benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, or other evaluative processes used by the district in reaching its design solution should be included.
- 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.
- If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts must consider 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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

There are up to 25 points available for a documented comprehensive discussion on 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 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. Providing benchmark values such as fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, 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. Phased funding. (30 points possible) Prior state funding refers to **grant funds appropriated by the legislature to the department and administered under AS 14.11 as partial funding for this project only**. Any amounts noted here should also be included in Table 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 by the legislature.

8f. Participating share waiver. Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix F in the attachments to these instructions for detailed information. Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 that are not REAAs, are eligible to request a waiver of participating share. Contact the department for a district's most recent full-value per ADM calculation.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

District preventive maintenance and facility management (55 points possible)

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with 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 E for details.

The scoring criteria for this area reflect efforts beyond just preventive maintenance. For each element of a qualifying plan outlined in 4 AAC 31.013, documents, including reports, narratives, and schedules, have been identified for eight separate 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 55 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

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

Maintenance Management

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.

How *effective* is your work order-based maintenance management system? How do you assess effectiveness? Describe the formal system in place that tracks timing and costs as stated in regulation and attach documentation (sample work orders, etc.). Discuss the quality of your program as it is reflected in the submitted formula-driven reports for 9b (i.e diversity in work types, hours available is accurate, there is a high percentage of reported hours).

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.)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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.

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 5 years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded.) The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2012 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11.

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

Energy Management

9e. Energy Management Narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Custodial Program

9f. Custodial Narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

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

Maintenance Training

9g. Maintenance Training Narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

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

Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)

9h. Capital Planning Narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

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

ATTACHMENTS 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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS
 Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
 September 10, 2014

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:^{1, 2}

- A. "Avert imminent danger or correct life threatening situations." This category is generally referred to as, "Health and Life Safety." A project classified under "A" must be documented as having unsafe conditions that threaten the physical welfare of the occupants. Examples might be that seismic design of structure is inadequate; that required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative; or that the structure and materials are deteriorated or damaged seriously to the extent that they pose a health/life-safety risk. The district must document what actions it has taken to temporarily mitigate a life-threatening situation.
- B. "House students who would otherwise be unhoused." This category is referred to as "Unhoused Students." A project to be classified under "B" must have inadequate space to carry out the educational program required for the present and projected student population. Documentation should be based on the current Department of Education & Early Development Space Guidelines. (Refer to 4 AAC 31.020)
- C. "Protection of the structure of existing school facilities." This category is intended to include projects that will protect the structure, enclosure, foundations and systems of a facility from deterioration and ensure continued use as an educational facility. Work on individual facility systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$25,000. The category is for major projects, which are not a result of inadequate preventive, routine, and/or custodial maintenance. An example could be a twenty year old roof that has been routinely patched and flood coated, but is presently cracking and leaking in numerous locations. A seven year old roof that has numerous leaks would normally only require preventive maintenance and would not qualify. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.
- D. "Correct building code deficiencies that require major repair or rehabilitation in order for the facility to continue to be used for the educational program." This category, Building Code Deficiencies, was previously referred to as "Code Upgrade." The key words are "major repair." A "D" project corrects major building, fire, mechanical, electrical, environmental, disability (ADA), and other conditions required by codes. Work on individual facility

¹ 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)].

² Projects will be considered for replacement-in-lieu-of-renewal when project costs exceed 75% of the current replacement cost of the existing facility, based on a twenty year life cycle cost analysis that includes disposition costs of the existing facility.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
September 10, 2014

systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed \$25,000. An example could be making all corridors one hour rated. Making one or two toilet stalls accessible would not fit this category. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.

- 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.
- G. "Meet an educational need not specified in (A)-(F) of this paragraph, identified by the department." Any situation not covered by (A)-(F), and mandated by the Department of Education. (Currently, there are no such mandates.)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX B: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES
 Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
 September 10, 2014

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 1st.

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. Prepare a facility condition/component survey **(Required if project is a major renovation)**
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 major rehabilitations to existing facilities)**
7. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **(Required for new facilities)**
8. Complete concept design studies and planning cost estimate - **(Required)**

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)**
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**
7. Accomplish a condition survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project is a major renovation)**

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

1. Complete suggested elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **(Required)**
2. Review and confirm planning (4 AAC 31.030)
3. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project is a major renovation)**
4. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **(Required for new facilities)**
5. Complete design development documents, including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans - **(Required)**
6. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
7. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
APPENDIX B: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
September 10, 2014

PHASE III - CONSTRUCTION

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE
 Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
 March 6, 2014

Construction Management (CM) by a private contractor. Costs may include oversight of any phase of the project by a private contractor. Construction management includes management of the project's scope, schedule, quality, and budget during any phase of the planning, design and construction of the facility. The maximum for construction management by consultant is 4% of the total project cost as defined in statute [AS 14.11.020(c)].

Land is a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include actual purchase price plus title insurance, fees and closing costs. Land cost is limited to the lesser of the appraised value of the land or the actual purchase price of the land. Land costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Site Investigation is also a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include land survey, preliminary soil testing, environmental and cultural survey costs, but not site preparation. Site investigation costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Design Services should include full standard architectural and engineering services as described in AIA Document B141-1997. Architectural and engineering fees can be budgeted based upon a percentage of construction costs. Because construction costs vary by region and size, so may the percentage fee to accomplish the same effort. Additional design services such as educational specifications, condition surveys, and post occupancy evaluations may increase fees beyond the recommended percentages.

Recommended: 6-10% (Renovation, 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 EED's *Guideline for School Equipment Purchases*. If special technology plans call for higher levels of funding, itemized costs should be presented in the project budget separate from standard equipment.

Recommended: 0-10% of construction cost or between \$1700 - \$3050 per student depending on school size and type.

District Administrative Overhead includes an allocable share of district overhead costs, such as payroll, accounts payable, procurement services, and preparation of the six year capital improvement plan and specific project applications. In-house construction management should be

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
APPENDIX C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
March 6, 2014

included as part of this line item. The total of in-house construction management costs and Construction Management by Consultant should not exceed 5% of the construction budget.

Recommended: 2-9%

Percent for Art includes the statutory allowance for art in public places. This may fund selection, design/fabrication and installation of works of art. One percent of the construction budget is required except for rural projects which require only one-half of one percent. For this category projects are rural if they are in communities under 3000 or are not on a year-round, publicly-maintained road system and have a construction cost differential greater than 120% of Anchorage as determined in the Cost Model for Alaskan Schools. The department recommends budgeting for art.

Project Contingency is a safety factor to allow for unforeseen changes. Standard cost estimating by A/E or professional estimators use a built in contingency in the construction cost of $\pm 10\%$. Because that figure is included in the construction cost, this item is a project contingency for project changes and unanticipated costs in other budget areas

Recommended: 5% Fixed

Total Project Request is the total project cost, as a percent of the construction cost, except in extreme cases, should average out close to the same for all projects, and when the variables of land cost and site investigation are omitted. This item is the best overall gauge of the efficiency of the project.

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX D: TYPE OF SPACE ADDED OR IMPROVED
 Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
 April 18, 1997

Category A - Instructional or Resource

Kindergarten
 Elementary
 General Use Classrooms
 Secondary
 Library/Media Center
 Special Education
 Bi-Cultural/Bilingual
 Art
 Science
 Music/Drama
 Journalism
 Computer Lab/Technology Resource
 Business Education
 Home Economics
 Gifted/Talented
 Wood Shop
 General Shop
 Small Machine Repair Shop
 Darkroom
 Gym

Category B - Support Teaching

Counseling/Testing
 Teacher Workroom
 Teacher Offices
 Educational Resource Storage
 Time-out Room
 Parent Resource Room

Category C - General Support

Student Commons/Lunch Room
 Auditorium
 Pool
 Weight Room
 Multipurpose Room
 Boys Locker Room
 Girls Locker Room
 Administration
 Nurse
 Conference Rooms
 Community Schools/PTA Administration
 Kitchen/Food Service
 Student Store

Category D - Supplementary

Corridors/Vestibules/Entryways
 Stairs/Elevators
 Mechanical/Electrical
 Passageways/Chaseways
 Supply Storage & Receiving Areas
 Restrooms/Toilets
 Custodial
 Other Special Remote Location Factors
 Other Building Support

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

Component

A part of a system in the school facility.

Component Repair or Replacement

The unscheduled repair or replacement of faulty components, materials, or products caused by factors beyond the control of maintenance personnel.

Custodial Care

The day to day and periodic cleaning, painting, and replacement of disposable supplies to maintain the facility in safe, clean and orderly condition.

Deferred Maintenance

Custodial care, routine maintenance, or preventive maintenance that is postponed for lack of funds, resources, or other reasons.

Major Maintenance

Facility renewal that requires major repair or rehabilitation to protect the structure and correct building code deficiencies, and shall exceed \$25,000 per project, per site. It must be demonstrated, using evidence acceptable to the department that (1) the district has adhered to its regular preventive, routine and/or custodial maintenance schedule for the identified project request, and (2) preventive maintenance is no longer cost effective.

Preventive Maintenance

The regularly scheduled activities that carry out the diagnostic and corrective actions necessary to prevent premature failure or maximize or extend the useful life of a facility and/or its components. It involves a planned and implemented program of inspection, servicing, testing and replacement of systems and components that is cost effective on a life-cycle basis. Programs shall contain the elements defined in AS 14.11.011(b)(4) and 4 AAC 31.013 to be eligible for funding.

Renewal or Replacement

A scheduled and anticipated systematic upgrading or replacement of a facility system or component to establish its ability to function for a new life cycle.

System(s)

An assembly of components created to perform specific functions in a school facility, such as a roof system, mechanical system or electrical system.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX F: 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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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.

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

Points will be assigned in increments using the following guidelines:

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 discrepancies described. Costs associated with each discrepancy 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 personnel with documented expertise in a building system. It is less than 4 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

Code deficiencies / Protection of structure / Life safety (Application Question 4a;

Points possible: 50)

- 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. Incremental points may be provided for severity, the nature of the item, and effect on the school facility.
- Consider how information provided on the type and nature of code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions relates to definitions provided in Appendix B of the application instructions.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- A project can address a single condition or multiple conditions. Evaluate the severity of each condition. A single condition where the severity and criticalness of the issue is evident may receive more points than a combination of conditions.
- Based on severity and criticalness, individual conditions in a project will be evaluated and the rating will reflect each condition's portion of the project scope. When a combination of code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions create a situation where utilization of the facility is significantly impacted, the project may be awarded higher points.
- For code issues, higher consideration will be given for immediate code upgrades, as compared to upgrades necessary due to other repairs and replacements or updates to older buildings to meet current codes.
- Does the project scope combine severe and non-severe or critical and non-critical conditions? Inclusion of non-severe or non-critical conditions in a project may reduce the score of the project.
- The highest level of points is rare but is reserved to address a situation where the severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions are to the point that the project takes a higher position over other projects. Those rare projects that demonstrate situations with building failure may reach the highest category of need and points.
- 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.
- Per 4 AAC 31.022(c)(8), scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted.

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

Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the failure or imminent failure of the building with evidence that the student population will be vacated. Projects at this level will likely have an emergency situation that will be addressed in the emergency question.	35 to 50 points
Deficiencies related to building code where there is no threat to life safety. These issues include compliance with various current building and accessibility codes. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the type and nature of the building and accessibility code deficiencies. The documentation supports the condition and severity of the violation.	0 to 35 points
Deficiencies in the protection of the structure 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. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the type and nature of the deficiencies in the protection of the structure. The documentation supports the condition and severity of the deficiencies.	0 to 35 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions threatening the health and life safety of students, staff, and the public; building code conditions impacting health and life safety. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the type and nature of the health and life safety deficiencies. The documentation supports the condition and severity of the deficiencies.	0 to 35 points
---	----------------

Regional community facilities (Application Question 5g; Points possible: 5)

- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there documentation with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- 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:

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Cost estimate for total project cost (Application Question 7a; 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 EED 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.

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

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.	27-30 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 65% design development level specifications and drawings.	23-26 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.	18-22 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.	12-17 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.	6-11 points
Construction costs are not supported or many cost elements are missing.	1-5 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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 "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.

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.

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 is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

<p>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.</p>	25-45 points
<p>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. 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.</p>	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 guideline:

<p>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.</p>	25-40 points
<p>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.</p>	11-24 points
<p>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.</p>	1-10 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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 considered?

Points will be assigned in increments using the following guidelines:

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 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:

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

Maintenance Management Narrative (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?
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?

Energy Management Narrative (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?

Custodial Narrative (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?

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?

Maintenance Training Narrative (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?

Capital Planning Narrative (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?

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

School District _____ Date _____
 School Name _____
 Project Title _____
 Fund _____ Category _____
 Phase _____ Maximum Points _____

Max Points		School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
10	1. Condition/Component Survey (Question 6a) Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points		
30	2. District ranking (Question 3a) Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less		
30	3. Weighted average age of facility (Question 3b) A. 0-10 years = 0 points B. > 10 ≤20 years = .5 / year in excess of 10 years C. > 20 ≤30 years = 5 + .75 per year in excess of 20 years D. >30≤40 years = 12.5 + 1.75 per year in excess of 30 years E. > 40 years = 30 points		
30	4. Previous AS 14.11 funding for this project (Questions 8e & 7a) Previous funding = 30 points No previous funding = 0 points		
25	5. Planning & design phase has been completed (Question 6a-6e and Appendix D) A. All required elements of planning = 10 points B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points		
50	6. Unhoused students today (Questions 5a-5g) A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points		N/A
30	7. Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy) (Questions 5a-5g) A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points		N/A
30	8. Type of space added or improved (Question 5i) A. Instructional or resource 30 points B. Support teaching 25 points C. Food service, recreational, and general support 15 points D. Supplemental 10 points		N/A

Formula-Driven Rating Form (continued)

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

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

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

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

Max Points		School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
25	1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program (Question9) A. Maintenance Management Narrative = 5 points maximum B. Energy Management Narrative = 5 points maximum C. Custodial Narrative = 5 points maximum D. Maintenance Training Narrative = 5 points maximum E. Capital Planning Narrative = 5 points maximum		
50	2. Emergency conditions (Question 8a) Did application check “yes”? <input type="checkbox"/> Did discussion support emergency status? <input type="checkbox"/>		
50	3. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions (Question 4a)		
40	4. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs (Question8b) A. Mandated Program = 40 points maximum B. Existing local program = 20 points maximum C. New approved local program = 20 points maximum		
30	5. Reasonableness & completeness of cost or cost estimate (Question 7a)		
30	6. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings (Question 8d)		
5	7. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project (Question 5g)		N/A
25	8. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project (Question 8c)		
255	Total Points		