

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

December 3, 2014
8:30 am to 4:30 pm
1st Floor Conference Room #106
Atwood Building
550 West 7th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska

Chair: Elizabeth Nudelman

Wednesday, December 3rd

8:20 – 8:30 AM	Committee Preparation, Arrival, Packet Review
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Call to Order, Roll Call Review and Approval of Agenda Review and Approval of Minutes
8:45 – 9:00 AM	Public Comment
9:00 – 10:15 AM	CEFPI Presentation Preparation (BR&GR subcommittee)
10:15 – 10:30 AM	BREAK
10:45 – 12:00 PM	CEFPI Presentation Preparation (BR&GR subcommittee) (continued)
12:00 – 1:15 PM	LUNCH
1:15 – 2:30 PM	CEFPI Presentation Preparation (BR&GR subcommittee) (continued)
2:30 – 3:00 PM	Department Briefing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventive Maintenance Update • Debt Reimbursement Funding Status • FY2016 CIP Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Summary Statistics ○ Initial Priority Lists
3:00 – 3:15 PM	BREAK
3:15 – 3:45 PM	Review Appendix D “Type of Space Added or Improved” (BR&GR subcommittee)
3:45 – 3:50 PM	Set Date for Next Meeting
3:50 – 4:00 PM	Committee Member Comments
4:00 PM	Adjourn

This page is intentionally blank

BR & GR September 9 & 10, 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
 Lori Weed

Additional Participants

Julie Cisco (KPBSD)
 Dave Norum (FBNSB)
 Don Carney (Mat Su)
 Jim Hartz (Yupiit SD)
 Gale Bourne (YKSD)
 Ben McFarlane (YKSD)
 Kathy Christy
 Kevin Lyon (Kenai)
 Don Hiley (SERRC)
 Robert Reed (LYSD)

SEPTEMBER 9TH

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL at 8:45AM

Elizabeth Nudelman, chair, called the meeting to order at 8:45am. Roll call was completed; Senator Dunleavy was excused, all other members present and a quorum was established.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA

Agenda reviewed and approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was offered.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Elizabeth reviewed the history of the 2012 request to the committee to rework the CIP application and the process involved that developed the proposed draft before the committee.

Kim began the review of the CIP packet, noting changes to the cover page now includes the grant application deadline of September 1; language was taken from statute. *Carl* asked to include clarification of “postmarked by”, as that is department policy. After discussion, a note “(postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable)” will be added to the instructions.

Kim highlighted additional language regarding supporting documentation, as lack thereof may result in an ineligible application. The next paragraph addresses number of projects and reuse scores. *Doug* noted that there could be an extra 10. *Elwin* agreed, stating this is current department practice. *Kim* continued review of cover page.

Elwin noted main change to Section 1 is the separation of the grant and debt primary purposes (1b) into two columns, as funding categories do not correspond directly. The phase question (1c) is left as a placeholder for possible future use. *Don Hiley* asked why the category letters were removed from debt categories, they are used in district six-year plans. *Elwin* responded that debt projects aren’t separated into lists like the grant projects, so it isn’t as relevant for debt projects. Discussion followed regarding the need for debt category letters.

Don Carney asked that question 1c be better addressed in the instructions, as it is more of a placeholder question; what would happen if there was a request for just planning. *Kim* said that the department doesn't fund a study, but would consider planning funding; if there is a question contact the department. *Don C.* noted that regulation doesn't allow escalation past two years, so value of bond money is lost in the fourth and fifth years of construction. *Elwin* commented that if a debt planning project was brought to the department, it would be approved; however, he foresees most grant projects checking all three phase boxes, until phased funding becomes a more viable option.

Kim covered section 2 questions and instructions, which are fundamentally the same as the FY16 application. *Elizabeth* noted that the department wanted to get the foundational and districtwide information up in front, before concentrating on the project.

Kim noted that the beginning of Section 3 (3a-3c) in the application and instructions is little changed from FY16. The project description/scope of work (3d) is the same as presented in March, but very different from FY16.

Kathy Christy asked for clarification regarding which facilities get listed in 3b. *Kim* stated that any buildings that are part of the project should be included. *Elizabeth* clarified that any out buildings that are connected to the school would need to be listed. *Carl* remarked that it should be any facility identified in the scope of work. *Don H.* asked why it the header includes "and their condition". *Kim* agreed with *Carl* that the header should read "School facilities within scope".

Kim presented project description/scope of work (3d), it now assists districts in walking through a project with headings and bulleted items. Discussion followed on how the outline may provide more assistance to districts in preparing detailed information for review.

General agreement with *Kathy's* suggestion that there be a bullet to address 2d ("explain why this project is not preventive maintenance"). Discussion followed *Don C.'s* comment to provide instruction that scope of work should reflect the category of the project. Committee agreed to add language to application and instructions.

Kim continued on to 3e and 3f, which did not change from previous version; to address an earlier question, 3e is mostly concerned with procurement of construction contracts, but it can be helpful when applicants include design contracts. *Carl* asked for clarification that this does not cover design contracts. *Elizabeth* explained that if there was procurement that did not meet state guidelines, then a lot of work would go into rating and awarding an ineligible grant application.

BREAK

Elizabeth called the meeting back to order and asked for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was offered.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Elwin introduced Section 4, pointing out new header that is more descriptive of what raters are looking for. Biggest change is that this question used to be part of the scope question, causing problems for some applicants that didn't differentiate between scope of project and code issues; it is now at the beginning of the evaluative point categories. Separation will allow the applicant to focus on the conditions that may be why the applicant is really doing the project. The check boxes are to help the

applicant keep the description focused, checking the box does not award points. *Elizabeth* noted that the section header and check boxes align with funding categories, and the description should support the project's category.

Mary and *Doug* suggested changing question and instructions to be "and/or", so all conditions can be incorporated. Discussion regarding the check box instructions. At *Elizabeth's* suggestions, *Elwin* reviewed the instructions for 4a, noting categories and list of conditions that raters will look for and evaluate severity of. Confirmed that a condition's percentage of the project is typically determined by cost. *Bob* suggested that it be explicit in the rater's guide.

Don C. inquired whether the past policy for awarding a small amount of points will continue. *Elwin* recognized that the scores have been conservative in the past, but there is an expectation that the life safety scores may double under the FY17 rater's guidelines. Writers can assist the raters in understanding the condition of the building by providing documentation to verify the severity of the conditions. *Elizabeth* reinforced that this is a significant portion of the application and this shift is to weight this question a little heavier, not to change the rating methodology.

Mary expressed concern that rating the proportionality of severe conditions may provide a strategic aspect to submitting single scope projects. *Elizabeth* acknowledged that that is part of the give and take of ranking projects together, and this approach is consistent with statute. *Carl* stated that it is a district's choice in how a project is presented.

Elwin presented the rater's guidelines, recognizing that while informative to a writer, this is directed to the raters. Outlines criteria for evaluating the conditions being scored; this reflects what the department has been doing. Discussion followed regarding the specifics of scoring and the scoring matrix. In response to an observation that a writer would spend time describing the totality of the building condition or failure, then focus on a few more critical issues, *Elizabeth* noted that the legislature did not say to mix projects together, but the department recognizes the opportunity for economic efficiency in related projects. The department is trying to set an expectation that, unless there is a very big problem, applicants are going to receive less than 35 points.

Don H. remarked that the project category is already chosen, and the check boxes are unnecessary in this question. Asked for clarification on what constitutes building failure. *Don C.* agreed with *Don H.'s* points. Brought up scenario where building was structurally sound, but couldn't be occupied – is that "building failure"? *Kim* pointed out language stating that if students cannot use the building, then that constitutes building failure.

Discussion regarding value of the application and rater's guidelines for question 4a having four categories, two categories, or no separation, and how to denote different point spreads. Agreement to remove "building failure" check box from application, instructions, and guidelines and replace it with a note containing similar language.

Dave Norum noted that, from the discussion regarding weighting of points for critical projects that include non-critical conditions, it sounds like district should put in two projects if there was a roof leak that damaged the interior. *Bob* agreed that correcting damage caused by a condition shouldn't lessen the project score. *Elwin* clarified that repairs due to the roof leak would be included, but a decision to remodel the classroom or wing where the roof leaked would not be part of the roof project. *Kim* suggested adding "unrelated" to guideline bullet regarding combining severe and non-severe projects.

Discussion on layout and scoring in 4a rater's guidelines. Building failure note will contain specific 35-50 point range, boxes will be 0-35. *Elwin* noted that "suggested guidelines" set a floor for building failure not a ceiling on other categories.

Elizabeth passed gavel to *Bob* and was excused.

Kim reviewed discussed changes to question 4a application, instructions, and rater's guidelines. *Mark* moved changes to 4a, *Dean* seconded, unanimous agreement.

LUNCH

Bob called the meeting to order.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes reviewed and approved.

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

Kim reviewed the debt reimbursement tracking, highlighting new department approvals since March.

Wayne presented the current PM State of the State report, noting that 50 of 53 of the school districts are certified. Bering Strait is currently provisionally certified, as it changed the preventive maintenance tracking program being used, but has had a strong preventive maintenance program history; it will be reviewed next year to either remove or give permanent status until next site visit. Iditarod Area, Aleutians Region, and Pribilof Islands are not currently certified and are ineligible for FY16 CIP grants.

Kim reported that the department is still working on the task given at the last meeting regarding project cost and percentage information. Department will continue looking into the design services percentage as time and staffing allows. The Technical Engineer/Architect position known as the facilities manager is still vacant.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Kim continued through the application with Section 5 Requirement for Space to be Added or Replaced. The first part of the section is substantially unchanged. Question 5f was added as a prompt for applicants. *Carl* asked why the change to question 5f to emphasize department worksheets. *Elwin* responded that most applications use the worksheets, and that applicants can still attach calculations and justifications for other methods. *Kim* noted that if another method is used and no justification is attached, then it will default to the department worksheets. *Kim* presented question 5g, which was a new question added as a double check and visual cue to an applicant as to space eligibility.

Instructions for the first part of section 5 are also substantially unchanged. There is a new sentence noting that space variance requests will not be considered during the CIP application review process for work in an application. *Mary* confirmed that information needed to be received prior to the deadline in order to be considered. *Bob* asked that the date of revision for the project worksheets noted in question 5c be included. *Kim* noted that additional instructions were added regarding the space calculation worksheets and a narrative regarding the point calculation for unhoused students was also included.

Kim presented the department proposal that question 5h, regional community facilities, be applicable only to school construction projects. General agreement. *Elwin* noted that the instructions, rater guidelines, and score sheets have corresponding changes.

On question 5i, Table 5.2 Project Space Equation, *Kim* noted that there hasn't been any change to the application, the instructions clarify that the 30 points is for school construction projects. The application doesn't exclude major maintenance projects because it is useful information that can inform projects, particularly renovations.

In the rater's guidelines for question 5h, *Kim* reviewed the scoring matrix. *Carl* asked about scoring for projects in small communities, where there are no reasonable facility options, can those projects get maximum points. *Kim* reiterated that these are suggested guidelines, applicants are unlikely to be penalized for fully answering question with an explanation of no viable options.

Bob turned the gavel back over to the chair.

Bob asked how reuse of score applications will be treated in the next cycle with the removal of question 5h from major maintenance projects scoring. *Kim* responded that any previously awarded points will be removed from the reuse score to make it comparable. *Elizabeth* observed that the applicant can choose to reuse or rewrite the application, and there is plenty of time to make that choice.

BREAK

Elizabeth called the meeting back to order at 4pm. Moving into Section 6, Planning.

Kim expressed the department's hope that it articulated in section 6 what was discussed in March: allows component surveys, allows condition/component surveys older than 4 years to be scored, the 5 point facility appraisal has been removed, condition/component survey has increased from 5 to 10 points, and design development has decreased from 10 to 5 points. Overall total points have decreased from 525 to 520.

Kim stated that the condition/component survey scoring is intended to be formula-driven, but a matrix has been included in the rater's guidelines so the assignment of points can be considered, similar to how the planning and design points are awarded, and districts will know what to expect. Note that the survey can be completed by an architect, engineer, or person with documented expertise in a building system. *Elizabeth* observed that this was directly from the committee request that the department rate based on the value the survey added, not based on who had written it. Discussion following regarding age of condition/component survey as it relates to the scoring matrix.

Bob requested that each change to the draft be recorded, for when the committee approves it at the end of the meeting. *Kim* added that the department would like to go through the packet page by page to reiterate each change. *Mary* requested a hard copy with the changes from the record written in. Committee agreed that one document would have the edits, and would be reviewed page by page at the end of the meeting prior to a vote to approve the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don C. thanked staff and committee for work here and expressed appreciation to the committee for allowing audience participation.

Dave expressed his thanks also and stated that the process has been informative and transparent. He looks forward to see what happens with these changes.

Elizabeth recessed committee meeting at 4:30pm and noted next day's start time to be 8:30 AM on September 10th for public comment and to continuation of the FY17 CIP application review.

SEPTEMBER 10TH

CALL TO ORDER

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 8:33 AM. *Carl* asked to be excused for a half hour teleconference at 2pm.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don C. said that he appreciated yesterday's work and looks forward to seeing it on the page.

Elizabeth noted that the packet that is on the website and in front of the committee is substantially what the final FY17 application will look like, with the committee edits.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Kim reiterated that the committee had completed discussion on the condition/component survey of Section 6, and was now on questions 6b, concept design. Instructions for question 6b now state that the department cost model is acceptable as a planning cost estimate and also include additional language that limited scope projects may not need the services of architect or engineer for an invitation to bid. The appendix lists out the items needed for concept design.

Mary asked whether the condition survey falls under phase one planning and design, as it is listed in two locations as a requirement. *Kim* acknowledged that the department had discussed it and determined that department was trying to reflect that the condition/component survey can get up to 10 points on its own, but that it is also part of phase one, as required. Discussion followed regarding condition survey requirement for major maintenance projects causing double jeopardy. Noted that appendix language follows current department practice and that application changes will allow older surveys to be scored.

Additional discussion regarding what types of scope require what levels of condition documentation. *Don C.* suggested adding language "required if necessary to accomplish scope of project", and consult with department ahead of time if in doubt. Addressing a question brought up, *Kevin* pointed out that the definition allows use of maintenance reports and question 6e documents qualifications of project team members, using it appropriately may be sufficient to justify planning to the department. *Bob* acknowledged that changes to condition survey requirements open up uses for districts, but a definition for "major renovation" should be provided.

Discussion regarding definition of "major renovation" or an alternate term. *Kim* noted that "rehabilitation" is defined in regulation. Agreement to change "major renovation" to "major rehabilitation" with a footnote quoting regulation. *Mary* asked whether "major" is needed, *Doug* responded that including "major" gets people to think to the correct scale.

Mary recommended moving the note about facility appraisal from under instructions for question 6a to question 6b and including language regarding "other appropriate formats", as the appraisal form noted is outdated. *Mark* brought up need to change heading to "Project Planning & Design".

Kim presented design questions 6c and 6d. *Mary* noted that without a condition survey a project will get no points in all of section 6. *Kim* pointed out that this is not a change from existing practice regarding major rehabilitations and condition surveys are not required for other projects. *Bob* reemphasized that, with the new standards allowed for condition surveys, it should not be as difficult

for districts with major rehabilitations to meet the requirement. For question 6d, *Elizabeth* noted that the reduction in design points was at previous committee direction.

Don C. asked whether the boxes in questions 6c and 6d indicate requirements, or, in the case of cost estimates, can a design level document take the place of the schematic. *Bob* suggested referencing Appendix B for requirements. It was decided to add a note with the reference at the top of section 6.

After completing the review of section 6 questions, *Kim* asked for committee approval of the change of four years to five years for condition surveys. *Mary* asked that the age be changed to six years to align with districts' six-year plans. *Kim* noted that a previous facility manager had stressed the four years due to potential changes in code. Agreement to change maximum age to six years for a condition survey to receive full points.

BREAK

Kim noted that there are no changes to Sec. 7, cost model, in the application or instructions; however, the rater guidelines on page 85 has significant changes. Points generally reduce based on design level, this is based on what is currently being done.

Bob stated he was good with the distribution of points. Regarding the cost model generally, he requests that the next cost model extend the escalation out three to four years, as that is when the project "really hits the streets." *Kim* agreed that a task for the department in the upcoming year is issuing the cost model RFP, it could be looked into. *Mary* noted that professional firms do escalate out to three to four years.

Mary asked after the rationale of the matrix scores. *Kim* said it started with 15 points as a mid-point, and concept level seems like mid-range. *Elwin* commented that this was based on what raters' practices have been, and that each level can vary based on descriptions and support. *Bob* noted that there is no way to get above 18-22 points for less than 35% design estimates. *Kim* responded that these are "suggested guidelines" and points can go above or below based on support provided.

Don C. appreciated the point clarifications but is disappointed in the point spread given for EED cost model, as he has found it more accurate than some design teams. The state spends a lot on of money on the cost model, it is user friendly, detailed, and accurate. A lot of project design estimates are from the same company, and they are different. He doesn't believe that there is enough credibility given to cost model.

Elizabeth noted that the cost model is at the concept level, the project is not further defined. *Bob* agreed that the cost model is better than some estimates from other companies and he would like it extended out.

Kim emphasized that these are suggested guidelines, the cost model isn't identified as a 35% document, just as a concept tool.

Kevin concurred with the prior speakers in that it is more accurate than 65% estimates, and his district often overrides the estimates given by contractors because the cost model numbers are more accurate. He would like to see the inflation go out a few more years, because at three years you run out.

Dave has also found that the cost model seems closer than the estimates he has been getting.

Don C. noted that the built in contingency and contractor contingency gets you the extra money to meet inflation for the third year. That's why it works so well.

Elizabeth stated that this will be put on the list for later discussion.

Elwin introduced the emergency question, 8a, noting the added check boxes for emergency and submitted insurance claim. Instructions are new from FY16 but similar to the prior version the committee saw. *Carl* noted there is no 0-5 point award. *Elwin* explained that department discussions concluded that if a project can't get five points, there probably isn't an emergency.

Elizabeth followed up saying that the department didn't see this as an area where points will increase; everything is not an emergency and the department wants to be clear that this is not another code/life safety question. *Elwin* stated that if a facility is compromised for its purpose, that is an emergency.

Bob asked whether, if a project was funded by a district and then submitted, it is still scored as an emergency. *Elwin* confirmed that it is scored as an emergency, even if the district took steps to mitigate. *Kim* noted that it would lend more support to the emergency designation.

Don C. commented that he liked the breakdown and clarity; noting that it is up to the writer to make it clear and convince people it is an emergency as not all critical situations are emergencies.

Mary asked why the title of section 8 used the word "elements". *Elwin* explained that these were point gathering items that didn't fit well elsewhere, but inform the project. *Elizabeth* recommended use of "factors" to conform to language in statute.

Elwin explained that changes to question 8b, inadequacies of space, were in keeping with committee suggestions. *Mary* asked for explanation between state-mandated and local programs. If a school required a set number of electives, is that a local program? *Elwin* responded that perhaps it would depend on the number or kinds of electives available.

Elwin noted that question 8b is primarily directed to school construction, but over the years has affected major maintenance also, so a prompt was added to the rater guidelines to address major maintenance projects that describe educational space impacts. *Elizabeth* confirmed that it speaks to school construction but funding has put more project on major maintenance list. It has not been a highly used factor. These types of projects may move back to the construction list due to the REAA fund.

Mary asked if this would address projects improving security in buildings. *Bob* noted that regulations don't mention security. *Elizabeth* agreed that regulation says "instructional program".

Bob observed that, as the regulations don't speak to security, it would first require a change to statute and regulation; committee should address this in a workshop similar to prior one on vocational education space. General agreement to add topic to list.

Kim addressed question 8c, other options, noting clarifying instructions and incorporation of component aspect of project applications.

Mary asked why a district must specifically consider double shifting, as opposed to sliding schedules, etc., and what kind of action is needed. *Kim* responded that the current rater guidelines asked the question, so it was put on application. *Bob* suggested attaching minutes of either facility review committee or school board. *Bob* noted that many districts present options to get community support,

but may not be providing that information to the department. General discussion regarding life-cycle cost analysis.

Elizabeth asked that all return at 1:15. The committee recessed for lunch.

LUNCH

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kevin thanked the committee for the process and listening to the public throughout. Acknowledged that there will be tweaks needed in the next few years and challenges the committee to go ahead and address those tweaks as they need to happen.

Kathy agreed with *Kevin* and added that the changes will make it easier for new people and those who have completed the application before. Changes have eliminated some of her questions and pet peeves regarding the application.

Dave believes instructions will be much clearer and gave a thumbs up.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Elwin noted that question 8d, annual operating cost savings, is geared toward energy category projects. The application question did not change, instructions were cleaned up with an effort to make it clear department is looking for the potential payback, and in the rater guidelines the matrix was added. *Mary* asked about a scenario where a school isn't meeting air quality code and the system put in costs more to run than is saved; there will be no payback. *Bob* observed that it would be a code project. *Elwin* stated that some application discussion can occur regarding savings to maintenance and custodial time for minimal points, but this question is to bump up category E projects. Not all projects will score high in all questions. Discussion regarding span of payback period; longer than 20 years is not reasonable.

Kim stated that question 8e, phased funding, was reworded, but intent did not change, and no changes to instructions. *Elizabeth* observed that there are no rater guidelines as it is a formula-driven item. *Kim* noted that question 8f, participating share waiver, also had no changes to the application or instructions. Section 9 is also primarily unchanged. *Wayne* noted that the documentation and reports he looks for during his five-year rotation visits are the same needed for a CIP application, so districts that don't partake in the CIP process are not as familiar with these reports.

Elwin addressed previous discussion regarding the checkboxes in application question 4a, life safety, noting that the checkboxes are redundant between the instructions and rater's guidelines, and proposed deletion from the application. Committee agreed.

Returning to the end of the application, *Elwin* discussed the new layout of the attachment checklist: identifies project eligibility item, district eligibility items, and project description items. Committee discussed number of attachments required and added clarification sentence to six-year plan.

Lori presented the reorganization and changes to the instruction appendices. In reordered Appendix A, the sentences noting corresponding debt categories were removed. *Mary* asked if there will be a new debt appendix. *Lori* responded that, with the change to question 1b, the debt is no longer separated into different categories in the application. *Elwin* noted that debt projects do not relate directly to the

grant categories and do not have the same restrictions as grant projects. Any debt project could be a 70 percent or 50 percent project, depending on unhoued space available.

Lori noted previous discussion of changes in Appendix B; new date reflects potential adoption at meeting. Appendix C has a new date reflecting committee revision from March meeting. Appendices D and E were unchanged. *Mary* requested that a future committee topic be updating the nomenclature of Appendix D, which has significantly changed.

The title of Appendix F was revised. *Mary* asked whether the date should also be updated. *Kim* stated that previously the date has not been updated unless there were changes to the body. Consensus to not change the date in order to keep a clearer historical record.

Kim reviewed the changes to the formula-driven and evaluative rating forms.

Elizabeth proposed that *Kim* read through the changes the committee will be approving to the packet as presented. *Kim* read through the packet copy labeled "committee edits" page by page, reading each proposed change for the record. Additional minor changes were incorporated per committee direction.

ACTION ITEM: APPROVE FY17 CIP APPLICATION

Carl made a motion to approve edits as marked in *Kim's* green-tabbed "Committee Edits" book for the FY17 CIP application. *Bob* seconded. Roll call vote passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Carl thanked the department for a remarkable job with very few edits. Also thanked the public for attending and providing excellent recommendations that the committee took under advisement and in many cases incorporated. Asserted that everyone has done a terrific job with this process.

Bob agreed and expressed his thanks for the many hours that the department has obviously spent working on the packet. Shared appreciation for the public, the end users that provided feedback.

Mary noted that the committee needs to go back and revisit the educational spaces listed in Appendix D for the FY18 application. Possibly look at separating a simpler debt reimbursement form. After next year's project submission, would like a briefing on the shifts in the types of projects from a historical perspective. She hopes that districts see a cost savings based on these changes.

Mark echoed *Carl* and *Bob*, and thanked committee for the nice work.

Doug shared his belief that this is a superior product than if the committee had continued with prior approach. Appreciates that the people with a lot of experience in the process, who have read hundreds of applications, came in with the beginnings of a plan and that there was an efficient process: main areas of change were identified, run by credible people, i.e. the committee, and received excellent input from expert users in the field. Product is not perfect, but solves the concerns brought up and is very serviceable. Believes that it gets to objective of rating the project, not the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don C. appreciated that the committee accepted and considered suggestions. Agrees that the application is a living document and will have to be looked at next year in a post-application meeting to see what worked well and what did not. Likes the additions to the rater guidelines. Believes it was a well done process and looks forward to seeing how the product works.

Dave thanked the committee for making the public part of the process; suggestions were vetted and talked out.

Don H. echoed *Doug* and believes the process is vastly superior. Appreciated the time taken to go back and look at things as well as allowing public comment.

Elizabeth thanked the public and committee for patience and work. Noted that this was direction brought by the commissioner and will look forward to telling him that the committee has completed the project with the support of stakeholders across the state.

FUTURE MEETING DATE

Elizabeth proposed December 3, 2014, for a half day, as the next meeting to present the CIP lists. Noted that many stakeholders will be in town for various conferences and meetings.

Carl recommended that the committee present the changes in the application to CEFPI to assist in the understanding of what the committee does. *Mary* agreed that a sidebar discussion on best practices could be helpful also. *Carl* suggested an hour presentation, using part of the December meeting to put it together. *Mary* proposed the purpose would be twofold, talk about what the committee is and does and explain the structure of the new application and the impetus for the change; make it more of a roundtable. *Elizabeth* asked *Carl* to lead the subcommittee to prep, *Carl* accepted. *Carl* asked for subcommittee members, *Bob* volunteered. *Bob* clarified that the whole committee will attend CEFPI. *Kim* would be available to participate in a roundtable discussion to provide background.

Mary proposed agenda item to begin reviewing Appendix D. *Doug* recommended asking around the state as to what kinds of space should be on the list. *Mary* and *Doug* agreed to form a subcommittee.

Doug asked that the department come back to the committee with information regarding the suggestion to run out the cost model estimation to three or four years, possibly as part of the upcoming RFP: generation of costs for the department, inherent limitations, and other issues that may not be obvious. *Elizabeth* responded that the department may be able to do a short update. *Doug* clarified that he would like an indication if it is possible, or if factors make it too challenging. *Kim* noted that December is early for the RFP, next spring is typical. *Elizabeth* remarked that it is under the Administration's oversight. *Kim* noted that there may be a technical correction in the application to reflect any update to the version of the cost model.

Elizabeth reviewed potential agenda items. *Mary* asked for department to provide some historical information on Appendix D, why is it there, what areas need to be updated. *Bob* stated that it probably came from last CEFPI presentation. *Kim* agreed that it relates back to the CEFPI document on how to write educational specifications, and that the document was revised a couple of years ago.

Elizabeth confirmed that the first part of the December 3rd meeting will be on the CEFPI presentation and agenda topics will be addressed after lunch.

Carl moved to adjourn, seconded.

MEETING ADJOURNED

This page is intentionally blank

FY2017 CIP Application Packet Summary

Application

- Questions are reorganized for clarity. Questions are grouped under section headers to establish eligibility, project description, and scoring criteria.
- Additional clarification is added to inform question completion.
- The project scope description (3d) and the code deficiency/protection of structure/life safety (4a) questions are separated.
- For the project planning section (6a-6d) of the application, check boxes are added to ensure that all applicable required planning and design elements have been completed.
- Check boxes are included in the emergency and code deficiency/protection of structure/life safety (4a) questions to identify the type of emergency or conditions described in the application.

Instructions

- Expanded guidance is included throughout. For example, the code deficiency, protection of structure, life safety (4a) question includes descriptions on the types of conditions that are evaluated.

Guidelines for Raters

- Additional clarifying information is added to the Guidelines.
- Matrices are added to provide evaluation transparency.
- Component surveys may now be submitted.
- Condition/component surveys older than 4 years are now eligible for point consideration.
- The code deficiency/protection of structure/life safety question is updated to provide guidance to raters. The expectation with the incremental points is that scores will be higher than in previous years.
- The regional community facilities question (5g), valued at 5 points, is removed from major maintenance scoring.

Points

- Facility appraisal is removed and 5 points are deleted; condition/component survey points increase from 5 points to 10 points.
- Design development points decrease from 10 points to 5 points.
- Total points possible decreased from 525 points to 520 points.

This page is intentionally blank



**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 within scope** (Up to 30 points)
 What buildings or building portion (i.e., original building or addition) will be included in the scope of work of the project?

(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)). Ensure project aligns with selected funding category.

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
- Explain why this project is not preventive maintenance
- 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/or life safety conditions; attach supporting documentation.

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
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			
2022-2023			

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

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 & DESIGN

NOTE: Reference Appendix B of the instructions for required elements.

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

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

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

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

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 14th 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.

Table 7.1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE					
Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	I Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant ¹	2 - 4%				
Land ²					
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					

- 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%).
- Include only if necessary for completion of this project. Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the Project Description (Question 3d), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
- Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.
- Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department’s publication, Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases for calculation methodology (2005). The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate (from the base year of 2005) added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
- Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project; this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost.
- 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.

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

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

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

Has the district submitted an insurance claim? yes no

If no, explain below.

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

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

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 F 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. Submit two copies, regardless of the number of project applications.

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

District eligibility attachments: Submit two copies, regardless of the 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: _____

This page is intentionally blank

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



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

FY2017

*These instructions support AKEED Form #05-15-020
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 (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable).

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 (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable).

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

1b. Primary purpose. 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 05-11-068. 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 the existence of a Fixed Asset Inventory System during its on-site Preventive Maintenance program review every five years. The department will annually review the district's most recently submitted annual audit for information regarding its fixed asset inventory system. School districts that 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.

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

- 2c. Property insurance.** The department may not award a school construction grant to a district that does not have replacement cost property insurance. AS 14.03.150, AS 14.11.011(b)(2) and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.
- 2d. Capital improvement project.** AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request is for a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix 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, 2014 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Fund 100 General Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. *[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. 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 within scope. (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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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 5i. 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 how 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 2d: 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

projects as well as projects adding space. For projects adding space, use this question to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

Question 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 and summarized, 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; ensure project aligns with selected category. 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

complete, attach documentation that establishes that the construction was procured in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080.

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

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

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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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

The project could contain a single severe condition or multiple moderate conditions. Multiple conditions will be rated collectively, but may not necessarily rank as high as a single severe condition. For projects, such as districtwide projects, that combine critical and non-critical work, points for the critical portion of the project will be weighted proportionally. 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 2002 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, "2015 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 Capacity", and "Projected Capacity" with the application. The department may adjust the submitted ADMs 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

awarded. If current capacity is over 100%, then one point for every 3% percent over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a current capacity over 250%, the full 50 points will be awarded.

2. Unhoused Students in Seven Years: If capacity five years post-occupancy is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 5% over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a capacity five years post-occupancy over 250%, the full 30 points will be awarded.

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 (e.g., 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 (e.g. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project. 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 & DESIGN:

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

6a. Condition/Component survey. (0 to 10 points possible – refer to Rater Guidelines for scoring criteria) A *facility condition survey* is a technical survey of facilities and buildings, using the department’s Guide for School Facility Condition Survey or a similar format, for the purpose of determining compliance with established building codes and standards for safety, maintenance, repair, 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.

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.

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

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 / Design team. The application needs to identify the district’s architectural or engineering (A/E) consultant for the Condition Survey, Planning, Schematic Design and Design Development work. 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

7. COST ESTIMATE

7a. Cost estimate 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 [AS 14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If the project exceeds the recommended percentages, add a detailed justification 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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>

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 project costs.

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

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

8a. Emergency conditions. (50 points possible) Emergencies are conditions that pose a high level of threat for building use by occupants. An emergency exists when students are currently unhoused due to the loss of the facility, or damage to the facility due to circumstances associated with the emergency. An emergency also exists when the district's ability to utilize the facility is impacted or there is an immediate or high probability of a threat to property, life, health, or safety.

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

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,

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- what action the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions, and
- the extent to which any portion of the project is eligible for insurance reimbursement or emergency funding from any state or federal agency.

Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, photos, third party communications, insurance claims, or other records verifying the conditions. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the emergency condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

The emergency descriptions with check boxes contained in question 8a are to help the applicant identify the type of emergency the project is resolving. The applicant must provide a description of the particular emergency in the application and include all relevant documentation that supports the immediacy or high probability of the threat or emergency. An application that checks an emergency building condition box without a description of the emergency will receive no points.

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

Building

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

Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. Example: The roof of a school came off in a severe wind storm with water damage to interior finishes.

Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. Example: It is discovered that the building does not meet current specified safety standards and the building will need to be made current with the standards within the next 90 days. Documentation substantiating the order needs to be supplied.

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 may consider options such as double shifting, service area boundary changes, and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes.
- Projects that propose construction of a new school should discuss other options, such as renovation of the existing building or acquisition of alternative facilities, and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.
- Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary.

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 operating cost savings. (30 points possible) Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. Explain and document ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. This analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis. Consider energy costs, costs related to wear-and-tear, maintenance of existing facilities costs, and costs incurred by current functional inadequacies at the facility and attendance area level. Provide benchmark values such as fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, and historical record of problems to be addressed by this project.

For new facilities, discuss design choices that will provide periodic and long-term savings in the operation and maintenance of the facility. Although the addition of square footage may increase overall operational costs, project descriptions for this category of project should include information on methods and strategies used to minimize operational costs over the life of the building. Include cost benefit analyses that were accomplished on building systems and materials.

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

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

8e. 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.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Item C: Produce a districtwide report showing the number of incomplete work orders sorted by age (30 days, 60 days, 90 days, etc.) and status for the previous 12 months (deferred, awaiting materials, assigned, etc.).

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

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 five years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded.) The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2014 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Fund 100 General Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11.

The five-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide. 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

systems, some related to the way the facilities are being used. The results of the energy management program should also be discussed.

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 (e.g., 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 the 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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. Include a condition/component survey as referenced above - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation¹)**
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 rehabilitation¹)**

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 rehabilitation¹)**
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)**

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
APPENDIX 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 (4 AAC 31.040)
4. Advertising, bidding and contract award (4 AAC 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, and environmental and cultural survey costs, but not site preparation. Site investigation costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

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

Recommended: 6-10% (Renovation, complexity of scope, and scale might run 2% higher)

Construction includes all contract work as well as force account for facility construction, site preparation, and utilities. This is the base cost upon which others are estimated and equals 100%.

Equipment/Technology includes all moveable furnishing, instructional devices or aids, electronic and mechanical equipment with associated software and peripherals (consultant services necessary to make equipment operational may also be included). It does not include installed equipment, nor consumable supplies, with the exception of the initial purchase of library books. Items purchased should meet the district definition of a fixed asset and be accounted for in an inventory control system. The Equipment/Technology budget has two benchmarks for standard funding: percentage of construction costs and per-student costs as discussed in 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 3,000 or are not on a year-round, publicly-maintained road system and have a construction cost differential greater than 120% of Anchorage as determined in the Cost Model for Alaskan Schools. The department recommends budgeting for art.

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

Recommended: 5% Fixed

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

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

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.

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 6b-6e and Appendix B) 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		

This page is intentionally blank



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

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 A 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 unrelated 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.
- 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)
- 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 guidelines:

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?
- 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 that is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the failure, and that the students are currently unhoused.	25-45 points
A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and 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.	5-25 points

Inadequacies of Existing Space (Application Question 8b; Points possible: 40)

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

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

Other options (Application Question 8c; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed. Does the discussion provide alternatives and details that support a strong vetting of the project options?
- Consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other. Does the comparison of options support the project chosen?
- Scoring should increase in accordance with the amount of detailed information; graduated into three levels of: 1) unsupported narrative, 2) well supported narrative, and 3) detailed cost analysis.
- Consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For installed mechanical equipment, was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new?
- For over-crowding, was double shifting or other alternatives considered?

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested 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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Annual operating cost savings (Application question 8d; Points possible: 30)

- This should be rated based on information provided which specifically address this issue.
- Evaluation should be based on district provided data and analysis rather than opinion.
- Top scores should be reserved for those projects that can demonstrate a payback within a relatively brief period of time.
- Should be consistent with life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis (if provided). This may have either a positive or a negative relationship to justification of a project.
- Evaluation may reward efforts to contain or reduce operating costs even if the project doesn't save money or have a payback (i.e. – utilizing LEED or CHPS standards for construction).

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

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

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

Maintenance Management Narrative (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?

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 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?
- 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?

By: Facilities Staff**Date:** December 3, 2014**Phone:** 465-6906**File:** 2014-12-3 Staff Briefing**For:** Bond Reimbursement and Grant
Review Committee**Subject:** EED Facilities Overview

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

Preventive Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)

To date, 50 of 53 school districts have certified preventive maintenance programs.

Completed school district site visits since the September 2014 BR&GR meeting include:

- Kodiak Island
- Kashunamiut

Upcoming school district site visits for FY 2015 include.

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

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report (attached) was updated on August 15, 2014.

Districts that are certified, but still working with the department to develop a full year of reports (Provisional Certification) include:

- Bering Strait

Districts that are not currently certified include:

- Aleutian Region
- Iditarod Area
- Pribilof Island

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.

Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB 237)

The updated debt tracking report under SB237 starting July 1, 2010 is attached to 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 total voter approved amount is \$718,922,128. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$718,922,128.

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 70% - \$550,583,249

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

Initial CIP Lists

The initial CIP lists are included in the packet. The department provided a memo to the School Superintendents that announced the availability of the lists. The department also transmitted the lists to the Governor's office for their use in developing the FY2016 capital budget.

Following are some year-to-year statistics

	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Districts Submitting Applications	35	34	35
Number of Applications Submitted	137	121	126
Number of Applications Scored	85	98	69
Number of Applications Reused	52	23	57
Number of Applications Ineligible	2	2	6
Number of Applications with a Change in List	2	2	4
Number of Applications with a Budget Adjustment	5	11	7
Number of Projects on the Major Maintenance List	111	102	102
Number of Projects on the School Construction List	24	17	18
Amount Requested on Major Maintenance List	\$253,682,082	\$183,505,181	\$172,195,526
Amount Requested on School Construction List	\$284,133,432	\$274,150,436	\$230,920,120

Publications Update

Following is a list of publications currently managed by the department along with an estimated revision priority, and the year of publication or latest draft:

1. Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Guide (Preventative Maintenance

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

Staffing Update

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

This page is intentionally blank



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



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
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	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
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
Yupiit	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.

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

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	

<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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</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"/>	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"/>	
	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"/>	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-14-105	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
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	\$412,367	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Haines Vocational Education Building Mechanical Upgrades	7/22/2014	\$1,711,027	\$1,711,027	\$1,711,027	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<i>District</i>	<i>Project Number</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Dept Approval</i>	<i>Req Amt</i>	<i>Voter Amt</i>	<i>EED Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	7/22/2014	\$783,938		\$783,938	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not submitted to voters 10/7/14
		Haines High School Roof Replacement	7/22/2014	\$1,814,747	\$0	\$1,814,747	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	not approved by voters 10/7/14
Haines Totals:				\$4,722,079	\$2,123,394	\$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	\$2,178,251	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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	DR-13-101	Schoenbar Middle School Field Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$232,000	\$232,000			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Combined with DR-13-103
	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"/>	
	DR-13-103	Districtwide Site Upgrades	9/10/2012	\$228,728	\$228,728	\$788,800	70%	<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"/>	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			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Funds are redirected from DR-10-100; Combined with DR-13-103
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"/>	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	
	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"/>	

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

<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 Apprvd Amt</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>EED Apprvd</i>	<i>Voter Apprvd</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"/>	
	DR-12-122	Districtwide HVAC Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	\$7,100,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-123	Emergency Power Generators & Switch Gear, 9-Schools	2/29/2012	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-124	Houston HS Exterior Envelope Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-125	Houston MS/Palmer MS Locker Replacement	2/29/2012	\$335,000	\$335,000	\$335,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	DR-12-126	Districtwide ADA Upgrades	2/29/2012	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	70%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<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	\$718,922,128	\$775,845,813				
----------------------	--	--	--	---------------	---------------	---------------	--	--	--	--

Total of Projects Both Voter and EED Approved: \$718,922,128
(This is a total of the EED Approved Amount.)

This page is intentionally blank

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler Rehabilitation	\$37,793	\$37,793	\$0	\$37,793	\$13,228	\$24,565	\$24,565
2	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K Demoski K-12 School Renovation, Nulato	\$10,854,763	\$10,854,763	\$0	\$10,854,763	\$217,095	\$10,637,668	\$10,662,233
3	Nome City	Districtwide Lighting Replacement	\$275,447	\$275,447	\$0	\$275,447	\$82,634	\$192,813	\$10,855,046
4	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Boiler Replacement	\$2,689,945	\$2,689,945	\$0	\$2,689,945	\$53,799	\$2,636,146	\$13,491,192
5	Fairbanks	Barnette K-8 Magnet School Renovation, Phase 4	\$10,483,430	\$10,483,430	\$0	\$10,483,430	\$3,145,029	\$7,338,401	\$20,829,593
6	Kake City	Kake High School Boiler Replacement, Phase 2	\$258,703	\$258,703	\$0	\$258,703	\$51,741	\$206,962	\$21,036,555
7	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary HVAC System Upgrades	\$1,499,455	\$1,499,455	\$0	\$1,499,455	\$524,809	\$974,646	\$22,011,201
8	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Sprinkler Upgrades	\$93,927	\$93,927	\$0	\$93,927	\$32,874	\$61,053	\$22,072,254
9	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	\$1,644,086	\$1,644,086	\$0	\$1,644,086	\$575,430	\$1,068,656	\$23,140,910
10	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	\$1,047,202	\$1,047,202	\$0	\$1,047,202	\$20,944	\$1,026,258	\$24,167,168
11	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	\$249,815	\$249,815	\$0	\$249,815	\$49,963	\$199,852	\$24,367,020
12	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Headquarters Classroom Building Renovation	\$7,972,807	\$7,972,807	\$0	\$7,972,807	\$398,640	\$7,574,167	\$31,941,187
13	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	\$299,736	\$299,736	\$0	\$299,736	\$104,908	\$194,828	\$32,136,015
14	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	\$58,999	\$58,999	\$0	\$58,999	\$1,180	\$57,819	\$32,193,834
15	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	\$1,249,562	\$1,249,562	\$0	\$1,249,562	\$24,991	\$1,224,571	\$33,418,405
16	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	\$5,707,874	\$5,550,444	\$0	\$5,550,444	\$277,522	\$5,272,922	\$38,691,327
17	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, & Intercom Replacement	\$528,005	\$528,005	\$0	\$528,005	\$184,802	\$343,203	\$39,034,530
18	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door & Flooring Replacement	\$142,754	\$142,754	\$0	\$142,754	\$14,275	\$128,479	\$39,163,009
19	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Air Conditioning & Ventilation Replacement	\$1,404,509	\$1,404,509	\$0	\$1,404,509	\$421,353	\$983,156	\$40,146,165
20	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	\$2,951,930	\$2,951,930	\$0	\$2,951,930	\$59,039	\$2,892,891	\$43,039,056
21	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	\$223,203	\$223,203	\$0	\$223,203	\$4,464	\$218,739	\$43,257,795
22	Craig City	Craig Middle School Renovation	\$11,576,829	\$11,576,829	\$0	\$11,576,829	\$1,157,683	\$10,419,146	\$53,676,941

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
23	Hoonah City	Hoonah Campus Boiler Replacement	\$254,406	\$254,406	\$0	\$254,406	\$76,322	\$178,084	\$53,855,025
24	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary East Wing Flooring Replacement	\$323,326	\$323,326	\$0	\$323,326	\$113,164	\$210,162	\$54,065,187
25	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$3,788,070	\$3,788,070	\$0	\$3,788,070	\$189,403	\$3,598,667	\$57,663,854
26	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	\$107,692	\$107,692	\$0	\$107,692	\$32,308	\$75,384	\$57,739,238
27	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$575,201	\$575,201	\$0	\$575,201	\$11,504	\$563,697	\$58,302,935
28	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance	\$102,608	\$102,608	\$0	\$102,608	\$35,913	\$66,695	\$58,369,630
29	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Sound System	\$244,443	\$244,443	\$0	\$244,443	\$4,889	\$239,554	\$58,609,184
30	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School, Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	\$1,078,065	\$1,078,065	\$0	\$1,078,065	\$21,561	\$1,056,504	\$59,665,688
31	Copper River	District Office Roof Renovation & Energy Upgrade	\$1,071,600	\$1,071,600	\$0	\$1,071,600	\$21,432	\$1,050,168	\$60,715,856
32	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Biomass Boiler	\$2,148,207	\$2,148,207	\$0	\$2,148,207	\$751,872	\$1,396,335	\$62,112,191
33	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$171,745	\$171,745	\$0	\$171,745	\$60,111	\$111,634	\$62,223,825
34	Haines	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	\$783,938	\$783,938	\$0	\$783,938	\$274,378	\$509,560	\$62,733,385
35	Kenai Peninsula	Kenai Middle School Asbestos Removal/Security Upgrade	\$7,689,657	\$7,689,657	\$0	\$7,689,657	\$2,691,380	\$4,998,277	\$67,731,662
36	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$454,629	\$454,629	\$0	\$454,629	\$9,093	\$445,536	\$68,177,198
37	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	\$931,657	\$931,657	\$0	\$931,657	\$93,166	\$838,491	\$69,015,689
38	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	\$599,336	\$599,336	\$0	\$599,336	\$11,987	\$587,349	\$69,603,038
39	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Roof & Siding Replacement, Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$2,126,025	\$2,126,025	\$0	\$2,126,025	\$425,205	\$1,700,820	\$71,303,858
40	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$885,683	\$633,095	\$0	\$633,095	\$189,928	\$443,167	\$71,747,025
41	Yukon Flats	Boiler & Control Upgrades, 3 Schools (Fort Yukon Voc Ed Center, Beaver & Chalkyitsik K-12 Schools)	\$1,921,947	\$1,921,947	\$0	\$1,921,947	\$38,439	\$1,883,508	\$73,630,533
42	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Security Upgrades	\$1,061,608	\$1,061,608	\$0	\$1,061,608	\$371,563	\$690,045	\$74,320,578
43	Craig City	Craig High School Biomass Boiler	\$545,970	\$545,970	\$0	\$545,970	\$54,597	\$491,373	\$74,811,951
44	Denali Borough	Districtwide Security Upgrades	\$2,319,402	\$2,319,402	\$0	\$2,319,402	\$463,880	\$1,855,522	\$76,667,473

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
45	Lower Yukon	Fuel Tank & Soil Remediation Projects, 3 Sites (Ignatius Beans, Pilot Station & Scammon Bay K-12 Schools)	\$4,361,975	\$4,361,975	\$0	\$4,361,975	\$87,239	\$4,274,736	\$80,942,209
46	Kenai Peninsula	Homer High School Roofing Replacement	\$5,791,055	\$5,791,055	\$0	\$5,791,055	\$2,026,869	\$3,764,186	\$84,706,395
47	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting System Installation	\$115,367	\$115,367	\$0	\$115,367	\$2,307	\$113,060	\$84,819,455
48	Copper River	Slana K-12 School Renovation	\$1,414,866	\$1,414,866	\$0	\$1,414,866	\$28,297	\$1,386,569	\$86,206,024
49	Lower Kuskokwim	Eek K-12 School Renovation	\$3,546,235	\$3,546,235	\$0	\$3,546,235	\$70,925	\$3,475,310	\$89,681,334
50	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Carpet Replacement	\$98,719	\$98,719	\$0	\$98,719	\$1,974	\$96,745	\$89,778,079
51	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	\$2,694,694	\$2,694,694	\$0	\$2,694,694	\$53,894	\$2,640,800	\$92,418,879
52	Sitka City Borough	Keet Gooshi Heen Covered PE Structure Renovation	\$463,823	\$463,823	\$0	\$463,823	\$162,338	\$301,485	\$92,720,364
53	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	\$4,057,191	\$4,057,191	\$0	\$4,057,191	\$81,144	\$3,976,047	\$96,696,411
54	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	\$624,473	\$624,473	\$0	\$624,473	\$124,895	\$499,578	\$97,195,989
55	Copper River	Glennallen & Kenny Lake K-12 Schools Energy Upgrades	\$2,581,525	\$2,581,525	\$0	\$2,581,525	\$51,630	\$2,529,895	\$99,725,884
56	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	\$1,393,754	\$1,393,754	\$0	\$1,393,754	\$27,875	\$1,365,879	\$101,091,763
57	Haines	Haines High School Roof Replacement	\$1,814,747	\$1,814,747	\$0	\$1,814,747	\$635,161	\$1,179,586	\$102,271,349
58	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$1,389,662	\$1,389,662	\$0	\$1,389,662	\$27,793	\$1,361,869	\$103,633,218
59	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Emergency Generator	\$2,458,389	\$2,458,389	\$0	\$2,458,389	\$860,436	\$1,597,953	\$105,231,171
60	Chugach	Tatitlek K-12 School Renovation	\$1,009,029	\$1,009,029	\$0	\$1,009,029	\$20,181	\$988,848	\$106,220,019
61	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School/Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$504,070	\$504,070	\$0	\$504,070	\$151,221	\$352,849	\$106,572,868
62	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Plumbing Renovations	\$471,039	\$471,039	\$0	\$471,039	\$141,312	\$329,727	\$106,902,595
63	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation, Bethel	\$189,206	\$189,206	\$0	\$189,206	\$3,784	\$185,422	\$107,088,017
64	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Provisions Installation	\$43,931	\$43,931	\$0	\$43,931	\$879	\$43,052	\$107,131,069
65	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	\$182,125	\$266,233	\$0	\$266,233	\$53,247	\$212,986	\$107,344,055
66	Kuspuk	Districtwide Energy & Sprinkler Upgrades	\$5,605,303	\$5,605,303	\$0	\$5,605,303	\$112,106	\$5,493,197	\$112,837,252
67	Kodiak Island	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$1,271,862	\$1,271,862	\$0	\$1,271,862	\$381,559	\$890,303	\$113,727,555

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
68	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Locker Room Renovation	\$515,375	\$515,375	\$0	\$515,375	\$180,381	\$334,994	\$114,062,549
69	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	\$1,895,488	\$1,895,488	\$0	\$1,895,488	\$663,421	\$1,232,067	\$115,294,616
70	Chugach	Chenega Bay K-12 School Renovation	\$1,268,089	\$1,268,089	\$0	\$1,268,089	\$25,362	\$1,242,727	\$116,537,343
71	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$307,577	\$307,577	\$0	\$307,577	\$6,152	\$301,425	\$116,838,768
72	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon K-12 School Soil Remediation & Tank Farm Replacement	\$9,164,825	\$9,164,825	\$0	\$9,164,825	\$183,296	\$8,981,529	\$125,820,297
73	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Renovation	\$738,248	\$738,248	\$0	\$738,248	\$14,765	\$723,483	\$126,543,780
74	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$1,218,912	\$1,218,912	\$0	\$1,218,912	\$24,378	\$1,194,534	\$127,738,314
75	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Exterior Envelope Replacement	\$1,031,355	\$1,031,355	\$0	\$1,031,355	\$20,627	\$1,010,728	\$128,749,042
76	Kake City	Districtwide Exterior Upgrades	\$768,898	\$266,233	\$0	\$266,233	\$53,247	\$212,986	\$128,962,028
77	Yupitit	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Removal & Replacement	\$4,690,676	\$4,690,676	\$0	\$4,690,676	\$93,814	\$4,596,862	\$133,558,890
78	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 Renovation	\$3,091,136	\$3,091,136	\$0	\$3,091,136	\$61,823	\$3,029,313	\$136,588,203
79	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Mechanical Control Upgrades	\$1,375,231	\$1,375,231	\$0	\$1,375,231	\$27,505	\$1,347,726	\$137,935,929
80	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$272,602	\$272,602	\$0	\$272,602	\$81,781	\$190,821	\$138,126,750
81	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,651,554	\$1,651,554	\$0	\$1,651,554	\$33,031	\$1,618,523	\$139,745,273
82	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	\$91,559	\$91,559	\$0	\$91,559	\$1,831	\$89,728	\$139,835,001
83	Kodiak Island	Main Elementary & Kodiak Middle School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$625,483	\$625,483	\$0	\$625,483	\$187,645	\$437,838	\$140,272,839
84	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrades	\$264,549	\$264,549	\$0	\$264,549	\$5,291	\$259,258	\$140,532,097
85	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	\$3,151,227	\$3,151,227	\$0	\$3,151,227	\$63,025	\$3,088,202	\$143,620,299
86	Kodiak Island	East Elementary & Peterson Elementary Flooring Replacement	\$1,810,343	\$1,810,343	\$0	\$1,810,343	\$543,103	\$1,267,240	\$144,887,539
87	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline Projects, 2 Sites (Pilot Station & Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	\$1,661,050	\$1,661,050	\$0	\$1,661,050	\$33,221	\$1,627,829	\$146,515,368
88	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 School Gymnasium Relocation & Foundation	\$180,593	\$180,593	\$0	\$180,593	\$3,612	\$176,981	\$146,692,349
89	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	\$4,014,732	\$4,014,732	\$0	\$4,014,732	\$80,295	\$3,934,437	\$150,626,786

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
90	Southwest Region	Ekwoq K-8 Renovation	\$6,314,728	\$6,265,005	\$0	\$6,265,005	\$125,300	\$6,139,705	\$156,766,491
91	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School Addressable Fire Alarm Replacement	\$457,171	\$457,171	\$0	\$457,171	\$137,151	\$320,020	\$157,086,511
92	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 Renovation	\$4,813,416	\$4,813,416	\$0	\$4,813,416	\$96,268	\$4,717,148	\$161,803,659
93	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School & Peterson Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement And Recommissioning	\$2,911,203	\$2,911,203	\$0	\$2,911,203	\$873,361	\$2,037,842	\$163,841,501
94	Kodiak Island	Flooring Replacement, Akhiok, Karluk, Ouzinkie K-12 Schools	\$661,595	\$661,595	\$0	\$661,595	\$198,478	\$463,117	\$164,304,618
95	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	\$702,767	\$702,767	\$0	\$702,767	\$14,055	\$688,712	\$164,993,330
96	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	\$302,743	\$302,743	\$0	\$302,743	\$6,055	\$296,688	\$165,290,018
97	Kodiak Island	East Elementary Interior Renovation	\$2,739,545	\$2,739,545	\$0	\$2,739,545	\$821,863	\$1,917,682	\$167,207,700
98	Kodiak Island	Underground Storage Tank Replacements, 5 Sites (Chiniak, Karluk, Port Lions, Larsen Bay, Old Harbor K-12 Schools)	\$1,810,440	\$1,091,680	\$0	\$1,091,680	\$327,504	\$764,176	\$167,971,876
99	Lower Yukon	Security Access System Upgrades - 6 Sites	\$1,566,586	\$1,566,586	\$0	\$1,566,586	\$31,332	\$1,535,254	\$169,507,130
100	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point Exterior Envelope Replacement	\$813,007	\$813,007	\$0	\$813,007	\$16,260	\$796,747	\$170,303,877
101	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay & Port Lions K-12 Schools HVAC Controls Replacements	\$2,448,283	\$2,448,283	\$0	\$2,448,283	\$734,485	\$1,713,798	\$172,017,675
102	Yupit	Districtwide HVAC & Plumbing Upgrades	\$181,481	\$181,481	\$0	\$181,481	\$3,630	\$177,851	\$172,195,526
TOTALS:			\$198,031,497	\$196,434,438	\$0	\$196,434,438	\$24,238,912	\$172,195,526	

This page is intentionally blank

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
 School Construction Grant Fund

Initial List

Nov. 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	\$63,094,777	\$63,094,777	\$0	\$63,094,777	\$12,618,955	\$50,475,822	\$50,475,822
2	Kenai Peninsula	Kachemak Selo New K-12 School Construction	\$16,234,498	\$16,719,236	\$0	\$16,719,236	\$5,851,733	\$10,867,503	\$61,343,325
3	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Tuntutuliak	\$49,313,256	\$49,313,256	\$0	\$49,313,256	\$986,265	\$48,326,991	\$109,670,316
4	Yukon-Koyukuk	Jimmy Huntington K-12 Addition/Renovation, Huslia	\$19,753,172	\$19,753,172	\$0	\$19,753,172	\$395,063	\$19,358,109	\$129,028,425
5	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Atmautluak	\$46,589,678	\$46,589,678	\$0	\$46,589,678	\$931,794	\$45,657,884	\$174,686,309
6	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$19,170,941	\$19,170,941	\$0	\$19,170,941	\$383,419	\$18,787,522	\$193,473,831
7	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional High School Cafeteria Addition	\$9,659,239	\$7,189,911	\$0	\$7,189,911	\$143,798	\$7,046,113	\$200,519,944
8	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	\$14,981,869	\$14,981,869	\$0	\$14,981,869	\$299,637	\$14,682,232	\$215,202,176
9	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	\$441,630	\$441,630	\$0	\$441,630	\$154,570	\$287,060	\$215,489,236
10	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area	\$443,950	\$443,950	\$0	\$443,950	\$8,879	\$435,071	\$215,924,307
11	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	\$6,317,059	\$6,317,059	\$0	\$6,317,059	\$126,341	\$6,190,718	\$222,115,025
12	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	\$110,049	\$110,049	\$0	\$110,049	\$38,517	\$71,532	\$222,186,557
13	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track & Field Improvements	\$5,565,782	\$5,565,782	\$0	\$5,565,782	\$111,316	\$5,454,466	\$227,641,023
14	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Drainage & Traffic Upgrades	\$1,103,103	\$1,103,103	\$0	\$1,103,103	\$22,062	\$1,081,041	\$228,722,064
15	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg School Covered Play Area Construction	\$693,584	\$693,584	\$0	\$693,584	\$69,358	\$624,226	\$229,346,290
16	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Playground Upgrades	\$103,727	\$103,727	\$0	\$103,727	\$10,373	\$93,354	\$229,439,644
17	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Playground Upgrades	\$226,089	\$226,089	\$0	\$226,089	\$4,522	\$221,567	\$229,661,211
18	Yupit	Districtwide Playground Construction	\$1,284,601	\$1,284,601	\$0	\$1,284,601	\$25,692	\$1,258,909	\$230,920,120
TOTALS:			\$255,087,004	\$253,102,414	\$0	\$253,102,414	\$22,182,294	\$230,920,120	

This page is intentionally blank

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emer-gency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
1	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler Rehabilitation	27.00	26.03	0.00	30.00	1.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.00	2.33	3.00	6.00	13.00	0.00	28.00	25.00	3.67	17.67	226.80
2	Yukon-Koyukuk	Andrew K Demoski K-12 School Renovation, Nulato	30.00	26.03	0.00	30.00	2.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	4.00	3.00	3.67	3.67	18.00	6.67	23.33	8.00	4.67	16.67	223.41
3	Nome City	Districtwide Lighting Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	3.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.67	0.00	3.33	0.00	26.67	29.33	4.33	18.33	222.49
4	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Boiler Replacement	24.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	13.33	0.00	28.33	18.33	4.00	13.00	220.59
5	Fairbanks	Barnette K-8 Magnet School Renovation, Phase 4	30.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	3.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	2.67	17.33	6.00	23.33	8.33	4.33	10.00	218.36
6	Kake City	Kake High School Boiler Replacement, Phase 2	30.00	18.34	0.00	30.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.00	3.33	4.67	3.33	3.67	6.67	0.00	26.67	26.33	4.33	14.67	211.93
7	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary HVAC System Upgrades	30.00	17.75	0.00	30.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.33	4.00	0.00	9.00	0.67	28.33	19.67	4.00	14.33	207.95
8	Haines	Mosquito Lake K-8 School Sprinkler Upgrades	30.00	14.25	0.00	30.00	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	2.67	4.00	3.00	3.67	8.33	12.33	0.00	30.00	6.67	4.00	15.33	205.40
9	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	30.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	1.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	5.67	7.67	24.67	5.33	3.67	16.33	203.77
10	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	30.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	10.33	2.00	28.67	3.33	3.67	12.33	202.41
11	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	30.00	19.56	0.00	30.00	3.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.00	4.33	4.67	3.33	13.33	4.67	0.00	28.33	5.67	4.67	12.67	202.21
12	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Headquarters Classroom Building Renovation	30.00	12.50	0.00	30.00	4.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.33	0.00	12.67	9.00	22.33	5.00	5.00	15.67	201.45
13	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	30.00	12.10	0.00	30.00	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.33	3.00	0.00	9.33	0.67	29.00	23.33	3.33	10.00	199.80
14	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	30.00	12.50	0.00	30.00	1.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	10.00	10.67	0.00	28.67	11.00	4.67	14.33	199.56
15	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	30.00	21.25	0.00	30.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	2.33	2.00	2.33	1.67	10.67	18.33	2.67	16.00	9.00	4.00	13.00	197.34
16	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	30.00	27.47	0.00	30.00	1.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.33	4.00	5.00	4.33	0.00	6.00	0.00	25.33	5.67	3.00	11.00	195.27
17	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, & Intercom Replacement	27.00	19.50	0.00	30.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	29.00	4.33	3.33	10.33	185.80
18	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door & Flooring Replacement	30.00	16.00	0.00	30.00	2.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.33	3.00	4.00	3.67	0.00	4.33	0.00	27.00	4.33	3.67	12.33	183.44
19	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Air Conditioning & Ventilation Replacement	27.00	5.75	0.00	30.00	3.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.67	3.00	0.00	6.33	0.00	29.67	11.67	3.00	17.33	183.34

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Existing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
20	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	15.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.67	13.00	0.00	19.67	3.67	3.67	14.00	182.26
21	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	2.67	3.33	3.67	1.67	13.67	0.00	18.00	5.00	2.33	10.00	181.98
22	Craig City	Craig Middle School Renovation	27.00	18.06	0.00	10.00	2.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.67	4.00	2.33	21.33	3.33	15.33	5.67	2.67	15.67	178.03
23	Hoonah City	Hoonah Campus Boiler Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	3.00	3.00	0.33	7.67	0.00	16.67	21.67	4.00	14.00	177.67
24	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary East Wing Flooring Replacement	24.00	17.75	0.00	30.00	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.33	4.00	0.00	4.33	0.00	28.67	2.67	4.00	12.00	177.62
25	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School Major Maintenance	30.00	24.67	0.00	10.00	3.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	2.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	0.00	13.33	0.00	15.67	4.67	5.00	18.67	175.78
26	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	30.00	10.25	0.00	30.00	3.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	5.00	3.67	3.33	4.00	3.33	4.00	0.00	6.00	2.33	28.33	4.00	3.67	14.67	175.67
27	Chatham	Tenakee K-12 School Roof Replacement	27.00	10.25	0.00	30.00	1.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.33	3.67	3.33	3.67	3.00	14.67	1.33	14.33	3.00	3.67	17.33	174.59
28	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance	27.00	13.32	0.00	30.00	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	6.33	0.00	28.67	10.00	3.33	9.33	172.68
29	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Sound System	27.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	2.33	3.67	3.00	0.00	0.00	2.67	25.00	1.00	3.00	12.33	172.54
30	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School, Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	18.00	16.56	0.00	20.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.33	10.67	0.00	19.33	4.00	3.00	14.67	169.15
31	Copper River	District Office Roof Renovation & Energy Upgrade	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.00	8.67	0.00	15.67	5.67	3.33	9.67	168.93
32	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Biomass Boiler	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	3.33	3.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.33	18.67	4.00	12.00	167.03
33	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	24.00	12.50	0.00	30.00	1.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	3.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	0.00	9.00	0.00	24.00	2.33	3.33	12.00	166.34
34	Haines	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.67	0.00	12.00	0.00	15.00	5.00	3.00	9.00	165.22
35	Kenai Peninsula	Kenai Middle School Asbestos Removal/Security Upgrade	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	2.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.33	3.33	8.00	0.00	13.00	5.67	3.00	11.00	163.65
36	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	30.00	6.92	0.00	10.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	7.00	15.33	0.00	17.33	6.67	4.67	11.00	163.17
37	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	15.00	2.00	4.00	11.67	161.11
38	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	30.00	4.50	0.00	10.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	4.33	2.33	10.67	12.00	1.67	16.67	7.33	4.00	17.00	160.97

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emer-gency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
39	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Roof & Siding Replacement, Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	24.00	18.96	0.00	10.00	3.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.00	4.33	4.67	3.33	0.00	10.67	0.00	14.67	6.00	4.67	10.33	157.61
40	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Roof Replacement	30.00	19.50	0.00	30.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	12.67	0.00	13.33	1.67	1.33	5.33	156.96
41	Yukon Flats	Boiler & Control Upgrades, 3 Schools (Fort Yukon Voc Ed Center, Beaver & Chalkyitsik K-12 Schools)	30.00	14.43	0.00	10.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	12.67	0.00	15.00	6.00	3.00	9.67	156.40
42	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Security Upgrades	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	3.33	3.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	8.00	0.00	11.67	1.33	4.33	17.33	155.69
43	Craig City	Craig High School Biomass Boiler	24.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	2.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.67	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.67	26.00	2.67	17.33	154.31
44	Denali Borough	Districtwide Security Upgrades	27.00	17.51	0.00	10.00	3.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.00	4.33	4.67	3.33	0.00	9.33	1.00	14.33	5.67	4.67	10.67	153.49
45	Lower Yukon	Fuel Tank & Soil Remediation Projects, 3 Sites (Ignatius Beans, Pilot Station & Scammon Bay K-12 Schools)	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	0.00	9.67	0.00	13.67	0.67	0.67	9.00	153.35
46	Kenai Peninsula	Homer High School Roofing Replacement	24.00	11.00	0.00	20.00	2.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.33	0.00	9.00	0.00	14.00	4.00	3.33	15.33	153.31
47	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting System Installation	9.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	2.00	7.33	0.00	29.33	3.00	4.00	7.33	149.69
48	Copper River	Slana K-12 School Renovation	24.00	9.65	0.00	10.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	0.00	13.67	0.00	14.67	7.33	3.00	10.33	148.58
49	Lower Kuskokwim	Eek K-12 School Renovation	9.00	17.80	0.00	10.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.00	12.67	0.00	15.33	4.33	3.33	13.00	148.06
50	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Carpet Replacement	18.00	7.67	0.00	30.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	2.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	4.00	0.00	20.00	3.33	3.33	12.00	147.65
51	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	27.00	10.25	0.00	10.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	3.00	11.00	1.00	14.67	4.67	3.00	12.67	147.55
52	Sitka City Borough	Keet Gooshi Heen Covered PE Structure Renovation	30.00	9.50	0.00	10.00	1.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	7.33	0.00	15.00	3.33	3.33	13.67	147.26
53	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	27.00	19.50	0.00	0.00	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	4.33	2.33	2.00	17.00	0.67	12.67	4.67	3.33	13.00	146.97
54	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.00	3.33	4.67	3.33	0.00	7.00	0.00	11.00	2.67	4.00	13.00	145.93
55	Copper River	Glennallen & Kenny Lake K-12 Schools Energy Upgrades	30.00	7.75	0.00	10.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	0.00	2.67	0.00	14.67	10.33	3.33	10.67	145.35
56	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	24.00	16.73	0.00	10.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	5.67	10.00	0.00	12.67	2.33	2.33	9.33	143.36

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emer-gency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
57	Haines	Haines High School Roof Replacement	24.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.67	0.00	13.33	0.00	11.67	3.67	2.67	8.33	142.89
58	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	24.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	1.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	14.00	0.00	13.33	4.00	4.67	12.00	142.23
59	Ketchikan	Ketchikan High School Emergency Generator	24.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	3.33	3.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	3.33	0.00	14.33	3.67	4.33	8.67	141.36
60	Chugach	Tatitlek K-12 School Renovation	30.00	12.12	0.00	10.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	2.33	0.00	12.33	0.67	14.67	4.33	3.33	8.33	141.30
61	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School/Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrade	30.00	12.02	0.00	10.00	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.00	2.33	3.33	3.67	0.00	11.33	0.00	15.00	3.00	3.33	8.67	140.25
62	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Plumbing Renovations	27.00	7.61	0.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	3.00	3.00	0.67	6.67	10.00	15.00	3.33	2.67	13.67	139.95
63	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation, Bethel	3.00	27.35	0.00	10.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	9.00	0.00	14.67	3.67	4.00	13.33	139.61
64	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Provisions Installation	12.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	29.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	138.98
65	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	21.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.00	3.33	4.67	3.33	0.00	4.33	0.00	12.00	4.33	4.00	11.67	138.59
66	Kuspuk	Districtwide Energy & Sprinkler Upgrades	24.00	29.84	0.00	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	2.33	2.00	2.33	1.67	0.00	10.33	0.00	12.33	6.33	3.67	8.00	136.93
67	Kodiak Island	East Elementary School Roof Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	12.00	0.00	13.67	2.00	2.00	6.00	135.80
68	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Locker Room Renovation	30.00	21.52	0.00	0.00	1.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	2.00	1.33	2.00	2.67	0.00	6.67	3.00	13.67	4.33	3.67	10.67	135.66
69	Yakutat City	Yakutat High School Exterior Upgrades	27.00	21.52	0.00	0.00	1.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	1.33	2.00	2.67	2.00	7.33	1.33	13.67	4.33	3.67	11.67	135.00
70	Chugach	Chenega Bay K-12 School Renovation	27.00	5.98	0.00	10.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	2.33	0.00	13.33	0.67	14.67	5.33	3.33	8.33	134.15
71	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	24.00	9.50	0.00	10.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	0.00	11.00	0.00	14.33	1.33	3.67	10.67	133.75
72	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon K-12 School Soil Remediation & Tank Farm Replacement	21.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	12.00	0.00	12.33	2.33	2.33	6.67	131.97
73	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Renovation	21.00	4.29	0.00	10.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	15.00	4.33	3.33	10.00	130.56
74	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	18.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	9.67	0.00	13.33	2.00	2.67	9.33	130.30
75	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Exterior Envelope Replacement	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	0.00	10.67	0.00	5.00	5.33	3.67	16.00	128.35

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Existing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
76	Kake City	Districtwide Exterior Upgrades	24.00	19.74	0.00	0.00	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	4.00	3.33	0.00	2.67	0.00	13.67	3.33	3.67	10.00	128.01
77	Yupit	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Removal & Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	1.33	2.00	1.67	1.67	2.67	10.67	0.00	11.33	3.00	0.00	9.33	127.12
78	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 Renovation	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	3.67	2.33	2.67	3.67	3.33	0.00	11.67	0.00	13.00	5.67	3.00	11.00	126.97
79	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Mechanical Control Upgrades	21.00	6.92	0.00	0.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	0.00	7.67	0.00	11.00	11.67	4.33	8.67	125.50
80	Hoonah City	Hoonah Natatorium Fire Alarm Upgrade	24.00	7.61	0.00	0.00	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	3.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	15.00	3.33	3.00	9.00	125.28
81	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	15.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	0.00	10.33	0.00	12.33	2.00	2.33	7.67	124.97
82	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	3.00	12.45	0.00	10.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	2.67	13.00	0.00	14.33	5.33	3.33	9.67	123.03
83	Kodiak Island	Main Elementary & Kodiak Middle School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	24.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	8.33	0.00	11.67	1.33	1.33	3.00	122.80
84	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrades	21.00	1.50	0.00	30.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	3.67	2.33	2.67	3.67	3.33	0.00	8.00	0.00	20.33	2.33	2.67	12.00	120.47
85	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	18.00	16.65	0.00	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	5.00	0.00	9.33	0.00	13.33	6.67	0.67	7.00	119.63
86	Kodiak Island	East Elementary & Peterson Elementary Flooring Replacement	18.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	3.00	0.00	11.00	0.00	1.33	8.00	114.46
87	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline Projects, 2 Sites (Pilot Station & Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	24.00	4.05	0.00	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	0.00	9.00	0.00	13.33	2.67	0.67	7.33	113.73
88	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 School Gymnasium Relocation & Foundation	0.00	14.25	0.00	0.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	1.33	8.33	9.00	14.33	2.00	3.67	11.33	113.50
89	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	6.00	7.42	0.00	0.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	2.00	12.67	2.33	12.67	4.67	4.00	11.67	112.67
90	Southwest Region	Ekwok K-8 Renovation	24.00	21.25	0.00	0.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	3.67	2.33	2.67	3.67	3.33	0.00	11.33	0.00	12.67	5.00	3.00	9.67	109.56
91	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School Addressable Fire Alarm Replacement	9.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	10.00	0.00	11.00	1.33	1.33	3.00	108.80
92	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 Renovation	27.00	16.00	0.00	0.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	3.67	2.33	2.67	3.67	3.33	0.00	11.00	0.00	13.00	5.67	3.00	10.33	108.64
93	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Middle School & Peterson Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement And Recommissioning	12.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	5.33	0.00	11.33	2.00	2.00	2.33	108.13

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Apprai	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emer-gency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-na-tives	Op-tions	Total Points
94	Kodiak Island	Flooring Replacement, Akhiok, Karluk, Ouzinkie K-12 Schools	15.00	24.40	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	4.33	0.00	10.33	0.67	0.67	8.00	106.53
95	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	15.00	6.34	0.00	0.00	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	0.00	6.67	0.00	12.33	4.00	4.00	8.67	106.26
96	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	5.00	2.00	6.00	0.00	16.67	4.33	0.33	6.67	103.98
97	Kodiak Island	East Elementary Interior Renovation	6.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	6.67	0.00	10.67	0.67	1.33	2.33	100.80
98	Kodiak Island	Underground Storage Tank Replacements, 5 Sites (Chiniak, Karluk, Port Lions, Larsen Bay, Old Harbor K-12 Schools)	21.00	12.82	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	8.33	0.00	9.67	1.33	1.00	3.00	100.29
99	Lower Yukon	Security Access System Upgrades - 6 Sites	21.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	5.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	13.00	0.00	1.00	5.33	99.31
100	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point Exterior Envelope Replacement	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	0.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	3.33	3.67	8.00	83.69
101	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay & Port Lions K-12 Schools HVAC Controls Replacements	3.00	12.48	0.00	0.00	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	3.67	2.67	0.00	5.33	0.00	11.00	2.00	1.33	2.00	80.28
102	Yupiit	Districtwide HVAC & Plumbing Upgrades	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	1.33	2.00	1.67	1.67	0.00	5.33	0.00	7.00	4.00	0.00	7.00	65.45

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2016)
School Construction Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Initial List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Main	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Survey and Appraisal	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cusd Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/ Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-na-tives	Op-tions	Total Points	
1	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Kenai Peninsula	Kachemak Selo New K-12 School Construction	30.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	2.96	50.00	30.00	19.90	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	10.00	23.33	34.00	13.33	5.33	4.33	16.33	306.53	
3	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Tuntutuliak	27.00	12.87	0.00	10.00	3.26	41.86	29.74	20.16	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	13.00	22.67	15.33	4.33	3.67	12.67	272.89	
4	Yukon-Koyukuk	Jimmy Huntington K-12 Addition/Renovation, Huslia	27.00	24.13	0.00	20.00	2.71	15.31	14.01	24.23	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	18.00	15.33	19.33	5.00	3.67	14.33	260.72	
5	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Atmautluak	30.00	8.07	0.00	10.00	3.36	21.16	23.21	24.18	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.33	1.67	15.00	20.33	14.00	5.67	4.00	14.00	250.65	
6	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	30.00	13.81	0.00	30.00	2.29	25.33	19.97	22.78	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	2.33	2.00	2.33	0.67	0.00	10.67	17.67	22.00	3.00	2.00	8.00	248.86	
7	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional High School Cafeteria Addition	6.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	3.26	5.32	3.19	13.32	5.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	4.00	7.33	25.33	2.67	3.67	12.33	197.77	
8	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	23.72	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	2.33	2.00	2.33	1.67	5.00	17.33	11.33	13.67	7.33	4.00	15.67	197.48	
9	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	24.00	13.32	0.00	30.00	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	1.67	0.00	28.00	5.33	2.67	11.67	161.35	
10	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area	9.00	14.25	0.00	0.00	2.25	13.36	11.50	15.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	0.00	0.00	16.67	13.00	0.00	3.67	10.00	155.69	
11	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	21.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	10.67	0.00	19.67	3.67	3.67	14.67	152.92	
12	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	21.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.33	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.33	0.00	2.33	0.00	28.33	5.33	2.67	11.67	146.03	
13	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track & Field Improvements	24.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	0.67	3.33	12.00	1.67	3.00	12.00	143.74	
14	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Drainage & Traffic Upgrades	12.00	16.91	0.00	10.00	3.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.33	0.00	5.67	0.00	16.00	3.00	4.33	5.33	132.84	
15	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg School Covered Play Area Construction	24.00	28.16	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	15.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	3.67	1.33	14.00	2.33	3.33	11.00	123.29	
16	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Playground Upgrades	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	5.33	0.67	14.33	2.00	3.33	13.00	116.13	
17	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Playground Upgrades	12.00	7.67	0.00	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	2.67	3.33	3.67	0.00	4.67	0.67	14.33	2.67	3.33	12.67	107.32	
18	Yupit	Districtwide Playground Construction	24.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	1.33	1.33	2.00	1.67	1.67	0.00	3.33	0.00	8.67	0.00	0.00	1.00	52.12	

This page is intentionally blank