

# Agenda

## Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

April 16, 2009  
9:00 am to 4:15 pm  
State Board Auxiliary Room  
801 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Juneau, Alaska

Chair: Eddy Jeans

Thursday, April 16<sup>th</sup> **Agenda Topics**

8:45 – 9:00 AM	<b>Committee Preparation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Arrival, Packet Review</li></ul>
9:00 – 9:15 AM	<b>Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New Business, Additions to the Agenda</li><li>• Public Comment</li></ul>
9:15 – 10:30 AM	<b>Staff Briefing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preventive Maintenance Update (PM State of the State)</li><li>• Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (HB 13/HB 373)</li><li>• State Board Actions</li><li>• Final CIP Lists;</li><li>• Ineligible &amp; Reuse Application List</li><li>• Cost Model Update</li></ul>
10:30 – 10:45 AM	<b>BREAK</b>
10:45 – 12:30 PM	<b>Legislative Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SB 113, HB 95; Supplemental budget</li><li>• SB 75, HB 82; Capital Budget</li></ul>
12:30 – 1:30 PM	<b>LUNCH</b>
1:30 – 3:00 PM	<b>Statute and Regulation Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regulation project in review</li><li>• Achieve Operating Cost Savings as Maintenance</li></ul> <b>Space Guidelines Discussion (continuing)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Career Technical Educational space</li></ul> <b>FY 2011 CIP Application Review and Approval</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FY 2011 Application</li><li>• FY 2011 Application Instructions</li><li>• FY 2011 CIP Eligibility and Scoring Criteria</li><li>• FY 2011 Rater's Guide</li></ul> <b>Review Educational Summit recommendations on CTE</b> <b>Publications Update</b>
3:00 – 3:15 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:15 – 3:30 PM	<b>Staff Goals and Objectives</b>
4:15 PM	<b>Adjourn</b>

**Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting  
December 3, 2008  
Talking Book Library  
Anchorage, Alaska**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>EED Staff</b>	<b>Audience</b>
Eddy Jeans – Chair	Sam Kito III	Don Hiley – SERRC
Dee Hubbard – teleconference	Kimberly Andrews	Charlie Carlson – SERRC
Carl John	Gregg Parker	Ronald Alstrom – LYSD
Robert Tucker		Don Carney – Mat-Su
Harley Hightower		Randy Ribble – Anchorage
Thomas Richards		Kathy Christy – NWABSD
Mark Langberg		Rachel Molina – Anchorage
Lyman Hoffman		Henry Cottle – Mat-Su

Eddy Jeans, Chair, called the meeting to order and proceeded with Roll Call. Representative Hawker was not present. A quorum was established and Mr. Jeans proceeded with the packet overview.

The committee reviewed the agenda and made changes as follows: On paragraph 5 of page 5 Tom Richards’ name was corrected from “Richard” to “Richards.” No other changes were noted, and the minutes were adopted as corrected.

Ms. Hubbard requested clarification on upcoming discussions on statutory changes. Mr. Jeans stated they will be working on regulations only first, since they were the most important. Ms. Hubbard requested the topic be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

(Senator Hoffman has joined the group.)

The agenda was adopted.

**Public Comment**

Mr. John requested Mr. Kito add the CIP process to the topic agenda to give people an opportunity to discuss it. The consistency of the system in relation to the scores received greatly impact the participants, and the subjective and objective scores can vary greatly from year to year which should not occur with relatively few changes in student enrollment or changes made by the applicant. The applicant should ideally be able to increase overall scores on an annual basis. Maintaining participants’ stakes in this system is directly related to the scores received and the consistency of the system. He asks that the Department maintain the consistency we have grown to trust in the past, and any changes in the way subjective and objective categories are viewed from one application period to the next are passed on to participants, regarding how the point structure will be viewed, well in advance of the application cycle, perhaps through the BRGR committee meetings and the annual DEED CIP application workshop training.

Mr. Jeans invited public comment. Don Hiley from SERRC has received comments from people upset about the inconsistency in scoring. Districts spent a considerable amount of money trying to move their projects forward up the list and did not get the results they expected as the rules seemed to change all of a sudden. Everyone has limited funds, and they need to be able to plan in advance year to year how to get the most out of the money available to them. He asked if there were any questions from the committee on this.

Mr. Jeans informed the committee they just went through the process of evaluating the CIP projects from all school districts, prioritized those projects, and now the staff will make recommendations based on the reconsideration hearings. Districts will be notified of the department's decisions and then formal hearings will be held if the districts want to have them. Since we are in that process at this time he did not think it appropriate to discuss individual projects. He stated we have 12 districts reconsidering and that we had eight last year.

Kathy Christy indicated that the districts she works with were satisfied with the process.

Rachel Molina of the Anchorage School District said they were disappointed with where they ended up on some of their projects.

Mr. Carney stated prior notice of any change in procedure is essential. The districts learn through training what is expected, and can not bring new evidence to the table at reconsideration. Presenting the rules clearly up front is essential and that is not what happened this year. He used as an example the adders. They recommended in the training sessions that you not exceed 30% or 130% of the project. This year there were projects that were under 130% with changes made in the adders, which has not occurred in the past. It is important that what they learn in training is consistent with what is required in the application.

He stated two categories to the scoring process are grossly underutilized and misunderstood: Emergency and life safety and code conditions. The only time he ever saw the maximum number of emergency points used is when a school burned down, and that usually there are no more than 4 or 5 emergency points. He does not believe the category is being utilized in the best way that it was intended. He wants the BRGR Committee and the Department to take another look at the process on how they assign emergency points.

He said the Department should let boroughs and school districts put the prices on the items in their locale as they know better what those costs are. Managing the money on that end is an effective way of managing it.

He asks the BRGR work with the department to get some parameters on the cost model and the cost-estimate process.

Ms. Hubbard asked how the emergency points are derived, that a roof can start as a 1 and become a 4. Mr. Jeans said the emergency points are subjective points and there is always some disagreement as to how they are allocated. Mr. Carney said the importance of the roof and entire building envelope has been stressed enough that people have become more aware of it than they were.

Ms. Hubbard asked about budgets being changed that were over 130%. Mr. Kito stated this year they notified the districts of their budget adjustments whereas in the past they had not. Mr. Tucker said if there was nothing in the rater's guide that indicated the adders were going to need backup documentation, that it should be put in there for next year so people are warned. Mr. Kito was not sure that was the place to put that information as it is not involved with adjusting the budget. Mr. Tucker said it does not say anything about backup documentation, but that if your project exceeds the recommended overall guideline to add a justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines, and that perhaps supporting documents need to be sent on all of it, no matter what the number is. Mr. Kito said he will look at the guidelines to be sure some of the items in the percentages are actually addressed. There are some subjective aspects, and that in coming up with the priority list, the rating team treats all its applications the same in the year they are reviewed and that nobody is being singled out. Mr. Jeans stated they would take a look at that and the application process in April.

### **Staff Briefing**

Mr. Kito began with the PM update. A review of the State-of-the-State report in its revised format shows 9 districts that will be visited this calendar year. In addition, there are 5 districts who need to submit reports in February 2009 to maintain certification. Ms. Hubbard asked if February was an arbitrary time, and Mr. Kito explained it is a date that we can see a full six months of reporting.

Mr. Kito gave an update on the building management specialist position. He has developed a preventative maintenance certification process. Regarding a new review item of “fixed asset inventory system,” we have used districts’ audits in the past, but the building management specialist will now verify the fixed asset inventory so the department will have documentation that we have approved the fixed asset inventory.

Mr. Jeans added that every five years is the full certification process, and the department annually reviews district compliance from information submitted in the CIP application. He asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Hubbard asked about a way to look at the energy in the schools. Mr. Kito stated at the school visit we verify the existence of energy management reports at the district level and go over them in the programs when we meet with them every five years.

Mr. Kito stated districts work with architects and are encouraged to do post-occupancies, which is worded into the contract by at least one architect to do a day-long visit in the school one year after completion, and they try to do this before the warranty period expires on the project.

Ms. Hubbard had some concerns and recommendations over wording as follows: Under the school visit on “note custodial level of service,” 1 through 4 would be 1 through 5; and the third paragraph, third bullet, under district certification, “identify issues with those projects” sounded unnecessarily negative. Mr. Kito agreed those items should be changed. He asked if there were any other questions or comments, and then moved on to Debt Reimbursement Funding Status.

### **Debt Reimbursement Funding Status**

Mr. Kito summarized as of November 14 of this year the total amount that has been requested under HB 13 and HB 373 is \$275 million and some change. The total approved by the department was \$259 million and the total voter-approved amount was \$261 million. The amount for projects that are both voter-approved and EED-approved is \$250 million. There is a discrepancy between the \$259 and the \$261 million and he is not sure where that came from.

The amount of money awaiting EED approval is \$647 thousand. Ms. Andrews found a discrepancy in the voters approving a larger amount for the Thunder Mountain Pool than we approved. That was expected. And there is \$8.7 million EED-approved but not yet approved by voters.

### **2010 CIP Report**

Mr. Kito reported the 2010 CIP report summary statistics are 33 of 53 school districts submitting applications, three more than last year. 185 applications were submitted, down from last year’s 206. 161 of the applications were scored, down from last year’s 172. 24 projects requested re-use of scores, down from last year’s 34. The department determined 15 schools were ineligible, up from last year’s 13. The department modified the category of 22 projects, and the department adjusted the cost of 76 projects. He asked if there were questions.

Ms. Hubbard asked about the dates on the first three columns. Our initial list comes out November 5 and our reconsideration list comes out December 15. The final list comes out at the conclusion of the appeal process, usually in February or March.

### **Staffing Update**

Mr. Kito gave an update on the process of interviewing candidates for the building management specialist position.

## **FY 2011 CIP Application Changes**

Mr. Kito continued with FY 2011 application changes. If all districts submit five applications in a year, we potentially have 265 applications coming in. Limiting the total number of applications a district can submit to five was discussed. We currently fund a quarter of the total list, so we have a total volume of the list between \$700 million. Last year we were funded at \$206 million, which means districts are submitting applications for \$800 million dollars' worth of projects. For \$800 million dollars of unfunded projects, the department is scoring and prioritizing projects that will not actually get funded. With a large number of 15 or 20 applications coming in, if every one of those applications got funded, a district would not be able to implement those in the year and a half to two-year time frame the funding is directed towards.

Mr. Tucker expressed concern when the districts submit the six-year CIP plan showing all the construction and major maintenance outside of the ones they are submitting applications for. Does that information go to the legislature, as how much they have that they are really going to have to work on over the next six years? He stated the overall project is going to get smaller and the legislators are not really going to know what is floating out there. He suggested a report on the total of their six-year plans be sent to the legislators.

Mr. Kito concurred, we are required by law to provide a six-year plan to the legislature, but the information we get is not laid out from districts as a six-year plan. We get a fair number of districts that have a one-year plan. We could put that together as a report to the legislature. We do want to have the year versus need represented on the priority list. Mr. Tucker agreed. This can be addressed in the CIP application workshop training.

Ms. Hubbard said all districts are not required to submit a six-year plan, so they are not currently getting a full picture. Mr. Jeans suggested that since not all districts submit an application, it might be good to do a survey of all the student facilities to get an overall picture. Mr. Tucker suggested requiring each district submit one application each year. Mr. Kito stated on the six-year plan there is a column identifying project cost, and we can report to the legislature the total of the six-year plan. Mr. Tucker agreed this is a good idea if we are going to limit applications, so the districts that want more will know there is a need for a lot more than what is being submitted on an application. Mr. John agreed and said the list of major maintenance needs has 135 legitimate projects that need to be done; school districts need to learn to put more effort into those projects they want to score higher on the list.

Mr. Kito stated there were two occasions where the entire maintenance list was funded, and we are now still working on some of those projects that were funded back in 2003, so the effect was we funded a ten-year plan rather than a one-year plan. He believes that limiting the number of applications will increase the quality of the applications which will be more convincing to the legislature as to the priority need of the projects. Mr. Jeans stated there was no request for action on this today; rather it is information to be considered for the April application process.

Mr. John said he received some email responses he wished to read before the committee. Some of the application writers for the school districts are not highly trained in this area, and some important projects score low on the list because of this. He said for example, if a boiler is bad, that is a significant need and it should score high on the list.

Mr. Langberg wanted to be sure we are being fair to the larger school districts, considering Anchorage and Mat-Su alone have as much need as most of the rest of the state combined. There could be a procedure to weed out applications that should not make the top capital list and mark them unscorable to save some effort for the more worthwhile applications.

Mr. Richards asked about electronic applications. Mr. Kito said we had not done the electronic version, but that would save some of the database support work. Each of the raters still has to read each application. Mr. Richards asked how many raters we had, and was told there are three. Sam said the projects come in prioritized by each district. Mr. Jeans stated application procedures can be changed through the application process, or through a regulatory change. Mr. Tucker said theoretically they could end up with ten projects on the list if they had their first five re-use their numbers. Mr. Jeans said this will all be up for discussion by the committee in seeking ways to improve the process.

Mr. Carney said when the legislative body funded a major portion of the need for the state they found out the next year it wasn't even half of the real need, and this list is probably less than a third of the real need. The need can not be hidden by limiting it to five applications. If DEED has 600 applications or anticipates that might happen, start by changing the due date. September 1 has always put a pinch on getting everything done by November. It is too short a time span, even with a reasonable amount of applications. Mat-Su is the fastest growing district in the state, and has to add three more new schools in the next five years. It gives no opportunity to present the need.

Mr. Jeans requested Mr. John read his five emails, and that we then end the discussion on the limit of five.

Tye Peterson of Petersburg Schools wrote that he did not know if the proposed change would include resubmitting projects from previous years' lists, if they would count against the five that they currently submit for the current year. If that's the case, they could submit five new ones in addition to the ones currently on the list that have not been funded. If the rule change is that each district can only have five projects on the list at a given time, they would be against that change.

Brad Allen of Kuspuk Schools, wrote that this really limits things for all districts, urban, rural, big and small. He is not in favor of that kind of limitation, especially being pressed getting the facilities and maintenance in the districts under the current system. This would have a huge negative impact on districts in terms of budgetary concerns.

Eric Gebhart wrote that rather than just five perhaps there should be an assessment to determine how many projects a district should be able to manage. It will vary from district to district based on size and resources. The application is only one step in completing the projects. Managing construction is a lot of work and while it may be work for the districts and the DEED to process so many proposals, the root cause comes from legislative funding for a total on a feast-or-famine basis. One year only a small number of projects were funded and the next the whole list was funded. He has well-done and necessary projects. But this year it's looking to be a down year for funding. How else are districts to respond? Districts have needs, so we better get them in somehow when the funding looks good. And in down years good proposals go unfunded.

Kathy Christy wrote that one issue is the limit on applications on rural school districts. This is a good idea. She supports manageable CIP's with a reasonable number of projects and has advised districts to identify three or four top projects to put their resources in to getting funded. The higher the priority, the more pre-planning effort and resources. The result could be an even more competitive process and a higher-quality application.

She does not support subjective points for adequacy of facilities to increase in overall points given to unhoused students. There is validity to giving points to inadequacy, even if it is hard to score. Some of these are unsuitable construction space that still count as square footage, making it appear there is more space than can actually be used for students. Some schools are so poorly configured that on paper it appears that the students are housed, when in reality they are not. There is more to over crowding than just a lack of overall space. Some well-designed schools function far better at capacity than others do at below capacity. Population projections are becoming increasingly more difficult to predict. We are better off with the subjective than heavily weighed on a single criteria. Certain districts submit a substantial number of applications and some may not even apply. This may be because they have facilities directors who can commit the time and resources to write several applications, so they end up at the top of the list. There must be a way to provide more support throughout the state to ensure districts with the most need are funded, regardless of size, resources utilized to write the applications, etc.

Mr. Kito proposed a change in the subjective scoring area "existing space." We have an existing space criteria in our scoring guide, which says we allocate the points based on the type of program, and the most points in that category goes to mandated programs. The second level of points goes to existing local programs, and the third level of points goes to new local programs. Districts do not always tell us whether a program that a project impacts is mandatory, existing local, or new local, so we do not really use that criteria when we are scoring some applications. We base it in general on how that space is being used. Districts that have more unhoused students get more points in this category. Absent any information in applications directing the department to the type of space being worked on, we can put criteria in the rating guide that memorializes what we do in providing points to school districts. Up to ten points could be available for descriptions of space inadequacies where there are no future un-housed students, up to 25 points for descriptions of space inadequacies in future unhoused students up to 200% of the capacity, and up to 40 points for descriptions of space inadequacies in future unhoused students over 200%.

Mr. Jeans asked if there were any questions or comments. Ms. Hubbard asked if we are adding more subjective points. Mr. Jeans said no. If we do not have information from the district about the type of program being impacted by a project we still offer points – or we still give points for space inadequacies. Ms. Andrews stated what we are trying to do is let districts know that if they answer the question, and do not have a significant number of unhoused students, they will still get points. It is offering more points to people than has traditionally been given in this subjective category.

**Database Update:**

Mr. Kito described the department's efforts to consolidate databases into a single database or combine with the Unity project and have a centralized database, which would provide us with an opportunity to have online entry of information by districts.

**Publications Update:**

Mr. Kito asked the committee to decide whether they believe the Educational Specification Supplement is ready to present as an approved guideline for actual use. The important point was paying more attention to indoor air quality while in the design stage, and then monitor the quality on a schedule.

Mr. Tucker started a discussion about double-flush toilets at the Homer library, which cause a lot of maintenance calls. Waterless toilets were also discussed, known to present problems as well. The pipes need to be replaced more frequently due to corrosion and need to be installed with ease of access for replacement in mind.

It was moved and seconded to adopt this as a supplement to the education specifications.

Ms. Hubbard asked about doors with regard to wind direction. Mr. Kito said he wants to add consideration of door and ventilation locations with respect to prevailing winds.

**State Goals and Objectives:**

Mr. Kito discussed the annual workplan, which includes review of the application scoring process, and stated that tweaking the scoring process will make it work better for districts.

The FY 2011 application will be brought to the committee in April 2009. They will work on the online CIP application and Mr. Kito will bring an update in April 2009. There should also be an update on the statute and regulations changes for the committee in April 2009.

Mr. Kito has two publications he would like to finish this year: the integrative facility management guide and the A&E selection guide, which should be ready for review in July 2009. The date for July's meeting will be set in April.

**Additional Discussion Items:**

Mr. Tucker requested that re-use projects be noted on the list for the BRGR committee's information.

Senator Hoffman referred to the CIP project requests and funding history report. He suggested there should be data on what the Governor of Alaska requested, to compare with what the legislature funds, and people can see the difficulty between the legislative and executive branch on the total spending. With school construction being at zero for years, and the major maintenance slowly gaining momentum since the one year that the whole list was funded, this missing column is very important to the presentation.

Ms. Hubbard suggested we need to do a voc-tech meeting sometime soon, referring to the discussion last July regarding a voc-tech summit as a separate meeting, which can be added as an extra day. Mr. Jeans said July would be better than April and will ask the members what they want on the next agenda.

Mr. Kito suggested getting the education summit report to work from which discussed some of those items, and have the committee meet with work group members dealing with voc tech issues statewide as part of a specific voc-tech summit for the July meeting. Mr. Tucker asked that we get the April meeting report and have another one in July. Mr. Jeans said the education summit workgroups will be posted on the web in the next week and links will be added to the website as an April agenda item for discussion.

Ms. Hubbard asked to look at statute changes regarding subjective scoring on applications. Mr. Jeans asked her to let them know about any specific statute concerns she has. Mr. Kito said we could get the application and rater's guide out a couple weeks ahead of the April meeting.

Mr. Hightower asked about the publications review, and Mr. Kito said the cost model is updated, with minor updates done annually, and every two or three years there is a major workthrough of the prototype HMS uses for estimating.

Senator Hoffman said this is the first year the Legislature is going to have a special regular committee on education, which in the past was combined with the HSS committee. Mr. Richards said the Legislature did a good job a few years ago by coming up with the preventative maintenance plan, as this is the first time we have almost 50% compliance, so districts are getting the message.

Fire alarms were discussed and that if a buildings burns down it goes up the list. Mr. Jeans suggested we need some type of review of the statutory / regulatory requirements of the PM program and a discussion by the committee on whether or not we can improve it.

Ms. Hubbard wanted an explanation via email regarding the 15 applications that were deemed unqualified. Mr. Kito stated they are still in the recommendation process so that could change. Mr. Jeans stated he could report it to her in April.

The meeting was adjourned.

*G:\BR\_GRCCom\Minutes\2009-03-10 Final BRGR Committee Minutes.doc*

**By:** Sam Kito III, P.E.

**Date:** April 16, 2009

**Phone:** 465-6906

**File:** 2009-04-16 Staff Briefing

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

**Subject:** EED Facilities Overview

## **S T A F F   B R I E F I N G**

---

### **Staff Briefing**

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

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report (attached) was updated on March 30, 2009, and reflects the district visits the department has completed to date.

The department visited the Lower Kuskokwim, Lower Yukon, and Saint Mary's school Districts in March, and Bering Strait, Iditarod, Yukon Flats, and Yukon Koyukuk school districts in early April. The district has visits at Kashunamiut and Yupitit school districts pending for the remainder of the current year.

In the last BR&GR staff report, the department identified five districts that would be required to submit reporting in order to remain certified. The department contacted those five districts and has recertified the Chatham, Skagway, and Southeast Island school districts. Reports are still pending from the Hoonah and Pelican school districts. These districts are identified with a double star located in the "status" column.

As you are aware, on January 26<sup>th</sup> the department hired Wayne Marquis as the new Building Management Specialist. Wayne has been busy getting caught up on the PM reviews for this year. He has also re-organized the PM filing system, and is overcoming a steep learning curve. He has shown a solid understanding of maintenance and an ability to learn quickly.

#### ***Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (HB 13/HB373)***

Since December, the department has added debt authorization for \$90,860,000 Anchorage projects. As you may be aware, those projects were rejected at the polls on April 7<sup>th</sup>.

As of January 30th, 2009, the total bond amount requested under House Bill 13/373 was \$366,294,672. The total amount approved by the department was \$350,389,221. The total voter approved amount was \$261,324,435. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$250,823,221. There is \$99,566,000 that is EED approved, but not approved by voters.

### ***State Board Actions***

On March 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, the State Board of Education met and considered and approved the final School Construction and Major Maintenance CIP lists.

The Facilities Section also presented information to the Board as an information item that described some of the issues surrounding insurance proceeds and valuation. The board established a working group to review insurance issues, and staff will be working with board member Pat Shier on ideas for handling catastrophic loss situations.

### ***Final CIP Lists***

The final, Board approved, CIP lists are included in the packet.

One change was made on the final list to reduce the amount requested for the Alakanuk K-12 School Replacement project.

The department had one appeal this year that involved the replacement of an urban school. The department's position is that replacement space needs to be supported by the student population. The appeal was withdrawn, but the department is committed to making sure that districts understand the department's position regarding replacement of space.

### ***Ineligible & Reuse Application List***

During the December meeting, the BR&GR committee requested a listing of projects identified as ineligible, as well as a listing of projects requested by districts to be reused.

The department determined that 15 projects were ineligible, and increase of 6 from last year. A list of ineligible projects is included in the attachments.

Districts requested reuse of 24 applications this year, a decrease of 10 from last year. A listing of scored projects that identifies a project reuse status is included in the attachments.

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

The department has commissioned HMS Inc. to update the cost components of the cost model for the FY 2011 CIP cycle. We have been informed that HMS has received updated cost information and is currently updating the model. The updated cost model should be available by mid-May and posted on the website around the time the department will be conducting its annual CIP training sessions.

Based on information seen during recent project bid openings, the department doesn't anticipate a significant increase in project cost estimates for the upcoming year.

### ***Legislative Update***

HB 113/SB 95 – Supplemental Budget; the supplemental budget bill includes funding for 5% of the local share for Tanana. Tanana’s local share changed as a result of House Bill 373 last year, but the corresponding local share was inadvertently left out of last year’s budget. The bill also includes \$18,688,685 funding for the reconstruction of the Kalskag High School.

SB 75/HB 82 – Capital Budget; the capital budget includes funding for 23 projects on the Major Maintenance List amounting to \$42,443,481.

HB 180 – Participating Share change; Representative Joule introduced House Bill 180 which adds a 20% local share level at \$500,000 full value per ADM. This change is being proposed as a retroactive change that would impact several projects from last year, and one from this year.

### ***Statute and regulation Issues***

The attached regulation changes have been submitted to the department of law for review.

### ***Space Guideline Discussion***

Open discussion.

### ***FY 2011 Application Review and Approval***

The application contains several technical, and a few substantive changes. This discussion will walk through the changes in the application, then changes to the application instructions.

Title and Introduction – The department has added a statement at the beginning of the application limiting the number of applications from a single school district to ten. In the past, the department has had no restrictions on the number of applications submitted by districts. The department has received close to 200 applications each review cycle in recent years. Each application takes about an hour for each reviewer to review, and all of the submitted applications are scored and prioritized. In a good year, the Governor and Legislature will fund up to four projects (of 30 or more) on the construction list, and 20-25 projects (of 130 or more) on the major maintenance list. The state is funding far less than 20% (volume, not cost; the percentage is less if you calculate it as a percentage of cost) of the submitted projects. That is a lot of work for staff to complete each year that does not practically result in funded projects. The interest in limiting the number of applications is to try and decrease the scoring workload to a more manageable level, and to improve the quality of applications received. Basically, the department scores and prioritizes ten years worth of projects each year, and the Governor and Legislature fund one to two years of projects each year. This year, there is no single district that has more than 10 projects in the top 20 of the construction list (LKSD is the highest with 7), or has more than three in the top 25 of the major maintenance list (LKSD, Craig, Yukon

Koyukuk). In fact, the largest districts (Anchorage, Mat-Su, Fairbanks and Juneau) are not represented in the top 20 of the construction list, and don't show up until project 27 on the major maintenance list. As an additional point, the larger districts that would be in a position to administer more than ten projects in a single year, are already doing so under the debt program. If a smaller district received funding for a full ten projects in a single year, there is concern, that they would be capable of administering all of those projects without postponing at least a couple of them for a year or two, and funding projects too far in advance of the actual work has the effect of decreasing the funding available to those projects as a result of inflation and rising construction costs.

Question 9 – A 'Total GSF' line is added to the gross square footage table. The department regularly totals up the information submitted by the district in this table. This change will save department staff valuable time during the review process.

Question 16 – A statement is added as a note that asks applicants to include identification of their A/E consultant, or to provide information explaining why an A/E consultant is not necessary for the project. In Appendix A under Phase 1, item 1 provides that selection of a consultant should be demonstrated, if required. This change in the application draws an applicant's attention to this requirement, and directly requests that the information identifying the consultant, or explaining why a consultant is not required.

Question 17 – A statement is added requesting that the project description be a clear statement of the project scope to be completed with the requested project. The department regularly sees applications that provide a description of an entire project, only a portion of which is being funded. This change will clarify the scope of work being requested for a particular application.

Question 18 – The note under question 18 is modified to provide clarification regarding allowable percentages for additional project costs. One substantive clarification is that the total of all additive percentages should not exceed 130% without a detailed explanation. Other clarifications are provided in the notes for the budget table. Note 1 is updated to add the actual dollar amounts for eligible percentages of Construction Management by Consultant. Note 4 is updated to clarify that the administrative overhead costs should be those costs born by a district/municipality/borough for the administration of the project in the application. Note 5 is clarified by adding a statement indicating that equipment and technology costs should be estimated based on the number of students served using information in the department's Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases. Note 6 clarifies that art requirements only apply to projects over \$250,000, which require an Educational Specification.

Question 30 – Individual assessment items are listed for the benefit of the applicant.

Question 31 – Additional attachment check boxes are included for planning documentation, schematic design documentation, and design development documentation.

Changes to the Application Instructions included the following

04/16/09

Title and Introduction – The introduction of the application is amended to add a statement providing that one set of attachments can be provided in PDF format. This change will save printing costs of the district; however they will still be required to provide one copy of the attachments as a hard copy. The introduction also includes a note reinforcing the maximum of ten projects per district as discussed under the application.

Question 2 c – Clarification language is added so that applicants can understand the regulatory requirements cited in the section. Clarifications include a discussion of procurement requirements, and in-house requirements. The department has required districts to comply with these provisions, but has only provided a reference to the appropriate regulation in the past. With this change, it is hoped that the district applicant has a better understanding of the requirements as the application is being completed.

Question 4 – As a result of a recent interpretation of statute, the department will now be verifying the existence of a district's Fixed Asset Inventory System during the periodic Preventive Maintenance reviews. The PM report now provides a column that will identify if a district has an approved Fixed Asset Inventory System. The department will also utilize audit findings to annually determine continued functionality of the system.

Question 5 – A reminder regarding insurance coverage is added in order to reinforce the department's insurance requirements.

Question 9 – A sentence is removed that allows for an average of all buildings ages to be considered when a district proposes a new school project. This statement is not supported in statute or regulation, and has not been utilized in analysis of new school projects, therefore it is being deleted.

Question 10 – A clarification is added that reinforces the department's position that points are only available for projects that were intentionally short funded by the legislature.

Question 13 – Corrects bullet three by changing EED 'net' square footage to EED 'gross' square footage.

Question 16 – Clarifies that the department does not consider a Spill Prevention and Response Plan to be a condition survey for fuel tanks for the purpose of receiving points on a project application. Also added a paragraph that reinforces the requirement to provide A/E consultant information, or provide an explanation of why an A/E consultant is not required.

Question 17 – Clarification is added that suggests including the question number in the project description when answering other questions from the application.

Question 17 – (Question #16 narrative), added clarification that facility appraisal, schematic design, or design development documents included in the attachments can be summarized and referenced in the project description.

04/16/09

Question 18 – Provide a clarification that reinforces the art requirements, and overall project percentage requirements that were discussed under question 18 in the application.

Question 30 – Under the Maintenance Management heading, the text under assessments 2 and 3 were under the wrong title. The text has been moved to accurately reflect the item requested. Under the Maintenance Training heading, a clarification was added that a training log should be included along with the narrative description of maintenance training.

### ***Review Educational Summit Recommendations***

The facilities component of the Educational Summit is enclosed as part of the packet. The report also has a working group committed to working on

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/edsummit/home.html>

### ***Publications Update***

**Integrated Facility Management Guide** – This document is in draft form. Staff continues to work on the document, and is approximately 60% through completion of the first draft. The status of this update has not changed since the last BR&GR meeting. This document was originally envisioned as a complete rewrite of the Preventative Maintenance Handbook with a re-focus on overall management of district facilities, not only preventative maintenance issues.

**A/E Services Manual** – The A/E Services Manual project was started a number of years ago, and is approximately 90% complete. The status of this document has not changed since the last BR&GR meeting. The manual will provide school districts with guidance for selecting Architectural and Engineering consultants, and is a vital component of the reference documentation cited by the department in our project agreement.

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

1. Integrated Facility Management Guide (Preventative Maintenance Handbook (1999)); [Draft revision started in 2005]
2. A/E Services handbook (1999-Draft)
3. Outdoor Facility Guidelines (new)
4. Space Guidelines Handbook (1996)
5. Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook (1999)
6. Facility Appraisal Guide (1997)
7. Swimming Pool Guidelines (1997)
8. Site Selection Criteria Handbook (1997)
9. Condition Survey (1997)
10. Renewal & Replacement Guideline (2001)
11. Project Delivery Handbook (2004)
12. Equipment Purchase Guideline (2005)

13. Educational Specification Handbook (2005); and Educational Specifications Supplement (2009)
14. Capital Project Administration Handbook (2007)

### ***Staff Goals and Objectives***

Application Scoring – Staff will continue a review of the application scoring process and report back to the committee in December.

Publications – Staff will continue to review and update department publications as time permits.

Database review – The Facilities Section currently operates with six separate, but interlinked databases that were developed over a long period of time. The goal of staff is to continue to work with the Information Technology staff in the department in the effort to incorporate all of the databases into one secure, integrated database structure.

Online application submittal –Continue to research the possibility of developing an online CIP Application. Data entry online for the CIP process has the potential to save a significant amount of staff time during CIP review time and will allow staff to concentrate on reviewing the substance of applications more thoroughly.



# PM State-of-the-State

## Report of EED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data

AS Of 03/30/2009

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	5/10/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Aleutian Region	8/31/2005	2011		N	N	Y	N	Y	NP	2 of 5	D	No	No
Aleutians East	5/25/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Anchorage	7/17/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
Annette Island	2/27/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Bering Strait	6/19/2001	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	TMA	Yes	Yes
Bristol Bay Borough	2/27/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	QQuest	Yes	No
Chatham	7/11/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Chugach	1/16/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Copper River	5/7/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Cordova	4/20/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Craig City	6/25/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Delta/Greely	5/9/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Denali Borough	3/21/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Quick Time	Yes	No
Dillingham City	4/10/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Fairbanks	7/15/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	JW Edward	Yes	No
Galena	7/19/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Haines	4/3/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Hoonah City	6/15/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5**	Maximo*	Yes	Yes
Hydaburg City	6/26/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Iditarod Area	7/26/2001	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	Yes
Juneau	1/10/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
Kake City	11/9/2005	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kashunamiut	5/16/2002	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	Yes
Kenai Peninsula	1/14/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Ketchikan	1/25/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Klawock City	7/27/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Kodiak Island	1/10/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Quest	Yes	No
Kuspuk	4/7/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Lake & Peninsula	2/25/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	QQuest	Yes	No
Lower Kuskokwim	3/10/2009	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	?	Yes	No
Lower Yukon	3/11/2009	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Mat-Su Borough	12/10/2006	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	5 of 5	C	Yes	No
Nenana City	3/23/2005	2010		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 03/30/2009

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	1/28/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
North Slope Borough	7/17/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Maximo	Yes	No
Northwest Arctic	3/26/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Pelican City	5/22/2008	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5**	School Dude	Yes	Yes
Petersburg City	1/23/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Pribilof Island	8/27/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Sitka City Borough	2/26/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	School Dude	Yes	No
Skagway City	5/28/2008	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	MC	Yes	No
Southeast Island	6/28/2007	2012		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Southwest Region	4/11/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
St Marys	3/13/2009	2014		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Tanana City	3/9/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Unalaska City	5/23/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	5 of 5	D	Yes	No
Valdez City	12/17/2007	2013		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	Micro-Main	Yes	No
Wrangell City	1/24/2006	2011		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yakutat City	4/18/2005	2010		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	No
Yukon Flats	3/11/2005	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	Yes
Yukon-Koyukuk	4/16/2003	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	5 of 5	mpulse	Yes	Yes
Yupiit	5/9/2002	2009		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	5 of 5	Maximo*	Yes	Yes

**In Compliance**

0            52            52            53            52            53            52

**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                 | ** = reexamine in 6 months                  |
| FIAS = Fixed Asset Inventory System |   |

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Heating System Replacement	\$1,115,740	\$1,100,852	\$0	\$1,100,852	\$22,017	\$1,078,835	\$1,078,835
2	2	2	Bering Strait	Diomedea K-12 School Renovation	\$16,214,920	\$16,214,920	\$0	\$16,214,920	\$324,298	\$15,890,622	\$16,969,457
3	3	3	Kodiak Island	Kodiak Schools Seismic Mitigation Project	\$4,623,062	\$4,623,062	\$0	\$4,623,062	\$1,386,919	\$3,236,143	\$20,205,600
4	4	4	Craig City	Craig Middle School Classroom Renovation, Recovery of Funds	\$87,987	\$87,987	\$0	\$87,987	\$4,399	\$83,588	\$20,289,188
5	5	5	Saint Marys	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Replacement	\$3,480,528	\$3,480,528	\$0	\$3,480,528	\$174,026	\$3,306,502	\$23,595,690
6	6	6	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$90,323	\$90,323	\$0	\$90,323	\$4,516	\$85,807	\$23,681,497
7	7	7	Lower Yukon	Kotlik K-12 Heat Plant Relocation	\$1,688,267	\$1,396,955	\$0	\$1,396,955	\$27,939	\$1,369,016	\$25,050,513
8	8	8	Southwest Region	HVAC Upgrades, Aleknagik, Clarks Point and Ekwok K-12 Schools	\$466,471	\$392,027	\$0	\$392,027	\$7,841	\$384,186	\$25,434,699
9	9		Wrangell City	Evergreen Elementary School Playground Safety Upgrades	\$1,126,571	\$1,100,997	\$0	\$1,100,997	\$330,299	\$770,698	\$26,205,397
10	10	9	Lower Kuskokwim	Floor Failure Repairs, Generator Building - Kasigluk-Akula K-12 School	\$947,532	\$947,532	\$0	\$947,532	\$18,951	\$928,581	\$27,133,978
11	11	10	Galena	Galena Regional Learning Center Dining Facility Upgrade	\$3,714,314	\$3,714,314	\$0	\$3,714,314	\$185,716	\$3,528,598	\$30,662,576
12	12		Ketchikan	Houghtaling Elementary Outdoor Physical Education Shelter Replacement	\$394,443	\$394,443	\$0	\$394,443	\$118,333	\$276,110	\$30,938,686
13	13	11	Aleutians East	False Pass K-12 School Siding Replacement, Recovery of Funds	\$131,488	\$131,488	\$0	\$131,488	\$39,446	\$92,042	\$31,030,728
14	14	12	Lower Kuskokwim	Prime Power Generators - Platinum K-12 School	\$185,386	\$185,386	\$0	\$185,386	\$3,708	\$181,678	\$31,212,406
15	15	13	Yukon-Koyukuk	Allakaket K-12 School Water System Improvements	\$188,500	\$165,300	\$0	\$165,300	\$3,306	\$161,994	\$31,374,400
16	16	24	Saint Marys	Garage and Warm Storage Renovation	\$929,061	\$929,061	\$0	\$929,061	\$46,453	\$882,608	\$32,257,008
17	17	14	Galena	Galena Regional Learning Center Gym Building Upgrade	\$7,251,059	\$7,251,059	\$0	\$7,251,059	\$362,553	\$6,888,506	\$39,145,514
18	18	15	Aleutians East	Cold Bay K-12 Heating System Upgrade	\$108,270	\$108,270	\$0	\$108,270	\$32,481	\$75,789	\$39,221,303
19	19	16	Craig City	Craig Middle School Exterior Envelope Upgrades, Recovery of Funds	\$28,282	\$28,282	\$0	\$28,282	\$1,414	\$26,868	\$39,248,171
20	20	17	Ketchikan	Valley Park Elementary Siding Replacement	\$667,377	\$667,377	\$0	\$667,377	\$200,213	\$467,164	\$39,715,335

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
21	21	18	Yukon-Koyukuk	Huslia High School Exterior Upgrade	\$951,719	\$942,536	\$0	\$942,536	\$18,851	\$923,685	\$40,639,020
22	22	19	Sitka City Borough	Pacific High School Renovation	\$2,837,276	\$2,671,558	\$0	\$2,671,558	\$935,045	\$1,736,513	\$42,375,533
23	23	20	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Window Replacement, Recovery of Funds	\$97,068	\$97,068	\$0	\$97,068	\$29,120	\$67,948	\$42,443,481
24	24	21	Lower Kuskokwim	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat Elementary Deferred Maintenance Phase 2, Bethel	\$12,469,272	\$12,469,272	\$0	\$12,469,272	\$249,385	\$12,219,887	\$54,663,368
25	25	22	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	\$955,357	\$827,225	\$0	\$827,225	\$16,544	\$810,681	\$55,474,049
26	26	23	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement	\$1,278,955	\$1,278,955	\$0	\$1,278,955	\$25,579	\$1,253,376	\$56,727,425
27	27	25	Fairbanks	North Pole Middle School Mechanical Systems Upgrades	\$7,602,397	\$6,293,960	\$0	\$6,293,960	\$1,888,188	\$4,405,772	\$61,133,197
28	28	26	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Window Replacements, 4 Schools	\$1,795,741	\$1,681,196	\$0	\$1,681,196	\$588,419	\$1,092,777	\$62,225,974
29	29	27	Skagway City	Skagway K-12 School Dry Sprinkler Replacement	\$274,780	\$274,780	\$0	\$274,780	\$96,173	\$178,607	\$62,404,581
30	30	28	Hoonah City	Hoonah High School Key Card Access System and Door Replacement	\$635,802	\$635,802	\$0	\$635,802	\$190,741	\$445,061	\$62,849,642
31	31	29	Chatham	Gustavus K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$4,492,274	\$4,492,274	\$2,061,484	\$2,430,790	\$48,616	\$2,382,174	\$65,231,816
32	32	30	Mat-Su Borough	Wasilla Middle School, Wasilla High School, Palmer Middle School Roof Replacements	\$15,100,321	\$13,717,086	\$0	\$13,717,086	\$4,115,126	\$9,601,960	\$74,833,776
33	33	31	Hoonah City	Hoonah Schools Major Maintenance	\$7,769,630	\$7,769,630	\$0	\$7,769,630	\$2,330,889	\$5,438,741	\$80,272,517
34	34	34	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Newtok	\$339,238	\$339,238	\$0	\$339,238	\$6,785	\$332,453	\$80,604,970
35	35	32	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Generator & Fuel Tank Relocation	\$274,005	\$187,815	\$0	\$187,815	\$3,756	\$184,059	\$80,789,029
36	36	33	Lower Yukon	Pitka's Point K-8 School Renovation	\$7,436,304	\$6,453,151	\$0	\$6,453,151	\$129,063	\$6,324,088	\$87,113,117
37	37	35	Lower Kuskokwim	Back-Up Generators - Chefornak K-12 School	\$5,405,853	\$5,405,853	\$0	\$5,405,853	\$108,117	\$5,297,736	\$92,410,853
38	38	36	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Bethel	\$166,119	\$166,119	\$0	\$166,119	\$3,322	\$162,797	\$92,573,650
39	39	37	Mat-Su Borough	Roof Replacements & Repairs, 4 Schools	\$9,855,792	\$8,875,636	\$0	\$8,875,636	\$2,662,691	\$6,212,945	\$98,786,595
40	40	38	Mat-Su Borough	Administration Building Generator and Related Electrical Replacement	\$680,844	\$633,920	\$0	\$633,920	\$190,176	\$443,744	\$99,230,339
41	41	39	Nenana City	Nenana K-12 School ADA / Erosion Control	\$2,328,029	\$1,924,313	\$0	\$1,924,313	\$96,216	\$1,828,097	\$101,058,436

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
42	42	40	Copper River	Slana K-12 School Upgrade	\$1,108,949	\$1,108,949	\$0	\$1,108,949	\$22,179	\$1,086,770	\$102,145,206
43	43	41	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Upgrades	\$42,610	\$42,610	\$0	\$42,610	\$852	\$41,758	\$102,186,964
44	44	42	Lower Kuskokwim	Tununak K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$13,891,691	\$4,278,431	\$0	\$4,278,431	\$85,569	\$4,192,862	\$106,379,826
45	45	43	Yukon-Koyukuk	Kaltag K-12 School Siding Completion	\$202,989	\$508,014	\$322,140	\$185,874	\$3,717	\$182,157	\$106,561,983
46	46	44	Copper River	Glennallen High School Upgrade	\$3,210,830	\$3,210,830	\$0	\$3,210,830	\$64,217	\$3,146,613	\$109,708,596
47	47	45	Southeast Island	Generator Replacement, 3 Schools	\$137,938	\$137,938	\$0	\$137,938	\$2,759	\$135,179	\$109,843,775
48	48	46	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$9,356,328	\$9,356,328	\$0	\$9,356,328	\$187,127	\$9,169,201	\$119,012,976
49	49	47	Copper River	Chistochina Elementary School Upgrade	\$625,575	\$625,574	\$0	\$625,574	\$12,511	\$613,063	\$119,626,039
50	50	48	Copper River	Kenny Lake High School Upgrade	\$361,129	\$361,129	\$0	\$361,129	\$7,223	\$353,906	\$119,979,945
51	51	49	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Major Maintenance	\$4,019,854	\$4,019,854	\$0	\$4,019,854	\$80,397	\$3,939,457	\$123,919,402
52	52	50	Lower Kuskokwim	Fuel Tank Remediation - Nunapitchuk	\$799,301	\$799,301	\$0	\$799,301	\$15,986	\$783,315	\$124,702,717
53	53	51	Pelican City	Pelican Schools Major Maintenance	\$2,703,769	\$2,703,769	\$0	\$2,703,769	\$811,131	\$1,892,638	\$126,595,355
54	54	52	Klawock City	Klawock K-12 Fuel Tank Decommissioning	\$179,709	\$179,708	\$0	\$179,708	\$17,971	\$161,737	\$126,757,092
55	55	53	Annette Island	Metlakatla Elementary School Renovation	\$5,313,608	\$5,313,608	\$0	\$5,313,608	\$106,272	\$5,207,336	\$131,964,428
56	56	54	Juneau City Borough	Marie Drake Renovation	\$16,769,090	\$16,769,090	\$6,336,522	\$10,432,568	\$3,651,399	\$6,781,169	\$138,745,597
57	57	55	Mat-Su Borough	Butte, Cottonwood Creek, Pioneer Peak & Snowshoe Elementary Wash Fountain Replacements	\$138,829	\$138,829	\$0	\$138,829	\$41,649	\$97,180	\$138,842,777
58	58	56	Southeast Island	Roof Replacement, 2 Schools	\$1,933,364	\$1,869,974	\$0	\$1,869,974	\$37,399	\$1,832,575	\$140,675,352
59	59	57	Yupit	Districtwide Site Deficiencies Upgrade	\$2,558,673	\$2,558,673	\$0	\$2,558,673	\$51,173	\$2,507,500	\$143,182,852
60	60	58	Copper River	Copper Center Elementary School Upgrade	\$555,145	\$555,145	\$0	\$555,145	\$11,103	\$544,042	\$143,726,894
61	61	59	Delta/Greely	Delta High School and Fort Greely School New Entrance Doors and Security	\$373,430	\$373,430	\$0	\$373,430	\$7,469	\$365,961	\$144,092,855
62	62	60	Annette Island	Metlakatla Elementary School Underground Fuel Tank Replacement	\$211,752	\$190,113	\$0	\$190,113	\$3,802	\$186,311	\$144,279,166

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
63	63	61	Aleutians East	Akutan K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$93,331	\$93,331	\$0	\$93,331	\$27,999	\$65,332	\$144,344,498
64	64	62	Juneau City Borough	Mendenhall River Community School Renovation	\$4,081,200	\$4,081,200	\$0	\$4,081,200	\$1,428,420	\$2,652,780	\$146,997,278
65	65	63	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Building Renovation	\$4,128,063	\$3,841,560	\$0	\$3,841,560	\$76,831	\$3,764,729	\$150,762,007
66	66	64	Bering Strait	Shaktolik K-12 School Renovation	\$11,885,454	\$11,309,245	\$0	\$11,309,245	\$226,185	\$11,083,060	\$161,845,067
67	67	65	Anchorage	Districtwide Roof Replacement & Structural Upgrades, 4 Schools	\$5,678,000	\$5,678,000	\$0	\$5,678,000	\$1,703,400	\$3,974,600	\$165,819,667
68	68	66	Anchorage	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades, 5 Schools	\$1,645,000	\$1,645,000	\$0	\$1,645,000	\$493,500	\$1,151,500	\$166,971,167
69	69	70	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades	\$2,410,038	\$2,259,411	\$0	\$2,259,411	\$677,823	\$1,581,588	\$168,552,755
70	70	67	Yukon Flats	Venetie Generator Building Renovation	\$886,313	\$886,313	\$0	\$886,313	\$17,726	\$868,587	\$169,421,342
71	71	68	Kake City	Kake Elementary School Ventilation System Upgrade	\$695,837	\$695,837	\$394,029	\$301,808	\$30,181	\$271,627	\$169,692,969
72	72	69	Kuspuk	Districtwide Heating System Upgrades	\$11,457,480	\$9,246,510	\$0	\$9,246,510	\$184,930	\$9,061,580	\$178,754,549
73	73	71	Petersburg City	Digital HVAC Controls	\$465,256	\$491,591	\$0	\$491,591	\$147,477	\$344,114	\$179,098,663
74	74	72	Lower Kuskokwim	Bulk Fuel Tank Upgrade - Eek	\$1,809,301	\$1,809,301	\$0	\$1,809,301	\$36,186	\$1,773,115	\$180,871,778
75	75	73	Delta/Greely	Delta High School Lead Dust Removal	\$488,000	\$488,000	\$0	\$488,000	\$9,760	\$478,240	\$181,350,018
76	76	74	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades	\$3,978,047	\$3,978,047	\$0	\$3,978,047	\$1,193,414	\$2,784,633	\$184,134,651
77	77	75	Fairbanks	Districtwide Locker Replacement	\$1,389,686	\$1,106,412	\$0	\$1,106,412	\$331,924	\$774,488	\$184,909,139
78	78	76	Delta/Greely	Districtwide Clock and Intercom Systems Upgrade, Security Alarm and Cameras	\$497,906	\$497,906	\$0	\$497,906	\$9,958	\$487,948	\$185,397,087
79	79	77	Petersburg City	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades	\$336,165	\$336,165	\$0	\$336,165	\$100,849	\$235,316	\$185,632,403
80	80	78	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water System Pipe Replacement	\$130,581	\$130,581	\$0	\$130,581	\$2,612	\$127,969	\$185,760,372
81	81	79	Petersburg City	Petersburg Elementary School Lunchroom Renovation	\$1,209,885	\$1,577,187	\$0	\$1,577,187	\$473,156	\$1,104,031	\$186,864,403
82	82	80	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance, Recovery of Funds	\$103,936	\$103,936	\$0	\$103,936	\$31,181	\$72,755	\$186,937,158
83	83	81	Chatham	Tenakee Springs K-12 School Renovation	\$1,058,253	\$1,058,253	\$0	\$1,058,253	\$21,165	\$1,037,088	\$187,974,246
84	84	82	Anchorage	Districtwide Sprinkler Upgrades, 3 Schools	\$2,710,000	\$3,143,606	\$0	\$3,143,606	\$943,082	\$2,200,524	\$190,174,770

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
85	85	83	Alaska Gateway	Northway K-12 School Building Renovation	\$1,159,134	\$1,076,665	\$0	\$1,076,665	\$21,533	\$1,055,132	\$191,229,902
86	86	84	Fairbanks	Districtwide Septic System Replacement	\$764,252	\$648,873	\$0	\$648,873	\$194,662	\$454,211	\$191,684,113
87	87	85	Mat-Su Borough	Big Lake Elementary, Renovate Old Classroom Wing	\$1,785,516	\$1,690,486	\$0	\$1,690,486	\$507,146	\$1,183,340	\$192,867,453
88	88	86	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Security Systems	\$1,625,000	\$1,562,286	\$0	\$1,562,286	\$546,800	\$1,015,486	\$193,882,939
89	89	87	Anchorage	Districtwide Intercom/PA Upgrades, 5 Schools	\$1,555,000	\$1,457,868	\$0	\$1,457,868	\$437,360	\$1,020,508	\$194,903,447
90	90	88	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Locker Replacements	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$350,000	\$650,000	\$195,553,447
91	91	89	Fairbanks	Districtwide Technology Upgrades	\$8,916,275	\$7,440,783	\$0	\$7,440,783	\$2,232,235	\$5,208,548	\$200,761,995
92	92	90	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Roof Replacements: Seward High School Auditorium, Kalifornsky Beach Elementary And Warehouse	\$3,712,387	\$3,005,422	\$0	\$3,005,422	\$1,051,898	\$1,953,524	\$202,715,519
93	93	91	Ketchikan	Districtwide Major Maintenance	\$929,733	\$929,733	\$0	\$929,733	\$278,920	\$650,813	\$203,366,332
94	94	92	Wrangell City	Wrangell High School, Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrade	\$363,670	\$281,805	\$0	\$281,805	\$84,541	\$197,264	\$203,563,596
95	95	93	Fairbanks	North Pole High School Vocational Wing Renovation	\$4,114,690	\$3,532,012	\$0	\$3,532,012	\$1,059,604	\$2,472,408	\$206,036,004
96	96	94	Fairbanks	Lathrop High School Major Maintenance	\$3,074,587	\$2,615,477	\$0	\$2,615,477	\$784,643	\$1,830,834	\$207,866,838
97	97	95	Southeast Island	Port Protection K-12 Gym Relocation / Foundation	\$141,878	\$141,878	\$0	\$141,878	\$2,838	\$139,040	\$208,005,878
98	98	96	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley School, Gymnasium and Locker Rooms Roof Replacement	\$254,122	\$254,122	\$0	\$254,122	\$76,237	\$177,885	\$208,183,763
99	99	97	Anchorage	Emergency Communication Systems, 5 Middle Schools	\$820,000	\$820,000	\$0	\$820,000	\$246,000	\$574,000	\$208,757,763
100	100	98	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$273,671	\$256,202	\$0	\$256,202	\$5,124	\$251,078	\$209,008,841
101	101	99	Fairbanks	Weller Elementary School Lighting Upgrade	\$2,150,119	\$1,756,887	\$0	\$1,756,887	\$527,066	\$1,229,821	\$210,238,662
102	102	100	Lower Kuskokwim	Generator Replacement, Oscarville	\$1,101,527	\$175,609	\$0	\$175,609	\$3,512	\$172,097	\$210,410,759
103	103	101	Juneau City Borough	District Maintenance Facility Renovation	\$3,480,860	\$3,480,860	\$185,587	\$3,295,273	\$1,153,346	\$2,141,927	\$212,552,686
104	104	102	Petersburg City	Petersburg Elementary School Siding Replacement	\$882,589	\$882,589	\$0	\$882,589	\$264,777	\$617,812	\$213,170,498
105	105	103	Fairbanks	Woodrider Elementary Gymnasium Upgrade	\$1,455,270	\$1,241,962	\$0	\$1,241,962	\$372,589	\$869,373	\$214,039,871

**State of Alaska  
Department of Education and Early Development  
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
Major Maintenance Grant Fund**

**Final List**

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
106	106	104	Anchorage	Districtwide Security System Upgrades, 18 Schools	\$2,735,000	\$2,342,223	\$0	\$2,342,223	\$702,667	\$1,639,556	\$215,679,427
107	107	105	Alaska Gateway	Eagle K-12 School Building Renovation	\$5,667,661	\$5,227,433	\$0	\$5,227,433	\$104,549	\$5,122,884	\$220,802,311
108	108	106	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$1,711,181	\$1,711,181	\$0	\$1,711,181	\$34,224	\$1,676,957	\$222,479,268
109	109	107	Anchorage	Districtwide Electrical Projects, 4 Locations	\$3,005,000	\$3,005,000	\$0	\$3,005,000	\$901,500	\$2,103,500	\$224,582,768
110	110	108	Delta/Greely	Delta High School, Delta Cyber School Bldg. & Construction Trades Building Generator Back-Up	\$124,477	\$124,477	\$0	\$124,477	\$2,490	\$121,987	\$224,704,755
111	111	109	Mat-Su Borough	Snowshoe Elementary, Finger Lake Elementary, Cottonwood Elementary, Colony Middle School Flooring Replacements	\$1,383,561	\$1,383,561	\$0	\$1,383,561	\$415,068	\$968,493	\$225,673,248
112	112	110	Lower Kuskokwim	Fire Alarm Repair/Replacement - Nunapitchuck & Platinum	\$430,763	\$430,763	\$0	\$430,763	\$8,615	\$422,148	\$226,095,396
113	113	111	Southeast Island	Gym Lighting Upgrade, 2 Schools	\$349,384	\$349,384	\$0	\$349,384	\$6,988	\$342,396	\$226,437,792
114	114	112	Lower Kuskokwim	Fire Alarm Repair/Replacement - Quinhagak, Nightmute, Napaskiak	\$837,272	\$837,272	\$0	\$837,272	\$16,745	\$820,527	\$227,258,319
115	115	113	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Gym Floor Replacement	\$413,395	\$413,395	\$0	\$413,395	\$124,018	\$289,377	\$227,547,696
116	116	114	Fairbanks	North Pole High School Lighting Upgrade	\$4,811,883	\$3,854,165	\$0	\$3,854,165	\$1,156,249	\$2,697,916	\$230,245,612
117	117	115	Yukon Flats	Stevens Village Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,020,310	\$1,020,310	\$0	\$1,020,310	\$20,406	\$999,904	\$231,245,516
118	118	116	Iditarod Area	McGrath K-12 School Roof Repair, Phase 2	\$233,400	\$513,886	\$32,600	\$481,286	\$9,626	\$471,660	\$231,717,176
119	119	117	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Replace / Upgrade Air Conditioning Units	\$2,431,066	\$1,947,207	\$0	\$1,947,207	\$584,162	\$1,363,045	\$233,080,221
120	120	118	Fairbanks	Lathrop High School Kitchen Upgrade	\$3,522,826	\$2,904,290	\$0	\$2,904,290	\$871,287	\$2,033,003	\$235,113,224
121	121	119	Mat-Su Borough	Renovate HVAC Systems, 5 Schools	\$24,556,571	\$22,619,426	\$0	\$22,619,426	\$6,785,828	\$15,833,598	\$250,946,822
122	122	120	Denali Borough	Cantwell School Sprinkler Installation, Fire Alarm Upgrade, New Well	\$646,154	\$758,494	\$0	\$758,494	\$227,548	\$530,946	\$251,477,768
123	123	121	Fairbanks	Districtwide Safety & Security Systems Upgrades	\$5,731,766	\$4,929,541	\$0	\$4,929,541	\$1,478,862	\$3,450,679	\$254,928,447
124	124	122	Lake & Peninsula	Newhalen Kitchen Renovation	\$121,504	\$121,504	\$0	\$121,504	\$12,150	\$109,354	\$255,037,801

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
125	125	123	Anchorage	Districtwide Mechanical Upgrades, 8 Schools	\$10,725,000	\$10,725,000	\$0	\$10,725,000	\$3,217,500	\$7,507,500	\$262,545,301
126	126	124	Denali Borough	Anderson School Septic Leach Field Replacement	\$601,548	\$654,332	\$0	\$654,332	\$196,300	\$458,032	\$263,003,333
127	127		Fairbanks	Salcha Elementary School Playground Upgrades	\$549,306	\$436,279	\$0	\$436,279	\$130,884	\$305,395	\$263,308,728
128	128	125	Iditarod Area	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades	\$200,700	\$462,599	\$0	\$462,599	\$9,252	\$453,347	\$263,762,075
129	129	126	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Kitchen Upgrade	\$1,771,215	\$1,771,215	\$0	\$1,771,215	\$35,424	\$1,735,791	\$265,497,866
130	130	127	Fairbanks	Badger Road Elementary School Repair/Refinish Building Exterior	\$1,241,191	\$945,531	\$0	\$945,531	\$283,659	\$661,872	\$266,159,738
131	131	128	Delta/Greely	Delta Elementary School Mechanical Room Access	\$124,477	\$124,477	\$0	\$124,477	\$2,490	\$121,987	\$266,281,725
132	132	129	Mat-Su Borough	Snowshoe, Pioneer Peak, Big Lake Elementary Schools, ADA Parking And Access Improvements	\$196,519	\$196,519	\$0	\$196,519	\$58,956	\$137,563	\$266,419,288
133	133	130	Anchorage	Districtwide Building Renewal Projects, 7 Schools	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$0	\$1,620,000	\$486,000	\$1,134,000	\$267,553,288
134	134	131	Juneau City Borough	Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School Renovation	\$2,367,096	\$2,367,096	\$0	\$2,367,096	\$828,484	\$1,538,612	\$269,091,900
135	135	132	Iditarod Area	Innoko River K-12 Boiler Replacement, Shageluk	\$61,600	\$132,604	\$0	\$132,604	\$2,652	\$129,952	\$269,221,852
136	136	133	Iditarod Area	Blackwell K-12 School Shower & Bathroom Repair Phase 2, Anvik	\$77,200	\$156,175	\$0	\$156,175	\$3,123	\$153,052	\$269,374,904
137	137	134	Iditarod Area	Top of the Kuskokwim K-12 School Generator Project, Nikolai	\$68,860	\$151,053	\$0	\$151,053	\$3,021	\$148,032	\$269,522,936
138	138	135	Iditarod Area	Innoko River K-12 School Fire Suppression / Tank Upgrade, Shageluk	\$53,700	\$106,583	\$0	\$106,583	\$2,132	\$104,451	\$269,627,387
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$366,770,517</b>	<b>\$338,300,733</b>	<b>\$9,332,362</b>	<b>\$328,968,371</b>	<b>\$59,340,984</b>	<b>\$269,627,387</b>	

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
 School Construction Grant Fund  
 Final List

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
1	1	1	Lower Yukon	Alakanuk K-12 School Replacement	\$46,002,600	\$46,002,600	\$0	\$46,002,600	\$920,052	\$45,082,548	\$45,082,548
2	2	2	Lower Kuskokwim	Kipnuk K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$52,120,017	\$33,721,379	\$0	\$33,721,379	\$674,428	\$33,046,951	\$78,129,499
3	3	3	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwigillingok K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$36,524,739	\$21,934,862	\$0	\$21,934,862	\$438,697	\$21,496,165	\$99,625,664
4	4	5	Lower Yukon	Emmonak K-12 School Renovation / Addition	\$49,293,728	\$48,632,092	\$0	\$48,632,092	\$972,642	\$47,659,450	\$147,285,114
5	5	4	Lower Kuskokwim	Nightmute K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$31,934,293	\$31,934,293	\$0	\$31,934,293	\$638,686	\$31,295,607	\$178,580,721
6	6	6	Lower Kuskokwim	Kuinerramiut Elitnaurviat K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Quinhagak	\$31,160,414	\$31,160,414	\$0	\$31,160,414	\$623,208	\$30,537,206	\$209,117,927
7	7	7	Southeast Island	Hyder New K-12 School Construction	\$8,147,388	\$8,147,388	\$0	\$8,147,388	\$162,948	\$7,984,440	\$217,102,367
8	8	8	Lower Kuskokwim	Nelson Island K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Toksook Bay	\$35,762,990	\$35,762,990	\$0	\$35,762,990	\$715,260	\$35,047,730	\$252,150,097
9	9	9	Lower Kuskokwim	Z. J. Williams Memorial K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Napaskiak	\$35,625,141	\$23,925,048	\$0	\$23,925,048	\$478,501	\$23,446,547	\$275,596,644
10	10	10	Southwest Region	Koliganek K-12 School Replacement	\$26,311,134	\$26,311,134	\$0	\$26,311,134	\$526,223	\$25,784,911	\$301,381,555
11	11	11	Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Renovation / Addition	\$26,204,226	\$15,414,491	\$0	\$15,414,491	\$4,624,347	\$10,790,144	\$312,171,699
12	12	12	Lower Kuskokwim	Kwethluk K-12 Replacement School	\$51,178,075	\$37,403,377	\$0	\$37,403,377	\$748,068	\$36,655,309	\$348,827,008
13	13	15	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	\$18,560,443	\$12,363,060	\$0	\$12,363,060	\$247,261	\$12,115,799	\$360,942,807
14	14	16	Northwest Arctic	Districtwide Clock Upgrade	\$178,760	\$178,760	\$0	\$178,760	\$53,628	\$125,132	\$361,067,939
15	15	17	Galena	Galena Regional Learning Center Iditarod Classroom Conversion	\$13,892,376	\$13,892,376	\$0	\$13,892,376	\$694,619	\$13,197,757	\$374,265,696
16	16	18	Craig City	Craig Schools Alternative Wood Heat Project, Recovery of Funds	\$179,080	\$179,080	\$0	\$179,080	\$8,954	\$170,126	\$374,435,822
17	17	19	Kuspuk	Johnnie John Sr. K-12 Replacement School, Crooked Creek	\$17,180,983	\$13,314,890	\$0	\$13,314,890	\$266,298	\$13,048,592	\$387,484,414
18	18	20	Lake & Peninsula	Port Alsworth Classroom Addition	\$5,995,108	\$7,309,818	\$0	\$7,309,818	\$730,982	\$6,578,836	\$394,063,250
19	19	21	Northwest Arctic	Buckland Heating System Improvements	\$220,200	\$220,200	\$0	\$220,200	\$66,060	\$154,140	\$394,217,390
20	20	22	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area	\$467,307	\$467,307	\$0	\$467,307	\$9,346	\$457,961	\$394,675,351
21	21	23	Mat-Su Borough	Iditarod Elementary School Interior Renovation	\$8,697,896	\$8,128,531	\$0	\$8,128,531	\$2,438,559	\$5,689,972	\$400,365,323
22	22	24	Mat-Su Borough	Wasilla Attendance Area New Elementary School	\$27,426,419	\$24,345,498	\$0	\$24,345,498	\$7,303,649	\$17,041,849	\$417,407,172

State of Alaska  
 Department of Education and Early Development  
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2010)  
 School Construction Grant Fund

Final List

Feb 19	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
23	23	25	Kenai Peninsula	Districtwide Asphalt Repair	\$1,490,000	\$1,469,467	\$0	\$1,469,467	\$514,313	\$955,154	\$418,362,326
24	24	26	Yakutat City	Yakutat Schools Bus Zone & Paving	\$357,289	\$357,289	\$0	\$357,289	\$107,187	\$250,102	\$418,612,428
25	25	27	Mat-Su Borough	Mat-Su Day School New Costruction	\$15,353,051	\$10,798,001	\$0	\$10,798,001	\$3,239,400	\$7,558,601	\$426,171,029
26	26	28	Juneau City Borough	Districtwide Food Service	\$1,907,961	\$1,907,961	\$0	\$1,907,961	\$667,786	\$1,240,175	\$427,411,204
27	27	29	Anchorage	Mears Middle School Paving & Site Circulation, Gruening Middle School Site Repairs	\$5,900,000	\$5,900,000	\$0	\$5,900,000	\$1,770,000	\$4,130,000	\$431,541,204
28	28	30	Petersburg City	Districtwide Covered Sidewalks	\$1,186,735	\$1,186,735	\$0	\$1,186,735	\$356,020	\$830,715	\$432,371,919
29	29	32	Anchorage	Middle & High School Athletic Field & Track Surface Improvements, 11 Schools	\$27,615,000	\$27,615,000	\$0	\$27,615,000	\$8,284,500	\$19,330,500	\$451,702,419
30	30	33	Mat-Su Borough	Colony High School Running Track Resurface	\$928,378	\$1,089,378	\$161,000	\$928,378	\$278,513	\$649,865	\$452,352,284
31	31	34	Anchorage	Whaley School Design	\$964,000	\$964,000	\$0	\$964,000	\$289,200	\$674,800	\$453,027,084
32	32	35	Delta/Greely	Delta Elementary School Bleachers	\$124,477	\$124,477	\$0	\$124,477	\$2,490	\$121,987	\$453,149,071
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$578,890,208</b>	<b>\$492,161,896</b>	<b>\$161,000</b>	<b>\$492,000,896</b>	<b>\$38,851,825</b>	<b>\$453,149,071</b>	

# INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

District	App	Project Name	Category:	Priorit
Anchorage	10-011	Service High School Renovation	F	01
Anchorage	10-023	Girdwood K-8 School Design	F	13
Anchorage	10-025	West High School Renovation Design	F	15
Anchorage	10-026	Gladys Wood Elementary School Design	D	16
Anchorage	10-027	Inlet View Elementary School Design	D	17
Anchorage	10-028	Turnagain Elementary School Design	D	18
Anchorage	10-029	Rabbit Creek Elementary School Design	D	19
Anchorage	10-030	Romig Middle School Renovation Design	F	20
Fairbanks	10-056	Barnette Magnet School Renovation & Reco	F	01
Lake & Peninsula	10-097	Newhalen Multipurpose Room	F	02
Mat-Su Borough	10-131	Districtwide Safety & Security Upgrade	C	08
Iditarod Area	10-180	Anvik Exterior Siding Repairs	C	04
Iditarod Area	10-182	Grayling School Welding Shop Replacement	B	06
Iditarod Area	10-184	Anvik Addition	D	08
Iditarod Area	10-186	Reimbursement of Emergency Heat Loop	C	10

*State of Alaska*  
*Department of Education and Early Development*  
*Fiscal Year 2010 -- Initial Project List*

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b><i>Alaska Gateway</i></b>					
10-002	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Northway K-12 School Building Renovation
10-003	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tanacross K-8 School Building Renovation
10-004	D	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eagle K-12 School Building Renovation
<b><i>Aleutians East</i></b>					
10-005	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	False Pass K-12 School Siding Replacement, Recovery of Funds
10-006	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sand Point K-12 School Window Replacement, Recovery of Funds
10-007	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cold Bay K-12 Heating System Upgrade
10-008	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Akutan K-12 School Siding Replacement
10-009	D	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sand Point K-12 School Gym Floor Replacement
10-010	C	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance, Recovery of Funds
<b><i>Anchorage</i></b>					
10-011	F	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Service High School Renovation
10-012	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades, 5 Schools
10-013	D	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Sprinkler Upgrades, 3 Schools
10-014	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Security System Upgrades, 18 Schools
10-015	C	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emergency Communication Systems, 5 Middle Schools
10-016	C	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Roof Replacement & Structural Upgrades, 4 Schools
10-017	D	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Electrical Projects, 4 Locations
10-018	D	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Intercom/PA Upgrades, 5 Schools
10-019	F	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mears Middle School Paving & Site Circulation, Gruening Middle School Site Repairs
10-020	C	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Building Renewal Projects, 7 Schools
10-021	D	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Mechanical Upgrades, 8 Schools
10-022	F	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whaley School Design
10-023	F	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Girdwood K-8 School Design
10-024	F	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Middle & High School Athletic Field & Track Surface Improvements, 11 Schools
10-025	F	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	West High School Renovation Design
10-026	D	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gladys Wood Elementary School Design
10-027	D	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inlet View Elementary School Design
10-028	D	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turnagain Elementary School Design
10-029	D	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rabbit Creek Elementary School Design
10-030	F	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Romig Middle School Renovation Design
<b><i>Annette Island</i></b>					
10-031	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Metlakatla Elementary School Underground Fuel Tank Replacement
10-032	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Metlakatla Elementary School Renovation
<b><i>Bering Strait</i></b>					
10-033	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Diomed K-12 School Renovation
10-034	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shaktoolik K-12 School Renovation

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b>Chatham</b>					
10-035	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Klukwan K-12 School Major Maintenance
10-036	C	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gustavus K-12 School Major Maintenance
10-037	C	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tenakee Springs K-12 School Renovation
<b>Copper River</b>					
10-038	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glennallen High School Upgrade
10-039	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kenny Lake High School Upgrade
10-040	D	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Slana K-12 School Upgrade
10-041	D	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chistochina Elementary School Upgrade
10-042	D	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Copper Center Elementary School Upgrade
<b>Craig City</b>					
10-043	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Craig Elementary School Roof Replacement
10-044	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Craig Middle School Classroom Renovation, Recovery of Funds
10-045	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Craig Middle School Exterior Envelope Upgrades, Recovery of Funds
10-046	E	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Craig Schools Alternative Wood Heat Project, Recovery of Funds
<b>Delta/Greely</b>					
10-047	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Delta High School Lead Dust Removal
10-048	C	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Delta High School, Delta Cyber School Bldg. & Construction Trades Building Generator Back-Up
10-049	C	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Delta Elementary School Mechanical Room Access
10-050	D	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Clock and Intercom Systems Upgrade, Security Alarm and Cameras
10-051	C	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Delta High School and Fort Greely School New Entrance Doors and Security
10-052	F	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Delta Elementary School Bleachers
<b>Denali Borough</b>					
10-053	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cantwell School Sprinkler Installation, Fire Alarm Upgrade, New Well
10-054	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anderson School Septic Leach Field Replacement
10-055	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tri-Valley School, Gymnasium and Locker Rooms Roof Replacement
<b>Fairbanks</b>					
10-056	F	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Barnette Magnet School Renovation & Reconstruction
10-057	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	North Pole Middle School Mechanical Systems Upgrades
10-058	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Septic System Replacement
10-059	D	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	North Pole High School Vocational Wing Renovation
10-060	D	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Technology Upgrades
10-061	D	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weller Elementary School Lighting Upgrade
10-062	C	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Administrative Center Replace / Upgrade Air Conditioning Units
10-063	D	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	North Pole High School Lighting Upgrade
10-064	C	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lathrop High School Major Maintenance
10-065	C	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Woodriver Elementary Gymnasium Upgrade
10-066	C	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Safety & Security Systems Upgrades
10-067	C	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Locker Replacement
10-068	C	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Badger Road Elementary School Repair/Refinish Building Exterior
10-069	C	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lathrop High School Kitchen Upgrade
10-070	D	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Salcha Elementary School Playground Upgrades

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b>Galena</b>					
10-071	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Galena Regional Learning Center Dining Facility Upgrade
10-072	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Galena Regional Learning Center Gym Building Upgrade
10-073	F	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Galena Regional Learning Center Iditarod Classroom Conversion
<b>Hoonah City</b>					
10-074	C	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hoonah Schools Major Maintenance
10-075	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hoonah High School Key Card Access System and Door Replacement
<b>Iditarod Area</b>					
10-177	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McGrath K-12 School Roof Repair, Phase 2
10-178	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Top of the Kuskokwim K-12 School Generator Project, Nikolai
10-179	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Innoko River K-12 Boiler Replacement, Shageluk
10-180	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anvik Exterior Siding Repairs
10-181	C	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Blackwell K-12 School Shower & Bathroom Repair Phase 2, Anvik
10-182	B	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grayling School Welding Shop Replacement
10-183	C	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Innoko River K-12 School Fire Suppression / Tank Upgrade, Shageluk
10-184	D	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anvik Addition
10-185	D	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades
10-186	C	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reimbursement of Emergency Heat Loop
<b>Juneau City Borough</b>					
10-076	C	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marie Drake Renovation
10-077	C	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mendenhall River Community School Renovation
10-078	C	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School Renovation
10-079	C	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	District Maintenance Facility Renovation
10-080	F	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Food Service
<b>Kake City</b>					
10-081	D	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kake Elementary School Ventilation System Upgrade
<b>Kenai Peninsula</b>					
10-082	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Roof Replacements: Seward High School Auditorium, Kalifornsky Beach Elementary And Warehouse
10-083	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Window Replacements, 4 Schools
10-084	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Locker Replacements
10-085	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Security Systems
10-086	F	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Asphalt Repair
<b>Ketchikan</b>					
10-087	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Houghtaling Elementary Outdoor Physical Education Shelter Replacement
10-088	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Valley Park Elementary Siding Replacement
10-089	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Major Maintenance
<b>Klawock City</b>					
10-090	C	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Klawock K-12 Fuel Tank Decommissioning
<b>Kodiak Island</b>					
10-091	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kodiak Schools Seismic Mitigation Project

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b><i>Kuspuk</i></b>					
10-092	A	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak
10-093	B	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Johnnie John Sr. K-12 Replacement School, Crooked Creek
10-094	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute
10-095	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Heating System Upgrades
<b><i>Lake &amp; Peninsula</i></b>					
10-096	B	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Port Alsworth Classroom Addition
10-097	F	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Newhalen Multipurpose Room
10-098	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Newhalen Kitchen Renovation
<b><i>Lower Kuskokwim</i></b>					
10-099	B	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kwigillingok K-12 School Renovation/Addition
10-100	B	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kipnuk K-12 School Renovation/Addition
10-101	D	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Floor Failure Repairs, Generator Building - Kasigluk-Akula K-12 School
10-102	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Prime Power Generators - Platinum K-12 School
10-103	C	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Back-Up Generators - Chefornak K-12 School
10-104	B	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nightmute K-12 School Renovation/Addition
10-105	B	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kuinerramiut Elitnaurviat K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Quinhagak
10-106	B	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Z. J. Williams Memorial K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Napaskiak
10-107	B	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nelson Island K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Toksook Bay
10-108	B	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kwethluk K-12 Replacement School
10-109	C	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tununak K-12 School Major Maintenance
10-110	C	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat Elementary Deferred Maintenance Phase 2, Bethel
10-111	D	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bulk Fuel Tank Upgrade - Eek
10-112	D	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fuel Tank Remediation - Nunapitchuk
10-113	D	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fuel Tank Remediation - Newtok
10-114	D	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fuel Tank Remediation - Bethel
10-115	D	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire Alarm Repair/Replacement - Nunapitchuck & Platinum
10-116	D	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire Alarm Repair/Replacement - Quinhagak, Nightmute, Napaskiak
10-117	C	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generator Replacement, Oscarville
<b><i>Lower Yukon</i></b>					
10-118	B	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alakanuk K-12 School Replacement
10-119	B	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emmonak K-12 School Renovation / Addition
10-120	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kotlik K-12 Heat Plant Relocation
10-121	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pitka's Point K-8 School Renovation
10-122	D	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hooper Bay K-12 School Electrical Upgrades
10-123	C	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scammon Bay K-12 School Generator & Fuel Tank Relocation

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b>Mat-Su Borough</b>					
10-124	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Fire Alarm Upgrades
10-125	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Administration Building Generator and Related Electrical Replacement
10-126	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Roof Replacements & Repairs, 4 Schools
10-127	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wasilla Middle School, Wasilla High School, Palmer Middle School Roof Replacements
10-128	B	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wasilla Attendance Area New Elementary School
10-129	B	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Iditarod Elementary School Interior Renovation
10-130	D	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Big Lake Elementary, Renovate Old Classroom Wing
10-131	C	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Safety & Security Upgrade
10-132	D	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Snowshoe, Pioneer Peak, Big Lake Elementary Schools, ADA Parking And Access Improvements
10-133	D	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Renovate HVAC Systems, 5 Schools
10-134	B	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mat-Su Day School New Construction
10-135	D	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Snowshoe Elementary, Finger Lake Elementary, Cottonwood Elementary, Colony Middle School Flooring Replacements
10-136	C	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Butte, Cottonwood Creek, Pioneer Peak & Snowshoe Elementary Wash Fountain Replacements
10-137	F	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Colony High School Running Track Resurface
<b>Nenana City</b>					
10-138	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nenana K-12 School ADA / Erosion Control
<b>Northwest Arctic</b>					
10-139	B	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kivalina K-12 Renovation / Addition
10-140	F	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Clock Upgrade
10-141	E	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Buckland Heating System Improvements
<b>Pelican City</b>					
10-142	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pelican Schools Major Maintenance
<b>Petersburg City</b>					
10-143	C	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Petersburg Elementary School Siding Replacement
10-144	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Digital HVAC Controls
10-145	D	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Petersburg Elementary School Lunchroom Renovation
10-146	A	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Covered Sidewalks
10-147	C	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Lighting Upgrades
<b>Saint Marys</b>					
10-148	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Fuel Tank Farm Replacement
10-149	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Garage and Warm Storage Renovation
<b>Sitka City Borough</b>					
10-150	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pacific High School Renovation
<b>Skagway City</b>					
10-151	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Skagway K-12 School Dry Sprinkler Replacement

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
<b><i>Southeast Island</i></b>					
10-152	B	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hyder New K-12 School Construction
10-153	C	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thorne Bay K-12 School Fire Suppression System Replacement
10-154	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement
10-155	D	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water System Pipe Replacement
10-156	C	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gym Lighting Upgrade, 2 Schools
10-157	F	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Physical Education Area
10-158	C	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Roof Replacement, 2 Schools
10-159	C	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generator Replacement, 3 Schools
10-160	D	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thorne Bay K-12 Kitchen Upgrade
10-161	C	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Port Protection K-12 Gym Relocation / Foundation
<b><i>Southwest Region</i></b>					
10-162	A	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Koliganek K-12 School Replacement
10-163	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HVAC Upgrades, Aleknagik, Clarks Point and Ekwok K-12 Schools
<b><i>Wrangell City</i></b>					
10-164	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Evergreen Elementary School Playground Safety Upgrades
10-165	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wrangell High School, Stikine Middle School Fire Alarm Upgrade
<b><i>Yakutat City</i></b>					
10-166	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yakutat Schools Mechanical System Upgrades
10-167	F	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yakutat Schools Bus Zone & Paving
<b><i>Yukon Flats</i></b>					
10-168	D	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fort Yukon Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement
10-169	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Venetie Generator Building Renovation
10-170	D	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cruikshank School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver
10-171	D	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stevens Village Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement
<b><i>Yukon-Koyukuk</i></b>					
10-172	C	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kaltag K-12 School Heating System Replacement
10-173	D	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allakaket K-12 School Water System Improvements
10-174	C	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Huslia High School Exterior Upgrade
10-175	C	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kaltag K-12 School Siding Completion
<b><i>Yupiit</i></b>					
10-176	C	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Districtwide Site Deficiencies Upgrade

---

<i>CIP Number</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>District Priority</i>	<i>Reuse</i>	<i>Eligibility</i>	<i>Project Name</i>
-----------------------	-----------------	------------------------------	--------------	--------------------	---------------------

---

*Project Count Summary*

<i>Total:</i>	185
<i>Reuse Scores:</i>	24
<i>To be rated:</i>	161
<i>Eligible Projects:</i>	170
<i>Ineligible Projects:</i>	15



Deleted: ¶

**BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

- 3. 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.)*
- 4. Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system?  yes  no  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1).)*
- 5. Is evidence of required insurance attached to this application or has evidence been submitted as required to the department?  yes  no  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(2).)*
- 6. Is the project a capital improvement project and not part of a preventive maintenance program or custodial care?  yes  no  
*(The scope of work as outlined in the project description, question 18, must meet the requirements of AS 14.11.011(b)(3).)*

**DISTRICT INFORMATION**

- 7a. Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. *(Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded. See instructions for specific accounting codes to be included.)*
- 7b. Districtwide replacement cost insurance values for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

- 8. The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):  
 renovated     added to     demolished     surplus     other  
*(If the project will result in demolition or surplus of building(s), provide for hazardous material abatement and demolition as part of the project. If the building(s) are state-owned or state-leased facilities, attach a transition plan for protection and disposal of the properties.)*
- 9. 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. Refer to the EED Facilities Database at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm> for facility number, name, year, and size information on record.)*

Deleted: 2008

Deleted: FY2010



Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies and please note the attachment in question 31.)

Has a facility appraisal been completed? (5 points possible)  yes  no  
(If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies and please note the attachment in question 31.)

Has work been completed on planning? (10 points possible)  yes  no  
(If yes, attach documentation supporting planning as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)

Has work been completed on schematic design?\*(10 points possible)  yes  no  
(If yes, attach documentation supporting schematic design as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)

Has work been completed on design development?\*(10 points possible)  yes  no  
(If yes, attach documentation supporting design development as described in Appendix A, and please note the attachment in question 31.)

\* - Be sure to identify the A/E consultant. If there is no A/E consultant for this project, please provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required.

17. Project Description/Scope of Work: The project description should provide a clear description of the project scope to be completed with this project. If prior or subsequent work is included as a part of the description, be sure to clearly identify the components of work to be completed with this project. (50 points possible for description of severity of life/ safety and code issues)

(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and to the instructions accompanying this form. Appendices A and C accompanying the instructions may be particularly helpful. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)

Deleted: 2008  
Deleted: FY2010

**COST ESTIMATES**

18. Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development's **11<sup>th</sup> Edition Update** Cost Model or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is **mandatory**. (30 points possible)

(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 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 <sup>1</sup>	2 - 4%				
Land <sup>2</sup>					
Site Investigation <sup>2</sup>					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction <sup>3</sup>					
Equipment & Technology <sup>2,5</sup>	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead <sup>4</sup>	up to 9%				
Art <sup>6</sup>	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
<b>Project Total</b>					

- 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.
- Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project.
- 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. The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
- Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).

Deleted: Page Break

Formatted: Font: Bold, Font color: Blue

Deleted: add

Deleted: Required for all

Deleted: 2008

Deleted: FY2010

**Table 2. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

Construction Category	New Construction			Renovation		
	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction <sup>2</sup>						
Special Requirements <sup>1</sup>		n/a			n/a	
Sitework and Utilities		n/a			n/a	
General Requirements		n/a			n/a	
Geographic Cost Factor		n/a			n/a	
Size Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
<b>Construction Total</b>						

1. Explain in detail and justify special requirements
2. If using the Cost Model, Base Construction = Divisions (1.0+2.0) for new construction, and Division 11.00 for Renovation, otherwise, the Base Construction = the total construction cost less the costs that correspond with other cost categories in the table.

**ATTENDANCE AREA AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM)**

**Please Note:** If you have classified this project as a Major Maintenance (Category C or D) and you are not including any new space skip to question 25. **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).

19. Indicate the student grade levels to be housed by in the proposed project facility: \_\_\_\_\_

20. Within the attendance area, is there any work (other than this project) 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, please provide information below about size, student capacity, and grades to be served in the table below.)*

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

21. Within the attendance area, are there school facilities that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project?  yes  no

*(If the answer is yes, please provide information below about size, student capacity, and grades served in the table below.)*

School Name	GSF	Grades	Capacity
_____	_____	_____	_____

Deleted: 2008  
Deleted: FY2010

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development


In lieu of data in the format above for questions 20 and 21, we are providing detailed attachments.  yes  no

22. What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility?  
*(Provide a project schedule if available.)* \_\_\_\_\_

23. In the table below provide the attendance area's current and projected ADM: (80 points possible for unhoused students)

Table 3. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM			
School Year	K-6 ADM	7-12 ADM	Total ADM
2007-2008			
2008-2009			
2009-2010			
2010-2011			
2011-2012			
2012-2013			
2013-2014			
2014-2015			
2015-2016			
2016-2017			

24. By what method(s) were ADM projections calculated?  
*(Attach calculations and justifications.)* \_\_\_\_\_

## PROJECT SPACE

25. 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. (30 points possible available for type of space constructed)

Deleted: 2008

Deleted: FY2010

**Table 4. PROJECT SPACE EQUATION**

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

26. Describe inadequacies of existing space. Specifically address how the inadequacies impact the educational program and facility operations. (40 points possible for inadequacy of space)  
*(Refer to 4 AAC 31.022 (c)(4). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

**ALTERNATIVE FACILITIES AND OPTIONS**

27. List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of housing students. (5 points possible)  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(4). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

28. Describe two or more viable options to this project that have been considered. (25 points possible)  
*(Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(6). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)*

Deleted: 2008  
 Deleted: FY2010

29. Quantify the project's annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost. (30 points possible)

(Refer to 4 ACC 31.022(c)(3). If attached documentation is intended to address this question, please note the attachment in question 31.)

**FACILITY MANAGEMENT**

Deleted: .....Page Break.....

30. Provide documents related to the district's maintenance and facility management program. 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. (Refer to AS 14.11.011(b)(1), AS 14.11.011(b)(4), AS 14.14.090(10), 4 AAC 31.013 and accompanying instructions. Note attached documentation in question 31.) (55 points possible)

- Assessment # 1 Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)
- Assessment # 2 PM corrective maintenance reports (Up to 5 Objective Points)
- Assessment # 3 Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 5 Objective Points)
- Assessment # 4 5-Year Average Expenditure on maintenance (Up to 5 Objective Points)
- Assessment # 5 Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)
- Assessment # 6 Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)
- Assessment # 7 Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)
- Assessment # 8 Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Subjective Points)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**ATTACHMENTS**

31. Please check to indicate all items that are attached to this application and note that two copies of each attachment should be included. Attachments designated as **Required** must be included for the application to be considered complete. Some items may not be applicable to specific projects.

- Documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080 (question 2c)
- Six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (question 3); **Required for eligibility**
- Description of maintenance and facilities management program (question 30); **Required for eligibility**
- Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (question 8)
- Justification for waiver of participating share (question 11)
- Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (question 15)
- Facility condition survey (question 16)
- Facility Appraisal (question 16)
- Planning documentation (question 16)
- Schematic Design documentation (question 16)
- Design Development documentation (question 16)
- Cost/benefit analysis (questions 17, 18, 28, 29)
- Life cycle cost analysis (questions 17, 18, 28, 29)

Deleted: and Appendix A

Deleted: 2008

Deleted: FY2010

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Value analysis provided (*question 17, 18, 28, 29*)
- Budget variance justification (*question 18*)
- Cost estimate worksheets (*question 18*)
- Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (*question 20, 21*)
- Enrollment projections and calculations (*question 23*)
- Appropriate compliance reports (*i.e., Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.*)

## CERTIFICATION

32. 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

Deleted: 2008  
Deleted: FY2010



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

Formatted: Font: 16 pt

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold

**FY2011**

Use these instructions with Alaska Department of Education & Early Development AKEED Form #05-95-017a, Rev 4/2009

Deleted: 2008

*Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement.  
Numbered paragraphs below correspond to numbered questions on the application.*

Unless otherwise indicated, 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 returned unranked.** 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). Please submit *one original and three complete copies* of each application and *two copies of each attachment*. One copy of the attachment may be in portable document format (PDF).

(Note: The department will only score ten projects from each district during a single rating period.)

Project scope and budget may be altered based on the department's review and evaluation of the application. The department will correct errors noted in the application and make necessary increases or decreases to the project budget. The department may decrease the project scope, but will not increase the project scope beyond that requested in the original application submitted by the September 1 deadline.

### TYPE OF PROJECT AND FUNDING REQUEST

1. Check one box to indicate which type of state aid is being requested. Grant funding applications are submitted to the department by September 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, or on a date at the beginning of September designated by the department in the event that the 1<sup>st</sup> falls on a weekend or holiday. Debt funding 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.
  
- 2a. Check one box 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 B of these instructions for descriptions of categories and the limitations associated with category C and category D projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted basis for mixed scope projects.

Deleted: 2008

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

b. Check the applicable phase(s) covered by this funding request. Refer to Appendix A for descriptions of phases.

c. Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. If the construction work is partially or fully complete, please attach documentation that establishes that the construction was procured in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080 CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES.

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. 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. 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. 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 utilizes in-house labor, or is constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project will not be scored.

Deleted: that

### BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

3. Attach a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-96-006. 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.

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

Deleted: In awarding points, t

5. 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.

6. 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 D for an explanation of maintenance activities.

Deleted: 2008

**DISTRICT INFORMATION**

7. 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, 2000 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Funds 100 General Fund and 500 Capital Project Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. [Note: This information is used in calculating scores for Assessment 4; see Question 31.]

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

8. The response to this question should be consistent with the space utilization table in question 25. 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 surplus or demolished, the project must provide for the abatement of all hazardous materials as part of the project. The transition plan should describe how surplus state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition.
9. This question requests information on the year the facility was constructed and size of each element of the facility to establish the weighted average age of facilities score. If a project's scope of work is limited to a portion of a building (i.e., the original or a specific addition), the age of *that building portion* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point calculation. If the project's scope of work expands to multiple portions of a building, the ages of *all building portions receiving work* will be used in the weighted average age of facilities point calculation. *Year built* refers to the year the original facility and any additions were completed or were first occupied for educational purposes. If a date of construction is not available, use an estimate indicated by an (\*). *Gross square footage (GSF)* of each addition should be the amount of space added to the original facility. *Total size* should equal the total square footage of the existing facility. 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>

**Deleted:** For new school projects, provide building data for existing buildings in the attendance area that serve the same grade levels as the proposed facility.

**RELATED FUNDING**

10. 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 1 of the Cost Estimate, Question #18. 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.

**Deleted:** 2008

11. Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix E in the attachments to these instructions for detailed information.

## PROJECT INFORMATION

12. The district ranking of each project application must be a unique number approved by the district school board and must place each discrete project in priority sequence. The project having the highest priority should receive a ranking of one, and each additional project application of lower priority should be assigned a unique number in priority order. The department will accept only one project with a district ranking of priority one. The ranking of each application should be consistent with the board-approved six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Please 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 at increments of 3 for each corresponding drop in district priority ranking.
13. 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.

*Note: for schools housing a combination of elementary and secondary grades, the space allocated to elementary (K-6) and secondary (7-12) may be necessary.*

14. Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(1). If this project is an emergency, the project description shall describe:
  - the nature of the emergency,
  - the facility condition related to the emergency,
  - the threat to students and staff,
  - the consequence of continued utilization of the facility,
  - the individuals or groups affected by the condition,
  - what action the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions, and
  - the extent to which any portion of the project is eligible for insurance reimbursement or emergency funding from any state or federal agency.

Evaluation of the emergency will consider all of the information submitted and the responses to each of the emergency elements noted in these instructions. Based on the information submitted in the narrative and other portions of the application, the emergency condition can generate up to 50 possible points.

Deleted: net

Deleted: 2008

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

15. *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 1997 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 A).
16. There are five distinct items in this question. Each one has the potential to generate points.

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 will need to be completed by an architect and/or an engineer. Someone reasonably familiar with the building and its components may complete portions of the condition survey that document the condition of building elements. 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. To receive points for this item, a facility condition survey needs to be less than four years old. 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. There are up to 5 points possible for a complete conditions survey.

A *facility appraisal* is an educational adequacy appraisal following the format of the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International "Guide for School Facility Appraisal". An appraisal is optional; however, an appraisal document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request. There are up to 5 points possible for a complete facility appraisal.

*Planning* work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix A of this document. There are up to 10 points possible for completed planning work.

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

*Design development* work includes items listed under design development in Appendix A of this document. There are up to 10 points possible for completed design development work.

Deleted: 2008

Identify the district's 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.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK

17. The project description/scope of work should include (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, (3) a description of the scope of the project and what the project will accomplish, and (4) information or detail related to the project's cost. If the construction of a new school is proposed, describe any code issues at existing facilities in the attendance area that will be relieved by the project. The scope should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state. The project description/scope of work is a good place to include responses to questions 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, and 16, where applicable. It is helpful to identify the question number if you are answering one of the previously mention questions in the project description. There are up to 50 points possible for descriptions identifying the severity of life safety issues addressed by the project.

Question #6: Statute requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the project is not preventive maintenance, routine maintenance, or custodial care. Refer to Appendix D of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

Question #8: 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 summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the project description. 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 #13: If the project impacts multiple facilities, the project description shall identify the facilities impacted and describe how each will be impacted. This applies to district wide projects as well as projects adding space. For projects adding space, use question #21 to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

Question #14: If the project is an emergency, the description shall address all the items specified in the instructions for question 14.

Question #15: Site description should include location, size, availability, cost and other pertinent information as appropriate. If a site selection and evaluation report is attached,

Deleted: 2008

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

the information can be referenced with a brief summary rather than being reproduced in this section.

Question #16: If a facility condition survey, [facility appraisal, schematic design, or design development document](#) is attached, it can be summarized and referenced rather than reproduced in the descriptions of project need, justification, and scope.

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 1 and 2 of question 18, 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 sitework and utilities. The project description and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.

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

## COST ESTIMATES

18. 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 Program Demand Cost Model (11th Edition Update), 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.

In Table 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 and Site Investigation. To calculate the percent of construction divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to \$500,000; 3% for project costs between \$500,000 - \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects of \$5,000,000 or greater [AS14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects [with a cost greater than \\$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification](#), is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%.

Deleted: Specificaiton

Deleted: 2008

## Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, please add a detailed justification for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 130% in additional percentage costs.

Deleted: overall guideline

Table 2, which summarizes construction costs, is structured to be consistent with the EED 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.

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

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

### ATTENDANCE AREA AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM)

**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.

19. The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.
20. Any additional square footage that is funded for construction or approved by local voters for construction should be described, showing student capacity, additional GSF, and grade levels to be served. Include these projects in any capacity/unhoused calculations provided in the year of anticipated occupancy.
21. 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 Capacity Worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. Please note that the Capacity Worksheet has been revised to reflect the regulatory changes to 4 AAC 31.020. The Capacity Worksheet is a MS Excel file and is available on the department's web site:

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

Deleted: 2008

22. 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.
23. All projects that are adding new space must complete Table 3. ATTENDANCE AREA ADM. There are 80 possible points available for unhoused students depending on severity.
24. Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 3. The department will compare the projections to historic growth trends for the attendance area. The department will revise population projections that exceed historical growth rates, show disparate growth between elementary and secondary populations, or are unlikely to be sustained as an attendance area's overall population grows. The application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (i.e. housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.

### PROJECT SPACE EQUATION

25. This table 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 9 as well as those shown in Table 2 of the cost estimate section. The worksheet at Appendix F lists types of school space that fit in each category. There are up to 30 points possible for the type of space being constructed.
26. Describe the inadequacies of the existing space. Inadequacies can vary from quality of space to amount of space to the configuration of the space. The response should also address how the inadequacies impact the educational program and whether the educational program is a mandatory, existing local, or new local program. The maximum number of points available for this question is 40. There are up to 40 points possible for description of mandated educational programs, up to 20 points are available for existing local educational programs, and up to 15 points are available for new local programs.

### ALTERNATIVE FACILITIES AND OPTIONS

27. Statutes require an evaluation of other facilities in the area that may serve as an alternative to accomplishing the project as submitted. Information regarding the availability of such facilities and the effort (i.e. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project. There are up to 5 points available for an adequate description showing that the district has considered alternatives to the proposed project for housing unhoused students.
28. In an effort to support the project, as submitted, as the best possible solution to school facility needs, districts should consider a full range of options during planning and project

Deleted: 2008

development. Options should address the specific scope of the project and the delivery of the project (phasing of the work, in-house labor, etc.). For example, 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. A project that proposes roof replacement should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or even altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected. If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts must consider service center boundary changes and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. At least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes. 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. There are up to 25 points available for a comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

29. **Operational Cost vs. Project Cost:** Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. The project cost and its impact on operational costs is an important consideration for any project. The project description should include a discussion of ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. Considerations could cover 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. For new facilities, consideration should be given to design choices that will provide periodic and long-term savings in the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Although the addition of square footage is certain to 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. This can include cost benefit analyses that were accomplished on building systems and materials, etc. There are up to 30 points possible for a full and complete description of the costs of the project including life-cycle costs and cost benefit analysis.

### FACILITY MANAGEMENT

30.

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with this application 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 D for details. The scoring criteria for this area now reflect efforts beyond just preventive maintenance. For each element of a qualifying plan outlined in 4 AAC 31.013, documents, including reports, narratives and schedules have been identified for nine separate assessments. 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 assessment are

Deleted: 2008

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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., subjective or objective). A district should provide any or all of the documents they have available. Refer to the Rater's Guide for additional information on scoring. There are up to 55 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

## Maintenance Management

**Assessment #1 – Maintenance management narrative (Subjective)** [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.).

**Assessment #2 – PM/corrective maintenance reports (Objective)** [up to 10 points available]:

*Item A:* Provide a districtwide report that compares scheduled 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 maintenance and unscheduled work. 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.

**Assessment #3 – Maintenance Labor Reports (Objective)** [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., scheduled, corrective, operations support, etc.] vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

*Item B:* Produce a districtwide report that shows scheduled and completed work orders by month, for the previous 12 months.

*Item C:* Produce a districtwide report showing the number of incomplete work orders sorted by age [30 days, 60 days, 90 days, etc.] and status. [deferred, awaiting materials, scheduled, etc.]

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

**Assessment #4 – 5-year average expenditure for maintenance (Objective)** [up to 5 points available]:

The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. [This information is provided in application question #7 and in

**Deleted:** *Item A:* Produce a districtwide report showing total maintenance labor hours collected on work orders by type of work [e.g., scheduled, corrective, operations support, etc.] vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.¶

¶ *Item B:* Produce a districtwide report that shows scheduled and completed work orders by month, for the previous 12 months.¶

¶ *Item C:* Produce a districtwide report showing the number of incomplete work orders sorted by age [30 days, 60 days, 90 days, etc.] and status. [deferred, awaiting materials, scheduled, etc.]¶

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

**Deleted:** *Item A:* Provide a districtwide report that compares scheduled 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 maintenance and unscheduled work. 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.¶

**Deleted:** 2008

# Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

---

district insurance records submitted separately to the department. No other information need be submitted.]

## **Energy Management**

**Assessment #5 – Energy Management Narrative (Subjective)** [up to 5 points available]:

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

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

## **Custodial Program**

**Assessment #6 – Custodial Narrative (Subjective)** [up to 5 points available]:

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

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

## **Maintenance Training**

**Assessment #7 – Maintenance Training Narrative (Subjective)** [up to 5 points available]:

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

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

Deleted: could

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

Deleted: 2008

**Assessment #8 – Capital Planning Narrative (Subjective)** [up to 5 points available]:  
Provide a narrative giving evidence the district has a process for developing a long-range plan for capital renewal.

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

Deleted: 2008

**ATTACHMENTS**

31. The attachments checklist is provided for your and the department's convenience to identify additional materials that are referenced in support of the project. Please check to see that your application is complete and indicate additional attachments the department should reference while evaluating the project.

**CERTIFICATION**

32. Please be sure the application is 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:**  
Sam Kito III, P.E., School Facilities Engineer  
(907) 465-6906

Deleted: 2008

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX A: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

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

PHASE I-PLANNING (10 points possible)

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (if needed)(4 AAC 31.065) - (as required)
2. Prepare a school facility appraisal (as required) (see application question 16)
3. Prepare a facility condition survey (as required) (see application question 16)
4. Identify need category of project - **(Required)**
5. Verify student populations and trends - **(Required)**
6. Complete education specifications (design the educational program - 4AAC 31.010) - **(Required)**
7. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **(Required)**
8. Complete concept design studies and planning cost estimate - **(Required)**

PHASE IIA - SCHEMATIC DESIGN (10 points possible)

1. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4AAC 31.025) - **(Required)**
2. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - **(Required)**
3. Accomplish site survey and perform preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical)
4. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - **(Required)**
5. Complete schematic design documents including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - **(Required)**
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

PHASE IIB-DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (10 points possible)

1. Complete suggested elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **(Required)**
2. Review and confirm planning (4AAC 31.030)
3. Accomplish a condition survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project includes renovation)**
4. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **(Required)**
5. Complete design development documents - **(Required)**
6. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
7. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

PHASE III-CONSTRUCTION

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX B: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

AS 14.11.013(a)(1)- annually review the six-year plans submitted by each district under [AS 14.11.011](#) (b) and recommend to the board a revised and updated six-year capital improvement project grant schedule that serves the best interests of the state and each district; in recommending projects for this schedule, the department shall verify that each proposed project meets the criteria established under [AS 14.11.014](#)(b) and qualifies as a project required to<sup>1, 2</sup>

- A. "Avert imminent danger or correct life threatening situations." This category is generally referred to as, "Health and Life Safety." A project classified under "A" must be documented as having unsafe conditions that threaten the physical welfare of the occupants. Examples might be that seismic design of structure is inadequate; that required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative; or that the structure and materials are deteriorated or damaged seriously to the extent that they pose a health/life-safety risk. The district must document what actions it has taken to temporarily mitigate a life-threatening situation.
- B. "House students who would otherwise be unhoused." This category is referred to as "Unhoused Students." A project to be classified under "B" must have inadequate space to carry out the educational program required for the present and projected student population. Documentation should be based on the current Department of Education & Early Development Space Guidelines. (Refer to AAC 31.020) This category corresponds to category A under AS 14.11.100(j) used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Projects can combine work in the different categories with the majority of work establishing the project's type. For the purpose of review and evaluation, projects which include significant work elements from categories other than the project's primary category will be evaluated as **mixed scope** projects [4 AAC 31.022(c)(8)].

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX B: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 16, 2007

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 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. This category corresponds to category B under AS 14.11.100(j) used for review of debt reimbursement projects.

- 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. This category corresponds to category C under AS 14.11.100(j) used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- 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. This category corresponds to category D under AS 14.11.100(j) used for review of debt reimbursement projects.
- 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 C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 17, 2008

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

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

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

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

Recommended: 6-10% (Renovation 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 included as part of this line item.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX C: PROJECT COST ESTIMATE  
Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee  
April 17, 2008

Recommended: 2-9%

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

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

Recommended: 5% Fixed

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

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
APPENDIX D: 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 E: WAIVER OF PARTICIPATING SHARE/IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS  
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  
APPENDIX F: 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

## 2009 Proposed Regulation Changes

### 4 AAC 31.013. Preventive maintenance and facility management

(2) an energy management plan that includes recording energy consumption for all utilities on a monthly basis for each building; for facilities constructed before 12/15/2004, a district may record energy consumption for utilities on a monthly basis when multiple buildings are served by one utility plant;

Deleted: my

### 4 AAC 31.014. Codes and regulations for school facilities

(1) the Building Code, adopted by 13 AAC 50.020;

Deleted: Uniform

(2) the Electrical Code, adopted by 8 AAC 70.025;

Deleted: National

(3) the Plumbing Code, adopted by AS 18.60.705 (a);

Deleted: Uniform

(4) the Mechanical Code, adopted by 13 AAC 50.023;

Deleted: Uniform

(5) The ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, adopted by 8 AAC 80.010; and

Deleted: Uniform

(6) the Fire Code, adopted by 13 AAC 50.025.

### 4 AAC 31.020. Guides for planning educational facilities

(a) The following are the basic guides for educational facility planning:

(1) for a school capital project application submitted to the department, *Creating Connections: The CEFPI Guide for Educational Facility Planning, as published by the Council of Educational Facilities Planners International, 2004 Edition*;

Deleted: before January 1, 1996, *The Guide for Planning Educational Facilities*, as published by the Council of Educational Facilities Planners, International, 1982 Edition (Revised); and

(A) repealed (??/??/???);

Deleted: on or after January 1, 1996, *The Guide for Planning Educational Facilities*, as published by the Council of Educational Facilities Planners, International, 1991 Edition (Revised)

(B) repealed (??/??/???);

(f) repealed, (??/??/???)

Deleted: The provisions of ¶ (1) subsections (c)(1) - (7), (d), and (e) as they read on and after October 10, 1995 and until April 17, 1998 do not apply to an application for a former school construction grant submitted under this chapter to the department before January 1, 1996; ¶ (2) subsections (c) - (e) and (g) of this section as they read on and after April 17, 1998 do not apply to an application for a former school construction grant submitted under this chapter to the department before January 1, 1996.

### 4 AAC 31.021. Applications for grants for capital improvement projects

(c) A grant application that includes new construction, addition of space, or replacement of space, must include verification that

Deleted: , as applicable,

(2) the situation cannot be relieved by adjusting the boundaries of service areas and transporting the children to nearby schools; and

(3) as demonstrated by commonly accepted demographic techniques resulting in population projections accepted as reasonable by the department, the proposed facility will reach and sustain design capacity within five years after the anticipated occupancy date;

Deleted: and

(6) repealed (??/??/???)

Deleted: insurance or a program of self-insurance exists under 4 AAC [31.200](#) - 4 AAC [31.225](#) and will be revised, if necessary, to include the proposed facility.

(h) All grant applications must include verification that insurance, or a program of self-insurance exists under 4 AAC 31.200 - 4 AAC 31.225 and will be revised, if necessary, to include the proposed facility.

#### 4 AAC 31.022. Annual grant application review and capital improvement grant schedule revision

(b)(2) major maintenance projects are those projects the primary purpose of which is to accomplish work under the categories established in [AS 14.11.013](#) (a)(1)(C) and (D), except that a major maintenance project may not include additional, or replacement square footage;

Deleted: intended to accommodate unboxed students

(c)(2) the percentage by which the number of unboxed students exceeds the design capacity of existing facilities in the attendance area;

Deleted: the

(9) the inclusion of new square footage to support unboxed students; the department staff shall place projects that add or replace square footage on the school construction list.

Deleted: for unboxed students

(e)(3) repealed (??/??/???)

Deleted: for a school construction grant application submitted to the department before January 1, 1996, if the nonassignable space in the proposed facility exceeds 25 percent of the total area of the facility, except that the department will, in its discretion, allow a variance of 35 percent for small schools in remote areas if it can be demonstrated that the variance is in the best interests of the state and the school district; repealed

#### 4 AAC 31.060. State financial assistance

(b) In accepting state aid from the department, the municipality or school district receiving the grant or debt reimbursement, shall comply with all pertinent state statutes, codes, standards, and regulations related to construction of a public facility. Further, the recipient shall comply with conditions, requirements, and stipulations in the forms prescribed by the commissioner for the capital improvement project agreement.

Deleted: the local bond election occurred after June 30, 1987 and before July 1, 1988

(f)(2) repealed (??/??/???); or

(m) A school facility for which state aid is sought under AS 14.11.100(j)(4), and that proposes to construct new space, add space, or replace exiting space, must meet the space eligibility requirements of this chapter.

(n) A district requesting financial assistance for a new school must demonstrate a minimum of 25 unboxed students in the five year post occupancy projection.

#### 4 AAC 31.085. Disposal of abandoned or obsolete property

(d) If a municipal government proposes a use for the facility, the department will, in its discretion, convey the facility to the municipality without charge. Removal from state-owned land, of the facility conveyed under this subsection is required, unless the department determines that no state agency has use for the land upon which the facility is located and approves conveyance of the land to the municipality.

Deleted: Department

Deleted: of Natural Resources

(i) If removal of a facility disposed of under (g) of this section is not feasible, the commissioner may determine that it is in the best interest of the state to approve the granting of a long-term lease with the non-profit entity that has been approved for use of the facility.

#### 4 AAC 31.900. Definitions

(4) "elementary and secondary schools" means, buildings that have been built or converted predominantly for instruction of students in grades kindergarten through 12, and buildings for the support of that instruction; for purposes of this subparagraph,

(22) "temporary" as applied to facilities means facilities, typically providing classroom or administrative space, of temporary construction, intended for use for a limited period of time, and installed with minimal site support and without water or sewer services or a foundation of permanent construction;

Deleted: ¶

(A) for a former school construction grant application that was submitted to the department before January 1, 1996, buildings that have been built or converted predominantly to support instruction of elementary and secondary students as defined in *Alaska Small Elementary Program and Space Guidelines*, 1983 Edition, and *Alaska Small High School Program and Space Guidelines*, 1983 Edition, or, for schools designed to house more than 500 students, buildings that provide not more than 100 gross square feet per student in kindergarten - 8th grade and not more than 150 gross square feet per student in 9th - 12th grade, subject to a variance granted under 4 AAC 31.030(c), and facilities for the support of that instruction; and ¶

(B) for a former school construction grant application submitted to the department on or after January 1, 1996, and before April 17, 1998, buildings that have been built or converted predominantly to support instruction of elementary and secondary students under the guides for educational facility planning and related standards set out in 4 AAC 31.020 or, in the discretion of the department, as defined in *Alaska Small Elementary Program and Space Guidelines*, 1983 Edition, and *Alaska Small High School Program and Space Guidelines*, 1983 Edition, or, for schools designed to house more than 500 students, buildings that provide not more than 105 gross square feet per student in kindergarten - sixth grade and not more than 150 gross square feet per student in 7th - 12th grade, subject to a variance granted under 4 AAC 31.030(c), and facilities for the support of that instruction; and ¶

(C) for a school capital project application submitted to the department on or after April 17, 1998,

Deleted: full utility

Deleted: grant

#### 4 AAC 31.215. Proceeds

(a) In the event of damage to or destruction of a school facility owned by a municipality, or a regional educational attendance area that holds title to its facilities under AS 14.08.151, the insurance proceeds shall be used to repair or replace the facility. If the facility is not repaired or replaced, and a grant application is not pending under (c) of this section for a similar facility in the approximate attendance area, the school district may use the insurance proceeds, as it deems appropriate, to pay for other proposed district projects that have been ranked, by the department, in the categories in 4 AAC 31.022(b) (1) or (b)(2).

(b) In the event of damage to or destruction of a school facility operated by a regional educational attendance area and owned by the state, the insurance proceeds shall be used to repair or replace the facility, but only with the department's prior approval. If the facility is not repaired or replaced, the proceeds shall be paid to the state.

(c) If a grant under AS 14.11 is sought to repair or replace a facility, the project amount will be reduced by the amount of insurance proceeds received, and, as provided in 4 AAC 31.210, by the amount of the deductible paid.





# LOWER YUKON SCHOOL DISTRICT

**Carl John, Director of Capital Projects**

P.O. Box 32089 • Mountain Village, Alaska 99632

Phone: (907) 591-2411 Fax: (907) 591-2449

**JOHN H. LAMONT**

Superintendent

April 1, 2009

Mr. Eddy Jeans, Director of School Finance  
800 Gold-Belt Place  
Juneau, AK 99801

REF: *Changing Category E "Achieve Operating Cost Savings" in the CIP Grant Application Requested Agenda Item*

Dear Eddy:

Again Eddy, I want to convey my thoughts as well as thoughts of many school districts providing CIP applications with energy cost saving projects in mind. In April 2008, I presented a letter requesting that the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee, along with the Department, take another look at changing Category E "Achieve Operating Cost Savings" in the CIP grant application from the School Construction Category to the Major Maintenance Category of the application. I presented this request in December 2005, then again in April 2007 and then one more time in April 2008. To date I feel that neither I nor the BR&GR Committee have been given a satisfactory explanation why this issue cannot be presented to the Legislature to modify statute and provide for this change. During our April 17, 2008 meeting Mr. Kito proposed removing the category, and accommodating the cost savings component of a project into the scoring process for applications. Although this did not happen, I'm not sure it is in the best interest of the State to do so. Considering the economy today and taking into consideration the cost of utilities, including fuel, electricity and water/sewer in rural communities as urban, it seems unthinkable that the State wouldn't want to put a method in place to help schools become more energy efficient, reducing their utility burden and ultimately being able to put those savings back into the classroom.

My earlier requests entailed changing statute to allow Category E to be placed as a Major Maintenance Category instead of a School Construction Category in the Capital Improvement Project Grant Application (CIP). Although my request was made part of the agenda at our April 2008 meeting, it died after some discussion, mostly due to lack of EED support. Reasoning for this lack of support was primarily because Department staff felt that if the application were written properly and if there was a short term pay-back that an Operational Cost Savings Application would be able to compete with the other School Construction

*IS IT BEST FOR ALL KIDS*

Applications, including those comprised of unhoused students. This is an ill-conceived thought, primarily because of the potential 80 points that can be achieved with unhoused students in the School Construction category far outweighs additional points an energy cost savings application can achieve. As an example, using the FY10 scoring lists, project scores for the No. 1 rated major maintenance project, Kaltag Heating System Replacement, scored 222.06 points vs. the No. 1 rated school construction project, Alakanuk School Replacement School project scoring 337.61 points with only 66.93 unhoused student points. The Kaltag Project scored 19 emergency points where the Alakanuk project scored 0 emergency points. Even with that, the school construction project far outweighed the major maintenance project, by 117.01 points. Even though the Kaltag project could potentially score another 40 points in the maintenance area they are still 77 points away from catching Alakanuk making it quite obvious that major maintenance projects cannot compete with school construction projects. These along with the fact school that construction projects are usually very costly, and funding of those projects receive the lesser of Legislative appropriations each year puts "*Achieving Operating Cost Savings*" applications at a severe disadvantage in our competitive application process. There was also the thought by EED staff that if there were a project that would have a short-term payback, that a school district could fund it and ask for a recovery of funds in their application. Even with this not enough points can be achieved to outscore a school construction project, not including the fact that most smaller or single site school districts are unable to pay for most energy cost savings projects from their general fund.

In light of high utility costs, primarily driven by the high price of fuel, it is a huge mistake not to change the Category E "*Achieve Operating Cost Savings*" to the Major Maintenance Category. I implore the Department and the BR&GR Committee to work with the Legislature and the State Board of Education in an effort to change statute and regulation, placing "*Achieve Operating Cost Savings*" to the major maintenance category.

I would like for the Department to consider putting this issue back on the agenda for our upcoming BR&GR Committee meeting on April 16 in Juneau. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this important issue.

Very Sincerely,

**Lower Yukon School District**



Carl John  
Director of Capital Projects

cc: BR&GR Committee Members

## **School Finance, Facilities and Planning**

This session will be split into three parts; participants will discuss various aspects of public school finance and school facilities and planning.

### **1) Long-Range School Finance Plan**

On September 1, 2007, the Joint Legislative Education Funding Task Force (EFTF) submitted its report to the Governor and legislature. The report recommended four changes to the foundation funding program and a recalibration of the pupil transportation rate to each school district. The report also recommended the establishment of standing education committees in both bodies and encouraged the legislature to act on education funding by the 60<sup>th</sup> day of the legislative session.

The EFTF recommended that the following four public school funding formula areas be addressed. They also established timelines for implementation.

1. District Cost Factors – 100 percent of the ISER-recommended factors implemented over five years; 50 percent in FY09 and an additional 12.5 percent in each of FY10-13. The EFTF also recommended creating a commission to study the district cost factors.
2. Increase the allocation for intensive-needs students. This will be implemented over three years. FY09 will be at 9 times the Base Student Allocation (BSA), FY10 will be 11 times the BSA, and FY11 will be 13 times the BSA.
3. Increase the BSA by a minimum of \$100 per year.
4. Hold Harmless for declining enrollment. This would be implemented in FY09 and provide transition funding for school districts that are experiencing a rapid decline in school enrollment.

These proposed changes were adopted into law with the passage of HB 273 that was passed in March of 2008. The full EFTF report can be downloaded at the following web site.

[http://www.housemajority.org/coms/hlef/final\\_report\\_20070831.pdf](http://www.housemajority.org/coms/hlef/final_report_20070831.pdf)

Participants will be asked to discuss public school funding issues, including early funding and flexibility of funding of state and federal grants.

For example:

Does the public school funding formula provide an appropriate funding level for special programs such as vocational, bilingual/multicultural, or special education?

## 2) Long-Range Facility Plan

Currently Alaska has two mechanisms to fund public school construction and major maintenance projects. School districts can apply for grants from the state or for school debt reimbursement.

All school districts applying for school construction or major maintenance grants must submit an application by September 1 for the upcoming grant cycle, which begins in July of the following year. The application must include a six-year capital improvement plan for the district. The district must prioritize the projects and include a project description for each project for which funding is being requested. The department's evaluation team reviews each request and scores each project. Based on the scores assigned to each project, the department produces two priority lists for consideration by the Governor and the Alaska Legislature. One list consists of new construction projects and the other is for major maintenance projects. Each project has a required local participation share determined by a sliding scale based on each school district's property value per student.

Municipal school districts may apply for school debt reimbursement for construction or major maintenance projects anytime during the year. The application is reviewed by department staff to determine the level of reimbursement for the project. Currently there are two levels of reimbursement available. Projects qualify for 70 percent reimbursement when the project meets the department's eligibility guidelines. Projects that exceed the department's eligibility guidelines are reimbursed at 60 percent. There is no priority list for school debt reimbursement projects. Once a project is approved by the department, the municipality must secure voter approval of the project. After the municipality has both department and voter approval, it may issue bonds for the project and the state will reimburse the approved percentage of the bond payments. School districts must notify the department of their anticipated debt reimbursement for the upcoming fiscal year by October 15 for state budgeting purposes.

Currently the department has open 280 school construction or major maintenance projects. Approximately 180 are debt reimbursement and 100 are grant projects. The total insured value of all public school facilities in Alaska is about \$6.2 billion.

Participants will be asked to discuss the effectiveness of the dual system of funding school construction or major maintenance.

For example:

Does the current system adequately provide for career and vocational programs?

Does the existing program provide for timely renewal and replacement of aging public school facilities?

### 3) Long-Range Planning and Accountability

There are two types of accountability in the public school system: educational and financial.

Alaska's educational accountability system consists of established state content standards, grade-level expectations and the state's assessment system. The state evaluates each school and school district based on its students' ability to meet proficiency standards as measured by the state's assessment system. The assessment system measures student proficiency in reading, writing, and math at grades 3 through 10. Beginning in 2008, science was added to the assessment system.

In 2008 the Alaska Legislature passed SB 285, which establishes clear standards for determining if individual schools and school districts are affording students a meaningful opportunity to learn. If the department determines, based on the standards established by SB 285, that a significant number of students are not meeting the state proficiency standards, then the state is required to intervene. When intervention is required, the state in collaboration with the school district must develop and implement a school improvement plan intended to increase student achievement through improved instructional practices.

Alaska's financial accountability system consists of the uniform chart of accounts for public schools, school districts' budget review, and annual audits conducted by certified public accountants. The department reviews each school district's budget and audit for compliance with state and federal laws. The budget reviews and audits provide state policymakers with information about how school districts are spending the resources that are allocated to them. The audited financial information is also compiled and reported to the federal government for easy comparisons between states.

Participants will be asked to discuss the merits of the Alaska's public school accountability system and suggest areas for improvement.

For example:

Is the current 70 percent instruction requirement an effective tool to increase student achievement?

Is the state assessment system an appropriate measure of student success?

*Facilitator: Eddy Jeans, Director of School Finance, Alaska Department of Education & Early Development.*

**2009 Work Topics for the BR & GR Committee**  
Reviewed 04/16/09

<b>2008 Work Items</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
1. Subjective Scoring Review	Staff	December 09
2. FY2011 CIP List Review	Committee	December 09
3. Database Review		
3.1. Consolidation into a single Database	Staff	December 09
3.2. Coordination with the Unity project	Staff	December 09
3.3. Incorporate renewal and replacement information	Staff	December 09
4. 2011 Application	Staff	April 09
5. Online CIP Application Status	Staff	April 09
6. Statute/Regulation Changes	Staff	April 09
7. Publications Review	Staff	Ongoing
7.1. Integrated Facility Management Guide (IFM)	Staff	July 09
7.2. A/E Selection Guide	Staff	July 09
7.3. Outdoor Facilities Guidelines		
7.4. Space Guidelines		
7.5. Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook		
7.6. Swimming Pool Guidelines		
7.7. Site Selection Criteria Handbook		
7.8. Condition Survey		
7.9. Renewal and Replacement Guideline		
7.10. Project Delivery Handbook		
7.11. Equipment Purchase Guideline		
7.12. Educational Specifications Handbook		
7.13. Capital Project Coordinators Handbook		

**Projected Meeting Dates**

July 16-17, 2009 (Kenai Area)

December 02, 2009 (Anchorage)

April 14, 2009 (Juneau)

Other times as necessary teleconference