

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE
September 9 & 10, 2014
Anchorage – Talking Book Library
Approved Minutes

Committee Members Present

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

Staff

Kimberly Andrews
Elwin Blackwell
Wayne Marquis
Lori Weed

Additional Participants

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

SEPTEMBER 9TH

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL at 8:45AM

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

REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA

Agenda reviewed and approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was offered.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

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

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

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

Elwin noted main change to Section 1 is the separation of the grant and debt primary purposes (1b) into two columns, as funding categories do not correspond directly. The phase question (1c) is left as a placeholder for possible future use. *Don Hiley* asked why the category letters were

removed from debt categories, they are used in district six-year plans. *Elwin* responded that debt projects aren't separated into lists like the grant projects, so it isn't as relevant for debt projects. Discussion followed regarding the need for debt category letters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BREAK

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was offered.

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

Elwin introduced Section 4, pointing out new header that is more descriptive of what raters are looking for. Biggest change is that this question used to be part of the scope question, causing problems for some applicants that didn't differentiate between scope of project and code issues; it is now at the beginning of the evaluative point categories. Separation will allow the applicant to focus on the conditions that may be why the applicant is really doing the project. The check boxes are to help the applicant keep the description focused, checking the box does not award points. *Elizabeth* noted that the section header and check boxes align with funding categories, and the description should support the project's category.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Elizabeth passed gavel to *Bob* and was excused.

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

LUNCH

Bob called the meeting to order.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes reviewed and approved.

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

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

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

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

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

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

presented question 5g, which was a new question added as a double check and visual cue to an applicant as to space eligibility.

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

Kim presented the department proposal that question 5h, regional community facilities, be applicable only to school construction projects. General agreement. *Elwin* noted that the instructions, rater guidelines, and score sheets have corresponding changes. On question 5i, Table 5.2 Project Space Equation, *Kim* noted that there hasn't been any change to the application, the instructions clarify that the 30 points is for school construction projects. The application doesn't exclude major maintenance projects because it is useful information that can inform projects, particularly renovations.

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

Bob turned the gavel back over to the chair.

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

BREAK

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

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

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

who had written it. Discussion following regarding age of condition/component survey as it relates to the scoring matrix.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

SEPTEMBER 10TH

CALL TO ORDER

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

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

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

Noted that appendix language follows current department practice and that application changes will allow older surveys to be scored.

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

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

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

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

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

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

BREAK

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

Bob stated he was good with the distribution of points. Regarding the cost model generally, he requests that the next cost model extend the escalation out three to four years, as that is when the project “really hits the streets.” *Kim* agreed that a task for the department in the upcoming year

is issuing the cost model RFP, it could be looked into. *Mary* noted that professional firms do escalate out to three to four years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mary asked why a district must specifically consider double shifting, as opposed to sliding schedules, etc., and what kind of action is needed. *Kim* responded that the current rater guidelines asked the question, so it was put on application. *Bob* suggested attaching minutes of either facility review committee or school board. *Bob* noted that many districts present options to get community support, but may not be providing that information to the department. General discussion regarding life-cycle cost analysis.

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

LUNCH

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

REVIEW OF FY17 CIP PACKET

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

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

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

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

Lori presented the reorganization and changes to the instruction appendices. In reordered Appendix A, the sentences noting corresponding debt categories were removed. *Mary* asked if there will be a new debt appendix. *Lori* responded that, with the change to question 1b, the debt is no longer separated into different categories in the application. *Elwin* noted that debt projects do not relate directly to the grant categories and do not have the same restrictions as grant projects. Any debt project could be a 70 percent or 50 percent project, depending on unleased space available.

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

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

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

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

ACTION ITEM: APPROVE FY17 CIP APPLICATION

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

COMMITTEE COMMENT

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

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

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

FUTURE MEETING DATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Carl moved to adjourn, seconded.

MEETING ADJOURNED