

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee
December 3 and 4, 2013
Anchorage – Talking Book Library
MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present

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

Staff

Stuart Gerger
Elwin Blackwell
Wayne Marquis
Courtney Preziosi

Additional Participants

Robert Reed (LYSD)
Don Hiley (SERRC)
Larry Morris (FNSB)
Don Carney (Mat Su)
Kevin Lyon (Kenai)
Dave Norum (FNSB)
Kathy Christy
Gale Bourne (YKSD)

DECEMBER 3

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL AT 8:40 AM

REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA

Agenda reviewed and approved.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes approved as submitted. *Dean* thanked the committee for sending the minutes and agenda early.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Larry Morris would like the restrictions as far as use of maintenance equipment to be reevaluated. He feels as though having equipment purchased for a project at one school should also be able to be used at a different school. The expense of equipment makes it difficult for some districts to have ample maintenance equipment for schools.

Senator Dunleavy questioned whether the use of equipment purchased only for a certain school was on the honor system and if there is any monitoring of the use. *Larry* answered that it was on the honor system. *Don Hiley* also agreed that the department needs to revisit the rules on the use of equipment.

STAFF BRIEFING

Doug asked why the amount requested on the School Construction and Major Maintenance lists in FY2015 has decreased from previous years (referencing page 21 of 97). *Elwin* said that he speculates that it has something to do with the fact that major renovations have taken place in previous years as well as there is better preventative maintenance programs taking place. *Mary* stated that the debt reimbursement program may be taking the burden of projects that would normally be seen on the grant application process. *Doug* asked if the decrease is indicative of a trend. *Elwin* said that it is not.

Bob referenced a time when the debt program was not being reimbursed by the State. *Elizabeth* clarified that there was a time when the debt program wasn't funding at 100%, but rather payments were prorated. *Elwin* stated that there were a couple of years where the state did not fund 100%. As far back as he can remember there was never a time when no money was appropriated.

Bob wanted to know how many projects on the current FY2015 initial list were already completed. *Stuart* did not recall. *Elizabeth* said the department will get that information.

Elwin gave an overview of the Debt Reimbursement Funding Status under SB237. *Senator Dunleavy* asked how much debt has currently been paid down. *Elizabeth* stated that the department can certainly put that information together for the committee. *Elwin* stated that the SB237 report has the current functioning piece of the statute. *Elizabeth* said that the department can bring back what the outstanding liability for the debt projects currently is.

Carl asked if the legislature is presented with the 6-year plans so that they are aware of the need around the state. *Elizabeth* stated that comments she has heard is that the dollar amount on the 6-year plan is only a start and does not accurately depict the need of the state. *Mary* suggested that a key be added to the 6-year plans so that the readers of the 6-year plan would be able to distinguish the categories.

Don Hiley stated that in his opinion you realistically only have a 1 in 10 chance on a project being funded. Districts that are able to bond for projects may apply for the debt program rather than the grant process. *Don Carney* added that 6-year plans for districts change dramatically. He feels as though the list is a living document and it is hard to plan for failure. He believes that until funding is increased, for some districts, maintenance will just accumulate.

Senator Dunleavy brought up the topic of buildings becoming obsolete after only 50 years. *Mark* answered that in a lot of cases the school district is saying you have to implement a certain program. By the time you add up the cost of all the compliant changes, you may as well build a new school somewhere. Some entity will use that building as is. *Kevin* stated that updating buildings according to the current codes adds an exponential cost. Once a minor modification is made, you have to bring the whole building up to code. In his borough, he says there are some buildings they cannot do anything with. *Bob* added that the state has a tab in their cost model that will tell you how long each section should last. You can calculate based on the size of the building. The cost of operating the building will far exceed the cost of the building.

BREAK

Preventative Maintenance Update

Wayne gave an overview of the Preventative Maintenance State of the State. *Senator Dunleavy* asked whether Pribilof and Aleutian Region were ever qualified. *Wayne* stated that Aleutian Region is really close to being qualified. The PM State of the State outlines what category each district is qualified for. Aleutian Region does not have a certified Maintenance Management program. *Stuart* added that the department has been contacted by Pribilof and that they want to get their program back on track.

Don Carney stated that it is difficult for some districts to maintain a preventative maintenance program with limited resources and personnel. It takes a lot of time and effort.

Wayne added that school districts are on a 5-year visit rotation. *Carl* asked if a visit is made sooner than 5 years if that district failed its initial inspection. *Wayne* answered yes.

Stuart added that the PM handbook is currently being updated by *Wayne* to be tailored as a more user friendly resource. *Dean* asked if the committee will see the draft. *Stuart* answered yes.

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

LUNCH BREAK

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

Stuart began the discussion of the CIP application beginning with question 6a, Emergency Conditions. *Stuart* reviewed what had been discussed in the August meeting regarding this question. *Stuart* stated that in the instructions there is an addition of point ranges. *Bob* asked why in the instructions there was a 6-40 point range in the matrix (page 82 of 97). *Stuart* explained that it's a draft, and this question was only for the portion of the educational structure. *Stuart* noted that the removal of 'multiplied by 50-60' will be replaced with 'multiplied by 50'. *Elizabeth* stated that the application should add 'based on the portion that is destroyed'. *Carl* was asking about the different categories of emergency. *Bob* stated that each category will explain that point range for the type of emergency.

Elwin stated that as a rater he will take into consideration the amount of space that is now compromised and the type of space that is unusable. He stated that if a portion of the building that has burned down lost educational space, it will be weighted higher than, say, storage space. *Elizabeth* reiterated that these point areas are very rare, whereas the 'System or Component failures' portion is an event that is more likely to happen.

Doug would like to see the word "Critical" on page 83 of 97 to be omitted. He stated that the application should ask for "components" that are failing and leave out the descriptor. *Elizabeth* asked if we should bring the last category to a 0-20 point range. *Bob* stated that this question should state "based on recent documented records". *Bob* suggested that this point category be 0-20 points and strike out everything below. It would simplify the question. *Doug* reiterated the point that the more good documentation that is provided, the likelihood of the project scoring higher is greater. *Mary* mentioned that the third paragraph on page 82 of 97 would need to change "1-10 point range" as that point range would no longer be accurate.

Elizabeth suggested that the department select 10 or 15 applications to check for error.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Carney expressed his concern that a school district cannot put kids in danger; if they have to, that is an emergency. Anytime a kid is at risk it's an emergency. He mentioned that most

districts do not have extra places to put kids. *Don* stated that a 25 point limit for ‘a building is unsafe for occupancy’ is not fair as no child should be in a building that is unsafe.

Larry Morris said he was pretty happy with what has been done so far in the application. He feels that a few more descriptors in the raters guide would be helpful to the user. He feels as though the committee is going in the right direction.

Elizabeth asked *Don* whether this draft speaks to his concern about emergency points. *Don* answered that the draft is much better. *Don* agreed that more descriptors and more established minimums will be beneficial to the application process.

Kevin Lyon expressed concern that security is not even addressed in the life safety component of the application.

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

Elizabeth summarized what she felt the consensus of the meeting was, that emergency is not just when a building is burning down, for example.

Mary stated that there are different tiers of asbestos and she suggests that hazmat expert advice is given in order to ensure that the wording in the application is in alignment with industry protocols. *Elizabeth* clarified that this was in 6b, Life Safety Conditions. *Stuart* continued with 6b, Life Safety Conditions. The Committee suggested putting check boxes next to point ranges so that the rater has a better idea of where the applicant feels their emergency is. *Carl* reiterated that the applicant still needs to describe their issue no matter what.

Carl expressed concern that the application should not be made simplified for the sake of smaller districts. He feels as though we are diluting the importance of the CIP application by providing check boxes. He stated that this is a highly competitive process and there is a lot of money to be awarded.

Doug wants the boxes included in the application to be made larger in order to ensure that districts don’t feel as though the box is a sufficient enough space. The committee suggested putting in a sentence that states “please attach a separate page for any further description”. *Elizabeth* agreed that a sentence should be there for those that may think they need to limit their description to the size of the box.

Mark suggested that 6b of the instructions be reworded to “Life Safety/Code Conditions” in order to match the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Larry Morris referenced 6h, Funds expended for Maintenance. He stated that looking at past rating years, the districts with the highest points are the ones who spent the least maintaining their facilities. He feels as though there needs to be more points for this category. He also referenced 5g, Cost estimate for total project cost. He is concerned with Table 1 as far as District Administrative Overhead and the percentages in accordance with the project total. He does not

believe that a high dollar project will need 9% of the project total for District Administrative Overhead. He feels as though that will free up percentage for other budgeted categories. He stated that the Committee has talked about Commissioning in the past. He would like Commissioning to be taken into account. *Mark* clarified that the table states “up to 9%”. *Larry* answered that most projects use the full 9%. *Larry* would like some of that percentage be put in Construction Management and adjusting the percentage to the project total. *Carl* asked where *Larry* would like to see Commissioning. *Larry* answered that it should be put at its own line item. *Mark* agreed that commissioning should be a line item and be added as “up to 2%”.

Elizabeth asked whether the Department made changes to question 5g. *Stuart* answered that there have been changes to the footnotes, but not since August 1, 2013. *Stuart* stated that he is almost positive the only change was the addition of number 8 in the footnote on page 69 as well as a few word changes. *Mark* asked that the word “electrical” be added as a category to Footnote 7 on page 68. *Elizabeth* asked whether this footnote was just a reiteration of the Statute. *Stuart* said yes, but then added that the law says for “any project” the 1% Art is required. *Stuart* stated that the Department was given clarification on this law by the State Council of the Arts. *Bob* asked whether this was in writing. *Mark* asked whether Footnote 7 was then an interpretation of the State Council of the Arts.

Kathy Christy suggested making the 130% of construction cost limitation for the total project cost as a part of the application and not just the instructions. The committee agreed that this should be added as a footnote under Table 1 of question 5g. *Elizabeth* said that they will leave it in the instructions and add the footnote to the application. *Kathy* added that a 10% limit for design services has been hard for districts to comply with, especially smaller projects. *Bob* agreed with *Kathy*, his experience is that it is hard to stay within a 10% budget for design services.

Don Hiley disagrees that Design fees should be micromanaged by the department. He agrees that 10% Design budget for small projects is really hard to meet.

Don Carney believes that the design fee should be increased, but so should the 130% of the construction cost. *Mary* stated that we are asking the A/E to do more in the past, so the inflation level has increased proportionately with the services provided. *Don Carney* stated that he did not mean to imply that they were ramping their prices up, but given services have become more complex, the percentage has not changed to reflect that. *Mark* advocates increasing that percentage as well.

Doug asked if the Department has authority to change that percentage. *Elizabeth* said the Department can discuss the possibility and check with the proper Regulation and Statute.

BREAK

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

Stuart continued the discussion with section 5, Scoring Factors Related to Planning and Maintenance, of the Application. *Mary* wants the committee to revisit the nomenclature of some of categories. *Mary* suggested renaming 5b from “Analysis” to “Planning and Analysis”.

Bob stated that the current drafted application states that for question 5, Scoring Factors Related to Planning and Maintenance, they can earn “up to” the certain points but the instructions are a more “all or none concept”. He feels this is misleading if they are earning zero or ten points, not “up to” ten points. *Stuart* asked the committee how they feel the points should be awarded. *Mary* wanted clarification as to whether the documents submitted in question 5 are being graded on the quality of the document or whether they are awarded points if they are simply checked “yes”.

Bob said that currently the application is graded on whether the document is submitted, not necessarily qualitative. *Stuart* stated that the Department does not have the expertise to rate the documents. Currently the applicant is given points if the document is there. *Mary* suggested that the note at the top of question 5 on page 67 leads the applicant to believe the rater is looking at the quality of the documents. *Doug* suggested that the application could say that “adequate documentation and a picture of complete planning are necessary to show that there is quality or completeness”. *Stuart* said that the last sentence then should be removed because it would not be accurate.

Bob mentioned that some of the check boxes for question 5 on page 67 are not applicable to all projects. *Doug* suggested putting a box next to each sub section in question 5 that reads “Not Applicable”.

Carl expressed concern that districts have already done schematic design for some of their projects. The current FY2015 application does not require a site survey or preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical). The drafted application now requires it on page 92. He said the districts in good faith have proceeded without this but now is required.

Doug suggested that those projects that select “Not Applicable” provide a brief explanation why their project is not applicable to the requirements on page 92.

Don Hiley asked whether it is appropriate to dictate what a design professional is doing for a specific project. *Don* cautioned the committee about making changes for the sake of change. He has not seen any issue currently that would elicit change.

Bob pointed out that he likes the new version as is but reiterates what was said earlier regarding putting “zero or ten” instead of “up to ten” and the addition of a “Not Applicable” box. *Carl* stated that the drafted version is now more difficult for smaller districts to get points because of the costs. *Mary* disagreed, saying that the only difference now is the requirement of the signed letter of commitment from the land owner. *Mary* said that this is actually a less impact for the district.

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

DECEMBER 4

CALL TO ORDER

Elizabeth called the meeting to order at 8:40 AM.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Carney thanked staff for all the hard work that has been put into the CIP application. He would like the committee to look into emergency point minimums. He would like to see better distribution of emergency points. He also urged the committee to not change parts of the application for the sake of change. He stated that he sees real solid improvement to the application.

Kathy Christy said she appreciated all the effort and progress towards reorganizing the application. She feels as though it's hard to rate a smaller project versus a larger project using the same application. She suggests when the draft is done, running various projects through the new application and analyzing the results.

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

INADEQUACIES OF SPACE

Elwin began the discussion explaining the rater's mentality when it comes to this question. Typically the upper end of the space points are given when a district's inadequacy of space is affecting the ability to house a good portion of the population. The amount of students unhoused will affect a district's points accordingly. *Mary* wanted to know whether that was applicable to only new programs, as that is what the new question 6e on page 72 is. *Stuart* said it seems like an error that the question title referenced "New" programs. *Stuart* said that the current instructions have not been adjusted since the last committee meeting.

Bob asked if there has been an issue rating this question as it stands now. *Elwin* stated he does not recall hearing too many issues with applicants regarding space, but states he has only been involved in the reconsideration aspect of the CIP process for a few years.

Larry said the only time he has used Inadequacy of Space points is in a major renovation. *Larry* feels as though this is really only appropriate for new space, because then mechanical/electrical major maintenance points will not get their deserved points. He says it works the way it is written but questions its reliability for major maintenance.

Carl said that although it's not always applicable to a major maintenance project, it still needs to be left there so it can be considered.

Kevin stated that a project he submitted got zero points for security in the inadequacy of space category. He said he got 8 points in life/safety for security.

Kathy is concerned that too many different projects are being held against the same criteria. She asked whether the department would entertain the idea of two separate applications for Major Maintenance and School Construction.

Bob asked why the application sets different point values for a Local program and a New Local program. He feels as though there could be a really good reason for a new local program, but the application would limit the amount of points that program would get.

Elwin stated that as a rater he takes into consideration whether the inadequacy of space will significantly impact the student's ability to learn. If it does, the space is inadequate. *Elwin* said his biggest concern as a rater is that the project's funding should serve its primary function, which is giving a place for children to be educated. *Elwin* said this question is geared more towards construction.

Elizabeth referenced recent scoring for this question. It looks as though that major maintenance projects were not awarded many points for this question. *Elizabeth* reiterated a previous public comment that both major maintenance and construction projects are rated against each other on this question. *Bob* feels as though this question needs to stay for both lists.

Don Carney said that when he was a rater the system that was in place had a way to counterbalance the inability for major maintenance projects to score high for inadequacy of space. He stated that the projects that aren't scoring high in this area will make up points in different areas.

Doug suggested a language change for this question. He would like question 6e to read "Inadequacies of existing space". In the explanation of this question, he would like to see the addition of "in terms of mandated programs, existing local programs, or a proposed new local program" after facility operations. This would point out the three areas of inadequacy that would be addressed. *Bob* added that somewhere we should add that this question is still applicable to major maintenance. *Mark* suggested that go in the instructions and agreed with *Doug's* proposed change.

Elizabeth asked if the practice of this question has now changed. *Bob* answered no, that only the wording has been changed.

Mary wanted to clarify that inadequacy of space is not only determined by size, but whether it has the right features to support the programs. *Mark* said he feels as though security needs to be worked into the application somehow. *Bob* asked if security would be addressed in the life safety question. *Mark* stated that security would either be addressed there or it would be addressed in question 6e, inadequacy of space.

Bob asked if the points in the instructions are going to change. Currently the instructions read "20 points are available for existing local education programs" and "15 points are available for new local programs". *Dean* suggested having it read "up to 20 points" for both programs. *Bob* agreed. *Elizabeth* asked if there was a consensus that points should be consistent for new and existing space. The committee agreed.

Don Carney stated that if you don't have adequate space for a mandated program, the idea was that it was a higher priority than a district who wants to put in a new program. A district that cannot support their mandated program would be outscored by a new program.

ALTERNATIVES AND OPTIONS

Stuart continued the application discussion with page 58, Alternatives and Options. *Stuart* said that even if there are no alternatives or options for a project, it is expected that an explanation or research proving there are no alternatives will be provided. *Bob* asked if this has been used on the major maintenance list. *Elwin* answered yes. *Elwin* stated that in the past in order to provide equity, if a district has gone ahead and answered it, the raters will score it. The only time a district has been awarded zero points is if they leave the question blank. He stated that applicants sometimes get frustrated when they feel as though this question does not apply to their project. *Elwin* stated that all options need to be explored, and in order to get some points, applicants need to provide some written explanation.

Carl said that in the past when he has wrote "not applicable to this project" he has gotten zero points. *Elizabeth* said that it's important for applicants to know that the raters are looking for an explanation.

Larry expressed his thought that for major maintenance, this question is not relevant. His feeling is that the department should head towards two applications, one for major maintenance and one for construction. *Don Hiley* disagreed saying that even on a boiler project, if your boiler fails and your school is closed, there aren't a lot of options but there are temporary solutions. He feels that this question applies mostly to construction but it's not completely useless for major maintenance.

Don Carney said that it was discussed a few years back where it was proposed that there be a part of the instructions that say "if you are not adding space, skip to". He feels as though in the new application that would be an easy way to solve the statute issue.

Kevin stated that it may be beneficial to just award the 5 points if it is not applicable. He said that for many years he never answered this question. *Carl* rebutted that all major maintenance points should get zero. *Kevin* answered that's fine as long as every major maintenance project is getting the same points.

Bob suggested that the department look at the top 15 of both categories and run them through the new drafted application. *Elizabeth* stated that the department needs to look at a significant sample and see what, if any, changes are on the two lists. *Carl* suggested scoring the top 5. *Bob* thinks that the department should also score where the funding stops. *Doug* stated that the department needs to ensure that the new drafted application is equitable across the board.

Elizabeth stated that this question will be scored for construction and not major maintenance. The department will then come back with an analysis of how the projects will score and come up with some sort of an analysis. *Bob* questioned whether both 6g and 6c will be for only construction.

BREAK

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

ALTERNATES AND OPTIONS

Stuart continued the CIP application discussion with question 6i, Other Options. *Mark* asked if 6i has been reworded or just renumbered. *Stuart* answered that 6i has been renumbered and has not been reworded since August's Draft 1. *Elwin* mentioned that when rating this question, the more that is written usually indicates that the applicant spent time evaluating all options for the project.

Bob asked if the committee feels the points awarded on this question should be changed from 25 to 20. *Elizabeth* stated that if there is not a problem with the question, this should be left as is.

Dave raised the concern that some projects don't really have many options. For example, a seismic issue would score low. He referenced roof projects and that the most cost effective way to replace it is a design build. That project would then not get planning points for that. *Elizabeth* said that people have to take in mind that at the end of the day different projects rate differently for some questions.

Larry said he likes this question although his personal belief is that it is highly overweighted. He said that although some of the options don't have answers yet, you have to list them out as a writer. *Kevin* said that he submitted an application for a project and listed out, what he feels, every option available but only got 17 points.

Doug asked that this question include the statutory reference.

LUNCH

CIP APPLICATION WORK SESSION

Stuart began the afternoon discussion with question 6j of the application, Operating Cost Savings. He directed the committee's attention to page 88 of 97 where the Statute and Regulations are referenced. *Stuart* explained that, for the draft application, this was the common area where applicants are able to see what regulation or statute backs each component. *Stuart* mentioned that some applicants leave this question blank. He proposed making the instructions for this question clearer. *Elwin* clarified that question 6j is not limited to Category E applications. He also stated that districts that provide adequate documentation to back up their claims usually score higher on this question. He would also like the question to provide more clarification in the instructions.

Don Carney agreed that this question is working. His theory is that points increase in categories that were reviewed at the CIP Workshop. He stated that this was a perfect opportunity for districts to partake in the training opportunity and should be fully utilized.

Larry said he likes this question as well. He feels as though question 6j has a lot to do with experience, and that with time districts are able to get their deserved points for annual operating cost savings.

Dave referenced this year's points and agreed that this question is a great teaching moment.

Mary stated that districts need to meet energy standards, so in essence this question is just an elaborated explanation. She said that if there was a model for districts to see, they would have a better understanding as to what the raters are looking for. *Mary* referenced the Alaska Housing Finance Committee and handbook they have regarding energy efficiency.

Don Carney said that over the years raters have developed a system as far as rating. He said that in the old application there was a section that allowed raters to rate the application in general. This was an opportunity for districts to get more points for this question. The current drafted application does not have that opportunity. He feels as though the application is used to rate hundreds of different applications and reality is there are going to be ups and downs for some categories.

Kevin expressed that as a writer you pretty much know where you are going to get your points. He feels that the application can't be fixed so that all applications score high.

Stuart reiterated that the committee feels as though this questions works although there needs to be more clarification in the instructions as well as a note that states it's important for all projects to complete this question.

Elizabeth stated that the department will need to come back with a final draft of the product that has been worked on as well as analysis and testing. Information and a final draft will be brought back to the committee.

Carl mentioned that the first page of the draft application, page 61 of 97, has an error. *Carl* stated that the draft application says each district can submit up to ten applications. He said that in the past it has been ten applications and ten reuse for a total of 20. *Elizabeth* said it was an error and this will be fixed.

Doug asked if it was decided there would be two separate applications. *Bob* stated that there is not enough time nor personnel to complete two applications for this upcoming rating period. *Elizabeth* explained that if the committee felt as though there should be two applications, there would need to be a long discussion. *Doug* said that he feels he has heard enough testimony that it is difficult to rate both a major maintenance and school construction project against the same question. He would like this to be discussed in a future meeting.

Don Hiley said that if there is no compelling reason to change, then it should be left alone. He believes there are some pretty significant scoring changes taking place this year. He expressed concern that reuse projects are using the old applications scores. He pleads caution that changes shouldn't be made for the sake of change.

Carl reiterated what *Don Carney* and *Don Hiley* stated. He stated that districts have spent money based on the current application. He urges the committee to test it and feels putting out the application this year is too early. He feels the committee needs to proceed with caution.

Bob stated that districts should know how their scores will differ with the new application. His feeling is that if districts feel they can get a better score by resubmitting an application instead of reusing scores, they should do so.

Mary asked what the transition plan was as far as submitting a reuse of score since the application has changed. *Elizabeth* responded that in the past if a question has been eliminated, those points would be eliminated from the reuse score. She said the only categories that will see changes on this upcoming application would be planning, emergency/life safety, and alternatives. She also reiterated what *Bob* said as far as districts evaluating whether they would score higher with the new application or whether to reuse scores from a previous year. *Doug* asked what the plan would be as far as number of applications able to be submitted since this may adversely affect the number of applications would be submitted with the new application as opposed to reuse of last year's scores.

Elwin said districts will have to go through the same evaluative process they have gone through in the past. He said the main reason for limiting the number of allowable submitted applications to ten was to make the review process more successful. He mentioned that in the past, when districts were allowed to submit more than 10 applications, the quality became decreased.

Don Hiley stated that this is all not that simple. Facility appraisal has been eliminated, condition survey has now changed, design points have changed. He said the change is not that clean. He said that in past meetings it has been stated that these are all changes to be discussed and that nothing has been ratified just yet. He mentioned that Superintendents have not even seen the changes. He wants everyone to be well aware of the changes, as it has real world consequences.

Larry wanted to remind people that the reason changes are being made is because there were districts that wanted change. He feels at some point there is going to be a change, and no matter what year the change is there is going to be a problem. If the process is delayed, the same complaints will be made. *Dave* encouraged the board to move forward on the changes.

Don Carney feels the committee will come back with a usable application. He stresses that the department should contemplate the suggestion of submitting more than 10 applications. His suggestion to accommodate the changes would be to allow no reuses but maybe allow 15 applications to be submitted. He would like the changes to be made next year and not this upcoming application period.

Doug asked that the next meeting allow time to discuss school security issue. *Elizabeth* stated that to her understanding points have been awarded to school security issues in the life safety category. She proposed going back and seeing what category it fits in and that it would be a separate discussion to be had. *Bob* thinks school security belongs in life safety. He feels that the current application doesn't provide a clear spot for where applications would receive points

for school security. Doug suggested that *Stuart* possibly, before the next meeting, come up with language to put in the instructions that would incorporate school security and its point range.

FUTURE MEETING DATE

Elizabeth stated that at the next meeting, a final draft and some analysis will be brought back to the committee. *Bob* wanted clarification that after the next meeting a new revised application will be put out for this next application period. The committee confirmed. A tentative meeting date was set for March 5th and 6th in Anchorage. *Mary* asked that the committee and Superintendents see the proposed draft application before, preferably late February. *Elizabeth* answered as early as possible. She stated that Superintendents will receive an email. The committee suggested that the email also be sent to the Facility managers at the districts.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Carl praised staff for all the work that has been done, although he does not agree with all the changes that have been made. *Doug* thought this was a productive two days and looks forward to seeing this through to completion. *Mary* would like to add to a future discussion the list of category of spaces on page 91. She would like those updated at a future time. *Bob* thanked staff for their work. He likes having some of the raters here for their input. *Dean* appreciates the input from users and feels that is helpful. *Mark* agreed with *Doug* that this has been a productive meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED