

Agenda

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Agenda

December 12, 2017
1:30 pm to 4:30 pm

Teleconference – School Finance Conf. Room
801 W. 10th Street
Juneau, Alaska

Chair: Heidi Teshner, Chair

Wednesday, Dec. 12, 2017

Agenda Topics

1:30 – 1:35 PM

Committee Preparation

- Call-in, Roll Call, Introductions
- Chair's Opening Remarks
- Agenda Review/Approval
- Past Meeting Minutes Review/Approval

1:35 – 1:45 PM

Public Comment

1:45 – 2:15 PM

Department Briefing

- FY2019 CIP Report
 - Summary Statistics
 - Initial Priority Lists
 - Scoring Issues
- School Capital Project Funding Report

Action Item: BRGR Recommendation to SBOE on FY2019 CIP List

2:15-2:45 PM

Subcommittee Reports: Construction Standards

- Commissioning (Mark Langberg)
- Design Ratios (Dale Smythe)
- Model School (Doug Crevensten)

2:45 – 3:00 PM

Construction Standards for Cost-effective Construction – [(b)(3)] Strategy

- Discussion

3:00 – 3:15 PM

BREAK

3:15 – 3:55 PM

Construction Standards for Cost-effective Construction – [(b)(3)] Strategy

- Report to Legislature on Recommendations

3:55 – 4:10 PM

BR&GR 2018 Work Topics Review

4:10 – 4:15 PM

Set Date for Next Meeting

4:15 – 4:20 PM

DEED Wrap-up

4:20 – 4:30 PM

Committee Member Comments

4:30 PM

Adjourn

This page is intentionally blank

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 9, 2016

Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES - FOR REVIEW & APPROVAL

Committee Members Present

Elwin Blackwell
Mary Cary
Doug Crevensten
Mark Langberg
Robert "Bob" Tucker

Staff

Tim Mearig
Courtney Preziosi
Lori Weed
Wayne Marquis

Additional Participants

Don Hiley (SERRC)
John Bitney
Kevin Lyon (KPB/KPBSD)
Kathy Brown (SERRC)
Kathy Christy

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL at 1:33pm

Elwin Blackwell, chair, called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. Roll call of members present; Sen. MacKinnon and Rep. Vazquez are excused. Quorum of 5 members.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of AGENDA

Agenda reviewed and approved.

REVIEW and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes reviewed and approved as submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kevin Lyon expressed concerns with the changes to the *Capital Project Administration Handbook* regarding additional work and the additional approvals. Believes it will gather additional delay costs.

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

Tim Mearig summarized the Preventative Maintenance update. Currently 52 of 53 districts are certified. The department has conducted four site visits this fiscal year, with eight more to be completed in late-winter and spring. It is already noticeable during these first visits that there is pressure on district maintenance programs, and he believes that there will be an increase in districts working under provisional certification.

Tim reviewed the FY2018 initial priority lists and CIP application statistics. He commented that he found a number of improvements to the application and process that were made since he last worked for the department. Note the good participation by districts even though there has been less funding by the legislature during the current budget situation. Tim observed that there has been a significant decrease in the total dollar value requested from 10 years ago to the present. The state, through debt reimbursement and grants, has made a huge impact on the backlog, particularly of the school construction list.

Tim noted that this will be the fifth publication of the School Capital Funding Report required by SB 237. There are no changes to the debt reimbursement funding report. The legislature funded two projects from the school construction list last session. In addition, the

department and the governor's office of management and budget (OMB) have also allocated funds from regional education attendance area and small municipality (REAA) fund for two rural school projects.

Tim reviewed the list of department publications and observed that many are getting dated. The department has drafted a schedule to work on updating publications over the next five years. He believes that the committee should have oversight of certain publications referenced in the application process or that relate to a district applying for funding.

Mark asked whether there had been any consideration for pruning the list down. Tim responded that he had not reviewed from that standpoint, and noted that some publications respond to a statute requiring the department have a standard (e.g. *Swimming Pool Guidelines*). Tim requested that the committee or the public contact the department if they felt there was a publication that had little to no value.

Doug asked whether the department had a specific process in mind for committee input. Tim responded that the department collects issues and comments relating to subjects within the publications. The department will present proposed edits to the committee for review and comment. Then the committee would approve the document, pending any changes discussed. Review would be part of the regular committee schedule. Publications for which committee approval is not being sought may have a less formal method of soliciting input.

Mary Cary asked which four publications were in statute. Tim noted they were in regulation and he would get back to her on where they were referenced. [See 4 AAC 31.020]

Tim remarked that there are currently two vacant committee positions, both with terms ending February 28, 2017. One additional position, held by Mary Cary, also has a term ending in February. Tim said he and Elwin had discussed the process to fill the membership positions with the commissioner, and it was the commissioner's desire to continue to notice a vacancy each time it occurs prior to choosing an appointee.

Tim highlighted the compiled district six-year plans. Tim informed the committee that he had attended a meeting of the National Council on School Facilities, which is interested in assembling a nationwide needs assessment of school facilities for use should funding for infrastructure become available. The compiled six-year plan identifies a good portion of Alaska's needs, as defined by districts.

FY2018 CIP APPLICATION BRIEFING

Tim introduced the CIP application briefing, noting that it is more detailed than previous years but he felt it important for the committee to understand the issues that arose during the FY2018 CIP scoring process. Doug requested a quick review of the issues and with an evaluative statement on the criticalness of each element. Tim provided a brief commentary and evaluation of impact to scoring.

Bob Tucker requested that the public be allowed to comment, and Elwin agreed to open it up to public comment.

Don Hiley spoke on the eligibility of closed schools. He represented a district that had self-funded a roof project and put in a recovery of funds application for a few years, then the school closed due to low enrollment and the department made the project ineligible -- even though the building is owned by the district and is still in use as a community learning center.

Tim continued providing commentary on the scoring issues. The final item was the legislative intent language regarding projects on the lists that would be eligible for funding for energy efficiency improvements through an Alaska Housing Finance Corporation loan. For the FY2018, the application was approved prior to the intent language being developed. Actions taken by DEED during the rating process were to send project descriptions to AHFC for review and to look at the top 20 projects on the major maintenance list to remove clear and obvious scope elements that would be eligible for the AHFC program. Criteria will likely need to be developed for the FY2019 application.

Bob expressed dismay that the legislature told districts to have an energy program but then won't fund energy projects. Tim replied that it is not unreasonable for the legislature to want to encourage use of a program where the capital work is paid for through the energy savings it creates. Mark commented that this appears to shift more capital funding to the districts.

Tim encouraged the committee to review this issue as it will need to be addressed by the February meeting during the development of the FY2019 application.

Tim proposed that the committee could make a formal recommendation to the state board of education and early development regarding the grant ranking lists. Bob requested that a brief paper be put together on the committee options prior to the next meeting. Committee agreed that Tim and Bob will collaborate on presenting available options.

Tim presented the potential changes to the FY2019 application. Part of the changes correspond to the previous scoring issue discussion, part are more administrative. Lori Weed provided clarification on the items. Bob stated that he didn't see anything worrisome in the changes and would like to have a tracked changes version for the next meeting. Lori stated that the department intended to have it available and clarified the memo was to solicit input from committee and public. Doug appreciated that the department provided documentation of the scoring issues and then offered improvements to the application. Tim warned that not all proposed changes are minor, i.e. the legislative intent language eligibility criteria. Doug reiterated that it is helpful to have the larger issues identified for the committee to focus on.

PUBLICATION UPDATE: GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

Tim introduced the proposed 2016 revisions to the *Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases*. Mary asked what public process had been used to solicit district input. Tim responded that the publication update was noticed as a committee agenda item and widely distributed. Mary clarified that this was one of the publications referenced by regulation.

Elwin opened public comment. Kathy Christy noted the changes in the publications would impact the districts she represents.

Tim stated that the changes to the *Guideline* are fairly benign. It increases the per-student allocation, add definitions, clarifies that funds can be expended for bulk supplies, and expands

the explanation for fixed asset inventory. It does not take away any benefits to districts. It removes the escalation and shipping allowance; escalation will be handled by publication updates and a geographic cost factor will be used to balance for increased rural shipping costs.

Bob moved to adopt the revised *Guidelines*, seconded by Doug. Passed unanimously by roll call vote. Mary expressed her reservation that there has not been adequate notice to school districts regarding the changes and would like there to be a stronger process in the future.

PUBLICATION UPDATE: CAPITAL PROJECT ADMINISTRATION HANDBOOK

Tim presented the draft for the *Capital Project Administration Handbook* for initial committee input. The bulk of the changes are within the “Additional Work” section of the *Handbook*. Discussion followed on the section as it related to debt redirection. Tim reminded the committee that each grant project was competitively ranked and awarded based on the highest need of the project scope identified in the application. The proposed language is to identify what work is part of the original ranked project and what work is not part of the original project, and therefore not eligible. Mark clarified that it sounds like the intent is to manage the funds available at the end of the project, but there are items that are of concern from a logistical and practical point of view.

Mary questioned the nomenclature for “change order”. She also expressed concern regarding the approval levels and the potential for a contractor to seek damages due to delays and lack of a timely response to change orders. Mark agreed. Mary recommended holding a workshop session on the proposed changes with districts to solicit feedback. Mark suggested inviting A/E firms as well. Tim clarified that the “contracting for changes in scope” section is predicated on having to issue a new contract for the change, it is not talking about a scenario where there is an existing contract that can do the work. The intent is not to add a layer of administration, if an A/E can review the changes and affirm that it is a necessary change, then all that would be required is the change order log at the close of the project. The department has rarely disallowed a change order, and those are not contested because the item was clearly not part of the project scope.

Kevin commented that language for items c and d in the table needs to be clarified. If the “contracting for changes in scope” is after project closeout, then it makes sense. If the section is for while a project is ongoing, then a monetary value on a change order doesn’t make sense as A/E is selected on most qualified offeror and is not based on cost.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Doug thanked the chair and Tim for gathering the documentation and running an efficient meeting.

Elwin noted he is currently acting director for school finance and facilities, if he is still in acting status, he will be chairing the meeting in February.

MEETING ADJOURNED

The committee adjourned at 3:59 p.m.



To: Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
From: School Facilities
Date: February 28, 2017

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

FY 2018 CIP Report

The department received reconsideration requests from three districts on five projects. In the lists issued December 16, 2016, the department reconsidered its position on Galena City School District's Galena Interior Learning Academy Classroom Building Renovation project and moved the project to the major maintenance list and adjusted the budget and points awarded.

No appeals were received to the reconsideration decisions, so no changes were made to the final lists issued January 17, 2017. The final lists are included in the packet, and will be presented at the next State Board of Education meeting on March 20-22, 2017.

The major maintenance list contains a total of 107 projects amounting to a total state share request of \$164,887,094, and the school construction list currently contains 15 projects with a state share request of \$130,532,941.

Cost Model Update

The DEED Program Demand Cost Model, which is a tool used to assist school districts in estimating construction and renovation costs, will be updated again in 2017. This will be the 16th Edition of the tool and will largely be a housekeeping, unit price and escalation update. The contract with HMS, Inc. calls for final products on May 3rd for use in the FY2019 application cycle and will be posted on the department's website before the annual CIP training workshop.

The department is pursuing what will likely be a two-year effort to update the model's geographic cost factors. The factors have not been updated since the 2008 version of the 11th Edition. A table showing the history of geographic factors since 1997 is included for committee information.

School Capital Project Funding Report (SB 237) Draft

AS 14.11.035 requires, beginning in February 2013, an annual report on school construction and major maintenance funding. The statute requires reports of spending from each of the three funding programs providing state aid for capital improvement projects—school construction and major maintenance grants under AS 14.11.011, REAA and small municipal

district allocations under AS 14.11.025, and school construction debt reimbursement under AS 14.11.100. Summary tables from the 2017 draft report showing the funding activity by program, fiscal year, and category are included in the packet. The final report will be available on-line at the department's web site on March 1, 2017.

The statute requires that the SB 237 Report include information on both the effectiveness of the funding sources and analysis of those sources on the short-term and long-term of the fiscal effects of the funding on the state. With the amount of data available following this fifth report, the department may have the ability to provide such analysis.

REAA & Small Municipality Fund Report

The Regional Education Attendance Area fund was established by chapter 93, SLA 2010 (SB 237). The amount of money available each fiscal year is tied to the annual debt service incurred under AS 14.11.100. In 2013, the fund was amended to include "small municipal school districts".

Since the first appropriation in FY 2013, \$222,121,266 has been deposited into the Regional Education Attendance Area and Small Municipal School District (REAA) fund. A total of seven projects have obligated \$174,523,450. A summary sheet is included in the packet.

DEED Performance Review

A summary of the performance review by Public Works on behalf of the Division of Legislative Audit relating to the Facilities section and the CIP grant process is below. A full copy of the 390 page performance review is available on the website of the Division of Legislative Audit:

<http://legaudit.akleg.gov/docs/performance-reviews/PRVPJ-803-DEED-PR-Final-Rpt.pdf>

The objective of Section 8, starting on page 187, of the report was to "evaluate the department's process for developing capital projects."

The review offered two commendations to the capital project process:

- 8.A. DEED is commended for developing an effective process for the evaluation and prioritization of capital projects that incorporates all legislative requirements. (Pg. 190)
- 8.B. DEED is commended for developing a capital project review and prioritization process, and project agreements, that incentivize school districts to utilize best practices in their capital improvement projects and planning. (Pg. 192)

The review offered several recommendations, grouped into "tiers". There were no "Tier 1: Greatest Impact" recommendations to be immediately implemented to optimize efficiency and effectiveness related to Facilities. Recommendations noted as "Tier 2: Moderate Impact" were recommended to be implemented "as soon as practical to improve efficiency and effectiveness of operations and programs." "Tier 3: Minimal Impact" recommendations should be implemented "when time and funds are available as best suits the needs of the department."

The review offered up this recommendation on the CIP application:

8.3.1 Initiate steps to make the capital funding application process less cumbersome and the scoring process more straightforward. (Tier 2) (Pg. 194)

- Simplify funding applications: reduce redundant requirements, group similar requirements (need, cost, life/safety).
- Clarify point allocations: note number and percentage of points available for each group of requirements (need, cost, life/safety).
- Clarify how elements are scored: include scoring elements for full or partial scores on application.
- Consider revising the scoring process to better consider each district's priorities.
- Clarify priorities: provide summary of point weighting on application and score sheets (need, safety, planning, cost, alternative, district ranking).

The department did not concur with recommendation 8.3.1 (Pg. 375)

DEED argued that the recommendation did not offer support in the finding that the application is "unnecessarily cumbersome." Noted was the recent multi-year review process completed by BRGR and the public, which evaluated the question order and scoring elements and process. The response pointed out that the application is for competitive grant funds for major maintenance and construction projects that are routinely in the millions of dollars, and that an application for such is not deficient because it is not quick and short.

The following recommendations were made in regard to the preventative maintenance program:

8.4.1 Enhance preventative maintenance training with local school districts. (Tier 2) (Pg. 198)

- Update the *Alaska School Facilities Preventative Maintenance Handbook* to incorporate technology and service advancements.
- Encourage or coordinate training opportunities for multiple districts, possibly in conjunction with other government agencies.
- Coordinate readily available training resources from product vendors, equipment manufacturers, or school facility management organizations.

8.4.2 DEED should provide local school districts with preventive maintenance best practices and share "frequently-asked questions" and other information that could help districts with limited maintenance resources – especially within the context of compliance with DEED requirements. (Tier 2) (Pg. 199)

- Consider developing a FAQ database or online bulletin board on preventive maintenance.
- Document and share best practices and "lessons learned" during site visits.

Mention was made of a finding by a 2014 report from the Council of the Great City Schools that "every \$1 of preventive maintenance that is deferred results in \$4 of expenditures to ultimately repair or replace building systems."

The report also addressed potential changes to the capital development process:

8.5.1 DEED should provide districts with information on sustainable building practices. (Tier 3) (Pg. 201)

- Provide information and guidance to districts interested in sustainable building practices.

8.5.2 DEED should not adopt prototypical designs for schools. (Tier 3) (Pg. 202)

- The 2015 report found that a prototypical design program is unlikely to be successful.

DEED Mission & Vision

Last fall, the State Board of Education and Early Development adopted new mission, vision, and strategic priorities for public education in Alaska:

Mission An excellent education for every student every day.

Vision All students can succeed in their education and work; shape worthwhile and satisfying lives for themselves; exemplify the best values of society; and, be effective in improving the character and quality of the world around them.

Strategic Priorities

- Amplify student learning
- Inspire community ownership of educational excellence
- Modernize the educational system
- Ensure excellent educators
- Promote safety and well-being

Legislative Action

Governor introduced the budget bills for the First Session of the 30th Legislature. HB 57 is the operating budget vehicle with \$115,956,587 allocated for state aid for costs of school construction under AS 14.11.100 (Sec. 19(k)) and \$40,640,000 to the regional education attendance area and small municipalities fund (Sec. 21(t)). SB 23 is the capital budget vehicle; no school construction or major maintenance projects were proposed in the governor's bill.

SB 12 by Sen. Bishop proposes an employment tax for education facilities. Revenues would be accounted for in the fund established under AS 37.05.560 (Educational facilities maintenance and construction fund) for the design, construction, and maintenance of public school facilities and for maintenance of University of Alaska facilities.

Publications Update

Following is a list of publications currently managed by the department along with an estimated revision priority, and the year of publication or latest draft. Those in bold are publications proposed for committee approval.

1. Capital Project Administration Handbook (2007) *[Proposed update 2017]*

2. Project Delivery Method Handbook (2004) *[Proposed update 2017]*
3. **Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook** (1999) *[Proposed update 2017]*
4. **Life Cycle Cost Analysis Handbook** (1999)
5. Cost Format – *EED Standard Construction Cost Estimate Format* (2008 2nd Ed.)
6. **Space Guidelines Handbook** (1996)
7. **Swimming Pool Guidelines** (1997)
8. **Guide for School Facility Condition Surveys** (1997)
9. Architectural and Engineering Services for School Facility Construction (1999-Draft)
10. **A Handbook to Writing Educational Specifications** (2005); and Educational Specifications Supplement (2009)
11. Site Selection Criteria & Evaluation Handbook (2011 2nd Ed.)
12. **School Design and Construction Standards Handbook** (new)
13. Facility Appraisal Guide (1997)
14. Outdoor Facility Guidelines for Secondary Schools (new)
15. Renewal & Replacement Schedule (2001)
16. **Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases** (2016)

Capital Project Administration Handbook

Included in the packet is the draft 2017 update to the *Capital Project Administration Handbook*; yellow highlighted passages represent the major edits from the draft presented at the December 2016 meeting. The 2007 edition is available for reference on the internet at: <https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications/CapitalProjectAdminstrationHandbook-2007.pdf>.

Project Delivery Method Handbook

Included in the packet is the draft 2017 update to the *Project Delivery Method Handbook*; the 2004 edition is available for reference on the department's website at: https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications/project_delivery_handbook.pdf

The major elements to be addressed in the update include:

- The need for school board or governing authority to approve a specific use if the authority is granted, and delegated, on a general basis.
- The need to revise and update historical uses; or eliminate.
- Clarifications on the appropriate uses of a two-step process.
- Possible introduction of an approval request template.
- Introduce qualifications for evaluation team members.
- Updates to implementation sections including: decision flowchart, concurrence items, required and alternative directives, etc.
- Review of weighting and scoring formulas relative to making cost an appropriate component of selection
- Possible publishing of approval checklists to facilitate request and RFP preparation.

Department Staffing Update

The Architect Assistant position is currently vacant. All other facilities staff positions are filled.

Committee Member Update

Three committee positions have terms expiring on February 28, 2017. Two of the three positions were previously vacated out of cycle and Mary Cary's term ended. The

commissioner filled the vacancies and made appointments for the four-year terms to begin March 1, 2017:

- (1) Dale Smythe, professional degrees and experience in school construction;
- (2) William Murdock, experience in urban or rural school facilities management;
- (3) Don Hiley, representing the public.

The department thanks Mary, who decided against applying for a new four-year term, for her seven and a half years of service on the committee.

State of Alaska
Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
School Construction Grant Fund

Final List

Jan. 17	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	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$19,193,631.00	\$16,514,294.00	\$0.00	\$16,514,294.00	\$330,286.00	\$16,184,008.00	\$16,184,008.00
2	2	2	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Atmautiuk	\$46,920,307.00	\$44,376,426.00	\$0.00	\$44,376,426.00	\$887,529.00	\$43,488,897.00	\$59,672,905.00
3	3	3	Lower Kuskokwim	Eek K-12 School Renovation/Addition	\$32,901,573.00	\$30,922,520.00	\$0.00	\$30,922,520.00	\$618,450.00	\$30,304,070.00	\$89,976,975.00
4	4	4	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicoli Elementary School Replacement, Anlak	\$19,665,966.00	\$19,021,816.00	\$0.00	\$19,021,816.00	\$380,436.00	\$18,641,380.00	\$108,618,355.00
5	5	6	Keetchikan	Houghtaling Elementary Traffic Safety Revisions	\$624,987.00	\$495,980.00	\$0.00	\$495,980.00	\$173,593.00	\$322,387.00	\$108,940,742.00
6	6	7	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	\$6,139,710.00	\$5,813,798.00	\$0.00	\$5,813,798.00	\$116,276.00	\$5,697,522.00	\$114,638,264.00
7	7	8	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	\$441,630.00	\$441,630.00	\$0.00	\$441,630.00	\$154,570.00	\$287,060.00	\$114,925,324.00
8	8	9	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg School Covered Playground Structure	\$684,201.00	\$402,392.00	\$0.00	\$402,392.00	\$40,239.00	\$362,153.00	\$115,287,477.00
9	9	10	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Playground Upgrades	\$105,009.00	\$101,727.00	\$0.00	\$101,727.00	\$10,173.00	\$91,554.00	\$115,379,031.00
10	10	11	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Drainage and Traffic Upgrades	\$1,119,880.00	\$1,119,880.00	\$0.00	\$1,119,880.00	\$22,398.00	\$1,097,482.00	\$116,476,513.00
11	11	12	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	\$110,049.00	\$110,049.00	\$0.00	\$110,049.00	\$38,517.00	\$71,532.00	\$116,548,045.00
12	12	13	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Play Area Construction	\$448,077.00	\$448,077.00	\$0.00	\$448,077.00	\$8,962.00	\$439,115.00	\$116,987,160.00
13	13	14	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track and Field Construction	\$5,617,749.00	\$5,617,749.00	\$0.00	\$5,617,749.00	\$112,355.00	\$5,505,394.00	\$122,492,554.00
14	14	15	Southeast Island	Thome Bay K-12 School Playground Upgrades	\$227,111.00	\$221,703.00	\$0.00	\$221,703.00	\$4,434.00	\$217,269.00	\$122,709,823.00
15	15	16	Yupit	Playground Construction, 3 Schools	\$1,465,747.00	\$596,527.00	\$0.00	\$596,527.00	\$11,931.00	\$584,596.00	\$123,294,419.00
TOTALS:					\$135,665,627	\$126,204,568	\$0	\$126,204,568	\$2,910,149	\$123,294,419	
0	0		Northwest Arctic	Kivalina K-12 Replacement School - Kasayulie FY16 Final List Eligible Amount	\$9,048,027	\$63,094,777	\$43,237,400	\$9,048,027	\$1,809,605	\$7,238,422	\$7,238,422
FINAL TOTALS:					\$144,713,654	\$189,299,345	\$43,237,400	\$135,252,595	\$4,719,754	\$130,532,841	\$130,532,841

This page is intentionally blank

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	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	Kake City	Kake Schools Boiler #2 Replacement	\$235,335	\$235,335	\$0	\$235,335	\$47,067	\$188,268	\$188,268
2	2	2	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Primary Boiler Replacement	\$76,537	\$76,537	\$0	\$76,537	\$26,788	\$49,749	\$238,017
3	3	3	Bristol Bay Borough	Bristol Bay School Renovation	\$17,210,092	\$15,068,169	\$0	\$15,068,169	\$5,273,859	\$9,794,310	\$10,032,327
4	4	4	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Classroom Building Renovation	\$8,040,012	\$8,040,012	\$0	\$8,040,012	\$402,001	\$7,638,011	\$17,670,338
5	5	4	Anchorage	Rogers Park Elementary School Roof Replacement & Seismic Upgrades	\$2,325,000	\$2,240,782	\$0	\$2,240,782	\$784,274	\$1,456,508	\$19,126,846
6	6	5	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	\$228,236	\$228,236	\$0	\$228,236	\$45,647	\$182,589	\$19,309,435
7	7	6	Anchorage	Romig Middle School Gym Seismic Repairs	\$900,000	\$683,235	\$0	\$683,235	\$239,132	\$444,103	\$19,753,538
8	8	7	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	\$313,810	\$313,810	\$0	\$313,810	\$109,833	\$203,977	\$19,957,515
9	9	8	Fairbanks	Barnette Magnet K-8 School Renovation, Phase 4	\$11,032,043	\$11,032,043	\$0	\$11,032,043	\$3,861,215	\$7,170,828	\$27,128,343
10	10	9	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler 2 Replacement	\$99,273	\$74,682	\$0	\$74,682	\$26,139	\$48,543	\$27,176,886
11	11	10	Craig City	Districtwide Energy Upgrades	\$181,149	\$181,149	\$0	\$181,149	\$36,230	\$144,919	\$27,321,805
12	12	11	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	\$4,988,580	\$4,397,259	\$0	\$4,397,259	\$439,726	\$3,957,533	\$31,279,338
13	13	12	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	\$1,028,411	\$1,028,411	\$0	\$1,028,411	\$20,568	\$1,007,843	\$32,287,181
14	14	13	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	\$58,487	\$58,487	\$0	\$58,487	\$1,170	\$57,317	\$32,344,498
15	15	14	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	\$1,570,021	\$1,570,021	\$0	\$1,570,021	\$549,507	\$1,020,514	\$33,365,012
16	16	15	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	\$2,955,464	\$2,955,464	\$0	\$2,955,464	\$59,109	\$2,896,355	\$36,261,367
17	17	16	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	\$222,865	\$222,865	\$0	\$222,865	\$4,457	\$218,408	\$36,479,775
18	18	17	Northwest Arctic	Davis Ramoth K-12 School Window Replacement, Selawik	\$236,515	\$236,515	\$0	\$236,515	\$47,303	\$189,212	\$36,668,987
19	19	18	Ketchikan	Houghtaling Elementary Roof Replacement	\$3,443,206	\$3,295,779	\$0	\$3,295,779	\$1,153,523	\$2,142,256	\$38,811,243
20	20	19	Yukon-Koyukuk	Allakaket K-12 School Renovation	\$10,025,751	\$10,025,751	\$0	\$10,025,751	\$200,515	\$9,825,236	\$48,636,479

State of Alaska
Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	Dec 16	Nov 5	20	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
21	21	20	Northwest Arctic	Davis Ramoth K-12 School Sewer Line Repair, Selawik	\$65,873	\$65,873	\$0	\$65,873	\$13,175	\$52,698	\$48,689,177	
22	22	21	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	\$1,114,167	\$1,114,167	\$0	\$1,114,167	\$22,283	\$1,091,884	\$49,781,061	
23	23	22	Petersburg City	Petersburg High School Gym & Auxiliary Gym LED Lighting Upgrade	\$28,205	\$28,205	\$0	\$28,205	\$9,872	\$18,333	\$49,799,394	
24	24	23	Valdez City	Hermon Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, Intercom Replacement	\$534,605	\$534,605	\$0	\$534,605	\$187,112	\$347,493	\$50,146,887	
25	25	24	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Air Conditioning and Ventilation Replacement	\$1,422,066	\$1,422,066	\$0	\$1,422,066	\$497,723	\$924,343	\$51,071,230	
26	26	25	Chugach	Chenega Bay K-12 School Rehabilitation	\$6,227,249	\$5,433,884	\$0	\$5,433,884	\$108,678	\$5,325,206	\$56,396,436	
27	27	26	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	\$1,763,726	\$1,763,726	\$0	\$1,763,726	\$35,275	\$1,728,451	\$58,124,887	
28	28	27	Chugach	Tatitlek K-12 School Rehabilitation	\$6,242,472	\$5,140,440	\$0	\$5,140,440	\$102,809	\$5,037,631	\$63,162,518	
29	29	28	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley School Coal Heat Conversion	\$120,640	\$88,160	\$0	\$88,160	\$17,632	\$70,528	\$63,233,046	
30	30	29	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Entry Renovation	\$48,907	\$48,907	\$0	\$48,907	\$17,117	\$31,790	\$63,264,836	
31	31	30	Hoonah City	Hoonah Central Boiler Replacement	\$259,760	\$259,760	\$0	\$259,760	\$77,928	\$181,832	\$63,446,668	
32	32	31	Copper River	District Office Roof Renovation and Energy Upgrade	\$1,056,462	\$1,002,001	\$0	\$1,002,001	\$20,040	\$981,961	\$64,428,629	
33	33	32	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Fire Suppression System	\$460,870	\$460,870	\$0	\$460,870	\$9,217	\$451,653	\$64,880,282	
34	34	33	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$175,530	\$175,530	\$0	\$175,530	\$61,435	\$114,095	\$64,994,377	
35	35	34	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door and Flooring Replacement	\$140,193	\$140,193	\$0	\$140,193	\$28,039	\$112,154	\$65,106,531	
36	36	35	Denali Borough	Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$2,168,580	\$1,084,993	\$0	\$1,084,993	\$216,999	\$867,994	\$65,974,525	
37	37	36	Craig City	Craig Middle School Siding and Windows	\$146,242	\$146,242	\$0	\$146,242	\$29,248	\$116,994	\$66,091,519	
38	38	37	Anchorage	Goldenvue Middle School Water Main Replacement	\$2,450,000	\$2,064,697	\$0	\$2,064,697	\$722,644	\$1,342,053	\$67,433,572	

State of Alaska
Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
39	39	38	Pelican City	Pelican K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$118,720	\$118,720	\$0	\$118,720	\$41,552	\$77,168	\$67,510,740
40	40	39	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance	\$102,608	\$102,608	\$0	\$102,608	\$35,913	\$66,695	\$67,577,435
41	41	40	Anchorage	Central Middle School Seismic Improvements	\$500,000	\$394,562	\$0	\$394,562	\$138,097	\$256,465	\$67,833,900
42	42	41	Yup'it	Tuluksak K-12 School Fuel Tank Replacement	\$4,784,564	\$2,382,755	\$0	\$2,382,755	\$47,655	\$2,335,100	\$70,169,000
43	43	42	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	\$109,038	\$109,038	\$0	\$109,038	\$32,711	\$76,327	\$70,245,327
44	44	43	Nome City	Nome Beltz Jr/Sr High School Partial Roof Replacement	\$2,257,828	\$2,186,715	\$0	\$2,186,715	\$656,014	\$1,530,701	\$71,776,028
45	45	44	Haines	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	\$807,955	\$764,450	\$0	\$764,450	\$267,557	\$496,893	\$72,272,921
46	46	45	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	\$233,801	\$233,801	\$0	\$233,801	\$4,676	\$229,125	\$72,502,046
47	47	46	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleitmute	\$1,663,167	\$1,628,357	\$0	\$1,628,357	\$32,567	\$1,595,790	\$74,097,836
48	48	47	Anchorage	Student Nutrition Boiler Replacement & Energy Upgrades	\$3,200,000	\$1,440,996	\$0	\$1,440,996	\$504,349	\$936,647	\$75,034,483
49	49	48	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	\$461,125	\$461,125	\$0	\$461,125	\$46,112	\$415,013	\$75,449,496
50	50	49	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	\$4,247,936	\$4,247,936	\$0	\$4,247,936	\$84,959	\$4,162,977	\$79,612,473
51	51	50	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	\$2,785,596	\$2,785,596	\$0	\$2,785,596	\$55,712	\$2,729,884	\$82,342,357
52	52	51	Yukon Flats	Boiler and Control Upgrades, 2 Schools (Beaver & Chalkyitsik K-12 Schools)	\$1,355,817	\$1,355,817	\$0	\$1,355,817	\$27,116	\$1,328,701	\$83,671,058
53	53	52	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrade	\$227,909	\$227,909	\$0	\$227,909	\$4,558	\$223,351	\$83,894,409
54	54	53	Craig City	Craig Middle School Gym Floor Replacement	\$428,193	\$354,706	\$0	\$354,706	\$70,941	\$283,765	\$84,178,174
55	55	54	Chatham	Fire Alarm Upgrades - 3 Sites	\$124,665	\$102,522	\$0	\$102,522	\$2,050	\$100,472	\$84,278,646
56	56	55	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Exterior Repairs	\$2,716,000	\$2,517,439	\$0	\$2,517,439	\$50,349	\$2,467,090	\$86,745,736
57	57	56	Anchorage	Willow Crest Elementary Roof Replacement	\$3,569,115	\$3,569,115	\$0	\$3,569,115	\$1,249,190	\$2,319,925	\$89,065,661

State of Alaska
Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
58	58	57	Yukon-Koyukuk	Ella B. Vernetti K-8 School Entry Access Repairs, Koyukuk	\$275,907	\$271,620	\$0	\$271,620	\$5,432	\$266,188	\$89,331,849
59	59	58	Anchorage	Nunaka Valley Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$2,922,938	\$2,922,938	\$0	\$2,922,938	\$1,023,028	\$1,899,910	\$91,231,759
60	60	59	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	\$1,491,895	\$1,491,895	\$0	\$1,491,895	\$29,838	\$1,462,057	\$92,693,816
61	61	60	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Siding Replacement	\$1,093,236	\$941,388	\$0	\$941,388	\$18,828	\$922,560	\$93,616,376
62	62	61	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 School Renovations	\$4,055,124	\$1,965,309	\$0	\$1,965,309	\$39,306	\$1,926,003	\$95,542,379
63	63	62	Haines	Haines High School Roof Replacement	\$2,559,188	\$2,352,160	\$0	\$2,352,160	\$823,256	\$1,528,904	\$97,071,283
64	64	63	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	\$1,263,276	\$1,263,276	\$0	\$1,263,276	\$25,266	\$1,238,010	\$98,309,293
65	65	64	Sitka City Borough	Keet Gooshi Heen Elementary Covered PE Structure Renovation	\$465,920	\$465,920	\$0	\$465,920	\$163,072	\$302,848	\$98,612,141
66	66	65	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Regional High School Boardwalk Replacement	\$1,853,660	\$723,916	\$0	\$723,916	\$14,478	\$709,438	\$99,321,579
67	67	66	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	\$116,809	\$116,809	\$0	\$116,809	\$2,336	\$114,473	\$99,436,052
68	68	67	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline Projects, 2 Sites (Pilot Station, Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	\$2,830,166	\$2,830,166	\$0	\$2,830,166	\$56,603	\$2,773,563	\$102,209,615
69	69	68	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Acoustical Upgrades	\$242,948	\$139,872	\$0	\$139,872	\$2,797	\$137,075	\$102,346,690
70	70	69	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	\$635,016	\$635,016	\$0	\$635,016	\$127,003	\$508,013	\$102,854,703
71	71	70	Anchorage	King Career Center Roof Replacement	\$4,147,664	\$4,147,664	\$0	\$4,147,664	\$1,451,682	\$2,695,982	\$105,550,685
72	72	71	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	\$177,528	\$177,528	\$0	\$177,528	\$35,506	\$142,022	\$105,692,707
73	73	72	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$9,203,997	\$9,203,997	\$0	\$9,203,997	\$184,080	\$9,019,917	\$114,712,624
74	74	73	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Renovation	\$744,966	\$689,213	\$0	\$689,213	\$13,784	\$675,429	\$115,388,053
75	75	74	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Seismic Upgrades, Phase 1	\$18,890,115	\$7,326,904	\$0	\$7,326,904	\$2,198,071	\$5,128,833	\$120,516,886
76	76	75	Anchorage	Northwood Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$2,679,366	\$2,679,366	\$0	\$2,679,366	\$937,778	\$1,741,588	\$122,258,474

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
77	77	76	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Mechanical Control Upgrades	\$1,394,447	\$1,394,447	\$0	\$1,394,447	\$27,889	\$1,366,558	\$123,625,032
78	78	77	Southwest Region	William "Sonny" Nelson K-8 School Renovations, Ekwok	\$5,440,078	\$3,143,326	\$0	\$3,143,326	\$62,867	\$3,080,459	\$126,705,491
79	79	78	Craig City	Craig High School Biomass Boiler	\$562,576	\$533,478	\$0	\$533,478	\$106,696	\$426,782	\$127,132,273
80	80	79	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 School Renovations	\$4,584,927	\$3,075,107	\$0	\$3,075,107	\$61,502	\$3,013,605	\$130,145,878
81	81	80	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	\$933,132	\$933,132	\$0	\$933,132	\$18,663	\$914,469	\$131,060,347
82	82	81	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	\$312,742	\$312,742	\$0	\$312,742	\$6,255	\$306,487	\$131,366,834
83	83	82	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Carpet Replacement	\$99,166	\$99,166	\$0	\$99,166	\$1,983	\$97,183	\$131,464,017
84	84	83	Anchorage	Multi-Site Sprinkler Upgrades (East & Service HS)	\$4,906,430	\$4,906,430	\$0	\$4,906,430	\$1,717,250	\$3,189,180	\$134,653,197
85	85	84	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	\$1,968,423	\$1,968,423	\$0	\$1,968,423	\$39,368	\$1,929,055	\$136,582,252
86	86	85	Yukon-Koyukuk	Ella B. Vernetti K-8 School Boiler Replacement, Koyukuk	\$440,315	\$430,076	\$0	\$430,076	\$8,602	\$421,474	\$137,003,726
87	87	86	Fairbanks	Joy Elementary Roof Replacement	\$1,995,968	\$1,995,968	\$0	\$1,995,968	\$698,589	\$1,297,379	\$138,301,105
88	88	87	Kake City	Exterior Upgrades - Main School Facilities	\$328,844	\$238,099	\$0	\$238,099	\$47,620	\$190,479	\$138,491,584
89	89	88	Anchorage	Campbell Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$2,528,735	\$2,528,735	\$0	\$2,528,735	\$885,057	\$1,643,678	\$140,135,262
90	90	89	Mat-Su Borough	Water System Replacement (Big Lake, Butte & Snowshoe Elementary Schools)	\$2,893,363	\$2,544,009	\$0	\$2,544,009	\$763,203	\$1,780,806	\$141,916,068
91	91	90	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	\$93,966	\$93,966	\$0	\$93,966	\$1,879	\$92,087	\$142,008,155
92	92	91	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	\$3,935,477	\$3,935,477	\$0	\$3,935,477	\$78,710	\$3,856,767	\$145,864,922
93	93	92	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Energy and Code Upgrade	\$2,705,485	\$2,705,485	\$0	\$2,705,485	\$811,645	\$1,893,840	\$147,758,762
94	94	93	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer High School Mechanical Upgrade, Phase 2	\$3,651,726	\$1,960,311	\$0	\$1,960,311	\$588,093	\$1,372,218	\$149,130,980

State of Alaska
 Department of Education and Early Development
 Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
 Major Maintenance Grant Fund

Final List

Jan 17	Dec 16	Nov 5	School District	Project Name	Amount Requested	Eligible Amount	Prior Funding	EED Recommended Amount	Participating Share	State Share	Aggregate Amount
95	95	94	Fairbanks	Ladd Elementary Roof and Exterior Upgrades	\$5,482,781	\$5,482,781	\$0	\$5,482,781	\$1,918,973	\$3,563,808	\$152,694,788
96	96	95	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	\$3,912,245	\$3,912,245	\$0	\$3,912,245	\$78,245	\$3,834,000	\$156,528,788
97	97	96	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point K-12 School Siding Replacement, Nunam Iqa	\$2,789,969	\$255,685	\$0	\$255,685	\$5,114	\$250,571	\$156,779,359
98	98	97	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer High School Window Upgrades	\$2,528,762	\$2,174,406	\$0	\$2,174,406	\$652,322	\$1,522,084	\$158,301,443
99	99	98	Kodiak Island	Ouzinkie K-12 School Lighting and HVAC Upgrade	\$875,848	\$875,848	\$0	\$875,848	\$262,754	\$613,094	\$158,914,537
100	100	99	Anchorage	Muldoon Elementary School Roof Replacement	\$929,946	\$929,946	\$0	\$929,946	\$325,481	\$604,465	\$159,519,002
101	101	100	Yup'it	Mechanical System Improvements, 3 Schools	\$192,718	\$165,180	\$0	\$165,180	\$3,304	\$161,876	\$159,680,878
102	102	101	Mat-Su Borough	Colony Middle School Heat Exchanger Replacement	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$0	\$350,000	\$105,000	\$245,000	\$159,925,878
103	103	102	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay and Port Lions K-12 Schools Flooring Replacement	\$597,291	\$597,291	\$0	\$597,291	\$179,187	\$418,104	\$160,343,982
104	104	103	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	\$214,007	\$214,007	\$0	\$214,007	\$4,280	\$209,727	\$160,553,709
105	105	104	Lower Yukon	Security Access Project, 6 Sites	\$1,553,223	\$1,553,223	\$0	\$1,553,223	\$31,064	\$1,522,159	\$162,075,868
106	106	105	Kodiak Island	North Star Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement	\$1,019,455	\$1,019,455	\$0	\$1,019,455	\$305,836	\$713,619	\$162,789,487
107	107	106	Lower Yukon	Kotlik & Pilot Station K-12 Schools Renewal & Repair	\$5,610,278	\$2,140,415	\$0	\$2,140,415	\$42,808	\$2,097,607	\$164,887,094
TOTALS:					\$239,762,413	\$200,736,844	\$0	\$200,736,844	\$35,849,750	\$164,887,094	

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
School Construction Grant Fund**

**Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg Age	Prev. 14-11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Main	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
1	Bering Strait	Shishmaref K-12 School Renovation/Addition	30.00	19.06	0.00	25.00	2.40	28.61	19.82	23.69	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	18.67	23.67	21.33	3.67	1.33	9.67	275.92
2	Lower Kuskokwim	J Alexie Memorial K-12 School Replacement, Almatluak	30.00	10.32	0.00	10.00	3.16	23.04	22.30	24.18	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	4.33	0.00	29.33	16.67	14.67	4.33	2.67	16.00	259.66
3	Lower Kuskokwim	Eek K-12 School Renovation/Addition	24.00	21.81	0.00	10.00	3.16	24.36	20.55	21.48	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	4.33	0.00	23.00	19.00	15.33	3.67	2.67	14.67	256.70
4	Kuspuk	Auntie Mary Nicolli Elementary School Replacement, Aniak	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.65	0.00	0.00	23.48	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	5.00	29.67	10.00	14.67	7.33	3.33	15.33	213.47
5	Ketchikan	Houghtaling Elementary Traffic Safety Revisions	30.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.00	2.00	3.33	0.00	8.67	0.00	19.33	0.33	3.00	15.00	171.27
6	Lower Kuskokwim	Water Storage & Treatment, Kongiganak	27.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	3.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	4.33	0.00	19.33	0.00	18.00	3.00	2.33	11.33	157.16
7	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Paving	24.00	16.82	0.00	25.00	1.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.67	0.00	4.67	0.00	28.00	4.33	2.33	9.33	155.09
8	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg School Covered Playground Structure	24.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	1.00	3.00	0.00	5.33	1.00	14.33	0.00	2.00	9.33	148.89
9	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Playground Upgrades	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	1.00	3.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	14.00	2.00	2.00	9.67	145.89
10	Lower Kuskokwim	Bathel Campus Drainage and Traffic Upgrades	15.00	18.66	0.00	10.00	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	0.00	11.00	0.00	15.67	3.00	3.33	5.67	139.79
11	Aleutians East	King Cove K-12 School Paving	21.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	1.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.67	0.00	5.33	0.00	28.00	4.33	2.33	9.33	135.94
12	Southeast Island	Kasaan K-12 School Covered Play Area Construction	9.00	17.75	0.00	0.00	2.56	0.00	4.63	15.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	0.00	16.33	14.67	0.33	2.33	9.33	133.94
13	Annette Island	Metlakatla Schools Track and Field Construction	24.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	0.00	0.00	3.67	12.33	0.33	3.00	9.00	132.21
14	Southeast Island	Thome Bay K-12 School Playground Upgrades	12.00	9.17	0.00	10.00	2.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.67	2.33	2.67	0.00	12.67	0.00	13.33	1.33	3.00	9.33	112.77
15	Yupit	Playground Construction, 3 Schools	24.00	0.69	0.00	10.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	3.33	2.67	0.00	6.67	2.67	10.00	0.00	1.00	8.00	98.32

This page is intentionally blank

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14,11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Fgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist- ing Space	Cost Esti- mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter- na- tives	Op- tions	Total Points
1	Kake City	Kake Schools Boiler #2 Replacement	30.00	21.84	0.00	25.00	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	4.67	3.33	4.00	4.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	28.33	28.67	0.00	13.00	213.20
2	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Primary Boiler Replacement	30.00	29.53	0.00	25.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	0.00	15.67	0.00	28.00	15.33	0.00	12.00	213.04
3	Bristol Bay Borough	Bristol Bay School Renovation	30.00	24.36	0.00	20.00	1.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.33	4.33	3.67	4.67	0.00	26.33	0.00	21.67	12.00	0.00	17.67	209.69
4	Galena	Galena Interior Learning Academy Classroom Building Renovation	30.00	14.25	0.00	25.00	4.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	3.67	0.00	25.00	8.33	23.33	5.67	0.00	17.00	209.18
5	Anchorage	Rogers Park Elementary School Roof Replacement & Seismic Upgrades	27.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	5.00	1.67	26.67	0.33	22.33	2.33	0.00	9.33	204.33
6	Denali Borough	Anderson K-12 School Water Line Replacement	30.00	23.06	0.00	25.00	4.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.67	11.67	17.00	0.00	29.00	4.33	0.00	12.00	203.74
7	Anchorage	Romig Middle School Gym Seismic Repairs	30.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.67	3.67	3.00	3.67	5.00	9.67	12.67	5.67	15.33	0.00	0.00	14.67	203.00
8	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Heating System Renovation	30.00	15.07	0.00	25.00	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.33	2.67	2.67	0.00	18.67	0.00	28.00	26.00	0.00	10.00	201.70
9	Fairbanks	Barnette Magnet K-8 School Renovation, Phase 4	30.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	3.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	4.00	2.33	2.33	0.00	24.67	3.00	26.67	8.00	0.00	10.00	200.79
10	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Boiler 2 Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.33	0.00	12.33	0.00	27.67	7.00	0.00	10.33	197.95
11	Craig City	Districtwide Energy Upgrades	30.00	8.18	0.00	25.00	2.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	0.00	16.00	0.00	28.00	26.00	0.00	14.33	195.68
12	Saint Marys	St. Mary's Campus Upgrades	30.00	29.81	0.00	25.00	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	26.00	5.00	0.00	10.33	195.39
13	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Kitchen Renovation	30.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	1.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	0.00	18.33	0.00	28.00	2.33	0.00	11.67	195.21
14	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Boiler Replacement	30.00	16.00	0.00	25.00	1.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.33	2.67	3.00	8.67	21.33	0.00	29.00	4.00	0.00	10.67	191.89
15	Petersburg City	Districtwide Food Service Renovations	24.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	24.67	4.00	0.00	14.33	191.51
16	Lower Kuskokwim	Bethel Campus Fire Pumphouse & Fire Protection Upgrades	18.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	0.00	26.33	0.00	20.00	4.00	0.00	14.67	190.46
17	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	25.33	0.00	16.67	3.67	0.00	10.67	187.89
18	Northwest Arctic	Davis Ramoth K-12 School Window Replacement, Selawik	30.00	9.70	0.00	25.00	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	0.00	12.67	0.00	26.00	20.67	0.00	10.00	187.47
19	Ketchikan	Houghtaling Elementary Roof Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	20.00	4.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.00	2.00	3.33	0.00	22.67	0.00	20.00	3.67	0.00	9.67	185.94
20	Yukon-Koyukuk	Allakaket K-12 School Renovation	24.00	20.37	0.00	20.00	2.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	2.33	3.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	23.00	5.00	19.67	2.33	0.00	18.00	184.18

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Fgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
21	Northwest Arctic	Davis Ramoth K-12 School Sewer Line Repair, Selawik	27.00	9.70	0.00	25.00	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.67	5.00	20.00	0.00	28.33	3.67	0.00	9.67	181.80
22	Lower Kuskokwim	Nuniwaarmiut K-12 School Wastewater Upgrades, Mekoryuk	21.00	18.31	0.00	20.00	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.33	5.00	20.33	0.00	19.33	4.00	0.00	16.00	181.44
23	Petersburg City	Petersburg High School Gym & Auxiliary Gym LED Lighting Upgrade	15.00	15.64	0.00	25.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	28.33	27.67	0.00	10.00	181.15
24	Valdez City	Heron Hutchens Elementary Fire Alarm, Clock, Intercom Replacement	30.00	21.25	0.00	25.00	2.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	14.00	0.00	29.33	3.67	0.00	9.33	179.86
25	Fairbanks	Administrative Center Air Conditioning and Ventilation Replacement	27.00	6.50	0.00	25.00	3.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	4.00	2.33	2.33	0.00	9.33	0.00	29.00	10.33	0.00	18.67	179.29
26	Chugach	Cheneaga Bay K-12 School Rehabilitation	30.00	10.09	0.00	20.00	1.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	0.00	29.00	0.00	20.33	2.67	0.00	15.33	178.91
27	Alaska Gateway	Tok K-12 School Sprinkler Renovation	30.00	6.50	0.00	20.00	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	3.00	7.00	24.33	0.00	21.00	5.00	0.00	10.00	176.10
28	Chugach	Taitielek K-12 School Rehabilitation	27.00	15.12	0.00	20.00	1.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	0.00	27.00	0.00	19.67	0.00	0.00	14.67	174.95
29	Denali Borough	Tri-Valley School Coal Heat Conversion	27.00	3.50	0.00	25.00	4.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.67	21.33	0.00	9.00	174.86
30	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Entry Renovation	18.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	0.00	6.33	0.00	28.33	1.67	0.00	8.67	173.51
31	Hoonah City	Hoonah Central Boiler Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.67	3.67	3.33	2.33	0.00	18.00	0.00	15.33	13.00	0.00	13.67	172.69
32	Copper River	District Office Roof Renovation and Energy Upgrade	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.00	3.67	0.00	21.00	0.00	15.00	4.00	0.00	9.33	172.26
33	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Fire Suppression System	30.00	8.42	0.00	10.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	8.67	26.67	0.00	16.33	6.00	0.00	11.33	171.98
34	Petersburg City	Petersburg Middle/High School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	21.00	14.25	0.00	25.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	0.00	16.33	0.00	25.00	2.33	0.00	10.33	171.76
35	Craig City	Craig Elementary School Door and Flooring Replacement	27.00	19.50	0.00	25.00	2.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	0.00	7.67	0.00	28.00	2.67	0.00	10.00	171.00
36	Denali Borough	Cantwell K-12 School Roof Replacement	24.00	22.78	0.00	10.00	4.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.67	0.00	24.00	0.00	15.00	4.33	0.00	10.00	170.46
37	Craig City	Craig Middle School Siding and Windows	24.00	21.56	0.00	10.00	2.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.33	3.33	0.00	17.67	0.00	28.00	3.67	0.00	9.67	170.22
38	Anchorage	Goldenview Middle School Water Main Replacement	21.00	4.50	0.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	5.00	0.00	21.33	0.00	20.00	2.33	0.00	16.33	170.17
39	Pelican City	Pelican K-12 School Siding Replacement	30.00	28.25	0.00	25.00	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	1.33	1.67	1.67	2.00	2.33	0.00	13.67	0.00	14.67	2.67	0.00	11.67	168.79

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Fgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist- ing Space	Cost Esti- mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter- natives	Op- tions	Total Points
40	Aleutians East	Sand Point K-12 School Pool Major Maintenance	27.00	16.82	0.00	25.00	1.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	2.67	2.67	0.00	9.67	0.00	29.00	8.33	0.00	9.67	166.09
41	Anchorage	Central Middle School Seismic Improvements	24.00	30.00	0.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	5.00	0.00	9.33	0.00	14.33	0.00	0.00	3.67	166.00
42	Yupit	Tuluksak K-12 School Fuel Tank Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	3.33	2.67	4.00	20.00	0.00	15.67	2.67	0.00	9.67	165.30
43	Nome City	Nome Elementary School Gym Flooring Replacement	27.00	11.00	0.00	25.00	2.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	0.00	11.33	0.00	29.00	2.67	0.00	11.67	164.85
44	Nome City	Nome Beltz Jr/Sr High School Partial Roof Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	2.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	0.00	18.33	0.00	16.33	3.67	0.00	9.67	164.26	
45	Haines	Haines High School Locker Room Renovation	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.00	2.67	2.67	3.33	0.00	18.33	0.00	14.00	4.33	0.00	10.00	163.49
46	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	24.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.67	0.00	11.67	0.00	28.00	12.67	0.00	9.67	163.13
47	Kuspuk	Jack Egnaty Sr. K-12 School Roof Replacement, Sleetmute	30.00	24.75	0.00	0.00	1.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	7.33	30.67	1.33	15.33	3.67	0.00	9.33	162.07
48	Anchorage	Student Nutrition Boiler Replacement & Energy Upgrades	18.00	11.00	0.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	5.00	0.00	18.00	0.00	12.00	4.67	0.00	10.67	159.00
49	Hydaburg City	Hydaburg Elementary Roof Replacement	30.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.33	3.33	2.00	3.00	0.00	14.00	0.00	15.00	1.67	0.00	7.67	158.56
50	Alaska Gateway	Tanacross K-8 School Renovation	27.00	23.00	0.00	0.00	2.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.67	3.00	3.33	2.33	0.00	29.33	0.00	14.33	6.67	0.00	11.00	158.49
51	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Generator Building Renovation	27.00	11.75	0.00	10.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	23.33	0.00	14.67	4.33	0.00	12.00	157.51
52	Yukon Flats	Boiler and Control Upgrades, 2 Schools (Beaver & Chalkyitsik K-12 Schools)	30.00	13.46	0.00	10.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	19.33	0.00	14.67	6.33	0.00	8.67	156.89
53	Southwest Region	Manokotak K-12 School Sewer & Water Upgrade	30.00	2.50	0.00	25.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.33	0.00	12.00	0.00	28.00	7.00	0.00	10.67	155.90
54	Craig City	Craig Middle School Gym Floor Replacement	21.00	23.00	0.00	10.00	2.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.33	3.33	0.00	9.00	2.00	21.67	2.33	0.00	10.00	154.66
55	Chatham	Fire Alarm Upgrades - 3 Sites	24.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.33	3.00	0.00	17.33	0.00	18.67	1.67	0.00	9.00	153.13
56	Lower Yukon	Hooper Bay K-12 School Exterior Repairs	12.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.33	0.00	17.67	0.00	27.33	4.33	0.00	12.33	150.24
57	Anchorage	Willow Crest Elementary Roof Replacement	15.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	24.00	0.00	14.67	3.33	0.00	9.33	150.00
58	Yukon-Koyukuk	Ella B. Verneti K-8 School Entry Access Repairs, Koyukuk	30.00	14.28	0.00	10.00	3.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	2.67	3.00	2.33	3.00	5.00	19.67	0.00	16.67	2.33	0.00	9.33	149.97
59	Anchorage	Nunaka Valley Elementary School Roof Replacement	12.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	26.00	0.00	14.67	3.33	0.00	9.33	149.00

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14,11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-Housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
60	Chatham	Klukwan K-12 School Roof Replacement	27.00	16.00	0.00	0.00	1.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.33	2.67	3.00	0.00	28.33	0.00	14.00	5.00	0.00	11.33	148.89
61	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Siding Replacement	30.00	0.50	0.00	20.00	2.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.33	0.00	14.67	0.00	16.67	4.00	0.00	11.00	148.41
62	Southwest Region	Twin Hills K-8 School Renovations	27.00	26.50	0.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	2.33	0.00	17.33	0.00	12.00	6.67	0.00	10.00	148.24	
63	Haines	Haines High School Roof Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	24.33	0.00	13.67	2.33	0.00	9.00	148.16	
64	Yukon Flats	Chalkyitsik K-12 School Water Tank Replacement	21.00	20.23	0.00	10.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	19.33	0.00	13.00	3.33	0.00	8.33	147.66
65	Sitka City Borough	Keet Gooshi Heen Elementary Covered PE Structure Renovation	30.00	11.00	0.00	10.00	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.00	3.33	3.00	0.00	15.33	0.00	15.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	147.02
66	Lower Kuskokwim	Beithel Regional High School Boardwalk Replacement	12.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	3.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	3.67	3.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	11.67	0.00	14.00	2.33	0.00	8.67	144.83
67	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay K-12 School Emergency Lighting & Retrofit	9.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.67	0.00	13.00	0.00	29.00	8.67	0.00	7.67	144.46
68	Lower Yukon	Marine Header & Pipeline Projects, 2 Sites (Pilot Station, Ignatius Beans K-12 Schools)	21.00	4.55	0.00	20.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.67	0.00	14.67	0.00	18.00	2.67	0.00	8.00	144.01
69	Annette Island	Metlakatla High School Gym Acoustical Upgrades	27.00	30.00	0.00	10.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	3.33	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	21.33	0.00	0.00	9.33	143.63
70	Kake City	Kake High School Plumbing Replacement	27.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	4.67	3.33	4.00	4.00	0.00	12.33	0.00	13.00	2.33	0.00	8.67	140.69
71	Anchorage	King Career Center Roof Replacement	6.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	23.67	0.00	14.67	3.00	0.00	9.00	140.00
72	Kake City	Kake High School Cafeteria Floor Structural Repairs	24.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	4.67	3.33	4.00	4.00	0.00	11.67	0.00	13.33	2.67	0.00	10.33	139.36
73	Yukon Flats	Fort Yukon Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	24.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	16.33	0.00	12.67	1.33	0.00	7.33	139.10
74	Copper River	Glennallen Voc-Ed Facility Renovation	27.00	5.44	0.00	10.00	1.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	3.00	3.00	3.67	0.00	15.67	0.00	15.33	3.33	0.00	8.67	138.37
75	Mat-Su Borough	Districtwide Seismic Upgrades, Phase 1	27.00	27.44	0.00	10.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	0.00	11.33	0.00	8.67	2.00	0.00	1.00	138.20
76	Anchorage	Northwood Elementary School Roof Replacement	3.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	23.00	0.00	14.67	3.33	0.00	9.00	136.67
77	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 Mechanical Control Upgrades	21.00	8.42	0.00	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	18.67	0.00	15.33	10.67	0.00	9.67	136.31
78	Southwest Region	William "Sonny" Nelson K-8 School Renovations, Ekwok	21.00	24.75	0.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.33	0.00	17.00	0.00	11.67	3.33	0.00	9.33	135.82
79	Craig City	Craig High School Biomass Boiler	18.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	2.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.33	3.33	0.00	1.00	0.00	15.67	17.00	0.00	18.00	133.33

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pri. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Pgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Esti-mate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points
80	Southwest Region	Aleknagik K-8 School Renovations	24.00	19.50	0.00	0.00	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.33	0.00	16.00	0.00	12.33	3.00	0.00	9.33	132.90
81	Yukon Flats	Cruikshank K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement, Beaver	18.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	15.67	0.00	12.67	1.33	0.00	7.33	132.43
82	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Underground Storage Tank Replacement	24.00	11.00	0.00	10.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	15.67	0.00	14.67	2.33	0.00	9.00	131.23
83	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay K-12 School Carpet Replacement	18.00	9.17	0.00	20.00	2.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	3.33	2.67	2.33	2.67	0.00	9.00	0.00	19.67	2.67	0.00	10.00	130.43
84	Anchorage	Multi-Site Sprinkler Upgrades (East & Service HS)	9.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	15.67	0.00	13.67	2.33	0.00	4.33	128.67
85	Yukon Flats	Venetie K-12 School Soil Remediation & Fuel Tank Replacement	15.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	0.00	14.67	0.00	12.67	1.33	0.00	7.33	125.43
86	Yukon-Koyukuk	Ella B. Vennetti K-8 School Boiler Replacement, Koyukuk	27.00	14.28	0.00	0.00	3.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	2.67	3.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	10.67	0.00	12.33	6.00	0.00	11.67	124.63
87	Fairbanks	Joy Elementary Roof Replacement	24.00	9.50	0.00	0.00	3.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	4.00	2.33	2.33	0.00	21.33	0.00	13.33	5.33	0.00	7.67	124.62
88	Kake City	Exterior Upgrades - Main School Facilities	21.00	23.24	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	5.00	3.33	4.00	4.00	0.00	5.67	0.00	13.33	2.33	0.00	10.00	122.74
89	Anchorage	Campbell Elementary School Roof Replacement	0.00	13.46	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	26.33	0.00	14.67	3.00	0.00	9.33	120.46
90	Mat-Su Borough	Water System Replacement (Big Lake, Butte & Snowshoe Elementary Schools)	30.00	24.05	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	0.00	12.00	0.00	9.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	119.81
91	Southeast Island	Port Alexander K-12 School Domestic Water Pipe Replacement	3.00	15.88	0.00	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	25.67	0.00	15.00	2.67	0.00	9.33	119.11
92	Lower Yukon	LYSD Central Office Renovation	15.00	20.15	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.67	0.00	11.00	0.00	13.33	5.33	0.00	7.00	118.95
93	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay K-12 School Energy and Code Upgrade	30.00	21.25	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	10.67	0.00	13.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.76
94	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer High School Mechanical Upgrade, Phase 2	24.00	24.91	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	0.00	9.67	0.00	10.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	115.34
95	Fairbanks	Ladd Elementary Roof and Exterior Upgrades	21.00	7.25	0.00	0.00	3.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	2.67	4.00	2.33	2.33	0.00	12.00	0.00	13.33	7.67	0.00	7.00	111.71
96	Southeast Island	Port Alexander & Thorne Bay K-12 Schools Roof Replacement	6.00	8.66	0.00	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	22.33	0.67	14.67	2.67	0.00	10.00	109.55
97	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point K-12 School Siding Replacement, Nunam Iqta	27.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.33	0.00	9.67	0.00	12.67	3.33	0.00	8.00	109.24
98	Mat-Su Borough	Palmer High School Window Upgrades	18.00	24.91	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	0.00	7.00	0.00	10.00	2.33	0.00	3.33	108.34

**Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Capital Improvement Projects (FY2018)
Major Maintenance Grant Fund
Total Points - Formula-Driven and Evaluative
Final List**

Pr. #	School District	Project Name	School Dist Rank	Weight Avg. Age	Prev. 14.11 Fund	Plan and Design	Avg Expend Maint	Un-Housed Today	Un-housed 7 Years	Type of Space	Cond Survey	Maint Labor	Maint Type	Maint Mgt	Energy Mgt	Cust Fgm	Maint Train	Capital Plan	Emergency	Life/Safety and Code Conditions	Exist-ing Space	Cost Estimate	Proj vs Oper Cost	Alter-natives	Op-tions	Total Points	
99	Kodiak Island	Ouzinkie K-12 School Lighting and HVAC Upgrade	27.00	19.22	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	7.00	0.00	12.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	107.40
100	Anchorage	Muldoon Elementary School Roof Replacement	0.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	10.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	5.00	0.00	23.00	0.00	14.33	3.67	0.00	9.33	106.50	
101	Yupit	Mechanical System Improvements, 3 Schools	27.00	0.69	0.00	0.00	1.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	3.33	2.67	0.00	8.00	0.00	15.33	5.33	0.00	9.67	101.32	
102	Mat-Su Borough	Colony Middle School Heat Exchanger Replacement	21.00	11.00	0.00	0.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	3.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	0.00	8.00	0.00	14.00	3.00	0.00	1.33	101.10	
103	Kodiak Island	Larsen Bay and Port Lions K-12 Schools Flooring Replacement	24.00	14.20	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	5.33	0.00	13.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.04	
104	Southeast Island	Thorne Bay & Port Protection K-12 Schools Gymnasium Lighting Upgrades	15.00	7.84	0.00	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.33	4.67	3.00	2.67	3.33	0.00	4.67	0.00	12.67	4.00	0.00	8.67	97.40	
105	Lower Yukon	Security Access Project, 6 Sites	18.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.67	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.67	0.00	10.00	0.00	13.00	1.67	0.00	7.33	97.13	
106	Kodiak Island	North Star Elementary HVAC Controls Replacement	21.00	6.50	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	10.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	0.00	9.67	0.00	14.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	93.01	
107	Lower Yukon	Kotlik & Pilot Station K-12 Schools Renewal & Repair	6.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.33	0.00	2.00	0.00	12.33	0.00	0.00	5.00	75.91	

TABLE NO. 1
GEOGRAPHIC AREA COST FACTOR
Historical Comparison - As of Feb 2017

	6th Ed 1996 Jun-96	7th Ed 1997 Aug-97	8th Ed 1999 Dec-98	9th Ed 2001 Apr-01	9th Ed 2003 Jun-03	9th Ed 2004 Jun-03	10th Ed 2005 Jan-05	10th Ed 2006 Jan-05	11th Ed 2007 Mar-07	% change	11th Ed 2008 Mar-08	11th Ed 2009 Apr-09	12th Ed 2010 Apr-10	12th Ed 2011 Apr-11	12th Ed 2012 Apr-12	13th Ed 2013 Apr-13	13th Ed 2014 Apr-13	14th Ed 2015 Apr-15	15th Ed 2016 Apr-16
Alaska Gateway	121.90	121.90	123.90	118.45	118.45	118.45	122.70	122.70	122.70	2.04%	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20	125.20
Aleutian Region	138.20	138.20	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	3.34%	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50
Aleutians East	121.90	121.90	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	1.98%	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70
Anchorage	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Annette Island	118.90	118.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Bering Strait	176.50	176.50	176.50	161.09	161.09	161.09	161.09	161.09	161.09	2.84%	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20	181.20
Bristol Bay Borough Schools	138.20	138.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	126.20	1.98%	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70	128.70
Chatham	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Chugach	111.40	111.40	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	0.93%	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50
Copper River	110.90	110.90	110.90	112.90	112.90	112.90	112.90	112.90	112.90	0.89%	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90	113.90
Cordova	118.90	118.90	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	107.50	0.93%	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50	108.50
Craig City Schools	118.90	118.90	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	0.90%	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40
Delta/Greely	110.90	110.90	110.90	114.90	114.90	114.90	117.13	117.13	117.13	2.13%	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63
Denali Borough	110.90	110.90	110.90	114.90	114.90	114.90	117.13	117.13	117.13	2.13%	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63	119.63
Dillingham City Schools	138.20	138.20	111.40	131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	1.91%	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54	133.54
Fairbanks	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00		105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	105.00
Galena	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	1.83%	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30	139.30
Haines	118.90	118.90	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	0.90%	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40
Hoonah City Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Hydaburg City Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Iditarod Area Schools			149.50																
Yukon River Village	136.80	136.80		138.05	138.05	138.05	138.05	138.05	138.05	3.62%	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05	143.05
Kuskokwim River Village	162.10	162.10		149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	3.34%	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50
Landlocked Village	136.80	136.80		154.73	154.73	154.73	156.90	156.90	156.90	2.55%	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90	160.90
Juneau City/Borough Schools	101.60	101.60	101.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60		103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60	103.60
Kake City Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	0.82%	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90	122.90
Kashunamuit	162.10	162.10	162.10	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	3.39%	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36
Kenai Peninsula																			
Kenai/Soldotna	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60		98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60	98.60
Homer Area	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	0.96%	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50
Ketchikan	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	0.91%	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80
Klawock City Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	117.90	117.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Kodiak Island																			
Kodiak	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	111.40	0.90%	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40	112.40
Village			121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Kuspuk Schools	136.80	136.80	162.10	149.00	149.00	149.00	149.00	149.00	149.00	3.36%	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00	154.00
Lake & Peninsula			121.90																
Gulf of Alaska Village	121.90	121.90		121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40

	6th Ed 1996 Jun-96	7th Ed 1997 Aug-97	8th Ed 1999 Dec-98	9th Ed 2001 Apr-01	9th Ed 2003 Jun-03	9th Ed 2004 Jun-03	10th Ed 2005 Jan-05	10th Ed 2006 Jan-05	11th Ed 2007 Mar-07	% change	11th Ed 2008 Mar-08	11th Ed 2009 Apr-09	12th Ed 2010 Apr-10	12th Ed 2011 Apr-11	12th Ed 2012 Apr-12	13th Ed 2013 Apr-13	13th Ed 2014 Apr-13	14th Ed 2015 Apr-15	15th Ed 2016 Apr-16
<i>Bristol Bay Village</i>				131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	131.04	3.82%	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04	136.04
<i>Landlocked Village</i>	138.20	138.20		154.73	136.80	136.80	154.73	154.73	154.73	3.88%	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73	160.73
Lower Kuskokwim																			
Bethel	151.10	151.10	151.10	137.36	137.36	137.36	137.36	137.36	151.10	3.31%	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10
Villages	162.10	162.10	162.10	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	162.10	3.08%	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10
Lower Yukon	162.10	162.10	169.10	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	162.10	3.08%	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10	167.10
Mat-Su Borough Schools																			
Palmer - Willow	97.00	97.00	97.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00		99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00	99.00
Other Areas			104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	0.96%	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50	105.50
Nenana City Schools	110.90	110.90	107.50	109.50	109.50	109.50	114.00	114.00	114.00	2.19%	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50	116.50
Nome City Schools	159.70	159.70	159.70	145.18	145.18	145.18	145.18	145.18	151.10	3.31%	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10	156.10
North Slope Borough																			
Barrow	165.80	165.80	165.80	150.73	150.73	150.73	150.73	150.73	165.80	3.62%	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80	171.80
Villages	177.20	177.20	177.20	161.09	161.09	161.09	161.09	161.09	177.20	2.82%	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20	182.20
Atqasuk/Pt. Lay			194.90	177.18	177.18	177.18	177.18	177.18	194.90	2.57%	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90	199.90
Northwest Arctic Schools																			
Kotzebue	159.70	159.70	159.70	145.18	145.18	145.18	145.18	145.18	145.18	3.44%	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18	150.18
Villages	176.50	176.50	176.50	160.45			160.45	160.45	176.50	2.83%	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50	181.50
Village on River					161.09	161.09													
Landlocked Village					165.00	165.00													
Pelican City Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	121.90	2.05%	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40	124.40
Petersburg City Schools	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	0.91%	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80
Pribilof Island Schools	138.20	138.20	149.50	156.50	156.50	156.50	159.70	159.70	159.70	3.13%	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70	164.70
Sitka City Borough	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	0.91%	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80
Skagway City Schools	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	0.91%	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80
Southeast Island Schools	130.40	130.40	121.90	120.69	120.69	120.69	120.69	120.69	120.69	2.07%	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19	123.19
Southwest Region Schools	138.20	138.20	149.50	135.91	135.91	135.91	135.91	135.91	135.91	3.68%	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91	140.91
St. Mary's School District	162.10	162.10	162.10	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	154.75	3.23%	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75	159.75
Tanana City Schools	110.90	110.90	107.50	138.05	138.05	138.05	132.15	132.15	132.15	1.89%	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65	134.65
Unalaska City Schools	121.90	121.90	116.50	126.20	126.20	126.20	135.00	135.00	135.00	3.70%	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00
Valdez City Schools	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	104.50	108.30	108.30	108.30	0.92%	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30	109.30
Wrangell City Schools	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	109.80	0.91%	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80	110.80
Yakutat City Schools	118.90	118.90	111.40	114.40	114.40	114.40	114.40	114.40	114.40	0.87%	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40	115.40
Yukon Flats			136.80																
Village on Road System	119.90	119.90		120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	2.08%	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95
Village on River	136.80	136.80		136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	3.65%	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80
Landlocked Village	136.80	136.80		154.73	154.73	154.73	154.73	154.73	154.73	3.23%	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73	159.73
Yukon-Koyukuk			149.50																
Village on Road System	110.90	110.90		120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	120.45	2.08%	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95	122.95
Village on Yukon River	136.80	136.80		136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	136.80	3.65%	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80	141.80
Village on Koyukuk River	136.80	136.80		149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	149.50	3.34%	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50	154.50
Yupit Schools	162.10	162.10	162.10	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	147.36	3.39%	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36	152.36

SCHOOL CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING UNDER SB 237

Excerpts from Draft 2017 Report

Total Funding Summary by Fiscal Year

Fiscal Year	Maintenance		Construction	
	City/Borough	REAA	City/Borough	REAA
FY11	\$112,973,055	\$2,965,455	\$500,000	\$128,500,000
FY12	\$87,306,741	\$21,752,950	\$317,164,997	\$61,910,901*
FY13	\$12,616,492	\$16,012,693	\$67,875,000	\$60,973,515
FY14	\$109,210,116	\$15,563,759*	\$36,839,182	\$60,619,572
FY15	\$7,097,638	\$0	\$18,018,647	\$31,516,900
FY16	\$0	\$2,623,689*	\$43,237,400	\$0
FY17	\$0	\$0	\$10,867,503	\$62,867,968
Totals	\$329,204,042	\$58,918,546	\$494,502,729	\$406,388,856

Total Funding Summary by Program

Program	Maintenance		Construction	
	City/Borough	REAA	City/Borough	REAA
Grant	\$35,317,035	\$58,918,546*	\$65,867,794	\$406,388,856
Debt	\$293,887,007	\$0	\$428,634,935	\$0
Totals	\$329,204,042	\$58,918,546	\$494,502,729	\$406,388,856

Total Funding Summary by Fiscal Year and Program

Program	Maintenance		Construction	
	City/Borough	REAA	City/Borough	REAA
FY11 Grant	\$21,821,504	\$2,965,455	\$0	\$128,500,000
FY11 Debt	\$91,151,551	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
FY12 Grant	\$4,101,741	\$21,752,950	\$0	\$61,910,901*
FY12 Debt	\$83,205,000	\$0	\$317,164,997	\$0
FY13 Grant	\$1,966,492	\$16,012,693	\$0	\$60,973,515
FY13 Debt	\$10,650,000	\$0	\$67,875,000	\$0
FY14 Grant	\$7,427,298	\$15,563,759*	\$0	\$60,619,572
FY14 Debt	\$101,782,818	\$0	\$36,839,182	\$0
FY15 Grant	\$0	\$0	\$11,762,891	\$31,516,900
FY15 Debt	\$7,097,638	\$0	\$6,255,756	\$0
FY16 Grant	\$0	\$2,623,689*	\$43,237,400	\$0
FY16 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY17 Grant	\$0	\$0	\$10,867,503	\$62,867,968
FY17 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	\$329,204,042	\$58,918,546	\$494,502,729	\$406,388,856

* Grant projects with funds approved before 7/1/2010 show the amount less the reappropriated money so that this report accurately represents funding only during the stated reporting period.

This page is intentionally blank

Department of Education and Early Development
Division of School Finance and Facilities
REAA Fund

As of:
Tuesday, February 14, 2017

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	Projected FY2018	Total
Deposits:							
REAA Fund Capitalization	35,512,300	35,200,000	39,921,078	38,789,000	31,230,000	40,640,000	221,292,378
Interest Earned (Actual as of 1/24/17)	118,206	368,142	383,180	-	-	-	869,528
Subtotal Deposits	35,630,506	35,568,142	40,304,258	38,789,000	31,230,000	40,640,000	222,161,906

REAA-funded Capital Project Funded Projects:

Nightmute School Renovation/Addition	-	32,965,301	-	-	-	-	32,965,301
Kuinerramiut Elitnaurviate K-12 Renovation/Addition, Quinhagak	-	13,207,081	-	-	-	-	13,207,081
Kwethluk K-12 Replacement School	-	25,008,100	31,516,900	-	-	-	56,525,000
St. Mary's Andreefski High School Gym Construction	-	-	8,958,100	-	-	-	8,958,100
Bethel Regional High School Multipurpose Addition	-	-	-	-	7,129,765	-	7,129,765
Lewis Angapak K-12 School Renovation/Addition, Tuntutuliak	-	-	-	-	40,343,416	-	40,343,416
Jimmy Huntington K-12 Renovation/Addition, Huslia	-	-	-	-	15,394,787	-	15,394,787
Subtotal REAA-funded Projects	-	71,180,482	40,475,000	-	62,867,968	-	174,523,450

Reconciliation of Available Funds: 35,630,506 18,166 (152,576) 38,636,424 6,998,456 47,638,456

This page is intentionally blank



8 OBJECTIVE 11: CAPITAL PROJECTS

Objective 11: Evaluate the agency's process for developing capital projects.

Overview and Summary of the Conclusion for Objective 11

The process the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) uses to review capital projects is systematic and effective at incorporating a variety of criteria provided by the legislature into its project evaluation and priority ranking system. Additionally, the application requirements DEED imposes on districts encourage districts to follow best practices for the capital programs.

Overall, the review team found that DEED has a robust process for reviewing capital projects. However, there is a perception among some superintendents that the process is cumbersome and expensive. Although DEED's Grant Committee review worked to improve the grant review process in 2012, additional revisions could be made to make the application process less cumbersome and scoring more straightforward.

Furthermore, Alaska Statutes require that local school districts maintain adequate preventive maintenance plans and operations in order to be eligible for state school construction and major maintenance grant and debt reimbursement programs. DEED provides limited resources to local districts to assist with preventive maintenance planning. DEED does not currently provide local districts with preventative maintenance best practices nor share "frequently-asked questions" or other information that could help districts with limited maintenance resources. In summary, the review team concluded that DEED's process for developing capital projects is effective at achieving its legislative purpose; however, the application process is unnecessarily cumbersome, and the scoring of some projects can be confusing to districts. The review team found that DEED provides limited resources for districts to assist with preventative maintenance planning. For these reasons, the team finds that DEED is only partially fulfilling its responsibilities of providing a quality process for developing capital improvement projects.

8.1 CAPITAL PROJECTS REVIEW PROCESS

Findings

The process DEED uses to review capital projects is systematic and effective at incorporating a variety of criteria provided by the legislature into its project evaluation and priority ranking system. Additionally, the application requirements DEED imposes on districts encourage districts to follow best practices for the capital programs. In 2012, DEED's Grant Committee Review worked to improve the grant review process by increasing transparency, better aligning the review process with statutes and regulations, and simplifying the process. However, despite these improvements, superintendents were nearly evenly split in their opinion as to whether the process is fair and efficient.

To clarify the terms of this objective, DEED does not typically "develop" capital projects per se; DEED reviews district requests for state funding for capital projects, and creates a prioritized list of projects to be funded. For Objective 11, the review team was asked to review four specific elements relating to the effectiveness of DEED's processes for evaluating capital projects:

1. The extent to which a formal process exists for developing capital projects including, but not limited to, school construction projects, and if a process exists;
2. Whether the department has followed the process when implementing recent capital projects. If a formal process exists;
3. Whether the process is within the department's control or has been developed in response to federal or other guidelines outside of the department's control; and
4. Level of public involvement in the process.

Each of these four elements is discussed below, followed by discussions of overall effectiveness of the DEED's process for reviewing and prioritizing capital project proposals, and other issues related to the process.

- a) **Does a formal process exist?** Yes. There are formal eligibility criteria, application requirements, and forms for both types of capital funding:

grants and debt reimbursement. For grant funding, once districts submit their requests, DEED's three-person team evaluates them based on set scoring criteria. The results of the evaluation are used to score and rank all capital project requests submitted. The ranked projects are placed on one of two lists: a major maintenance list or a construction list. These lists are forwarded to the governor and the legislature; according to statute, projects are funded in rank order as far down the list as legislative appropriations allow. There are typically many more requests than there are funding.

The application, eligibility, and review process for debt reimbursements are similar to those for grant applications. However, according to staff, for the last 10 to 20 years there has been no limit to debt reimbursement participation. In other words, all debt reimbursement requests have been funded. In 2015, legislation temporarily halted the debt reimbursement program, so no new projects will be funded from 2015 to 2020.

- b) **Does DEED follow the process?** Yes. Documents and interviews with both DEED staff and superintendents indicate that the process is followed.
- c) **Is the process in DEED's control?** No. Alaska Statute 14.11 creates a largely prescriptive process for DEED's use in evaluating capital funding requests. These requirements originated with the legislature, as there are no federal requirements pertaining to state school capital funding.
- d) **How much public involvement is there in the process?** Public involvement is variable. There are no state statutory requirements for school districts to involve the public in their decision-making processes. As a result, public input at the local level varies by district. Under AS 14.11.013, DEED is required to provide public notice of grant applications submissions in newspaper of general circulation and to every person who has requested notice; at a later date, it is also required to hold a public meeting about the project priority list it develops.

To assess the effectiveness of DEED's system for evaluating and prioritizing capital funding requests, one must understand the legislative intent of the program. This is essential to determine whether DEED is successful in accomplishing it. The primary statute governing state funding for capital projects in schools is AS 14.11.



This statute creates the funds from which grants and debt reimbursement payments may be made, outlines how the local share of funding should be calculated, and provides criteria for DEED to use when evaluating funding applications. No explicit legislative intent is given, however the criteria provided are evidence that the legislature wanted DEED to consider factors such as:

- Need, taking into consideration factors such as the number of un-housed students, health and safety issues, and the physical conditions of existing buildings;
- Whether the districts are conducting long-term capital asset planning; and
- Whether the districts have conducted preliminary work (such as plan development and cost estimates) for the project in question.

DEED's capital funding eligibility requirements require documentation of all of the above elements, and they are factored into the scores used to prioritize projects across the state. Therefore, we conclude that the program is effective at achieving its legislative purpose.

Commendation 8.A

DEED is commended for developing an effective process for the evaluation and prioritization of capital projects that incorporates all legislative requirements.

8.2 PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Findings

DEED's capital project review and prioritization process and its project agreements, incentivize school districts to utilize best practices in their capital improvement projects and planning.

In evaluating program effectiveness, we consulted best practices for government capital project management. The sources that addressed state

programs focused on state-owned buildings and thus were not applicable.^{73,74} However, a study funded by the World Bank Group identified best practices for a capital improvement program for use by the Washington, DC school district.⁷⁵ The findings in this report can be used to determine if DEED's capital project funding eligibility requirements encourage the districts to implement best practices in their own capital project planning.

The World Bank study reviewed the capital improvement programs and practices of seven school districts considered leaders in the field. The study found that all well-managed school district capital improvement programs consist of six basic elements:

- Accurate information systems;
- Comprehensive, multifaceted planning;
- Needs based decision-making process;
- Sufficient and stable funding;
- Skilled project management; and
- Effective oversight and monitoring.

DEED's requirements encourage districts to meet the first two best practices listed: accurate information services and comprehensive, multifaceted planning. To have accurate information services, districts must maintain information about their building assets, including condition, capacity, utilization, and expenses. DEED requires districts to have a functioning fixed asset inventory system (FAIS) that is verified on-site in conjunction with DEED's periodic district performance maintenance review. A multifaceted planning system should include a long-range facilities master plan (DEED requires districts to have a six-year capital improvement plan); a capital improvement plan detailing the costs of future

⁷³ *Executive Guide: Leading Practices in Capital Decision-Making*. U.S. General Accounting Office, December 1998. Web. <http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/ai99032.pdf> Accessed February 19, 2016.

⁷⁴ *Capital Budgeting in the States*. National Association of State Budget Officers, Spring 2014. Web. <http://www.nasbo.org/capital-budgeting-in-the-states> Accessed February 19, 2016.

⁷⁵ *Public School Capital Improvement Programs: Basic Elements and Best Practices: Guidance for the District of Columbia*. The Scientex Corporation and The 21st Century School Fund for the World Bank Group, July 1999. Web. <http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/publications/publicschools/PublicSchoolCapitalImprovementPrograms.pdf> Accessed February 19, 2016.



projects (DEED requires cost estimates with the applications); and an annual maintenance plan (another DEED requirement).

The third best practice, a needs based decision-making process, includes having mechanisms for public input; developing processes for creating a project list, updating it, regularly, and approving things on it; and articulating the public benefits of projects. DEED's requirements do not address the capital projects development process undertaken by districts.

The fourth best practice is having sufficient and stable funding. For grant-funded projects, DEED enters into a project agreement with the district that confirms the scope and budget of the project and outlines a payment schedule that is tied to the completion of specified milestones. Similar contracts are made with districts receiving debt forgiveness. Therefore, the structure of the payment system does provide sufficient and stable funding for projects for which districts are receiving state funds.

The fifth and sixth best practices - skilled project management and effective oversight and monitoring - are closely related. Both require project teams that can effectively plan and oversee the project from conception through to completion. Good project management results in projects being completed on schedule and within budget. Effective monitoring and oversight require routine document of progress to the management team for review and oversight purposes. Although DEED does not specifically review these elements, the progress requirements in the project agreement provide incentives to districts to effectively manage capital projects.

Commendation 8.B

DEED is commended for developing a capital project review and prioritization process, and project agreements, that incentivize school districts to utilize best practices in their capital improvement projects and planning.

8.3 PROJECT APPLICATION PROCESS

Findings

Although DEED's application process incorporates legislative priorities, the application process is unnecessarily cumbersome. The scoring of projects can be confusing and the program's priorities can be unclear, despite scoring



guidelines. As a result, DEED's capital project review and prioritization process is considered by some superintendents to be cumbersome, costly, and unfair.

As part of Public Works' assessment of DEED's capital projects system, the review team surveyed and interviewed school district superintendents and DEED staff. When asked in the survey if DEED's process for capital project review achieves its intended goals and fulfills its responsibilities, 66 percent of DEED staff and 46 percent of superintendents chose neither agree nor disagree. However, of those who selected an opinioned response, 36 percent of superintendents disagreed compared to 3 percent of DEED staff. Based on written feedback to the survey and personal interviews, the concerns superintendents raised were based on perceptions that the process is (1) cumbersome and expensive; and (2) unfair.

For example, it is perceived by some superintendents that, in order to submit a competitive application, districts must include professional drawings, plans, and other documents and information. Districts reported that hiring professionals to develop these documents is expensive: some districts reported that investing in the application paid off and they got funding, while others reported it as being a deterrent to applying at all. According to one survey taker, *The cost to prepare a project to get it to the top of the list is impossible for a small district.* Another described the process as *ridiculously cumbersome.*

Our review found that the need for such assistance and documentation depends on the scope of the project and the qualifications of district personnel developing it. DEED provides no-cost tools, manuals and guidelines, and assistance in the use of these resources, for all elements evaluated in the capital improvement project (CIP) process with some exceptions. Grant applications without drawings or plans produced by professionals do get evaluated, and eight applications without professional documentation did make it into the top 25 percent of the FY2017 Major Maintenance grant list.

The application itself is 12 pages long. It requires thorough documentation of need, cost, preventative maintenance plans, and other issues, plus various data and calculations. Depending on the project, over 25 attachments may also be required. For any district, compiling such a proposal would be a significant task; for a small district, it could be very challenging to impossible due to limited staff resources and training.

Assertions of unfairness by some superintendents were driven by two perceptions: first, that the resources required to submit a successful application effectively “price out” smaller districts; and second, that funding decisions are politicized. Multiple superintendents noted that larger districts seem to get more capital improvement funds (with the implication that larger districts have more resources to dedicate to a burdensome application process). Another stated that the process is too competitive and pits urban and rural districts against each other.

Potential politicization of the process was reflected in other comments: *Typically the decision defaults to less affluent districts, and large legislative delegations...bring home the bacon.* Frustration was also noted from one superintendent who complained that their district got funding, but not for what their application requested.

Recommendation 8.3.1

Initiate steps to make the capital funding application process less cumbersome and the scoring process more straightforward. (Tier 2)

Although DEED's application process incorporates legislative priorities, the application process is unnecessarily cumbersome. The scoring of projects can be confusing and the program's priorities can be unclear, despite scoring guidelines. Adjustments that could be adopted to simplify the application process and increase the clarity of scoring include the following recommendations:

- Simplify funding applications: Redundant or similar requirements should be eliminated or merged. Similar requirements (such as those addressing need, cost, or safety issues) should be clearly grouped.
- Clarify point allocations: On the application, clearly note both the number of points and the percentage of points available to be awarded for each group of requirements (such as need, cost, and safety issues), and for each element assessed within each group.
- Clarify how elements are scored: Currently on the application, an element might be noted as being worth “up to” a certain number of points. Applicants have to refer to scoring guidelines to learn what is required to get a full score. To clarify what is required for applicants, indicate on the

application how each element will be scored and what is required for full and partial scores.

- Simplify and clarify application scoring: The scoring sheets do not follow the same order as the application, which may cause confusion or inconsistent scoring. Reformat the scoring sheets so that they parallel the structure of the application.
- Consider revising the scoring process to better consider each district's priorities: Currently, districts are allowed to submit up to ten capital funding requests annually, each of which must be ranked by the district; however that ranking only comprises six percent of the total project score. As a result, some superintendents report frustration at receiving funding for their lower priority projects while their higher priority projects go unfunded.
- Clarify priorities: Of the total points possible in 2017, 35 percent are for awarded for need, 19 percent for safety, 17 percent each for planning and for cost, and six percent each for the consideration of alternatives and the district's ranking. Include a clear summary of this weighting on the application and scoring sheets so that funding priorities are clear to applicants, stakeholders, and decision makers.

This recommendation can be implemented utilizing existing resources.

8.4 PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

Findings

As the state education agency, DEED monitors compliance of local school districts with state laws requiring adequate upkeep of school facilities through site visits conducted once every five years. Greater preventive maintenance efforts are needed to ensure the longevity and proper upkeep of state-financed buildings and equipment. As the state education agency, DEED is positioned to play a more supportive role than it currently does in ensuring that local school districts are aware of preventive maintenance standards and best practices.

It is the obligation of the State of Alaska to ensure that every Alaskan child has access to a quality education. In many states, the courts have determined that school facilities that provide suitable educational settings are a significant part of



this responsibility.⁷⁶ As such, DEED's role with respect to supporting preventive maintenance for school facilities should be considered both as a fiscal steward of limited state education resources, as well as integral to its core mandate of ensuring access to quality education.

Alaska Statutes 14.11.011(b)(4) and 14.11.100(j)(5) require that local school districts maintain adequate preventive maintenance plans and operations to be eligible for state school construction and major maintenance grant and debt reimbursement programs. Alaska Administrative Code title 8, § 31.013 specifically requires that districts have a facility management program that addresses five elements of facility and maintenance management to be eligible for state aid, including:

- **Maintenance Management Program** - a formal maintenance management program that records maintenance activities on a work order basis, and tracks the timing and cost, including labor and materials, of maintenance activities in sufficient detail to produce reports of planned and completed work.
- **Energy Management Plan** - an energy management plan that records energy consumption for all utilities on a monthly basis for each building (for facilities constructed before December 15, 2004, a district may record energy consumption for utilities on a monthly basis when multiple buildings are served by one utility plant).
- **Custodial Program** - a custodial program that includes a schedule of custodial activities for each building based on type of work and scope of effort.
- **Maintenance Training Program** - a maintenance training program that specifies training for custodial and maintenance staff and records the training received by each person.
- **Renewal and Replacement Schedule (R&R)** - a renewal and replacement schedule that identifies, for each school facility of permanent construction

⁷⁶ <http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/publications/modelpolicies/planningsectionmay2005.pdf>



over 1,000 gross square feet, the construction cost of major building systems, including electrical, mechanical, structural and other components; evaluates and establishes the life-expectancy of those systems; compares life-expectancy to the age and condition of the systems; and uses the data to forecast a renewal and replacement year and cost for each system.⁷⁷

According to DEED facilities staff, local school building preventive maintenance (PM) efforts are limited in many districts due to declining local budgets and challenges in attracting and retaining qualified maintenance personnel (particularly in areas of the state with high cost of living). Adequate training is not in place for maintenance and custodial staff in many local schools around the state. While DEED provides some training and technical assistance to districts to help mitigate these challenges, this is very limited due to staffing restrictions.

DEED staff members have identified a lack of training opportunities for local maintenance and facilities purchasing staff, particularly in districts with limited resources. In particular, more training is needed on the proper use of facilities technology used to operate automated programs such as heating systems.

Currently, DEED has one full-time facilities/building maintenance specialist who visits school districts once every five years to review facility maintenance practices and procedures in preparation of the annual Preventive Maintenance State-of-the-State Report. This report evaluates local district compliance with statutory and administrative requirements and determines eligibility for state CIP funding.

After DEED staff members conduct local site visits, they issue site reports outlining the deficiencies local districts must address to maintain CIP funding eligibility. The most recent (August 2015) Preventive Maintenance State-of-the-State Report⁷⁸ listed 50 of 53 districts as eligible for CIP funding.

⁷⁷ AAC 31.013
(a)(1-5).

⁷⁸ "PM State-of-the-State Report of DEED Maintenance Assessments and Related Data," August 15, 2015.



DEED provides limited resources to local districts to assist with preventive maintenance planning. While the department published the “Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook” in 1999, the publication has not been updated in the last 17 years to reflect advances in technology and services. DEED does not currently provide local districts with PM best practices nor share “frequently-asked questions” or other information that could help districts with limited maintenance resources.

Recommendation 8.4.1

Enhance preventive maintenance training with local school districts. (Tier 2)

DEED should also update its “Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook” to incorporate technology and service advancements since the most recent edition in 1999. This publication can help districts better understand rudimentary PM issues as other training opportunities are developed. The DEED facilities staff recognizes the need to update the handbook, particularly to address some maintenance reports that are now collected as part of the compliance process. The facilities team has tentatively scheduled an update to the Handbook for May 2017. In the interim, the department should direct districts to other readily available resources.

DEED can also be a great coordinator/conduit of information for districts that would like to share training costs with other organizations on a collaborative basis (e.g., training sponsored by several neighboring school districts or school districts in conjunction with other government/public works departments in the area). DEED should also encourage districts to pursue low- or no-cost training opportunities that can be provided by other staff with demonstrated expertise with equipment or processes, other local (non-school) facility staff, or even vocational education staff. DEED may also see opportunities to connect districts with other state agencies such as the Department of Administration that could offer examples of contract terms requiring vendors to provide training as a condition of the purchase of their products.

Recognizing current budget limitations, it is not feasible for DEED to provide additional resources for training. However, DEED can coordinate readily available training resources available (many online) from product vendors, equipment manufacturers, or school facility management organizations for little or no cost.



DEED can also develop limited mentoring or collaboration projects, such as the ones outlined here to augment PM training for local districts at little cost.

Recommendation 8.4.2

DEED should provide local school districts with preventive maintenance best practices and share “frequently-asked questions” and other information that could help districts with limited maintenance resources – especially within the context of compliance with DEED requirements. (Tier 2)

In addition to augmenting access to training resources, DEED should consider developing a FAQ or common problem database and connecting struggling districts with others who have addressed a problem. Given current budget limitations, this effort can start small by launching a simple online bulletin board for questions and answers about preventive maintenance, identifying and sharing best practices from local districts nationwide, and highlighting in particular those best practices that can be implemented with minimal resources, both human and capital. This can be augmented with more resources and functionality as funding allows.

Additionally, DEED staff should document and share best practices and “lessons learned” during regular site visits to keep a record of things that have worked for some districts and might benefit others.

To develop a more robust (i.e., more frequent) site visit schedule, DEED would need to augment both staff and travel budgets. Such increases are not likely given current budget limitations.

It should be noted that many studies have confirmed that allowing schools to deteriorate by deferring maintenance greatly increases total facilities costs because dilapidated schools are far more costly to repair than the cost of regular maintenance. An October 2014 report from the Council of the Great City Schools indicated that every \$1 of preventive maintenance that is deferred results in \$4 of expenditures to ultimately repair or replace building systems.⁷⁹ In other words, deferring maintenance reduces the value of the education dollar by a factor of 400 percent where school facilities are concerned.

⁷⁹ “Reversing the Cycle of Deterioration in the Nation’s Public School Buildings,” Council of the Great City Schools, October 2014, page 8.



8.5 POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Findings

In addition to evaluating the capital project review effectiveness, Objective 11 also called upon the review team to recommend any necessary changes to the capital development process, where appropriate, and specifically to examine potential changes such as the implementation of statewide sustainability standards or standardized design requirements. The review team examined those ideas for their applicability in Alaska.

A. Sustainability Standards

Sustainability standards refer to architectural and construction standards that make buildings more energy efficient and environmentally sound. The potential benefits of sustainable building include saving money on long-term energy and utility costs; increasing the comfort and health of building users; and causing less detriment to the environment. California adopted the first statewide green building standards code in the nation⁸⁰ and is considered a national leader on both school sustainability standards and standardization of school design requirements. California's standards address siting, indoor environment quality, energy, water, materials, community matters, and faculty and student performance.⁸¹

⁸⁰ DSA-SS Green Code: CALGreen Code for Schools and Community Colleges. California Division of the State Architect. Web. <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/Programs/proqSustainability/greencode.aspx>. Accessed February 22, 2016.

⁸¹ DSA: Project Submittal Guideline: CALGreen Code. California Division of the State Architect. Web. http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/pubs/GL_4.pdf. Accessed February 22, 2016.

Recommendation 8.5.1

DEED should provide districts with information on sustainable building practices. (Tier 3)

Although school districts in Alaska have wide latitude in the design of their schools, they must ensure that the design is consistent with the Alaska Administrative Code. However, Alaska is one of just six states with no commercial building energy codes⁸² and one of only three states with no energy efficiency requirements for public buildings.⁸³ The state also lags behind other states in the field of green building.⁸⁴ For example, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is one of the most popular green building certification programs used worldwide. Alaska has only one LEED certified building per 20,889 citizens, compared to leading states in the Pacific Northwest such as Washington (one LEED certified building per 14,779 citizens) and Oregon (one LEED certified building per 13,490 citizens).^{85,86}

Adopting sustainability requirements for schools, while potentially beneficial for both districts and school users, would likely prove to be an arduous undertaking for DEED and result in increased building costs due to a lack of easily-available compliant resources and professionals knowledgeable in green building practices. Instead, DEED should make information and guidance available to interested districts. DEED may wish to refer to the California Division of the State Architect⁸⁷ as a model for providing such resources. This office provides design and construction oversight for K–12 schools, and as part of that function, has a

⁸² *State Building Energy Codes*. National Council of State Legislatures, November 2013. Web. <http://www.ncsl.org/research/energy/a-kilowatt-saved-is-a-kilowatt-earned-efficient-buildings-update-2013.aspx>. Accessed February 22, 2016.

⁸³ *Energy Efficiency Requirements for Public Buildings*. National Council of State Legislatures, November 2013. Web. <http://www.ncsl.org/research/energy/energy-efficiency-requirements-for-public-buildings.aspx>. Accessed February 22, 2016.

⁸⁴ Dispenza, Kristin, *Green Building Efforts in Alaska*. Green Building Elements, February 2008. Web. <http://greenbuildingelements.com/2008/02/05/green-building-efforts-in-alaska>. Accessed February 22, 2016.

⁸⁵ LEED is a well-known certification developed by the non-profit U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) and offered worldwide. It rates structure sustainability based on design, construction, operation, and maintenance.

⁸⁶ LEED building statistics from: *LEED Projects*. Green Building. Web. <http://greenbuildingwire.com/leed-projects>. Accessed February 22, 2016. Population statistics from: *2010 Census Interactive Population Search*. U.S. Census Bureau. Web.

⁸⁷ <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/home.aspx>.



sustainability resources page that provides links and information about all aspects of sustainable school construction available at: <http://www.sustainable-schools.dgs.ca.gov/sustainable-schools/>

This recommendation can be implemented utilizing existing resources.

1.School Design Requirements

To evaluate the standardization of school design requirements beyond the scope of what exists in code, we reviewed the use of prototypical school design. Prototypical school design refers to the development of a single school design intended for use at several sites with minimal modifications. The rationale for using prototypical school design is to reduce design and construction costs for districts, particularly those that are quickly growing and need to build several schools over the course of a few years.

In 2015, the Alaska Legislature commissioned a report on the benefits and disadvantages (pros and cons) of prototypical school design in Alaska. Released in October 2015, *A Report on the Benefits and Disadvantages of Prototypical School Design and Construction in Alaska*, found that such a program is unlikely to be successful in Alaska due to the diverse needs and socioeconomic situations of its geographically disperse districts.⁸⁸

Recommendation 8.5.2

DEED should not adopt prototypical designs for schools. (Tier 3)

The 2015 legislative report on the pros and cons of prototypical school design in Alaska clearly found that such a program is unlikely to be successful in Alaska.

⁸⁸ *A Report on the Benefits and Disadvantages of Prototypical School Design and Construction in Alaska*. Invision/Dejong-Richter, October 2015.

*State of Alaska***Department of Education & Early Development**
Division of School Finance/Facilities**By:** BRGR Subcommittee**Date:** February 15, 2017**Phone:** 465-6906**File:** BR_GRCom\Papers\CIP**For:** Bond Reimbursement & Grant
Review Committee**Subject:** School Construction Project
Recommendations to State Board

POSITION PAPER

Issue

The statute that establishes the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee (BRGR) lists specific duties for the committee. In particular, the department and the committee want to ensure that those duties are being carried out with regard to the review of the school construction grant priorities, the recommendations of those projects to the State Board of Education and Early Development (SBOE), and the recommendations to the commissioner concerning projects requesting debt reimbursement.

Discussion

As a preliminary note, it is worth mention that the statutes can be seemingly ambiguous in the use of “school construction” or “school construction grants”. While “school construction” is defined in AS 14.11.135 as “a project described in AS 14.11.013(a)(1)(A), (B), (F) or (G),” the term has also been interpreted generally to mean all capital improvement projects when there is no similar treatment specified for major maintenance (e.g. AS 14.11.013(b)). This lack of consistent treatment may be a result of the major maintenance grant fund being established and incorporated three years after the school construction grant fund.

Review of School Construction Grant Priorities

AS 14.11.014(b)(1) provides that the committee shall “review the department’s priorities among projects for which school construction grants are requested.” Since it is not practicable for the committee to participate in the two-month rating and review process, current practice has been for the department to annually provide the initial CIP priority lists (issued November 5) to the committee with an accompanying briefing that includes comparative statistics and any issues that arose in the lists’ preparation. This presentation of the lists and process typically occurs during a December committee meeting. The committee’s review has never resulted in a recommendation to revise the list; however, the issues covered in the briefing have often become discussion points for future improvements to the CIP application developed and approved by the committee.

Recommendations of School Construction Projects to State Board of Education

AS 14.11.014(b)(2) provides that the committee shall “make recommendations to the board concerning school construction grants. . . .” Historically, when the initial lists have been presented by the department to the committee, committee acceptance of the grants has been assumed unless a specific motion is made regarding a recommendation.

“Recommendations” could cover a variety of aspects, including priority (scoring), funding, phasing, eligibility. Again, since it is not practicable for the committee to participate in the detailed rating, review, and appeal process, the committee is likely to defer to the department’s judgement in the matters of budget, scoring, and eligibility.

In addition, the timing of such a recommendation is difficult. Under current statutes and regulations, school districts have opportunity to appeal the departments determination made in support of the initial lists. The reconsideration and appeal process occurs between approximately November 5th and mid-March of the following year. It is not practicable for the committee to participate in the appeal process.

SBOE reviews the final lists at its March quarterly meeting. AS 14.11.015 states that “the board shall review grant applications that have been recommended by the department under AS 14.11.013, and may approve a grant application if the board determines that the project meets the criteria specified in AS 14.11.013(a)(1) and 14.11.014. The department may not award a grant unless the grant application is approved by the board...”. The board typically makes a motion similar to the following:

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the department’s FY2018 Capital Improvement Program lists of projects eligible for funding under the School Construction Grant Fund and the Major Maintenance Grant Fund, as presented.

Recommendations to Commissioner Concerning Debt Reimbursement Projects

AS 14.11.014(b)(2) also provides that the committee shall also “. . . make recommendations to the commissioner concerning projects for which bond reimbursement is requested.” All projects requesting debt reimbursement are identified in statute as “school construction”. Historically, the committee has not been active in recommendations on debt reimbursement projects.

Options

Several levels of action could be taken by the committee regarding its roles and responsibilities in reviewing and making recommendations on grant priorities, school construction projects, and debt reimbursement projects:

Option 1 – Appoint a subcommittee to represent the committee and participate in the CIP evaluation and scoring process. Hold a meeting prior to November 1 to review department priorities and, relying on the subcommittee, accept or request revisions to the department’s priorities.

Option 2 – Hold a meeting prior to November 1 to review school construction projects in order to make a recommendation regarding the amount to appropriate to the school construction fund. To be considered by the commissioner when submitting the statewide six-year CIP forecast and initial priority lists for Major Maintenance and School Construction projects to the Governor.

Option 3 – Formalize a recommendation to the state board of education regarding the grant fund lists.

Option 4 - Take no additional action. Continue to receive briefings by the department on the CIP process, initial lists, and debt reimbursement and use the provided information to make necessary changes to the CIP Application, Instructions, and supporting documents.

Recommendation(s)

Option 3 -- Formalize a recommendation to the state board of education regarding the school construction grant list. The first motion below echoes the SBOE motion to adopt the CIP lists. The second motion provides a more detailed recommendation of funding levels and projects.

Suggested Motion(s)

I move the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee recommend the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the department's FY20XX Capital Improvement Program list of projects eligible for funding under the School Construction Grant Fund and the Major Maintenance Grant Fund, as presented.

I move that the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee recommend the state appropriate \$\$\$\$ to the school construction grant fund, which would enable the department to issue grants to [*fully fund the top project and provide funding for design of the number two ranked project on the school construction list*], and appropriate \$\$\$\$ to the major maintenance grant fund, which would enable the department to issue grants to the top [##] projects on the major maintenance list.

This page is intentionally blank

Summary of Changes: FY19 CIP Application & Instructions

Question	Application	Instructions	
2a	--	<i>Potential:</i> update form number as needed.	Minor
2d	--	Remove Chart of Account expenditure language; add language specifying insurance value total based on facilities reported in the School Facilities database.	Minor
3b	--	Add date to contact department regarding facility database changes.	Minor
3d	Remove “project schedule” portion to new question (3e).	Conforming change to “project schedule” -- remove to new 3e.	Moderate
3d	Remove “cost estimate discussion” portion to new question (7b and 7c).	Conforming change to “cost estimate discussion”, remove instruction relating to question 7a to new question 7c.	Moderate
3d	--	Various cleanup and reorganizing.	Minor
3f	Add new question relating to investment grade energy audit and removal of IGA energy efficiency measures.	Add new instructions.	Major
3g	Add new question relating to ability to use Alaska Energy Efficiency Revolving Loan Fund or equivalent without voter approval.	Add new instructions.	Major
3h	--	Add instruction to identify completed scope in question 3d.	Minor
4a	--	Add moved instruction from 3d relating to new construction.	Minor
5c	--	Remove dated reference.	Minor
Table 5.1	Conform “school year” ranges to current fiscal year.	--	Minor
5h	Reword question to be inclusive of school construction projects not relating to housing students.	Add instruction for Cat. F projects.	Moderate
5i	Add new question relating to the attachment of educational specifications. Conform Sec. 5 “skip to” note.	Add new instructions.	Moderate, Major
Sec. 6	Add clarification that more developed design documents may be submitted	Add conforming instructions to questions 6b, 6c, and 6d.	Moderate
6a	Add fields for identification of condition survey title and date prepared.	Add instruction clarifying when condition surveys are required.	Moderate
6b	--	Add instruction to justify lack of consultant, if needed.	Minor
7a	--	Conforming change for move of “cost estimate discussion” to question 7c.	Minor
Table 7.1	Conform footnote 2 to “cost estimate discussion” move.	Modify language regarding percentage justifications to reference question 7c.	Minor
Table 7.2	--	Remove language relating to attachments in support of reasonableness of cost estimate to new question 7c.	Minor

Question	Application	Instructions	
7b	Add new question relating to cost estimate source.	Add new instructions.	Moderate
7c	Add new question relating to cost estimate discussion (moved from 3d)	Add moved instructions from question 3d and Table 7.2.	Moderate
9a	--	Edit to remove reference to “you” and “your”.	Minor
9d	--	Add language specifying insurance value total based on facilities reported in the School Facilities database.	Minor
9g	--	Add language regarding CMMS ability to track training.	Minor
Project Attach.	Reordered attachments; added IGA (3f) attachment, removed budget variance justification (7a).	--	Minor
Appx B	--	Clarification of “required” elements.	Major
Appx C	--	Update recommended Equipment/Technology value to 2016 Ed. <i>Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases</i> .	Minor
Various	Renumber existing questions as needed.	Renumber existing questions as needed.	Minor
Various	Update “EED” to “DEED” throughout.	Update “EED” to “DEED” throughout.	Minor
All	Footer: conforming changes for new fiscal year and form	Footer: conforming changes for new fiscal year and form	Minor

For changes to the Project Eligibility Checklist and Formula-Driven and Evaluative Rating Forms, see drafts.

No changes are proposed for the Guidelines for Raters.

For changes to forms for the District Six-Year Plan and Space Calculation Worksheet, see samples.

This page is intentionally blank



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

FY2019

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION

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

When answering application questions, provide verifiable supporting documentation. Answers that cannot be verified will be considered unsubstantiated and may result in the department finding the application ineligible due to incompleteness.

The department will only score ten project applications from each district during a single rating period. In addition, a district can submit a letter to request reuse of an application's score for one year after the application was filed.

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

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

School District: _____

Community: _____

School Name: _____

Project Name: _____

CERTIFICATION

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

Superintendent or Chief School Administrator

Date

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE

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

Grant Funding

Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

1b. Primary purpose of project. Choose only **one** category. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.¹

Grant Funding Categories per AS 14.11.013(a)(1)
School Construction: <input type="checkbox"/> Health and life-safety (Category A) <input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students (Category B) <input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program (Category F)
Major Maintenance: <input type="checkbox"/> Protection of structure (Category C) <input type="checkbox"/> Building code deficiencies (Category D) <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings (Category E)

Debt Funding Categories per AS 14.11.100(j)(4)
<input type="checkbox"/> Unhoused students <input type="checkbox"/> Health and safety or building code deficiencies <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve operating cost savings <input type="checkbox"/> Improve instructional program

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

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

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

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

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

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

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

2c. Is evidence of required insurance attached to this application or has evidence been submitted as required to the department? yes no

2d. Is the project a capital improvement project and not part of a preventive maintenance program or custodial care? yes no
 (Supporting evidence must be outlined in the project description, question 3d. Reference AS 14.11.011(b)(3))

2e. Is the district's preventive maintenance program certified by the department? yes no

2f. Districtwide replacement cost insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

3. PROJECT INFORMATION

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

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

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

Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year	GSF
TOTAL GSF			0

3c. Facility status. Does this project change the status of any facility within the project scope to one of the below? The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):

- renovated added to demolished surplusd other

NOTE: If the project changes the current status of a facility to "demolished" or "surplusd," a transition plan is required as part of this application. A transition plan should describe how surplusd state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. See instructions.

3d. Project description/Scope of work. The project description/scope of work narrative is a required element of this application (Reference AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)). Ensure project aligns with selected funding category.

Project description

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

- Facilities impacted by the project
- Age of facility/system(s)
- Facility/system conditions requiring capital improvement
- Explain why this project is not preventive maintenance
- Other discussion

Scope of work

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

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

Cost estimate discussion

~~At a minimum, include the following:~~

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

3e. Project schedule. Provide estimated or actual dates for the following project milestones.

<u>Estimated receipt of funding date</u>	_____
<u>Contract with design team</u>	_____
<u>Begin design</u>	_____
<u>Design work 100% complete</u>	_____
<u>Project out to bid</u>	_____
<u>Begin construction</u>	_____
<u>Complete construction</u>	_____

Provide additional information regarding the project schedule, if needed.

3f. Has any facility in the scope of work received an investment grade audit (IGA) within the past seven years? yes no

If the answer is yes, attach two copies of the IGA(s).

IGA prepared by: _____

Date prepared: _____

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Have all energy efficiency measures (EEMs) for any specific upgrades within a qualified IGA, which have an estimated payback of 10 years or less, been excluded from the project? yes no

3g. Does the organizational charter of the capital funding entity for the school district require authorization from local voters before entering into a debt instrument similar or equal to the Alaska Energy Efficiency Revolving Loan Fund (AEERLF)? yes no

If yes, attach two copies of that documentation.

3e3h. Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete? yes no

If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with the department's requirements for bids and awards of construction contracts. (Reference 4 AAC 31.080)

3f3i. Will this project require acquisition of additional land or utilization of a new school site? yes no

If the answer is yes, attach site description or site requirements. If a new site has been identified, attach the site selection analysis used to select the new site. Note the attachment on the last page of the application.

4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety (Up to 50 points)

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and/or life safety conditions; attach supporting documentation.

5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED

NOTE: If this project is classified as Major Maintenance (Category C, D, or E) and is not including any new space, skip to ~~5i~~5j. **All applications requesting new or replacement space, or classified as School Construction (Category A, B, or F), must provide the information requested in this section.** For the purposes of this section, gross square footage is calculated in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020(e). Worksheets to be completed are available at the department’s website at:
<http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

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

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

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

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

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

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

5d. What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility? _____

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

5e. Unhoused students (Up to 80 points)

In the table below, provide the attendance area's current and projected ADM:

Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM			
School Year	K-6 ADM	7-12 ADM	Total ADM
2016-2017			
2017-2018			
2018-2019			
2019-2020			
2020-2021			
2021-2022			
2022-2023			
2023-2024			
2024-2025			
2025-2026			

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

Attach calculations and justifications.

5g. Confirm space eligibility:

Qualifies for _____ additional SF

Applying for _____ additional SF

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

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

5i. Are educational specifications attached?

yes no

ALL PROJECTS CONTINUE FROM THIS POINT

5i5j. Project space utilization (Up to 30 points)

Completion of this table is **mandatory for all projects that add space or change existing space utilization**. If the project does not alter the configuration of the existing space, it is not necessary to complete this table. Use gross square feet for space entries in this table.

Table 5.2 PROJECT SPACE EQUATION						
	A	I	II	III	IV	B
Space Utilization	Existing Space	Space to remain "as is"	Space to be Renovated	Space to be Demolished	New Space	Total Space upon Completion
Elem. Instructional/Resource						
Sec. Instructional/Resource						
Support Teaching						
General Support						
Supplementary						
Total School Space						

6. PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN

NOTE: Reference Appendix B of the instructions for required elements. [More developed design documents can be attached in lieu of previous documents.](#)

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

1. Is a facility or component condition survey attached? yes no
- Document title: _____
- Date prepared: _____

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

6c. Schematic design - 35% (0 or 10 points, all elements required for 10 points as applicable to the project)

1. Are complete schematic design documents attached? Schematic design documents include approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations, and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines. yes no
2. Is a schematic design level cost estimate attached? yes no

6d. Design development - 65% (0 or 5 points, all elements required for 5 points as applicable to the project)

1. Are design development documents attached? Design development documents include dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications and engineering plans. yes no
2. Is a design development cost estimate attached? yes no

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

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

7. COST ESTIMATE

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

Percentages are based on construction cost. See Appendix C for additional information. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, you must provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding the percentage. The total of all additive percentages should not exceed 130%. If the additive percentages exceed 130%, a detailed explanation must be provided or the department will adjust the percentages to meet the individual and overall percentage guidelines.

Table 7.1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE					
Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	I Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant ¹	2 - 4%				
Land ²					
Site Investigation ²					
Seismic Hazard ³					
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction ⁴					
Equipment & Technology ^{2,5}	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead ⁶	up to 9%				
Art ⁷	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
Project Total					

- Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: \$0-\$500,000 – 4%; \$500,001- \$5,000,000 – 3%; over \$5,000,000 – 2%).
- Include only if necessary for completion of this project; [address need in the project description \(Question 3d\)](#). Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the [Project Description cost estimate discussion](#) (Question [3d7c](#)), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
- Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.
- Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department’s publication, Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases for calculation methodology (2005). The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate (from the base year of 2005) added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
- Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project; this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost.
- Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).

Table 7.2 CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE						
Construction Category	New Construction			Renovation		
	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction ¹						
Special Requirements ²		n/a			n/a	
Sitework and Utilities		n/a			n/a	
General Requirements		n/a			n/a	
Geographic Cost Factor		n/a			n/a	
Size/Dollar Adj. Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
Construction Total						

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

7b. Cost estimate source. Identify and describe as needed the specific source of the costs provided in Table 7.1 (e.g. professional estimators, solicited vendor quotes, paid invoices).

7c. Cost estimate discussion & justifications. Identify and explain cost estimate assumptions, lump sums, and percentages in excess of the recommended percentages in Table 7.1. Provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding a recommended percentage.

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

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

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

Has the district submitted an insurance claim? yes no

If no, explain below.

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

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

Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. (50 points)

Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. (25-45 points)

Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. (5-25 points)

A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. (5-45 points)

A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. (25-45 points)

A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and has limited functionality. If the component fails, the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. (5-25 points)

8b. Inadequacies of existing space (Up to 40 points)

Describe how the inadequacies of the existing space impact mandated instructional programs or existing or proposed local programs and how the project will improve the existing facilities to support the instructional programs.

8c. Other options (Up to 25 points)

Describe, in addition to the proposed project, at least two or more viable and realistic options that have been considered in the planning and development of this project to address the best solution for the facility.

Major maintenance projects should include consideration of project design options, material or component options, phasing, cost comparisons, or other considerations.

New school construction or addition/replacement of space projects should include a discussion of existing building renovation versus new construction, acquisition or use of alternative facilities, a life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis, service area boundary changes where there are adjacent attendance areas, or other considerations.

8d. Annual operating cost savings (Up to 30 points)

Quantify the project's annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost.

8e. Phased funding (Up to 30 points)

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

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

EED grant #: _____

8f. Is the district applying for a waiver of participating share? yes no

Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than \$200,000 are eligible to apply for a waiver of participating share. REAA's are not eligible to request a waiver of participating share.

(If the district is applying for a waiver, attach justification. Refer to AS 14.11.008(d) and Appendix F of the application instructions.)

9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

District preventive maintenance and facility management (55 points possible)

Ensure that documents related to the district's maintenance and facility management program have been provided with district CIP submittals. Include management reports, renewal and replacement schedules, work orders, energy reports, training schedules, custodial activities, and any other documentation that will enhance the requirements listed in the instructions.

Include the following documents:

- 9a.** Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9b.** Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9c.** PM/Corrective Maintenance Reports (Up to 10 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9d.** 5-Year Average Expenditure on Maintenance. Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)
- 9e.** Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9f.** Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9g.** Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)
- 9h.** Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

Note all attachments included with the application.

Project eligibility attachments: Eligibility item is required on all projects. Submit two copies, regardless of the number of project applications.

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

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

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

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

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



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

FY2019

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

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION:

Answer all questions: Each question on the application form must be answered in order for the application to be considered complete. **Only complete applications will be accepted. Incomplete applications will be considered ineligible and returned unranked.** If a question is not applicable, please note as NA. The department has the authority to reject applications due to incomplete information or documentation provided by the district. The grant application deadline is September 1st (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable).

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

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

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

CERTIFICATION:

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

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

For further information contact:
School Facilities Manager

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE:

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

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

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

1b. Primary purpose. Based on whether the application is for grant funding or aid for debt retirement, check **one** box in the appropriate column to indicate the primary purpose of the project. Each application should be for a single project for a particular facility, and should be independently justified. The district may include work in other categories in a proposed project. These projects will be reviewed and evaluated as mixed-scope projects. Refer to Appendix A of these instructions for descriptions of categories and the limitations associated with grant category C, category D, and category E projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted basis for mixed scope projects. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.¹

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

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION:

2a. District six-year plan. Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use AKEED Form 05-11-068. The project requested in the application must appear on the district's six-year plan in order to be considered for either grant funding or debt reimbursement.

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 2c. Property insurance.** The department may not award a school construction grant to a district that does not have replacement cost property insurance. AS 14.03.150, AS 14.11.011(b)(2) and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.
- 2d. Capital improvement project.** AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request is for a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix E for an explanation of maintenance activities.
- 2e. Preventive maintenance program.** Under AS 14.11.011(b)(4), a district must have a certified preventive maintenance program to be eligible for funding. For more information contact the department.
- 2f. Insurance.** ~~The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2014 Edition annual audited district wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Fund 100 General Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11. Insured replacement value will include all district facilities reported in the department's School Facility database:~~

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

[Note: This information is used in calculating scores for question 9d. [The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide.](#)]

3. PROJECT INFORMATION:

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

3b. School facilities within scope. (30 points possible) This question requests information on the year the facility was constructed and size of each element of the facility to establish the "weighted average age of facilities" score. If a project's scope of work is limited to a portion of a building (i.e., the original or a specific addition), the age of *that building portion* will be used in the "weighted average age of facilities" point calculation. If the project's scope of 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://education.alaska.edu/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

Department data will be used for calculations, if there is an error in the database, contact the department [prior to September 1](#).

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

3d. Project description/Scope of work. Describe the scope of work of the entire project. The project description/scope of work should include: (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, [and](#) (3) a description of the scope of the project and what the project will accomplish, ~~and (4) information or detail related to the project's cost. If the construction of a new school is proposed, describe any code issues at existing facilities in the attendance area that will be relieved by the project.~~ The scope should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show how the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state.

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

It is helpful to identify the question number if you are providing detail to support another application question in the project description.

Question 2d: AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the project is a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance, routine maintenance, or custodial care. Refer to Appendix E of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

Question 3b: If the project impacts multiple facilities, the project description shall identify the facilities impacted and describe how each will be impacted. This applies to districtwide projects as well as projects adding space. For projects adding space, use this question to summarize gross square footage and student capacity of the impacted facilities.

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

Question 3f: Site description should include location, size, availability, cost, and other pertinent information as appropriate. If a site selection and evaluation report is attached, the information can be referenced with a brief summary, rather than being reproduced in this section.

[Question 3h: If project is complete or partial complete, identify which scope elements have been completed.](#)

Question 5c: If this project ~~(1)~~ will (1) 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:

- ~~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~~ DEED gross square footage for each affected facility (school) in the attendance area.

Question 6a-6d: If a facility condition survey, facility appraisal, schematic design, and/or design development documents are attached, they can be summarized and referenced, rather than reproduced in the description of project need, justification, and scope.

~~Question 7a. Cost Estimate Support: The project description shall include sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is to be incorporated into Tables 7.1 and~~

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

~~7.2 of question 7a, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. This is especially true for lump-sum elements used in the department's cost model in site work and utilities. The project description and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.~~

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

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

3e. Project Schedule. In addition to the description of the project, provide an estimated project timeline that includes, at a minimum, the estimated date for receipt of funding, estimated construction start date, and estimated construction completion date. Identify any additional project schedule milestones or special circumstances that are applicable to the project.

3f. Ineligible Energy Upgrades. Identify whether any facility in the scope of work has received an investment grade audit (IGA) in the seven years prior to the application submittal, funded through any source or mechanism, that meets the qualifications of the Alaska Housing and Finance Corporation's (AHFC) Retrofit Energy Assessment for Loans (REAL) program.

Provide the name of the individual or company that prepared the IGA and the date the IGA was completed.

Confirm that the energy efficiency measures (EEMs) with a payback of 10 years or less (unless a greater number of years is specifically stated within the REAL program guidance), as identified in the AHFC-qualified IGA, have been excluded from the scope of the application project.

3g. Some entities have organizational charters that prohibit the use of a loan program or other debt instrument similar to the Alaska Energy Efficiency Revolving Loan Fund (AEERLF) without prior authorization from local voters. Indicate whether the applicant's capital funding entity is prohibited from utilizing the AEERLF or similar program without voter approval and provide supporting documents if this is the case.

3h. Complete or partially completed project. Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. In question 3d, clearly identify which scope elements have been completed. If the construction work is partially or fully complete, attach

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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

3f3i. **Acquisition of additional land.** *Acquisition of additional land* refers to expansion of an existing school site using property immediately adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the existing school site. Land acquisition may result from long-term lease, purchase, or donation of land. *Utilization of a new school site* refers to use of a site previously acquired by the district, or a new site acquired as a result of this application and not previously utilized as a public school.

If the project site is not yet known, the site description should be the district's best estimate of specific site requirements for the project, and it should be included in the project description. The department's 2011 publication, *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook*, may be useful in responding to this question. A site selection study is required for those projects involving new sites in order to qualify for schematic design points (reference Appendix B).

4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety. (Up to 50 points) Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions being addressed by the project scope in question 3d; attach supporting documentation. 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.

Code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety-related categories:

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Code Deficiency: Deficiencies related to building code conditions where there is no threat to life safety. This includes compliance with various current building and accessibility codes.

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

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

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

The project could contain a single severe condition or multiple moderate conditions. Multiple conditions will be rated collectively, but may not necessarily rank as high as a single severe condition. For projects, such as districtwide projects, that combine critical and non-critical work, points for the critical portion of the project will be weighted proportionally. Examples of specific code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions that may be present include, but are not limited to:

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

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

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

Structural Systems: structural loads, foundations, seismic;

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

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

Projects with code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions will be assessed based on the severity of the conditions and upon the documentation provided to support the reported severity. Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, third party communications, or other records verifying the conditions. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the building or component condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

Supporting documentation elsewhere in the application can be summarized and referenced, rather than reproduced in the narrative. When citing information elsewhere in the application or application attachments, provide the specific location of the referenced information.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED:

NOTE: Gross square footage entries in this section should reflect the measurements specified by 4 AAC 31.020. Space variance requests not already approved by the department must be submitted in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020 by the application deadline in order to receive consideration with the current request. The department will not consider space variance requests during the application review process for work proposed in the application.

5a. Project grade levels. The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.

5b. District voter-approved projects. Any additional square footage that is funded for construction or approved by local voters for construction should be listed with a descriptive project name, additional GSF, grade levels to be served, and anticipated student capacity. Include these projects in any capacity/unhoused calculations provided in the year of anticipated occupancy.

5c. Other school facilities. List all schools in the attendance area that serve grade levels equivalent to those of the proposed project. If the project includes any elementary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving elementary students are to be listed. If the project includes any secondary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving secondary students are to be listed. For each school listed, include its size, the grades served, and the school's total student capacity. Use the department's "2016 Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations" MS Excel worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. A link to this form [and the "Attendance Areas" report](http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html) can be found under at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. ~~Please note that the Capacity Worksheet has been revised to reflect the 2002 regulatory changes to 4 AAC 31.020.~~

5d. Date of anticipated occupancy. The date provided here should be the anticipated date the facility will be occupied. This will be the starting point for looking at five-year post-occupancy population projections. If a project schedule is available, it should be provided to substantiate the projected date.

5e. Unhoused students. (80 points possible) All projects that are adding new space or replacing existing space must complete Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM and worksheets in the department's MS Excel workbook, "2016 Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations" found under "Space Guidelines" at <http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>. These worksheets are the tools for determining space eligibility.

Include copies of the worksheets "ADM", "Current Capacity", and "Projected Capacity" with the application. The department may adjust the submitted ADMs and allowable space as necessary for corrections.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

The points for this question are based on the following formulas:

1. **Current Unhoused Students:** If current capacity is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If current capacity is over 100%, then one point for every 3% percent over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a current capacity over 250%, the full 50 points will be awarded.
2. **Unhoused Students in Seven Years:** If capacity five years post-occupancy is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 5% over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a capacity five years post-occupancy over 250%, the full 30 points will be awarded.

5f. ADM projection method. Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 5.1. The department will compare the projections to historic growth trends for the attendance area. The department will revise population projections that exceed historical growth rates, show disparate growth between elementary and secondary populations, or are unlikely to be sustained as an attendance area's overall population grows. The application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (e.g., housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.

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

5h. Regional community facilities. (5 points possible) Statutes require an evaluation of other facilities in the area that may serve as an alternative to accomplishing the project as submitted. Information regarding the availability of such facilities and the effort (e.g. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project.

[Projects in Category F, which may not relate to providing alternate facilities for unhoused students, should describe existing community facilities \(parking, sporting, or outdoor recreation areas\) related to the project scope.](#)

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 [or providing the desired feature.](#)

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

5i. Educational Specifications. [A district planning a project to add or reconfigure space is required to develop an educational specifications document and provide it to the department for review. \[See AS 14.07.020\(11\), 4 AAC 31.010\] For projects adding or reconfiguring space, an educational specification is a required planning document in Appendix B for planning/concept design points.](#)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

5j. Project space utilization. (30 points possible) Table 5.2 Project Space Equation summarizes space utilization in the proposed project expressed in gross square feet. Space figures represented should tabulate to match the gross building square footages reported in question 3b as well as those shown in Table 7.2 of the cost estimate section. The worksheet at Appendix D lists types of school space that fit in each category. There are up to 30 points possible on the school construction list for the type of space being constructed.

6. PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN:

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

6a. Condition/Component survey. (0 to 10 points possible – refer to Rater Guidelines for scoring criteria) A *facility condition survey* is a technical survey of facilities and buildings, using the department's Guide for School Facility Condition Survey or a similar format, for the purpose of determining compliance with established building codes and standards for safety, maintenance, repair, and operation. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural and engineered systems including site assessment may be completed by an architect, engineer, or personnel with documented expertise in a building system. For project scopes that are component or system renovations, a condition survey of the component or system is acceptable.

A facility condition survey ~~is optional; however, a facility condition survey document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request.~~ is required for major rehabilitation projects to receive further planning and design points. Projects with scopes that warrant identification of in-depth examination of deteriorated systems will require a scope-specific facility or component condition survey to receive design development points beyond Phase I Planning/Concept Design. Condition surveys should be clearly identified and establish a specific date or date range when the survey occurred or was produced.

The department does not consider submittal of a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan as a condition survey for fuel tank or fuel facility projects. In addition, an energy audit, although useful and informative, will not receive condition survey points if the project's scope warrants additional facility condition survey data.

6b. Planning / Concept design. (0 or 10 points possible) *Planning* work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix B of this document. The department's Program Demand Cost Model is acceptable as a planning/concept level cost estimate. Some projects may not require the services of an architect or engineer; typically these projects are limited in scope where drawings and extensive technical specifications are not necessary in order to issue an Invitation to Bid. Provide a justification in question 6e if no consultant was selected. There are 10 points possible for completed planning work.

If design has progressed further than planning/concept design, then schematic design (35%).

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

[design development \(65%\), or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of concept design documents.](#)

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

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

[If design has progressed further than schematic design \(35%\), then design development \(65%\) or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of schematic design documents.](#)

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

[Construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of design development documents.](#)

- 6e. Planning / Design team.** The application needs to identify the district’s architectural or engineering (A/E) consultant for the Condition Survey, Planning, Schematic Design and Design Development work. If there is no consultant, the district must provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required for the project. For others besides licensed design professionals currently registered in the State of Alaska, provide the qualifications for design team members that the district accepted. For example, if one is a school board member who is also an electrician, please note both. Likewise, note a district employee with X years as a licensed roofing contractor, or a maintenance person with X years as the lead mechanical custodian for the district.

7. COST ESTIMATE

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate. In Table 7.1, all prior AS 14.11 funding for this project should be listed by category and totaled in Column I. If a grant has not been issued, but an appropriation has been made, use the appropriated amount plus participating share in lieu of the issued grant or bond amount. Column II should list the amount of funding being requested in this application, by category and in total. Column III should show a percentage breakdown for the total project allocated costs as a percentage of the total construction cost. Column IV should list the total project cost estimate from inception to completion, all phases. Calculate the percent of construction for all cost categories except Land, Site Investigation, and Seismic Hazard. To calculate the percent of construction, divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to \$500,000; 3% for project costs between \$500,000 - \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects of \$5,000,000 or greater [AS 14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than \$250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If the project exceeds the recommended percentages, add a detailed justification ~~in question 7c for each category that exceeds the specific sub-category guidelines as well as a detailed description of why the project requires more than 30% in additional percentage costs.~~

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

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

7b. Cost estimate source. Identify the source of the cost estimate. A cost estimate could be from a professional design or estimating firm, vendor quotes, actual invoices, or based on the documented costs of a similar project in the district.

7c. Cost estimate discussion and justifications. Question 7a. Cost Estimate Support: The project description shall include Provide sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is to be incorporated into Tables 7.1 and 7.2 of question 7a, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. Provide justification This is especially true for any lump-sum elements used in the department's cost model estimate, including site work and utilities. If the project exceeds a recommended percentage for a specific category or if the project is requesting more than 30% in additional percentage costs, provide a detailed justification. The project description and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.

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

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

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

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

Describe in detail the nature, impact, and immediacy of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions. At a minimum, include the following:

- the nature of the emergency,

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- 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.

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

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

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

Building

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

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

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

A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. Example: The roof leaked over a classroom causing structural damage to the walls, which restricts the use of the room until the repairs are made.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Components or Systems

A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. Example: The heating plant has completely failed leaving the building unusable to the student population and susceptible to freezing and further damage.

A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and has limited functionality. If the component fails, the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. Example: A fire alarm system has a history of components failing and given the age of the system, parts are no longer available. The system has a high probability of failing completely and district may have to vacate the building.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(1)

8b. Inadequacies of space. (40 points possible) Describe how the project will improve existing facilities to support the instructional program. The response should address how the inadequacies of the facility impact the instructional program and whether that instructional program is a mandatory, existing local, or a proposed new local program. Types of inadequacies addressed may include the quality of space, amount of space, or configuration of the space.

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

8c. Other options. (25 points possible) In an effort to support the project submitted as the best possible, districts should consider a full range of options during planning and project development.

- A cost/benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, or other evaluative processes used by the district in reaching its design solution should be included.
- A project that proposes component replacement should discuss the merits of alternative products, material options, construction methods, alternative design, or other solutions to the problem as applicable.
- A project that proposes roof replacement should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.
- If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts may consider options such as double shifting, service area boundary changes, and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes.
- Projects that propose construction of a new school should discuss other options, such as renovation of the existing building or acquisition of alternative facilities, and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary.

There are up to 25 points available for a documented comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(6), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(6)

8d. Annual operating cost savings. (30 points possible) Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. Explain and document ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. This analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis. Consider energy costs, costs related to wear-and-tear, maintenance of existing facilities costs, and costs incurred by current functional inadequacies at the facility and attendance area level. Provide benchmark values such as fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, and historical record of problems to be addressed by this project.

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

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

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

8e. Phased funding. (30 points possible) Prior state funding refers to **grant funds appropriated by the legislature to the department and administered under AS 14.11 as partial funding for this project only**. Any amounts noted here should also be included in Table 7.1 of the Cost Estimate, question 7a. No other fund sources apply, including debt retirement. There are up to 30 points available if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11, and the project was intentionally short funded by the legislature.

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

9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

District preventive maintenance and facility management. (55 points possible)

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with its application submittals a description of its preventive maintenance program, as defined by AS 14.11.011(b)(4), AS 14.14.090(10), and 4 AAC 31.013. Refer to Appendix E for details.

The scoring criteria for this area reflect efforts beyond just preventive maintenance. For each element of a qualifying plan outlined in 4 AAC 31.013, documents, including reports, narratives, and schedules, have been identified for eight separate evaluations. These documents will establish the extent to which districts have moved beyond the minimum eligibility criteria and have tools in place for the active management of all aspects of their facility management. The documents necessary for each evaluation are listed below. They are grouped according to the five areas of effort established in statute and are annotated as to the type of evaluation (i.e., evaluative or formula-driven). Refer to the Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application for additional information on scoring.

Up to 55 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

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

Maintenance Management

9a. Maintenance management narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the effectiveness of your work order based maintenance management system.

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

9b. Maintenance labor reports (Formula-Driven) (up to 15 points available)

Item A: Produce a districtwide report showing total maintenance labor hours collected on work orders by type of work (e.g., preventive, corrective, operations support, etc.) vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

Item B: Produce a districtwide report that shows a comparison of completed work orders to all work orders initiated, by month, for the previous 12 months.

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

9c. PM/corrective maintenance reports (Formula-Driven) (up to 10 points available)

Item A: Provide a districtwide report that compares scheduled (preventive) maintenance work order hours to unscheduled maintenance work order hours by month for the previous 12 months.

Item B: Provide a districtwide report with monthly trend data for unscheduled work orders showing both hours and numbers of work orders by month for the previous 12 months.

These reports support the district's ability to manage maintenance activities related to scheduled (preventive) maintenance and unscheduled work (repairs). One factor in determining the effectiveness of a preventive maintenance program is a comparison of the time and costs of scheduled maintenance in relation to the time and costs of unscheduled maintenance.

9d. 5-year average expenditure for maintenance (Formula-Driven) (5 points available)

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

The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide. [Insured value will include all district facilities reported in the department's facility database:](https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm)

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm>

No information need be submitted with the application for this question.

Energy Management

9e. Energy management narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

Address how the district is engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities. Energy *management* should address energy utilization with the goal of reducing consumption. This objective can be achieved through a number of methods: some related to the building's

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

Custodial Program

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

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

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

Maintenance Training

9g. Maintenance training narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the district's training program including, but not limited to: identification of training needs, training methods, and numbers of staff receiving building-system-specific training in the past 12 months. In addition to the narrative description, provide a copy of the district's training log for the past year. The training log should include the name of the person trained, the training received, and the date training was received. [Districts utilizing a computerized maintenance management system can track training and job shadowing activities through work orders and labor hours.](#)

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

Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)

9h. Capital planning narrative (Evaluative) (5 points available)

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

Discuss the district's process for identifying capital renewal needs. Renewal and replacement schedules can form the basis for this work, but building user input should also be considered. It is important to move the capital planning process from general data on renewal schedules to actual assessments of conditions on site. This helps to validate the process and allows the district to create capital projects that reflect actual needs. A final step

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

would be to review the systems needing replacement and to organize the work into logical projects (e.g., if a fire alarm and roof are confirmed to be in need of renewal, they may need to be placed in separate projects versus renewal of a fire alarm and lighting which could be effectively grouped in a single project).

ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

Eligibility and project description attachments. An application must include adequate documentation to verify the claims made in the application. The department may reject an application that does not have complete information or adequate documentation. See AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1). The eligibility and project description attachments checklist is provided to identify required materials and additional materials that are referenced in support of the project. The eligibility attachments are required for all projects. Projects with missing eligibility attachments will not be ranked. Check to see that your application is complete and indicate additional attachments the department should be referencing while evaluating the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- E. "Achieve an operating cost saving." This category is intended to improve the efficiency of a facility and therefore, save money. Examples that might qualify are increasing insulation, improving doors and windows, modifying boilers and heat exchange units for more energy efficiency. The project application must include an economic analysis comparing the project cost to the operating cost savings generated by the project. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.
- F. "Modify or rehabilitate facilities for purpose of improving the instructional unit." Category "F", Improve Instructional Program, was previously referred to as "Functional Upgrade." This category is limited to changes or improvements within an existing facility such as, modifications for science programs, computer installation, conversion of space for special education classes, or increase of resource areas. It also covers improvements to outdoor education and site improvements to support the educational program.
- G. "Meet an educational need not specified in (A)-(F) of this paragraph, identified by the department." Any situation not covered by (A)-(F), and mandated by the Department of Education. (Currently, there are no such mandates.)

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

The application form requires designation of the phase(s) for which the district requests funding. Below is a basic scope of effort for each phase. Items marked **Required** are mandatory (where project scope dictates) in order for projects to receive planning, schematic design and/or design development points. Required documents must be submitted by September 1st.

CONDITION/COMPONENT SURVEY (0 to 10 points possible)

PHASE I - PLANNING/CONCEPT DESIGN (0 or 10 points possible)

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (4 AAC 31.065) - **(Required if necessary to accomplish scope of project)**
2. Prepare a school facility appraisal (optional)
3. Include a condition/component survey as referenced above - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation¹)**
4. Identify need category of project - **(Required)**
5. Verify student populations and trends - **(Required for new facilities and additions to existing facilities)**
6. Complete education specifications (4 AAC 31.010) - **(Required for new facilities, additions, and major rehabilitations to existing facilities)**
7. Identify site requirements and potential sites - **(Required for new facilities)**
8. Complete concept design studies and planning cost estimate - **(Required)**

PHASE IIA - SCHEMATIC DESIGN – 35% (0 or 10 points possible)

1. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4 AAC 31.025) - **(Required for new facilities)**
2. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - **(Required for new facilities)**
3. Accomplish site survey and perform preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical) - **(Required for new facilities)**
4. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - **(Required for new facilities)**
5. Complete schematic design documents including development of approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - **(Required)**
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**
7. Accomplish a condition survey relevant to scope - **(Required if project is a major rehabilitation¹)**

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

1. Complete ~~suggested~~-required elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - **(Required)**
2. Review and confirm planning (4 AAC 31.030)
3. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - **(Required-if necessary to accomplish scope of project if project is a major rehabilitation¹)**
4. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - **(Required for new facilities)**
5. Complete design development documents, including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans - **(Required)**
6. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
7. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - **(Required)**

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

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

8. Energy consumption and cost report

PHASE III - CONSTRUCTION

1. Complete ~~suggested~~required elements of planning and design not previously completed - **(Required)**
2. Prepare final cost estimate - **(Required)**
3. Complete final contract documents and legal review of construction documents (4 AAC 31.040)
4. Advertising, bidding and contract award (4 AAC 31.080) - **(Required for contracts over \$100,000)**
5. Submit signed construction contract
6. Construct project
7. Procure furniture, fixtures, and equipment, if applicable
8. Substantial completion
9. Final completion and move-in
10. Post occupancy survey
11. Obtain project audit/close out

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Equipment/Technology includes all moveable furnishing, instructional devices or aids, electronic and mechanical equipment with associated software and peripherals (consultant services necessary to make equipment operational may also be included). It does not include installed equipment, nor consumable supplies, with the exception of the initial purchase of library books. Items purchased should meet the district definition of a fixed asset and be accounted for in an inventory control system. The Equipment/Technology budget has two benchmarks for standard funding: percentage of construction costs and per-student costs as discussed in DEED'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, 2,300 - \$3,800 per student depending on school size and type.

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

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

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

Recommended: 2-9%

Percent for Art includes the statutory allowance for art in public places. This may fund selection, design/fabrication and installation of works of art. One percent of the construction budget is required except for rural projects which require only one-half of one percent. For this category, projects are rural if they are in communities under 3,000 or are not on a year-round, publicly-maintained road system and have a construction cost differential greater than 120% of Anchorage as determined in the Cost Model for Alaskan Schools. The department recommends budgeting for art.

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

Recommended: 5% Fixed

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

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

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

Category A - Instructional or Resource

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

Category B - Support Teaching

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

Category C - General Support

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

Category D - Supplementary

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

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

Component

A part of a system in the school facility.

Component Repair or Replacement

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

Custodial Care

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

Deferred Maintenance

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

Major Maintenance

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

Preventive Maintenance

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

Renewal or Replacement

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

System(s)

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
 APPENDIX F: INFORMATION REGARDING PARTICIPATING SHARE & IN-KIND
 CONTRIBUTIONS OR REQUEST FOR FULL WAIVER
 Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
 April 23, 1999

Current law – AS 14.11.008(d) - requires that a district provide a participating share for all school construction and major maintenance projects funded under AS 14.11. The department administers all funds for capital projects appropriated to it under the guidelines of AS 14.11 and 4 AAC 31. The following points should be considered by those districts requesting a waiver of the local participating share.

1. A district has three years before and after the appropriation to fulfill the participating share requirement.

A review of the annual financial audits and school district budgets indicate that no district is in a financial condition which warrants a full waiver. Local dollars are available to fund all or a portion of the match during the six years. Districts continue to generate and budget for, local interest earnings, facility rental fees, and other forms of discretionary revenue adequate to fund some or all of the required local match. If properly documented and not already funded by AS 14.11, prior expenditures for planning, design, and other eligible costs may be sufficient to meet the match requirement.

2. Both the administration and the Legislature have strong feelings that local communities should at least be partially engaged in the funding of projects.

In recognition of the inability of some communities to levy a tax or raise large amounts of cash from other sources, the legislation provides an opportunity for in-kind contributions, in lieu of cash. All districts need to make a directed effort to provide the local match, utilize fund balances and other discretionary revenue, consider sources of in-kind contributions, document that effort, and then request a full or partial waiver, as necessary.

3. All waiver requests require sufficient documentation.

Requests should be accompanied by strong, compelling evidence as to overall financial condition of the school district and in the case of a city/borough school district, the financial condition of the city/borough as well. The attachments should include, at a minimum, cash account reconciliations, balance sheets, cash investment maturity schedules, revenue projection, cash flow analysis and projected use of all fund balances and documentation in support of attempts to meet the local match. Historical expenditures do not provide sufficient evidence of future resource allocations. Consideration should be given to new and replacement equipment purchases, travel, and other expenditures that support classroom activity, but may be delayed until the local match is funded. Each district has an opportunity to help itself and provide a safe, efficient school facility through shared responsibility.

4. Districts may request consideration of in-kind contributions of labor, materials, or equipment.

Under regulation 4 AAC 31.023(d), in-kind contributions are allowed. This also affords an opportunity for community participation through contributions to the art requirements for new buildings or other means. This option should be fully explored, as well as the documentation mentioned above, prior to requesting a waiver of all or part of the participating share.

**Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Capital Improvement Project Application
Project Eligibility Checklist**

Date _____

District _____ Project _____

Is the project eligible? Yes No

The following items are requirements for projects to be eligible for grants or bond reimbursement as required by statute or regulations. Please check YES or NO if project application is in compliance or not.

Primary Application Question(s)		Yes	No
A	All	The application is complete and all questions are fully answered – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)	
B	2a	The district’s CIP-6 year plan has been submitted – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)	
C	2b	The district has an auditable fixed asset inventory system – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)	
D	2c	Evidence of replacement cost property insurance – AS 14.11.011(b)(2)	
E	8f	If the district has requested a waiver of participating share, is the request attached? (If not applicable, leave blank) – AS 14.11.008(d)	
F	2d & 3d	Evidence that project should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance or custodial care – AS 14.11.011(b)(3)	
G	3d	Evidence that project meets the criteria of one of the A-F categories – AS 14.11.013 (a)(1)	
H	3d , 4a, & 7a	A detailed scope of work, project budget, and documentation of need – AS 14.11.011 (b)(1)	
I	3d , 7a, & 8c	The scope of work should include all information requested in the application instructions and should include life cycle cost analysis, cost benefit analysis or any other quantifiable analysis which demonstrates that the project is in the best interest of the district AND the state – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(C)	
J	5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, & 5g	For projects requesting additional space, evidence of space eligibility based on supported 2-year and 5-year-post-occupancy student population projection data – 4 AAC 31.021(c)(1)&(c)(3)	
K	3d, 4a, 5h, 8b, & 8c	Evidence that the existing facility can not adequately serve or that alternative projects are in the best interest of the state – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(B)	
L	5h & 8c	Evidence that the situation can not be relieved by adjusting service area boundaries and transportation – 4 AAC 31.021(c)(2) & AS 14.11.013(b)(6)	
M	2e & Sec. 9	DEED certification that the school district has a facility management program that complies with 4 AAC 31.013 and a description of the district’s preventive maintenance program – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)	
N	All	Adequate documentation supporting the project request – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1)	

This page is intentionally blank

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: _____	Project Title: <table border="1" style="width: 300px; height: 30px;"></table>
Fund: _____	
Rater: _____	CIP ID Number: _____ Category: _____
Date: _____	Ineligible?: _____ <input type="checkbox"/>

	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
1. Preventive maintenance (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Program		
1. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters 15 points	_____/15	_____/15
2. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters 10 points	_____/10	_____/10
3. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. 5 points	_____/5	_____/5
If % < 4, then (% x 1.25)		
If % > 4, then 5		
2. District ranking (Question 3a)	_____/30	_____/30
Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less		
3. Weighted average age of facility (Question 3b)	_____/30	_____/30
A. 0-10 years = 0 points		
B. > 10 ≤20 years = .5 / year in excess of 10 years		
C. > 20 ≤30 years = 5 + .75 per year in excess of 20 years		
D. >30≤40 years = 12.5 + 1.75 per year in excess of 30 years		
E. > 40 years = 30 points		
4. Condition/Component Survey (Question 6a)	_____/10	_____/10
Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points		
5. Planning & design phase has been completed (Question 6b-6e and Appendix B)	_____/25	_____/25
A. All required elements of planning = 10 points		
B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points		
C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points		
6. Previous AS 14.11 funding for this project (Questions 8e & 7a)	_____/30	_____/30
Previous funding = 30 points		
No previous funding = 0 points		
7. Unhoused students today (Questions 5a-5g)	_____/50	_____/N/A
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points		
8. Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy) (Questions 5a-5g)	_____/30	_____/N/A
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points		
9. Type of space added or improved (Question 5i)	_____/30	_____/N/A
A. Instructional or resource 30 points		
B. Support teaching 25 points		
C. Food service, recreational, and general support 15 points		
D. Supplemental 10 points		
Formula-Driven	Total Points	
	/265	/155

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: _____ Fund: _____ Rater: _____ Date: _____	Project Title: <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%;"></div> CIP ID Number: _____ Ineligible?: _____ <input type="checkbox"/>	Category: _____
---	---	-----------------

<i>Note: Points for elements two through eight will be weighted to apply to each specific category of a mixed-scope project.</i>	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Narrative = 5 points maximum	<u> /5</u>	<u> /5</u>
B. Energy Management Narrative = 5 points maximum	<u> /5</u>	<u> /5</u>
C. Custodial Narrative = 5 points maximum	<u> /5</u>	<u> /5</u>
D. Maintenance Training Narrative = 5 points maximum	<u> /5</u>	<u> /5</u>
E. Capital Planning Narrative = 5 points maximum	<u> /5</u>	<u> /5</u>
2. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions (Question 4a)	<u> /50</u>	<u> /50</u>
3. Reasonableness & completeness of cost or cost estimate (Question 7a)	<u> /30</u>	<u> /30</u>
4. Emergency conditions (Question 8a)	<u> /50</u>	<u> /50</u>
Did application check "yes"? <input type="checkbox"/> Did discussion support emergency status? <input type="checkbox"/>		
5. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs (Question 8b)	<u> /40</u>	<u> /5+</u>
6. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project (Question 8c)	<u> /25</u>	<u> /25</u>
7. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings (Question 8d)	<u> /30</u>	<u> /30</u>
8. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project (Question 5g)	<u> /5</u>	<u> N/A</u>
Evaluative	Total Points	/265
		/155



Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application

Introduction

The Department of Education & Early Development is charged with the task of compiling a prioritized list of projects to be used in preparing a six-year capital plan for submittal to the governor and the legislature (AS 14.11.013(a)(3)). The criteria for accomplishing the priorities are established in statute (AS 14.11.013(B)) and are awarded points based on a scoring system developed by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee under its statutorily imposed mandate (AS 14.11.014(b)(6)).

The guidelines provided here are to assure that raters are using a common set of terms and standards when awarding points for the evaluative scoring criteria.

Basis for Rating Applications

The following positions will define the base philosophy for rating applications.

Since districts are required to submit a request for a capital project no later than September 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which they are applying, no rater shall review, rank, or give feedback regarding scoring a project prior to this deadline.

Applications will be ranked based on the information submitted with the application, or applicants may use information submitted to the department in support of a project, provided the submission occurs on or before September 1 and is identified as an attachment to an application. Each rater shall arrive at the initial ranking of each project independently. Raters will be expected to go through each application question by question. They will also review all attachments for content, completeness, and bearing on each scoring element. Consistency in scores from year-to-year shall be considered. It is expected that projects will demonstrate different levels of completeness in descriptions and detail depending on the stage of project development.

Projects are prioritized in two lists, the School Construction List and the Major Maintenance List, and reflect the two statutory funds established for education capital projects. Under the definitions provided in statute and regulation, projects which add space to a facility are classed as School Construction projects and must fall in categories A, B, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (categories C, D, and E) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure, Code Compliance, or Achieve an Operating Cost Savings, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components, should be considered as maintenance projects.

Each rater should have an eligibility checklist available during rating. Eligibility items A, F, G, I, J, L, and N will be evaluated by each rater. Other eligibility items will be the responsibility of support team members doing data input and capacity/allowable calculations. Discussion regarding project eligibility should be brought to the attention of the rating team as soon as it becomes an issue in one person's mind.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Evaluative Rating Guidelines

For each of the evaluative rating categories, raters will consider the factors listed when evaluating and scoring applications. The list is not exclusive, nor exhaustive. As raters read and evaluate projects, review of the listed elements is to be done for referential purposes. Raters should also refer to the Application Instructions for each question.

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

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

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

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

Points possible: 50)

- Points will be assigned for code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions when the application documents the deficiency, the need for correction, and how the project corrects the deficiency. Incremental points may be provided for severity, the nature of the item, and effect on the school facility.
- Consider how information provided on the type and nature of code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions relates to definitions provided in Appendix A of the application instructions.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- A project can address a single condition or multiple conditions. Evaluate the severity of each condition. A single condition where the severity and criticalness of the issue is evident may receive more points than a combination of conditions.
- Based on severity and criticalness, individual conditions in a project will be evaluated and the rating will reflect each condition’s portion of the project scope. When a combination of code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions create a situation where utilization of the facility is significantly impacted, the project may be awarded higher points.
- For code issues, higher consideration will be given for immediate code upgrades, as compared to upgrades necessary due to other repairs and replacements or updates to older buildings to meet current codes.
- Does the project scope combine severe and non-severe or critical and non-critical conditions? Inclusion of unrelated non-severe or non-critical conditions in a project may reduce the score of the project.
- The highest level of points is rare but is reserved to address a situation where the severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions are to the point that the project takes a higher position over other projects. Those rare projects that demonstrate situations with building failure may reach the highest category of need and points.
- Simply identifying a condition in the application will not necessarily generate points. A well-described and documented condition that provides for full evaluation and point awards will include specificity, with attached documentation to support the narrative.
- Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the failure or imminent failure of the building with evidence that the student population will be vacated. Projects at this level will likely have an emergency situation that will be addressed in the emergency question. (35 to 50 points)
- Per 4 AAC 31.022(c)(8), scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted.

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

Deficiencies related to building code where there is no threat to life safety. These issues include compliance with various current building and accessibility codes. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the type and nature of the building and accessibility code deficiencies. The documentation supports the condition and severity of the violation.	0 to 35 points
Deficiencies in the protection of the structure that, when left unrepaired, will lead to new or continued damage to the existing structure, building systems, and finishes resulting in a shortened life of the facility. The narrative is supported by documentation that details the type and nature of the deficiencies in the protection of the structure. The documentation supports the condition and severity of the deficiencies.	0 to 35 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there documentation with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Consider the effort/results in identifying alternative facilities and the rationale behind the viability of the alternative facility.
- Were judgments about the viability of alternate facilities made with “institutional knowledge”, professional assessment, third party objectivity, and/or economic analysis?
- Are facilities listed in a narrative discussion or are they documented with supplemental data such as photos, maps, facility profile, etc.?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

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

A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc. The narrative discussion is documented with photos, maps, facility profiles, etc.	5 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc.	4 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided.	3 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified.	2 points
A community inventory is provided.	1 point
Question has not been answered	0 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Cost estimate for total project cost (Application Question 7a; Points possible: 0-30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- Primary evaluation should test both the “reasonableness” and the “completeness” of the cost estimate (i.e., How well can this estimate be used to advocate for this project?).
- Check for double entries, including factored items, cost after adjustment for geographic factor, and percentages and justification (with backup) when percentages exceed EED guidelines.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate including lump sum or actual construction costs.
- Rating considers the full range of estimates: from conceptual to detail design to actual construction costs. It should be noted that because this scoring element covers the full range of estimate possibilities, it is anticipated that conceptual estimates score less than more detailed construction estimates and actual construction cost documentation.

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

The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on construction document level cost estimate, bid tabulations, or actual invoices.	27-30 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 65% design development level specifications and drawings.	23-26 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 35% schematic design level documents.	18-22 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on concept design level documents. The DEED demand cost model is acceptable as a planning/concept level cost estimate.	12-17 points
The cost estimate is not adequately developed to support concept level costs. Components may not be present to confirm scope of work, reasonableness and completeness or other elements. Project may be at an early preliminary stage.	6-11 points
Construction costs are not supported or many cost elements are missing.	1-5 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

Emergency conditions (Application Question 8a; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency, points will not be awarded.
- Consider the "level of threat" to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider the "impact" on the use of the facility due to the emergency condition.
- Consider the "immediacy" of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the level of description and documentation provided.
- Consider whether the description provided is congruent with other application elements.
- Does the project scope include non-emergency conditions? Scoring of mixed-scope projects, which address both emergency and non-emergency conditions, should be weighted based on the amount of emergency work that is included in the project.

Points will be assigned in increments according to the level of threat using the following suggested guidelines. High threat emergency projects with high emergency points are infrequent.

Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the loss of the building, and that the students are currently unhoused.	50 points
Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	25-45 points
Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation from the local or state official providing the date when the repairs need to be completed. The documentation addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	5-25 points
A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy for the emergency, the circumstances surrounding the damaged portion of the building, and the portion of the building that is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

<p>A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the failure, and that the students are currently unhoused.</p>	<p>25-45 points</p>
<p>A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and has limited functionality. If the component fails the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the high probability of the failure and documents the requirement to restrict use of the building until corrected.</p>	<p>5-25 points</p>

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

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

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

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

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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

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

Were the options considered viable alternatives? The options are fully described viable options that are supported by a life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefits analysis that compare the cost of the options; an explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	21-25 points
The options are fully described viable options that include cost comparisons between options. An explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option; however, no life cycle cost analysis is included. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	11-20 points
A description is included for each option; however, the options are not supported with additional documentation or cost analysis. The options contain the proposed project and at least one other viable option.	1-10 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

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

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

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

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

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

Maintenance Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)

- Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine?
- How well does the program work for each individual school?
- Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil?
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?

Energy Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)

- Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities?
- Is a comprehensive set of methods being used?

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?

Custodial Narrative (Points possible: 5)

- Is the district's custodial program complete?
- Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice?
- Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?

Maintenance Training Narrative (Points possible: 5)

- Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff?
- Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems?
- Are training schedules attached?
- How is Training Recorded?
- How is effectiveness measured?

Capital Planning Narrative (Points possible: 5)

- Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs?
- Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?
- Does the system involve building occupants and users?
- Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?
- Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?

FY - _____ Capital Budget
Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan

District: _____ Date: _____ Page _____ of _____ Pages

District Priority	Project Location and Description	Primary Purpose	Year for which funding is being requested						Estimated Cost
			FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	
1									\$ -
2									\$ -
3									\$ -
4									\$ -
5									\$ -
6									\$ -

I hereby certify that the information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed _____ Date _____
Superintendent

Submit with CIP Application

Form #05-96-006

This page is intentionally blank

Instructions and Guidelines for Completing the Six-Year Plan

A six-year plan is a vital document for districts in planning and anticipating necessary capital improvement projects. A capital improvement project is a substantial, non-recurring expenditure for a physical improvement with a long useful life. Capital projects are not part of the district's preventive maintenance or custodial care programs.

Projects may be derived from reviewing renewal and replacement schedules or population projections, needs identified by school personnel or professional architect or engineer through a condition survey, or recommendations from an energy audit, etc.

Minimum project cost for consideration in the DEED CIP grant process is \$25,000.

The district is encouraged to use and submit this form for all capital projects, regardless of whether the project will be submitted for grant funding consideration.

To complete the "6-Year Plan Template", fill in the information identified below:

- Row 1 Enter school district name
- Row 3 In cell F3, enter the fiscal year being planned (e.g. in May 2018, a district is planning requests for the FY2020 capital budget). This is automatically fill in the six fiscal years in columns D - I.
- Column A "District Priority" List the district priority for each project.
- Column B "Project Title" Provide a short but descriptive project title that includes the facility name, major project scope, and town/village (if a borough or REAA serving multiple communities).
- Column B Below the project title, with a few sentences, provide a summary explanation of the scope of work the project will accomplish.
- Column C "Primary Purpose" As provided in AS 14.11.013, identify the primary purpose of the project:
 - A -- avert imminent danger or correct life-threatening situations
 - B -- house students who would otherwise be unhoused
 - C -- protect the structure of existing school facilities
 - 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
 - E -- achieve an operating cost savings
 - F -- modify or rehabilitate facilities for the purpose of improving the instructional program (includes outdoor facilities and site improvements)
- Column D-I "Year and Amount for Project Funding" In the appropriate anticipated funding year(s), enter the amount of funds estimated to accomplish the project. Projects may be planned in phases, where funding is provided in multiple years (e.g. design then construction; facility addition then renovation; etc.). The "Total Project Estimated Cost" will automatically sum the project cost for all years.
- Rows 7 - 28 If additional priority lines are required to fully complete the six-year district-wide plan, copy a pair of lines and insert the copied cells within the table. A multi-page plan is acceptable.

DRAFT

Row 30 Fill in the date and title of the school district board meeting where the capital improvement plan was approved.

Row 33 Have the superintendent and school board president or authorized person sign and date the document.

If submitting for AS 14.11 funding, submit two (2) copies with the application packet, regardless of the number of applications submitted.

Contact DEED Facilities section staff with any questions on completing this form.
<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/>

DRAFT

School District

Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan

Capital Budget : FY 2019

District Priority	Project Title	Primary Purpose	Year and Amount for Project Funding				Estimated Total Project Cost		
			FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022		FY 2023	FY 2024
1	Sample High School Flooring Replacement Replaces carpet and vinyl flooring and base throughout, includes repairs to sub-floor.	C	745,000						\$ 745,000
2	Model Middle School Window and Door Replacement Replaces and upgrades exterior windows and doors, including addition of security card readers.	C	1,200,000						\$ 1,200,000
3	Example Elementary School Renovation/ Addition, Somewhere Provides phased design and construction for renovating major systems and reconfiguring space at existing facility and constructing an addition for projected unhoused students.	B		1,600,000	17,680,000				\$ 19,280,000
4									\$ -
5									\$ -
6									\$ -
7									\$ -
8									\$ -
9									\$ -
10									\$ -
11									\$ -

Adopted [enter date] at a duly convened meeting of the [enter school district board name] at which a quorum was present and voting. I hereby certify that the information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Superintendent

Date

School Board President

Date

School District

Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan

Capital Budget : FY

District Priority	Project Title	Primary Purpose	Year and Amount for Project Funding				Estimated Total Project Cost
1							\$ -
2							\$ -
3							\$ -
4							\$ -
5							\$ -
6							\$ -
7							\$ -
8							\$ -
9							\$ -
10							\$ -
11							\$ -

Adopted [enter date] at a duly convened meeting of the [enter school district board name] at which a quorum was present and voting. I hereby certify that the information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Superintendent

Date

School Board President

Date

Allowable Gross Square Footage



District:	Chatham
School:	Gustavus School
Project Number:	19-xxx
School Type:	K-12

Projected ADM (K-6):	69.26 * #
Projected ADM (7-12):	50.70 * #
Existing DEED designated GSF	18,062 SF ^
Existing GSF To Remain:	18,062 SF
Additional GSF Requested:	
Total GSF Proposed:	18,062 SF
Eligible Base GSF:	16,261 SF
Eligible Supplemental GSF:	14,423 SF
Total GSF Eligible:	30,684 SF
Additional GSF Allowable:	12,622 SF
Additional GSF Reduction:	No Reduction
4 AAC 31.020(e)(2) Additional GSF Allowances	
Allowance for Covered Exterior Areas:	4,603 SF
Allowance for Water/Sewer Storage & Treatment:	1,534 SF

* - Projected ADM is calculated based on an average of the department's and district's ADM projections, except where the difference in the average percent change in ADM between the district and department is less than 0.5%, in which case the district's ADM projection is used.

- In a case of declining enrollment shown by a district, districts' projections may be used to calculate GSF Eligible. In such cases, this spreadsheet is only one tool that will be utilized to determine the GSF Eligible.

^ - the existing square footage entered into cell I15 must include the square footage for all facilities in the attendance area in the student category identified under School Type (Cell H7). For districts with more than one High School in an attendance area, the total square footage for all schools in the School Type must be included. For additional information contact DEED staff.

This page is intentionally blank



Capital Project Administration Handbook

AUTHOR [Tim Mearig](#)
[Facilities Manager](#)
[Alaska Department of Education & Early Development](#)
[Juneau, Alaska](#)

CONTRIBUTORS ~~Sam Kito III, P.E.~~ [Facilities Staff](#)
~~Facilities Engineer~~
[Alaska](#) Department of Education & Early Development
[Juneau, Alaska](#)

~~Kimberly Andrews~~
~~Architect Assistant~~
~~Department of Education and Early Development~~

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee members who reviewed the publication in its final form [and to those in the Department of Education & Early Development who were responsible for the predecessors to this document.](#)

This publication may not be reproduced for sale by individuals or entities other than the:

State of Alaska
Department of Education & Early Development
Juneau, Alaska

Table of Contents

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	2
SCHOOL CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING	4
Grant Projects.....	4
Debt Projects.....	4
Payment Milestones	5
Demonstration of Participating Share.....	6 ⁵
PROJECT AGREEMENT	7
SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS	10
Appendix B: Payment Schedule	10
Payment #1: Financial Structure (In-House Letter).....	10
Payment #2: Participating Share.....	10
Payment #3: Pre-Design Submittals	11
Payment #4: Schematic Design Submittal	11
Payment #5: Design Development Submittal	12
Payment #6: Construction Document Submittal	12
Payment #7: Contract Award Submittals.....	13
Payment #8: Certification of 50% Completion.....	13
Payment #9: Substantial Completion Submittal	13
Payment #10: Final Audit/Project Closeout	14
Appendix: Submittal Requirements.....	15
ALTERNATIVE PROJECT DELIVERY	25
ADDITIONAL WORK.....	26 ²⁵
Managing Changes in Scope.....	26 ²⁵
Contracting for Changes in Scope	28 ²⁷
IN-HOUSE SERVICES	29
PROJECT CLOSEOUT	30
CONCLUSION.....	31

Introduction

Overview

Alaska statutes provide for state aid—through debt reimbursement and grants—for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of schools and education-related facilities. While the state maintains the resources to responsibly execute such projects when awarded or approved, statutes provide for this responsibility to be transferred to local governments or regional school boards. Statutes require that an agreement be used to document the transfer and authorize the department to adopt regulations establishing the requirements for the agreement.

This document was developed to assist ~~school district representatives~~ the parties who are, or will be responsible for the ~~oversight~~ execution of capital improvement projects ~~which~~ that include state aid through the ~~of State of~~ Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED). Entities eligible to assume this responsibility include school districts, and municipal governments with education oversight.

~~funded school construction or major maintenance projects under AS 14.11.~~

~~This~~ The goal of this handbook is ~~intended~~ to provide ~~a brief~~ an outline of the department’s requirements for capital improvement project administration and to ensure that the implementation of the project is in compliance with school construction statutes and the regulations which implement them. From the initiation of the ~~Project~~ project Agreement ~~agreement~~ to the final execution of the termination agreement, the DEED Facilities Section is also available to assist the ~~district recipient in execute~~ executing their capital improvement project in an efficient and timely manner, ~~and to ensure that the implementation of the project meets the provisions of Alaska Statute and Regulations.~~ The handbook provides direction in three major areas: project initiation through the project agreement, submittal requirements, and project closeout. It also touches on the related issues of procurement and project delivery.

~~Entities eligible to receive funding for school construction and major maintenance include school district, and municipal governments with school oversight.~~ In this document, the term “department” will be used to identify the ~~State of~~ Alaska Department of Education and Early Development. Other State of Alaska ~~Departments~~ departments identified in this handbook will be referred to by their appropriate departmental designations.

Lastly, ~~t~~ This handbook provides information on the administration ~~of department funding of capital projects from the focused perspective of the department’s statutes and regulations.~~ For, ~~for~~ a more ~~detailed~~ general overview of construction management concepts and procedures, the Construction Management Association of America publishes a document entitled *An Owners Guide to Construction Management*, which is available on the internet at:

<http://cmaanet.org/sites/default/files/files/Owners%20Guide%20Ver%209-2011.pdf> ~~http://cmaanet.org/user_images/owners_guide.pdf.~~

Introduction

Authority

AS 14.11.17(a)

(a) The department shall require in the **grant agreement** that a municipality that is a school district or a regional educational attendance area . . .

AS 14.11.020(a)

(a) The assembly or council of a municipality that is a school district or a regional school board may, by resolution or majority vote of the body, assume the responsibilities relating to the planning, design, and construction of a school or an education-related facility located within the boundaries or operating area of the municipality or regional educational attendance area. After receipt of a request by an assembly or council under this subsection, the department shall provide for the assumption of the responsibilities requested. After receipt of a request by a regional school board under this subsection, the department may provide for the assumption of the responsibilities requested.

AS 14.11.020(d)

(d) The commissioner shall adopt necessary regulations implementing this section, and setting out the requirements for agreements between the department and a municipality or regional educational attendance area relating to the assumption by the municipality or regional educational attendance area of responsibilities for the planning, design, and construction of a project.

4 AAC 31.23(c)

(c) The department will, before the disbursement of grant or allocations of other financial assistance money to a school district, require the execution of a grant or other financial assistance agreement, on a form prescribed by the commissioner, that contains the following conditions:

(1) the project will be constructed and equipped under the requirements of 4 AAC 31.020(a), within the project budget determined under 4 AAC 31.022(e);

(2) money will be disbursed as the parties agree to allow the accomplishment of stages in the project, such as site acquisition; design and construction; and to reimburse the district for money actually and necessarily spent, before the award of the grant or allocation of other financial assistance,

(A) for planning costs, design costs, and construction costs incurred not more than 36 months before the submission of the grant application; and

(B) site acquisition costs incurred not more than 120 months before the grant or other financial assistance application for which the department has given its approval under 4 AAC 31.025;

(3) the district's performance under the grant or other financial assistance is subject to financial audit at any time; the cost of an audit required by the state is an allowable cost of school construction;

(4) the site for the school facility is approved under 4 AAC 31.025;

(5) designers of the facility shall be selected under 4 AAC 31.065; and

(6) construction shall be performed by contracts awarded under 4 AAC 31.080.

~~Differences Between Grant and Debt Projects~~ School Capital Project Funding

Background

The Department of Education and Early Development administers state aid for school capital projects under two basic school construction programs, with two funding options mechanisms, grants and debt reimbursement. Either of these mechanisms may be used to fund projects in two categories, school construction and major maintenance. The ~~School-school Construction construction Program-program~~ is designed for construction of new facilities, rehabilitation of facilities to improve instructional programs, or for adding square-footage to existing school facilities. The ~~Major-major Maintenance maintenance Program-program~~ is designed for maintenance, repair, and ~~reconstruction-rehabilitation~~ of existing school facilities. The minimum project amount for a grant is \$25,000,¹ and for debt under the current program, the minimum project amount is \$200,000.²

Grant Projects

The grant program is available to all school districts in Alaska, and consists of an annual application and ~~scoring-prioritization~~ process. Districts applying for grant funding need to submit applications to the department by the beginning of September of each year. Applications are then reviewed for eligibility and ~~then scored-ranked~~ by department staff, ~~and a preliminaryInitial~~ priority lists ~~is-are~~ transmitted to the Governor and made available to the public at the beginning of November. Districts have the opportunity to ask for reconsideration of ~~their score~~ the department's determination once the ~~preliminary-initial~~ priority lists ~~is-are~~ published, and, ~~if not satisfied, may continuing up to December 15~~ continue an appeal to the State Board of Education & Early Development. The department publishes ~~the final~~ priority lists by early February after appeals are settled. The timing of the grant program is designed to allow the legislature adequate time to consider the project priority lists (one for school construction and one for major maintenance) as they deliberate the budget for the following fiscal year.

For more information on the grant application process, please visit the department website at:

~~<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>~~ <https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html>

Debt Projects

The debt program is available to districts in municipalities or boroughs with the ability to sell bonds for-to finance local public works projects. Districts applying for state aid through the debt reimbursement program, do so on the same application form as the grant program, ~~however~~ However,

¹ Threshold established by the Department of Education and Early Development.

² AS 14.11.100(a)

~~Differences Between Grant and Debt Projects~~ School Capital Project Funding

~~a~~ debt applications ~~can be submitted at anytime~~ do not have a prescribed annual cycle. Instead, a variety of factors including legislative allocations and local election cycles establish opportunity for debt reimbursement funding. Over the history of debt reimbursement funding, there have been periods of time where allocations of debt for school projects were unrestricted, periods when limits on the allocations were made based on timeframes and district size, and periods, such as from 2015 – 2020 when the debt program was closed. Once the department receives and approves an application for debt reimbursement, the Recipient's next step is to provide the department with verification of a successful ballot initiative authorizing the sale of bonds for the project. ~~bond election in the form of e~~ Certified election results and a copy of the bond ballot language are adequate to serve this purpose.

~~The~~ A primary difference between grant and debt projects lies in their source of funding. Under AS14.011, Grant project funding for grant projects is to be appropriated by the legislature into the School Construction Grant Fund or Major Maintenance ~~fund~~ Grant Fund and is to be used to fund projects from ~~for specifically designated projects~~. ~~The projects are identified under~~ the department's priority lists that ~~is~~ are ~~redeveloped~~ prepared annually each year based on the submitted grant applications. The funds are part of the state's capital budget. Funds for d Debt projects are 100% local. All project funding for debt projects is locally available at the time the municipality sells the bonds and receives the proceeds. ~~authorized through the debt program that generally identifies a period of eligibility~~. Funding State funding for the debt program is ~~allocated~~ appropriated by the legislature in each year's operating budget and is allocated to each municipality based on ~~a~~ municipalitie's sits anticipated ~~bond expenditures~~ debt service payments for the subsequent fiscal year.³

Payment Milestones

Another major difference between grant and debt projects is in the processing of payments. Payments under the grant program are based on completion of certain milestones that are evidenced in the form of submittals to the department. Each submittal or series of submittals provides the department with verification on the progress of the project. Once the department confirms the adequacy of a submittal, a payment to the Recipient is processed. Additional description of the standard payment milestones are included as part of this handbook.

Payment for debt projects is based on an annual submittal from the Recipient that provides a projection of the expected municipal obligations for bond repayment. These reports are due to the department by October 15th of each year.⁴ For debt projects, payment to a municipality is not tied to the project submittals, ~~;~~ however, a Recipient is still required by law to provide the department with submittals as described in this handbook.

³ AS 14.11.100(a)

⁴ AS 14.11.102

~~Differences Between Grant and Debt Projects~~ School Capital Project Funding

Demonstration of Participating Share

In addition to complying with submittal requirements, Recipients of grant funding are required to provide a participating share in order to secure the state aid. The participating share amount for municipal districts varies between 5% and 35% in five stepped increments. The percentage is indexed to a ratio of taxable property valuations and district enrollments. All regional educational attendance areas—those in unincorporated areas of the state—have a 2% participating share. As a result of the participating share requirement, all grant projects have funds from at least two sources, state and local. ~~will also need to provide evidence of participating share⁵ A demonstration of participating share provides proof to the department that a district has a commitment to the success of the project.~~

–Participating share requirements are discussed further under the payment section of this handbook.

Similar to the participating share requirement for grant projects, debt projects also have a shared funding structure between the state and the local entity. The debt reimbursement mechanism establishes a percentage for each debt project at which the municipality’s scheduled debt service payment will be reimbursed. The percentage of reimbursement offered by the state has varied over time from 90% to 60%, depending on project type, and could decline even further if reinstated after 2020.

⁵ AS 14.11.008

Project Agreement

All capital improvement projects, whether funded the grant program or through the debt reimbursement program, begin with the execution of a Project Agreement between DEED, and the school district, or municipality that is receiving the financial aid. In the Project Agreement, the entity receiving the state aid is referred to as the Recipient; this term will be used for the remainder of this handbook. The Project Agreement transfers the responsibility for execution of the project from the DEED to the Recipient. The Project Agreement also establishes the terms and conditions by which the capital improvement project is to be executed. Requirements in the Project Agreement come from state statute, regulation, and state-adopted building codes. Other requirements come from adopted policies and guidelines produced by the department.

Soon after budget approval for a capital improvement project grant award, or receipt of voter approval documentation for debt reimbursement projects, a Recipient will receive a draft Project Agreement. The draft Project Agreement contains two parts: the standardized body of the agreement and either four or five appendices (for debt or grant projects respectively).

The body of the agreement identifies the name of the project, the DEED project number, and the Recipient entity. **All correspondence with the department regarding a project needs to include the DEED project number.** The first page of the Project Agreement body also defines two important pieces of information: the effective date of the agreement, and the name of the Recipient's project coordinator. For grant projects, the effective date of the agreement establishes the beginning of the three year period in which the Recipient is required to provide evidence of the district's participating share in accordance with AS 14.11.008(a)(2). Participating share requirements will be discussed in greater detail later in this handbook. The project coordinator is the individual working for the Recipient entity that will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the capital improvement project. The project coordinator does not have to be the same individual who signs the Project Agreement for the Recipient.

The body of the agreement incorporates the appendices by reference, and defines a number of standard contract clauses or provisions governing the transfer of responsibility between the two parties. The contract provisions are an integral part of the agreement, and modification is not generally considered. The standard provisions identify procedural requirements for the Recipient, cite statute, regulation and guidelines applicable to the project, and clarify important terms for the implementation of the Project Agreement. It is important for the Recipient to read and understand the Project Agreement in its entirety. Department staff is available to help explain the importance of language in the Project Agreement.

The final page of the main Project Agreement contains the signature line. The signatory individual does not need to be the project coordinator, but the agreement does need to be signed by an individual with the authority to accept the terms and conditions of the agreement on behalf of the Recipient.

The remainder of the Project Agreement consists of appendices that provide supporting information important for the implementation of the Project Agreement.

Project Agreement

Appendix A consists of four parts, and serves a similar purpose for both grant and debt reimbursement projects. It defines the project's scope of work and establishes the project budget by which the work will be executed and accounted. Appendix A is the most important part of the Project Agreement for the Recipient to review because this is one of the few parts of the Project Agreement that is flexible and can be modified.

The first section of Appendix A contains the scope of work. The scope of work specifically defines the project's eligibility for the construction of new space, and provides a brief description of the work to be accomplished by the project. For debt reimbursement projects, the scope also identifies the appropriate debt reimbursement rate. The Recipient should review this part of the Project Agreement carefully to verify that the department's description of the project matches the Recipient's understanding of the work to be completed.

The next section of Appendix A contains special provisions that apply to the project. This section is utilized to specify special or unique circumstances, conditions, or limitations relating to the project. Generally, this section contains standard language regarding the relationship between the municipality and the school district according to AS 14.14.060 for boroughs and AS 14.14.065 for cities. This relationship is clearly defined in statute and will not be covered in this handbook.

The third section of Appendix A details the project budget and funding available for the project. This section contains the name of the project and the source of funding. Total funding is identified by funding source. Some projects may be funded from a combination of state, local, or federal funds with state funding in the form of capital grants or debt reimbursement.

The final section of Appendix A provides a breakdown of the total project budget into nine categories. The budget categories provide the department with a method of accounting for various project costs. Descriptions of the budget categories are included in Appendix E of the grant Project Agreement and Appendix D of the debt reimbursement Project Agreement. Construction Management by Consultant is limited by AS 14.11.020(c)⁶.

Appendix B of the Project Agreement varies for debt reimbursement and grant projects. Appendix B defines the payment schedule and associated submittal items for grant projects. Debt projects do not have a payment schedule but rather are paid on an annual basis, so the remainder of this paragraph only applies to grant projects. Appendix B identifies the required project submittals and payment amounts by percentage of total grant funds, for each progress payment. The Recipient should carefully review the payment schedule to ensure that the schedule [and specific submittals are](#) ~~is~~ applicable to the proposed project.

Appendix C of the grant Project Agreement and Appendix B of the debt reimbursement agreement contain the applicable statutes, codes, regulations, standards, and guidelines that govern the implementation of the project. Some of the governing provisions are federal requirements, others

⁶ 4% for projects less than \$500,000; 3% for projects over \$500,000, but less than \$5,000,000; and 2% for projects over \$5,000,000

Project Agreement

are state requirements, and others are department requirements. Not all of the provisions apply to every project.

Appendix D of the grant Project Agreement and Appendix C of the debt reimbursement agreement are also identical and identify the submittal requirements and required approvals for the project. The requirements identified in this appendix duplicate the submittal requirements identified in the Appendix B Payment Schedule for grant projects. Again, not all submittal items are required for every project. For instance, a Site Selection Report is not required for a roof replacement project. The Recipient should review the required submittal items and discuss any questions or issues regarding the required items with the department prior to signing the Project Agreement.

Appendix E of the grant Project Agreement and Appendix D of the debt reimbursement agreement are also identical. This appendix provides definitions for the nine budget categories itemized in the Appendix A budget and also provides financial coding to be used when accounting for expenditures in a particular budget category. This standard appendix is included with the Project Agreement to facilitate proper categorization and accounting of the project costs. The definitions provided will help the Recipient when reviewing the proposed budget for the project.

The reading and understanding of the Project Agreement used to transfer responsibility for the execution of the project from the department to the Recipient is a very important step in understanding the Recipient's relationship with the department. If a Recipient does not fully understand the department's expectations and requirements, administration of the project will be more difficult.

Submittal Requirements

The submittals for grant and debt reimbursement projects provide the department with information the department uses to verify [both](#) project progress [and conformance with the scope identified in Appendix A](#). A listing of the submittals can be found in Appendix C of the debt reimbursement Project Agreement and Appendix D of the grant Project Agreement.

In the case of grant projects, the submittals and payments are integrated. The following section provides a discussion of the requirements for grant project payment submittals.

Appendix B-submittals: Payment Schedule

(Payment approval milestones for grant projects.)

In the grant Project Agreement, Appendix B contains the payment schedule the department uses for approval of payment requests. Throughout the life of most projects, there are ten milestones, each of which is more fully described below. The payment milestones provide the department with a means for tracking progress on the project. The payment schedule is structured so that the Recipient is able to receive up to 50% of the available funding prior to award of the construction contract. This allows the district to keep the project moving forward throughout the payment review process.

Payment #1: Financial Structure (In-House Letter)

The requirements for processing of payment #1 include submittal of a completed, signed Project Agreement, and DEED approval of the district's financial structure. The financial structure detail will vary from district to district, but must comply with DEED's reporting structure. This information helps the department [ensure](#) at the outset of a project, that the financial reporting done by the district is in accordance with the budget categories established in the project agreement.

This is the time that a district should be preparing an in-house letter for the department's approval if the district intends on completing any of the work with in-house forces. A sample in-house letter is available from the department, and department staff is available to work with a district in preparing the letter. The sample letter provides an example of the items that need to be covered when making such a request; [however](#), all portions of the letter may not need to be completed for all projects.

Payment #1 submittals qualify for release of 5% of the project funding.

Payment #2: Participating Share

Each district is required by law to provide evidence of participation in the project. A district's participating share "...may be satisfied by money from federal, local, or other sources, or with locally contributed labor, material, or equipment".⁷ A district's participating share is based on

⁷ AS 14.11.008(c)

Submittal Requirements

percentages codified in statute.⁸ A district has three years from the initiation of the project agreement to satisfy the participating share requirement.

The submittal can take the form of a resolution that directs a commitment of funding for the project in an appropriate amount, or in the form of a letter identifying appropriate in-kind contributions that a district or borough will be directing towards the project.

If a district plans on using an in-kind contribution of land, the land needs to be provided as a budget item in the project application and in the project agreement. If a district plans on using other local contributions, such as labor or equipment, the department needs to be notified within 30 days of signature of the project agreement.⁹

Payment #2 submittals qualify for release of 5% of the project funding.

Payment #3: Pre-Design Submittals ~~{10%}~~

Payment #3 combines receipt of submittals # 2, 3, and 4 as listed in Appendix D of the grant agreement. These submittals are more fully described in the next section of this document, but are listed here for reference.

- 2) Site Selection Report
- 3) Educational Specifications
- 4) A/E Services Agreement

In order to qualify for Payment #3, the department needs to receive copies of the documents mentioned above. In some instances, a project may not require Educational Specifications or Site Selection report, but a project will generally always have some type of A/E services agreement.

In the case of a district completing work in-house, where none of the above-referenced documents are available to be submitted, the department will work individually with the district to determine the most appropriate submittals for pre-design work on a project.

Submittals for payment #3 show the department that the Recipient has made the necessary arrangements to begin a school construction project.

Payment #3 submittals qualify for release of 10% of the project funding.

Payment #4: Schematic Design Submittal ~~{10%}~~

The submittals for Payment #4 are the Schematic Design Documents, which are sometimes referred to as the 35% documents. This item is listed as submittal #5 in Appendix D of the

⁸ AS 14.11.008(b)

⁹ 4 AAC 31.023(d)

Submittal Requirements

grant agreement. For more information on the schematic design submittal, please see the discussion in the next section of this document.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, Payment #4 submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

[Provide an Energy Consumption and Cost Report in accordance with AS 14.07.020\(a\)\(11\) and as further described under submittal #7 in the next section of this document.](#)

Payment #4 submittals qualify for release of 10% of the project funding.

Payment #5: Design Development Submittal [10%]

The submittals for Payment #5 are the Design Development Documents, which are sometimes referred to as the 65% documents. This submittal is listed as submittal #6 in Appendix D of the grant agreement. For more information on the design development submittal, please see the discussion in the next section of this document.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, Payment #5 submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

In the case of a new school in a Regional Education Attendance Area, the Recipient will need to provide evidence to the department that adequate site control exists for the project. Adequate site control is demonstrated in the form of a long-term lease, or document showing adequate title interest in the property on which the project will be constructed.

[Provide an Energy Consumption and Cost Report in accordance with AS 14.07.020\(a\)\(11\) and as further described under submittal #7 in the next section of this document. Submittal of this report under Payment #5 is only necessary if the report was not submitted under Payment #4.](#)

Payment #5 submittals qualify for release of 10% of the project funding.

Payment #6: Construction Document Submittal [15%]

The submittals for Payment #6 are the Construction and Bid Documents, which are sometimes referred to as the 95% documents. These submittals are listed as submittals #7-8 and #8-9 in Appendix D of the grant agreement. For more information on the construction and bid document submittal, please see the discussion in the next section of this document.

Submittal Requirements

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, Payment #6 submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

Payment #6 submittals qualify for release of 15% of the project funding.

Payment #7: Contract Award Submittals ~~[10%]~~

Payment #7 submittals include the following documents:

- 10) Building Permit
- 11) Bid Tabulation
- 12) Construction Contract
- 13) Contractors Payment/Performance Bond

This series of documents shows the department that construction start is imminent. In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, Payment #7 submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

Payment #7 submittals qualify for release of 10% of the project funding.

Payment #8: Certification of 50% Completion ~~certification [20%]~~

Payment #8 submittals include ~~is typically provided in the form of~~ a letter from the Architect or Engineer signifying that the project construction is 50% complete, a copy of the current request for information (RFI) log between the contractor and the architect designer, and the current change order log.

These submittals document the project progress and provide an opportunity for the department and Recipient to review the status of current and possible future changes and their categorization as ~~clarify potential~~ change orders. In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, Payment #8 submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

~~These items are described in more detail under the discussion of Appendix D submittals.~~

Payment #8 submittals qualify for release of 20% of the project funding.

Payment #9: Substantial Completion Submittal ~~[10%]~~

The submittal for Payment #9 ~~submittals~~ consists of a ~~the following documents:~~

Submittal Requirements

~~14)~~ Substantial Completion Certificate or ~~Occupancy Permit~~, [this is listed as submittal #14 in Appendix D of the grant agreement.](#)

~~15) Change Order Log~~

This submittal provides the department with verification that construction activities are complete. These items are described in more detail under the discussion of Appendix D submittals.

[Note that one year after the date of substantial completion the Recipient is to submit an auditable accounting of project expenditures.](#)

Payment #9 submittals qualify for release of 10% of the project funding.

Payment #10: Final Audit/Project Closeout ~~{5%}~~

Payment #10 submittals consist of the following documents:

15) Release of Liens

[16\) Change Order Log](#)

~~16)17)~~ Release from Contract

~~17)18)~~ Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Documents

~~18)19)~~ Recorded Building Title

~~19)20)~~ Final Project Accounting

~~20)21)~~ Corporate Income Tax Clearance

~~21)22)~~ Unemployment Security Tax Clearance

~~22)23)~~ ~~Certification of payment of prevailing wage rates~~ [Notice of Completion of Public Works](#)

The submittals for Payment #10 provide the department with the assurance that all necessary accounting and closure procedures are complete.

These items are described in more detail under the discussion of Appendix D submittals.

In addition to the above submittals, in the case of a Regional Education Attendance Area, the Recipient will need to provide evidence to the department of building disposal or demolition of abandoned or excess buildings. Evidence can be in the form of a letter from the district assuring the department that the appropriate disposition action has taken, or will take place.

Payment #10 submittals qualify for release of 5% of the project funding.

Submittal Requirements

Appendix: ~~D~~ Submittal Requirements

The Project Agreement contains a list of submittal requirements and required approvals in [Appendix D](#) ~~s~~ for grant projects ~~(and Appendix C for debt projects.)~~

The submittals listed in the [Appendix ~~D~~ submittals](#) constitute the actual deliverables required for each Project Agreement. These submittals are required for both grant and debt projects, ~~;~~ however, depending on the project, all submittals may not be required. The department will work with the Recipient in development of the Project Agreement to clearly identify which project submittals a Recipient will be required to submit. [Except as provided for in 4 AAC 31.040 for construction and bid documents,](#) ~~t~~ The department will process submittal reviews within a week of receipt, or will notify the Recipient if a longer time period is required.

1) Annual Report

The department requires that annual reports be submitted for all active grant and debt projects. Annual report forms are available on the department's website at:

~~<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm>~~ <https://education.alaska.gov/forms/default.cfm#Facilities>

Annual reports are required for all capital improvement projects funded through the Department of Education and Early Development. There are separate annual report forms for debt reimbursement projects and for grant projects.

Form number 05-~~01-001~~[08-016](#) is used for grant projects and it is due on or before July 31 each year that a project is active. The report consists of a two-page form requiring updated financial information for the project, and a narrative description of the progress on the project. Form number 05-~~94-037~~[08-015](#) is used for debt projects and is due on or before October 15 each year a project is active.

Much of the budget information required on the forms is available from Appendix A of the Project Agreement, or from any subsequent budget amendments to the Project Agreement. The forms include two columns for project budget information, the Original Budget and the Current Budget. The current budget should be the same as the original budget unless the Recipient and the department have agreed to modify the original budget by an amendment to the Project Agreement. The Expenditures to Date column should reflect the total project expenditures up to the end of the reporting period, for each budget category.

In addition to the financial information, the forms also require brief descriptions of the work performed to date, the work planned for next year, and reasons or explanations for any delays that might have occurred.

In addition, for debt projects, and in accordance with state law,¹⁰ by October 15th of each year, all municipal school districts are required to submit to the department, ~~;~~ the amount of funds they will

¹⁰ AS 14.11.102

Submittal Requirements

need in order to meet their anticipated debt service payments on DEED--approved debt projects; for the following fiscal year. This request will also need to include anticipated debt reimbursement on unsold bonds requiring payment during the subsequent fiscal year.

2) Site Selection Report

Projects that require the acquisition of land are required to provide a report detailing the site selection process. The department's publication entitled *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook* summarizes the department's suggested process for evaluating and selecting potential school sites. A district is not required to utilize the department's procedure for selecting a site, but this process has been identified by the department as a comprehensive and objective method of site selection. The department's handbook is available from the department's website:

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications/SiteSelection.pdf> <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/publications/SiteSelection.pdf>

Selection of a school site is complex and difficult decision not to be taken lightly by a district. The department's handbook provides general guidelines that will assist a district in identifying and acquiring an appropriate site.

In order to receive funding; or reimbursement for the costs of site acquisition, the site needs to be approved by the department.¹¹ The value of land eligible for funding or reimbursement is fair market value as determined by appraisal, not to exceed the amount identified in the project agreement.¹² If a district intends on using the purchase or exchange of land as part of the district's participating share, the department will need to be notified within 30 days of signing the grant ~~or debt~~ agreement¹³. It is important to note that only land purchased within the 120 months preceding [the](#) application will be determined eligible for reimbursement by the department.¹⁴

3) Educational Specifications

The department requires submittal of an Educational Specification for "all new public elementary and secondary schools, and additions to and rehabilitations of existing facilities."¹⁵

Educational Specifications describe the general educational goals of a proposed school construction project, and at a minimum should include the following components:¹⁶

- (1) the current year and five-year post-occupancy projected attendance area enrollments in the grades affected by the facility;
- (2) a statement of educational philosophy and goals for the facility;

¹¹ 4 AAC 31.025(a)

¹² 4 AAC 31.025(e)

¹³ 4 AAC 31.023(d)

¹⁴ 4 AAC 31.023(c)(2)(B)

¹⁵ 4 AAC 31.010

¹⁶ 4 AAC 31.010

Submittal Requirements

- (3) the curriculum to be housed by the facility;
- (4) the activities that will be conducted in the facility;
- (5) the anticipated community uses of the facility;
- (6) the specific and general architectural characteristics desired;
- (7) the educational spaces needed, their approximate sizes in square feet, their recommended equipment requirements, and their space relationships to other facility elements;
- (8) the size, use, and condition of existing school spaces in the facility;
- (9) the recommended site and utility requirements;
- (10) the proposed budget and method of financing; and
- (11) the technology goals of the curriculum and their facility requirements.

Educational Specifications communicate the facility owner or user's spatial and functional requirements of a project to the design team. The design team will then develop project constraints and requirements that ultimately guide the design solution for the project.

A more detailed description of the Educational Specifications and guidelines for its development are located in the department's *A Handbook ~~for~~ to Writing Educational Specifications – 2005 Edition*, which is available on the department's website:

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications/EdSpec2005Edition.pdf>
<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/publications/EdSpec2005Edition.pdf>

4) A/E Services Agreement

Submittal of an A/E Services Agreement provides the department with verification that the Recipient has entered into a contractual arrangement with a design professional for development of the project design. The department will also use this opportunity to review the design contract amount and verify that it does not exceed the amount budgeted in the project agreement for design services. The Recipient can use the AIA standard ~~from~~ form B141-1997 as a model agreement between the Recipient and design consultant.

The department will review the A/E Agreement, and may solicit additional information from the Recipient regarding the design services selection process in cases where the estimated consultant contract fee is in excess of \$50,000.¹⁷ In these cases, consultant selection needs to be accomplished by:

- soliciting written proposals;
- advertising in a newspaper of general circulation for at least 21 days in advance of the proposal due date;
- awarding the contract to the most qualified offeror; and
- providing a 10-day administrative review process for aggrieved offerors.

¹⁷ 4 AAC 31.065

Submittal Requirements

Nothing in the A/E selection requirements “precludes a school district from retaining the services of a consultant on an as needed basis under a multi-year contract, if the term of the contract is not more than five years.”¹⁸

Design fees should not exceed 810% of the construction cost of a project unless additional services are required over and above standard architectural and engineering services, such as a facility condition survey, site survey, geotechnical investigation, or an educational specification. In cases where the design fee exceeds 810%, the Recipient should be prepared to provide a detailed explanation of the additional services or costs that resulted in the increased design fee.

5) Schematic Design Documents

The schematic design documents are sometimes referred to as the 35% documents, and they provide the department with a milestone review of progress on the project. The department will review the documents for compliance with state statute and regulation regarding development of educational facilities.¹⁹ The documents will be compared with the direction provided in the Educational Specifications, and the budget will be compared with the Project Agreement and any associated project amendments. The review should not be considered as a code compliance review, or a value engineering review; however, if the department identifies a design issue, comments will be offered for consideration to the project designer.

At this stage of the project, the department will also review the square-footage of the facility and compare it with the amount of square-footage authorized in the Project Agreement in order to verify compliance with the department’s space requirements, so a summary table of square footage is helpful.

Schematic design documents should include the following components:

- Site Civil Drawings (including utility information)
- Architectural Drawings
- Structural Drawings
- Mechanical Drawings
- Electrical Drawings
- Project Specifications

Along with the schematic design documents, the Recipient will also need to submit a schematic level cost estimate for the project.

¹⁸ 4 AAC 31.065(b)

¹⁹ 4 AAC 31.030

Submittal Requirements

At this stage of the project, the Recipient should also submit any preliminary reports that were produced during the early stages of the design process such as a site survey, geotechnical investigation, and any additional reports that have a bearing on the design of the project.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

6) Design Development Documents

The design development submittal is sometimes referred to as the 65% submittal, and provides the department with a milestone review that helps track progress on the project. Like the schematic review, this submittal should include the following components:

- Site Civil Drawings (including utility information)
- Architectural Drawings
- Structural Drawings
- Mechanical Drawings
- Electrical Drawings
- Project Specifications

Along with the design development documents, the Recipient will also need to submit a design development level cost estimate for the project.

The department's review of the design development documents will focus on a verification of issues identified during the schematic design review. The department will also verify eligible space, and compare the cost estimate with previous estimates and the original project budget.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house ~~procedures~~[resources](#), or where alternative procurement methods are used, submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

7) [Energy Consumption and Cost Report](#)

[In accordance with AS 14.07.020\(a\)\(11\), the district is required to provide an Energy Consumption and Cost Report. This report will not be required for all projects. Projects that will require an Energy Consumption and Cost Report include new construction projects, major renovation projects where multiple buildings systems are being renovated or replaced, or renovation/addition projects where space is being added to an existing building and existing building systems are being renovated or replaced. This report will provide an annual estimate of energy consumption and cost for both electricity and heating.](#)

Submittal Requirements

8) Construction Documents

The Construction Document submittal is sometimes referred to as the 95% submittal. At this stage of project development, the drawings and specifications should be virtually complete.

The department has several roles and requirements when it comes to the review of the construction documents.

The 95% documents need to be submitted to the department at least 20 working days before a bid invitation is made.²⁰ This provides the department with adequate time to review the documents for compliance with DEED statutes and regulations.

If construction bids are to be invited, the Recipient needs to supply the department with fully stamped and signed construction documents at least five working days before bid invitation. The exception is if the 95% documents submitted to the department were stamped and signed.²¹

If the Recipient is not planning to invite bids, stamped and signed drawings need to be submitted to the department no less than 15 working days prior to the start of each construction phase.²²

A Recipient may request a waiver to the construction document submittal requirements identified above, if the district or municipality is able to demonstrate the capacity to provide a “through and complete independent review.”²³

The approval of construction documents submitted for review is void after two years unless construction is started.²⁴

In addition to the previously mentioned requirements, the department will review the documents to verify that the Recipient has addressed issues identified during the Design Development review, to verify square-footage, and to verify that the construction cost estimate is below the available construction budget as identified in the project agreement and associated project amendments.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

9) Bid Documents

The department reviews bid documents for compliance with state statute and regulation.

²⁰ 4 AAC 31.040(a)(1)

²¹ 4 AAC 31.040(a)(2)

²² 4 AAC 31.040(a)(3)

²³ 4 AAC 31.040(a)(4)

²⁴ 4 AAC 31.040(b)

Submittal Requirements

Bid documents need to be submitted to the department at least five working days prior to invitation to bid.²⁵

The Recipient is required to select a contractor on the “basis of competitive sealed bids”.²⁶ The Recipient is also required to advertise the invitation to bid in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080(b), which is included here for reference:

“The school district shall provide notice of its solicitation at least three times before the opening of the offers. The first printing of the advertisement must occur at least 21 days before opening the offers. The department may approve a solicitation period shorter than 21 days when written justification submitted by the school district demonstrates that a shorter solicitation period is advantageous for a particular offer and will result in an adequate number of responses. A school district may provide additional notice by mailing its solicitation to contractors on any list it maintains, and any other means reasonably calculated to provide notice to prospective offerors.”²⁷

The Recipient is must provide for the “administrative review of a complaint filed by an aggrieved offeror that allows the offeror to file a bid protest, within 10 days after notice is provided of intent to award the contract”.²⁷

Under no circumstances should the Recipient require a local contractor preference,²⁸ or include provisions in a bid request that requires or requests local hire as a criterion for contractor selection.

The department may deny or limit ~~is-its~~ participation in the costs of construction for debt projects if a district does not comply with department’s requirements, and can deny payment of construction funds for grant projects that are not competitively selected.²⁹

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

10) Building Permit

[The Division of Fire and Life Safety is the State Building Official. Construction, repair, remodel, addition, or change of occupancy of any building/structure, or installation or change of fuel tanks must be approved by the Division of Fire and Life Safety unless that review authority is delegated to specific community jurisdictions. Delegated jurisdictions typically provide a building permit following their approval. The Division of Fire and Life Safety issues a plan review certificate.](#)

²⁵ 4 AAC 31.040(a)(2)

²⁶ 4 AAC 31.040(a)

²⁷ 4 AAC 31.080(c)

²⁸ 4 AAC 31.080(d)

²⁹ 4 AAC 31.080(e)

Submittal Requirements

The building permit submittal provides verification that ~~local~~ [the appropriate building](#) officials have reviewed the plans and that they are in compliance with [state and](#) local requirements.

[Many cities and boroughs also have zoning or site plan permits that are needed and which fall under the general designation of building permit for the purposes of the Project Agreement. Project Coordinators should become familiar with these requirements and, when necessary, secure these additional permits and submit them to the department.](#) ~~In non-municipal areas, submittal of verification of a fire marshal review is acceptable.~~

11) Bid Tabulation

Once a Recipient receives and opens bids for a project, the department requires submittal of the bid tabulation. This document provides verification to the department that the lowest responsive bid is from the contractor selected to perform the work. This submittal document is typically in the form of a table that provides a list of bidders, base bids, additive alternates, and architect or engineers estimate for the work. This document can be faxed or emailed to the department.

In the case where a district is utilizing in-house procedures, or where alternative procurement methods are used, submittal requirements will be worked out on an individual basis between the department and the district.

12) Construction Contract

Once the Recipient has selected the Contractor, the next submittal is the actual construction contract. The department reviews the construction contract to verify that it is consistent with the bid, and that it adequately protects the state interests in regard to project funding.

[After the contract is awarded, the district should confirm that the contractor has filed a Notice of Work with the Department of Labor and Workforce Development. This ensures that submittal #23 Notice of Completion will be available.](#)

13) Contractor's Payment/Performance Bond

Along with the construction contract, the Recipient needs to provide evidence that the Contractor has obtained payment and performance bonds. This demonstration provides the department with the assurance that the project can be completed if the Contractor fails to meet its obligations under the contract.

14) Substantial Completion Certificate/Occupancy Permit

Once construction is complete, the Recipient is required to submit documentation that the project is substantially complete. Typically, a completed AIA form G704 will satisfy this submittal requirement.

Submittal Requirements

If a certificate of occupancy is required by the local jurisdiction, it should be supplied to the department at this time.

15) Release of Liens

The Release of Liens submittal assures the department that the Contractor has no pending financial obligations in regard to the project. The Recipient can have the Contractor complete AIA form G706A to satisfy this submittal.

16) Change Order Log

In order for the department to verify that the work completed is the work specified in the project agreement scope, the Recipient is required to submit a change order log that lists all approved change orders for the project. The change order log can be in the form of an Excel spreadsheet listing the change order description, date requested, date completed, and associated increase or decrease in the project cost associated with the change.

17) Release from Contract

The Release from Contract provides the department with the assurance that the Contractor has completed the work on the project, and that there are no outstanding obligations expected by the Contractor of the Recipient. The Recipient can have Contractor complete AIA document G707 in order to satisfy the submittal requirement.

18) Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Documents:

The preventive maintenance and facility management submittal provides the department with the assurance that the improvements have been added to the Recipient's preventive maintenance program. Documentation can be supplied in the form of ~~a~~ reports [from the district's maintenance management system](#) listing preventive maintenance components by building system; ~~and~~ preventive maintenance schedules, [a copy of the district's](#) custodial care plan, certification of training on [installed](#) building systems, and an updated renewal and replacement schedule. The report should clearly identify the inclusion of the improvements made by the project.

In addition, the Recipient should provide the department with verification that equipment purchased as a part of the project is included in the district's fixed asset inventory system.

19) Recorded Building Title

In the case of a replacement school project in a Regional Educational Attendance Area, the department will provide a quitclaim deed relinquishing the state's interest in the new facility.

Submittal Requirements

20) Final Project Accounting

The final project accounting provides the department with the ability to reconcile the original project budget with actual project expenditures. In general, the ~~department requires agreement provides for~~ an independent project audit to be submitted by the district; however, ~~for smaller projects when~~ acceptable to the department, the requirement may be satisfied with the submittal of a project closeout worksheet, ~~and completion of that includes~~ a certification of compliance funds expended consistent with the project agreement. ~~Both~~ These Microsoft Excel workbooks for grant and debt projects are available ~~by request from~~ on the department's website:

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications.html>

21) Corporate Income Tax Clearance

The corporate income tax clearance is requested by the Recipient from the State of Alaska, Department of Revenue (DOR) for the Contractor. The Recipient provides DOR with the Contractor's name, address and tax ID number, and the DOR will provide the department with the requested clearance.

22) Unemployment Security Tax Clearance

The Recipient requests an unemployment security tax payment clearance from the State of Alaska, Department of Labor & Workforce Development (DOLWD). The clearance is then submitted to the department.

23) ~~Certification of Payment of Prevailing Wage Rates~~ Notice of Completion of Public Works

The Contractor requests a Notice of Completion of Public Works from ~~the~~ DOLWD, Labor Standards and Safety Division, Wage and Hour Administration, www.labor.state.ak.us/lss/home.htm. This provides verification that the contractor paid the prevailing wage rates to its employees. The ~~DOL~~ agency will issue the document to the Contractor. Required for public construction contracts exceeding \$25,000.³⁰

³⁰ [AS 36.05.005](#)

Alternative Project Delivery

In 2004, the department implemented the *Project Delivery Method Handbook*. The handbook provides guidance to districts interested in utilizing alternative procurement methods for school construction. The [current](#) document can be viewed at ~~the following internet link:~~

https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications/project_delivery_handbook.pdf
~~http://www.eed.state.ak.us/Facilities/publications/project_delivery_handbook.pdf~~

Alternative project delivery offers districts additional choices for completing school construction projects in cases where the traditional design-bid-build process will not accomplish the desired result in terms of project flexibility or schedule.

Alternative project delivery does not allow a Recipient to provide any kind or type of local preference in selecting contractors or hiring staff for a particular project.

A decision to utilize alternative project delivery is a complicated one, and the department recommends that a district interested in exploring this type of procurement work closely with the department to identify if one of the methods described in the *Project Delivery Method Handbook* will accomplish the goals of the recipient.

Additional Work

Managing Changes in Scope

It would be extremely rare for a project to move from the award of a construction contract to completion of work without any changes in the scope of work contained in the Construction Documents. The purpose of this section is to define when changes in scope are allowed as Additional Work and when they become new work, and are not permitted. The following establishes the department's guidelines for managing changes in scope. The guidelines are based on four principles:

- 1) grants and approval for debt reimbursement are made to a specific, defined project,
- 2) funding for those projects is based on reasonable estimates and includes contingencies for unknowns,
- 3) it should be the norm for successful projects to have funds remaining at completion, and
- 4) those funds are reserved to the state as established within the provisions of AS 14.11 and 4 AAC 31 for use on subsequent department-approved projects.

For a district needing a change in scope on a grant or debt project funded or approved under AS 14.11.020 or AS 14.11.100, the following procedures apply:

- a. If the proposed change in scope is the result of a clarification of the department-approved Construction Documents and is necessary for the completion of the work as awarded, that change will be considered Additional Work. Approval from the department is not required for this activity, however, the district is required to capture the change in a change order log and must provide that log for review by the department as provided for in the submittal Appendix. This review could result in disapproval of unsupported change order work and a requirement that the Recipient self-fund that change.;
- b. If the proposed change in scope is for the award of an Alternate which was listed in the department-approved Construction Documents but was not awarded due to a lack of funding available to award the alternate under the original construction contract, that change will be considered Additional Work. Approval from the department is not required for this activity; however, the district is required to notify the department of this change in scope and shall provide a budget analysis demonstrating that the cost of the change is within the project's budget. [Note: a district is permitted to reduce, but shall not increase, the scope and cost of an alternate to match the budget.];
- c. If the proposed change in scope was an element of the project in the department-approved Schematic, Design Development, or Construction Documents submittals but was removed as a result of a lack of funding available to continue including that element in the project's scope of work, that change will be considered Additional Work. Approval from the department is required prior to issuing any contract document for this work and the district shall provide both evidence as to where the work was originally included in the project and a budget analysis demonstrating that the cost of the change is within the project's budget.;

Additional Work

- d. If, during the design phase of a project, a proposed change of scope from that identified in Appendix A of the Project Agreement is sought, that change will be considered **Additional Work** if: 1) it provides a different technical solution to a building system defined in the scope, and 2) -it is the result of additional information gained during the design process that was not available when the scope was defined, or 3) it is the result of a change to regulatory or code standards that were established—or should have been established—in the original scope. Approval from the department is required prior to incorporating these changes into the project and the district shall provide supporting evidence. An amendment to the Project Agreement scope will be issued by the department as needed.;
- e. If, following substantial completion of the construction contract, a proposed change in scope to correct a project deficiency is sought, that change will be considered **Additional Work** only if all the following conditions are met: a) it is to correct a specific design or construction deficiency within the project’s approved scope, or it is to correct an unanticipated life-safety deficiency caused by the project, b) the item is not a warranty issue as defined in the contract, c) it is identified within 12 months of substantial completion.
- f. If the proposed change in scope does not meet these definitions of **Additional Work**, then it will be considered new work and the proposed change will be denied. New work will be subject to inclusion in a new project under the provisions of AS 14.11 and 4 AAC 31 including the specific procedures identified in 4 AAC 31.064 for redirection of bond proceeds.

Table: Allowable Scope Change Summary

	<u>Reason for Scope Change</u>	<u>DEED Approval</u>	<u>District Action Needed</u>
a	<u>Changes due to clarifications, minor oversights, latent conditions</u>	<u>Not Required</u>	<u>1) include description and cost in change order log provided with submittals</u>
b	<u>Award of alternate, previously EED-approved in Construction Docs</u>	<u>Not Required</u>	<u>1) provide analysis proving change is within budget 2) provide CO log at closeout</u>
c	<u>Award of scope from EED-approved SD or DD, not included in bid</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>1) demonstrate where work was previously included in approved plans 2) provide analysis proving change is within budget</u>
d	<u>Changes in approach or changes necessary due to additional info or code/regulation updates</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>1) provide supporting evidence of new or additional info or updated codes 2) provide analysis proving change is within budget 3) wait for approval of PA amendment</u>
e	<u>Corrects deficiency in approved scope or life-safety issue caused by project, within 12 months of</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>1) provide supporting evidence of new or additional info or updated codes 2) provide analysis proving change is</u>

Additional Work

	substantial completion		within budget
f	Re-direction of bond proceeds	Required	3) wait for approval of PA amendment 1) follow procedures in 4 AAC 31.064

Contracting for Changes in Scope

Additional Work will, unless otherwise approved by the department, be accomplished within the existing design and construction contracts issued for the project. However, on occasion, such contracts may no longer be available for use or may have constraints which limit their effective use. If, in contracting for changes in scope within a project, the Recipient supports the use of new project management, design, or construction contracts, and the department concurs, the provisions of 4 AAC 31.065 and 4 AAC 31.080 will apply.

- ~~— If the proposed change in scope is consistent with the scope of work identified in the Project Agreement, and the estimated cost of the work is greater than \$25,000, but less than \$100,000, then the district will need approval from the department to add the work to the project scope, and the additional work can be added to the existing design contract and construction contract through change orders to those contracts. In practical terms, the district should follow the procedure described under “D” if the cost of the additional work is estimated to exceed \$80,000, this will assure that the \$100,000 threshold is not exceeded;~~
- ~~— If the proposed change in scope is consistent with the scope of work identified in the Project Agreement, and the estimated cost of the work is greater than \$100,000, then the district will need approval from the department to add the work to the project scope, and the additional work will need to be constructed with a new bid solicitation. If the A/E service cost for the additional work is estimated to exceed \$50,000, then a new A/E selection process will be required. In practical terms, a new A/E selection process should be utilized if the A/E services cost for the additional work is estimated to exceed \$40,000; this will assure that the \$50,000 threshold is not exceeded;~~

In-House Services

A Recipient may choose to accomplish a project with a combination of in-house and/or contracted services. Materials for the project may be directly procured and or included in the construction contract, as appropriate. A letter certifying that all procurement will be accomplished in accordance with established district procedures that fully comply with the provisions of *4 AAC 31.080(h) – Construction and Acquisition of Public School Facilities* must be provided to the department. These construction delivery methods are permissible under state guidelines when it is in the best interests of the state for the possible following reasons:

- The limited size and scope of a project makes this type of alternative project delivery appropriate.
- A District has experience on particular types of work where unknown factors may exist, and where the situation does not lend itself to a competitive traditional contractor bid process.
- A district's project timeline does not easily accommodate traditional construction processes.
- Small project size, and remote rural location does not provide enough incentive for general contractors to bid on the work, however, specialty and sub-contractors are, may be available to supplement district staff and capabilities.

A sample letter is available from the department that addresses these issues and provides a work plan template.

Project Closeout

The following final Recipient actions on a project allow the department to close a project. These actions assure the department that the final project funding can be released without concern of encumbrance by any of the involved parties. ~~Each of the tasks is described in detail below:~~

- Releases and Clearances
The department needs to receive copies of all appropriate releases and clearances (Submittals 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 22) in addition to copies of the Recipients preventive maintenance documents (Submittal 17) in order to process project closeout.
- Final Project Accounting and certificate of ~~completion~~ funds expended
In order to process the closeout, the department needs to receive the final project accounting (Submittals 19) in addition to a ~~completed~~ “certificate ion by the recipient that the grant funds were expended consistent with the project agreement. ~~of completion”~~ The certification ~~e of completion~~ provides the department with verification that the funds paid to the recipient were spent to complete the project scope ~~has been completed~~ as identified in the Project Agreement.
- One Percent for Art Expenditure
A project requires an art allocation if it involves construction of a new facility or a remodel or renovation of an existing facility.³¹ If a project requires art, the amount is identified in the project agreement and may be adjusted by amendment if necessary. The Recipient needs to confirm, through final project accounting, that the amount allocated for art has been expended. ~~Not all projects will require art, and if a project does require art, the amount is generally identified during the application phase of the project.~~ Assistance is available from the Alaska State Council on the Arts in completing the requirements for expenditures on art.
- Termination Agreement
Once all of the required submittals have been received, and the department verifies the accuracy of the final project accounting, the department will have the Recipient sign a Termination Agreement. This document terminates the relationship between the department and Recipient for a particular Project Agreement.

³¹ [AS 35.27.020](#)

Conclusion

This handbook provides some general guidelines and describes statutory limitations that a Recipient needs to be aware of when completing a capital improvement project for school construction or major maintenance.

The department also publishes other documents that are designed to help a district with various stages or components of the department's project application and funding processes. [Refer to the department's website for a list of these publications, which may be downloaded in their latest editions.](#)

<https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/publications.html>

- ~~Space Guidelines Handbook (1996)~~
- ~~Swimming Pool Guidelines (1997)~~
- ~~Site Selection Criteria Handbook (1997)~~
- ~~Condition Survey (1997)~~
- ~~Preventive Maintenance Handbook (1999)~~
- ~~A/E Services handbook (1999)~~
- ~~Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook (1999)~~
- ~~Renewal & Replacement Guideline (2001)~~
- ~~Project Delivery Handbook (2004)~~
- ~~Equipment Purchase Guideline (2005)~~
- ~~Educational Specification Handbook (2005)~~

This page is intentionally blank

Project Delivery Method Handbook

The draft 2017 update to the *Project Delivery Method Handbook* will be released as a supplement to the February 28, 2017 BRGR packet issued on February 15, 2017. Please refer to the summary of elements to be addressed on page 5 of the Department Briefing.

Check <https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/BRGR/> for availability.

This page is intentionally blank



Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

As of: January 31, 2017

Member	Appointed	Re-appointed	Term Expires
Elwin Blackwell Commissioner or Commissioner's Designee	Chair	Commissioner's Designee	
Vacant House of Representatives Member		Appointed by Speaker	
Vacant Senate Member		Appointed by President	
Mark Langberg Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction	03/01/2016		02/28/2019
Mary Cary Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction	03/01/2016		02/28/2017
Robert Tucker Experience in Urban or Rural School Facilities Management	03/01/2016		02/28/2019
William Murdock, appointed to fill vacancy Experience in Urban or Rural School Facilities Management	12/20/2016		02/28/2017
Doug Crevensten Public Representative	03/01/2016		02/28/2019
Don Hiley, appointed to fill vacancy Public Representative	1/30/2017		02/28/2017

Members appointed by commissioner unless noted. See AS 14.11.014 and 4 AAC 31.087.

This page is intentionally blank

Department of Education & Early Development
Division of School Finance/Facilities

Work Topics for the BR & GR Committee

As Of: 2/15/17

BR&GR 2017 Work Items	Responsibility	Due Date
1. CIP Grant Priority Review – [(b)(1)]		
1.1. FY18 MM & SC Grant Fund Final Lists (4 AAC 31.022(a)(2)(B))	Committee	Feb 2017
1.2. FY19 MM & SC Grant Fund Initial List	Committee	Dec 2017
2. Grant & Debt Reimbursement Project Recommendations – [(b)(2)]		
2.1. Six-year Capital Plan (14.11.013(a)(1); 4 AAC 31.022(2))	Staff	Annually, Nov
3. Construction Standards for Cost-effective Construction – [(b)(3)]		
4. Prototypical Design Analysis – [(b)(4)]		
4.2. 2015 Report Follow-up	Staff (w Cmte)	Aug 2017
5. CIP Grant Application & Ranking – [(b)(5) & (6)]		
5.1. FY19 CIP Draft Application & Instructions	Staff	2-15-17
5.2. FY19 CIP Final Application & Instructions	Committee	2-28-17
5.3. FY19 CIP Briefing – Issues and Clarifications	Staff	Nov 2017
5.4. Facility Condition Survey Minimum Standard	Dept (w Cmte)	Dec 2017
6. CIP Approval Process Recommendations – [(b)(7)]		
1.1. Publication Updates		
1.1.1. Program Demand Cost Model for Alaskan Schools	Staff	Annually, Apr
1.1.2. Capital Project Administration Handbook Final	Staff	Mar 2017
1.1.3. Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook Initial	Staff	May 2017
Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook Final	Committee	Dec 2017
1.1.4. Project Delivery Method Handbook Final	Staff	Aug 2017
1.1.5. Life Cycle Cost Analysis Handbook Initial Draft	Staff	Oct 2017
Life Cycle Cost Analysis Handbook Final	Committee	May 2018
7. Energy Efficiency Standards – [(b)(8)]		

Projected Meeting Dates

February 28, 2017 (Juneau), Full day

August 3, 2017 (Teleconference), Half day

December 6, 2017 (Teleconference), Half day

This page is intentionally blank

Work Topics for the BR & GR Committee

AS 14.11.014

Updated: 2/15/17

BR&GR Work Items – Master List	Responsibility	Due Date
1. CIP Grant Priority Review – [(b)(1)]		
1.1. FYXX MM & SC Grant Fund Initial Lists (4 AAC 31.022(a)(2)(B))	Committee	Annually
1.2. FYXX MM & SC Grant Fund Reconsideration Lists	Committee	TBD
1.3. FYXX MM & SC Grant Fund Final Lists	Committee	TBD
2. Grant & Debt Reimbursement Project Recommendations – [(b)(2)]		
2.1. Six-year Capital Plan (14.11.013(a)(3); 4 AAC 31.022(2))	Dept	Annually
2.1.1. Statewide Inventory	Dept	TBD
2.1.2. Statewide Facility Appraisal	Dept	TBD
2.1.3. Statewide Condition Survey	Dept	TBD
2.1.4. Renewal & Replacement Database	Dept	TBD
2.1.5. Presentation by ASD on Facility Condition Indexing	Committee	TBD
2.2. School Capital Funding	Dept (w Cmte)	TBD
2.2.1. Review Process & Funding Streams for Rural & Urban Projects		
2.3. State's Role in Design & Construction	Dept	
2.3.1. In Organized City/Boroughs		
2.3.2. In REAAs		
3. Construction Standards for Cost-effective Construction – [(b)(3)]		
3.1. Cost Model's Model School Analysis	Dept	2018
3.2. Cost Standards	Dept	TBD
3.2.1. Allowable Costs		
3.2.2. Cost/Benefit, Cost Effectiveness Guidelines		
3.2.3. Life Cycle Cost Guidelines		
3.3. Commissioning	Committee	TBD
3.4. Materials/Systems Analysis	Committee	TBD
3.5. Design Issues	Committee	TBD
3.5.1. Design Ratios		
3.5.2. Value Analysis		
3.6. Construction	Committee	TBD
3.6.1. Construction Duration		
3.6.2. Quality		
3.6.3. Component Use and Specifications		
4. Prototypical Design Analysis – [(b)(4)]		
4.1. Legislative Involvement		TBD
4.2. 2015 Report Follow-up	Committee	Aug 2017
5. CIP Grant Application & Ranking – [(b)(5) & (6)]		
5.1. FYXX CIP Draft Application & Instructions	Dept	Annually
5.2. FYXX CIP Final Application & Instructions	Committee	Annually
5.3. Separate School Construction and Major Maintenance Applications	Committee	
5.4. Separate Grant and Debt Applications	Committee	2019
5.5. Appendix D Update – Type of Space Added or Improved	Committee	2018
5.5.1. New Classifications & Terminology		
5.6. Duration of a Qualifying Condition Survey	Committee	(completed)
5.7. Facility Condition Survey Minimum Standard	Dept (w Cmte)	2017

- | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| 5.8. Review Issues with "Primary Purpose" Designations | | |
| 5.8.1. Playgrounds, Parking Lots, etc. | | |
| 5.9. Rural Definition For Art (see Instructions, Appx C) | Committee | TBD |
| 5.10. Space Allocation Issues (4 AAC 31.020(c)) | Committee | TBD |
| 5.10.1. Career Tech | | |
| 5.10.2. Resource Rooms and Special Ed | | |
| 5.10.3. Space Related to Security | | |
| 5.10.4. Net vs. Gross | | |
| 5.10.5. Electrical/Mechanical Space | | |
| 5.10.6. Storage in Remote Areas | | |
| 5.10.7. "Found Space" (cost-effectiveness test) | | |
| 5.10.8. Replacement Schools Clarifications | | |
| 5.10.9. Non-school Facilities | | |
| 5.10.10. Educational Adequacy/Space Increase | | |
| 5.10.11. Community Use Space | | |
| 5.10.12. Pre-school | | |
| 5.10.13. Out-of-District Enrollment (vocational/charters, etc.) | | |
| 5.10.14. Second Attendance Area Schools | | |
| 5.10.15. Enrollment Projection Models | | |
| 5.10.16. Standard Gym Size | | |

6. CIP Approval Process Recommendations – [(b)(7)]

- | | | |
|--|---------------|----------|
| 6.1. Publication Updates (4 AAC 31.020(a)) | | |
| 6.1.1. Program Demand Cost Model for Alaskan Schools | Dept | Annually |
| 6.1.2. Capital Project Administration Handbook | Dept | 2017 |
| 6.1.3. Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance Handbook | Dept (w Cmte) | 2017 |
| 6.1.4. Project Delivery Method Handbook | Dept | 2017 |
| 6.1.5. Life Cycle Cost Analysis Handbook | Dept (w Cmte) | 2018 |
| 6.1.6. Cost Format – <i>EED Standard Construction Cost Estimates</i> | Dept | 2018 |
| 6.1.7. Space Guidelines Handbook | Dept (w Cmte) | 2018 |
| 6.1.8. Swimming Pool Guidelines | Dept (w Cmte) | 2019 |
| 6.1.9. Guide for School Facility Condition Surveys | Dept (w Cmte) | 2019 |
| 6.1.10. A Handbook to Writing Educational Specifications | Dept (w Cmte) | 2020 |
| 6.1.11. Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook | Dept | 2020 |
| 6.1.12. Facility Appraisal Guide | Dept | TBD |
| 6.1.13. Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases | Dept (w Cmte) | TBD |
| 6.2. New Publications | | |
| 6.2.1. Architectural and Engineering Services for School Facilities | Dept | 2019 |
| 6.2.2. School Design & Construction Standards | Dept (w Cmte) | 2020 |
| 6.2.3. Outdoor Facility Guidelines for Secondary Schools | Dept | TBD |
| 6.2.4. Renewal & Replacement Guideline | Dept | TBD |
| 6.3. Regulations | | |
| 6.3.1. Commissioning Requirements | Dept (w Cmte) | TBD |
| 6.3.2. CIP "Primary Purpose" | Dept (w Cmte) | TBD |
| 6.4. Online Application | Dept | TBD |
| 6.5. Database Review | Dept | TBD |
| 6.5.1. Consolidate Into Single Database | | |
| 6.5.2. Coordination With Unity Project | | |
| 6.5.3. ADM By Grade Level (for SERRC?) | | |

7. Energy Efficiency Standards – [(b)(8)]

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----|
| 7.1. Reporting Requirements | | TBD |
| 7.2. Energy Modeling | | TBD |
| 7.3. | | |