

BR&GR April 21 and 22, 2005
Juneau - EED Auxiliary Board Room
MEETING MINUTES - Approved July 14, 2005

<u>Committee Members Present</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Additional Participants</u>
Eddy Jeans	Tim Mearig	Cole Saxton (CEFPI)
Mark Langberg	Don Carney	Kathy Christy (NWABSD)
Dee Hubbard	Abdoulie Manneh	Kate McIntyre (LKSD)
Harley Hightower	Cynthia Dau	Catherine Fritz (CBJ)
Robert Tucker		Deb Morse (JSD)
Thomas Richards		
Carl John		

April 21 – 10:25a

Eddy Jeans, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:25 and a roll call was completed. Representative Kevin Meyer and Senator Gene Therriault were absent. All other members were present and a quorum was established.

The agenda was reviewed. Tim Mearig stated he had information on the 10th Edition Cost Model that needed to be reviewed. Eddy proposed including that item in the agenda for April 22nd. Eddy also indicated his intent to finish earlier than the 2:30p time listed in the agenda for that day. Dee Hubbard moved to accept the agenda as amended. The motion passed.

Introduction of staff and guests were made. Eddy asked for volunteer to chair the meeting when he had to be at the Capitol building at 1:30p. Mark Langberg was appointed to act as chair.

The December 1, 2004 minutes were reviewed. Mark clarified that he was in attendance at the meeting and requested the minutes be revised accordingly. The following corrections were also noted:

- Pg 1– last sentence, that that (delete one “that”)
- Pg 2– under FY2006, projects (insert the plural “s”)
- Pg 4 – Countered by saying ... too (insert “too”) early....

The February 22, 2005 minutes were reviewed. The following corrections were noted:

- Page 1 – include a start time (1:30p) in the first sentence
- Pg 4 – 4th line Tim stated (insert past tense “d”)
- Pg 4 – fourth paragraph, second line, is (insert “is”) actually used

Dee made a motion to adopt the minutes of December 1, 2004 and February 22, 2005 as amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Staff Briefing

Eddy introduced Tim for the staff briefing as found in the BR&GR meeting packet. This included a review of recent State board action, legislation, the final FY06 CIP list, a regulations status and publications update as well as a preventive maintenance State of the State update.

Legislative Review - Discussion followed regarding the department's position on HB13 relating to reimbursement of municipal bonds for school construction. Eddy explained the history of the legislation and that it required a report of effectiveness. This report is not due until January 1, 2006. The department is requesting that the legislature allow enough time to gather data and produce the required report so that all entities can evaluate the program's effectiveness prior to enacting an extension to the debt reimbursement funding option.

Other legislation was briefly discussed and Eddy confirmed that Governor Murkowski had included funding for the first 20 major maintenance projects within his budget. Tim added that, for reference, the CIP lists were posted on the web.

Regulations review – Tim updated the committee saying that the regulations on Preventive Maintenance and Facilities Management (4 AAC 31.013) are completely approved and on the books. He noted that we have begun working on the follow up assessments with districts as required by the regulation.

Robert Tucker asked about the Project Delivery regulations. Tim said it had been adopted without substantive changes. He mentioned that the department has not had to apply them as yet since there have been no requests for alternative construction delivery.

Overall, with respect to all Facility's publications, Tim mentioned that the terms used to title the documents will be more consistent. There will be a distinction between guidelines and handbooks with guidelines being incorporated in the titles when the publication is referenced in regulation.

Tim noted the Architectural Services for School Construction publication is still pending awaiting completion of other projects. He had hopes that it would be an active project in December.

HB 2003 Funding Status - Tim moved on to review the HB2003 funding status and referenced the list enclosed in the committee's packet following the Staff Briefing. Dee asked if there would be a report on the entire FY2003 grant and debt funding program and both Tim and Eddy confirmed that there would be. Dee asked what the typical length of the bond repayment period was. Tim responded that most were 10 or 15 year bonds with an occasional 20 year bond but that statute required at least 10 year bonds..

Preventive Maintenance Status - Don Carney reviewed the PM state-of-the-state report noting that the committee requested background colors be removed and that +/- be dropped upon reinspections. He added that revisits will also begin to show on the report. Dee, in particular, liked the way the report now flowed.

Thomas Richards asked about Tanana's PM status. Carl answered that they never reached compliance. Don said at one point there was data to indicate Tanana had a program, which they do, but they are not implementing it in any way. Yukon Flats holds the same status at this time. Yukon Flats was beginning the PM steps while under a previous superintendent but now are not using the program. This means there will be a recertification process for these districts to go through to become compliant.

Dee asked if these districts actually had projects on the books. Tim said that Yukon Flats does. Don added that they will have benchmarks to meet before they will receive any payments.

Final PM Scoring Revisions – Tim directed the committee’s attention to the final scoring revisions as documented in the *Maintenance Points for CIP* briefing paper, 4/12/2005 version.

Assessment two - Item two.

Carl John had sent an email that included SERRC comments related to the ability of their program to show incomplete work orders. He thought what might happen is that to avoid work orders looking delinquent, school districts may not show advance planning. Bob Tucker agreed, saying he didn’t want work orders initiated but not yet completed making it look as if they were delinquent for 4 months. Tim reminded the group that the state was only looking for use of the program as a management tool, that the department was not evaluating a completion rate. Bob suggested using this category to track scheduled PM items only, and what percentage of those got done. Tim commented that this would not show the needs a district was facing for all maintenance work. Bob was assured that the state was not going to object to a district adding columns for definitions/comments. It would be very possible for districts to add terms such as ‘scheduled’ or ‘in progress’ or ‘on hold’, for their own detailed information/use. The purpose of this report was reinforced as simply a tracking tool to show work orders, both new and upcoming, as well as to show where man hours are spent.

After much discussion it was agreed that a change of wording may be of assistance in the clarity of this assessment item. Eddy asked the will of the committee and the final decision was made to amend to language to read:

“Produce a district wide report of monthly scheduled and completed work orders for the previous 12 months.” Eddy confirmed that all were in agreement.

Assessment 4

Dee asked if this category was asking for a per-building replacement value or for all buildings. Bob clarified that it was districtwide value here.

12:15p – The committee recessed for lunch. Eddy requested that all return at 1:15p.

1:15p

In Eddy’s absence (attending hearing on HB13) Mark Langberg, interim chair, called the meeting to order.

CIP Application Initial Review

Tim asked the group to turn their attention to the CIP application and raters guide. He said that on the application the only necessary changes were to update the fiscal year and question 31. Because there was a change to maintenance and facility management scoring (no certification of compliance required), there are no check boxes. Question 31 now requests support documents related to maintenance and facility management and references instructions.

Bob asked about the necessity for information requested in question 7, district information related to maintenance expenditures. Tim said that the audited maintenance expenditure provides a basis for EED evaluation.

Tim brought the group back to question 31 and asked the committee to use the CIP Scoring Guide along with the instructions for question 31 to get the best understanding about what districts are being asked to provide for maintenance scoring. Review continued on the three documents: the CIP Application, the Scoring Criteria and the Guidelines for Raters.

Tim and Mark agreed to review the instructions for question 31 by each assessment area.

Assessment 1

The instructions requesting the narrative description of the district's work order based system were acceptable. Tim described how the Guidelines for Raters assists in showing the requirements of subjective assessments. On the Guidelines, page 2– Tom asked why the sentence, “Consider results the district has noted in evaluating the effectiveness of the program.” was stricken. Tim suggested that it could just as easily be left in.

Assessment 2

[This assessment was discussed earlier in the meeting with resulting changes per the briefing paper.]

Assessment 3

Bob said this assessment doesn't match what Assessment 4 is looking for and asked if it was necessary to break it down by building instead of a districtwide report? No changes were implemented.

Assessment 4

The issue of the district needing to provide information in a separate question in order for EED to make this calculation was again raised. Don mentioned that with audits and insurance data already coming in to the department, we could say that ‘EED has this information.’ All members agreed that the department can use maintenance costs based on audit figures.

There was conversation about a discrepancy in how the application instructions, the briefing paper and the Scoring Criteria sheets depicted the required information. Don went to get the prior year application and returned. Tim pointed out that the FY06 Objective Rating Form shows calculations. All agreed that the narrative for #9/a/3 of the Objective Rating Form needed to be clarified and that the formula would be inserted so that Assessment 4 matched the briefing paper.

Finally, Question 7 is fine as-is in the application but the instructions will now say ‘This information is used in calculating scores for Assessment 4- see Question 31.’

Assessment 5

A brief discussion related to the ‘results’ of energy management commenced. If the district is not reducing consumption, why not? Tim asked if the raters guide should direct the rater to look for the why...but Mark said raters would look to see if the narrative submitted showed that the program is achieving results. Other comments suggested dispensing with the instructions and going with just the raters guide. All came back to the bottom line; the directions say address consumption not the cost.

Assessment 6

Discussion ensued of ‘...standards of care.’ There are defined standards and quality levels in place. Agreement was achieved to strike standards and insert ‘frequency’ – This now matches the raters guide.

Tom noted a typo in custodial text, “...has customized the its program...” (remove ‘the’)

Assessment 7

Tom suggested adding something about a training program to provide some guidance about frequency. Tim referred to regulation that specifies training noting that it says specify and record. All found it interesting that it doesn’t say you have to do it, just that you have to plan to do it. Bob agreed that he was ok with the way it’s written, asking for them to demonstrate their training program.

Mark and Bob went back to the raters guide with Mark being in favor of removing the 2nd paragraph all together.

Dee suggested inserting examples (comp training, video...), trying to show how to provide training without having to send personnel out-of-state.

All agreed that the last few sentences on the briefing paper, page 9, would be reworked with Tim’s notes about training and this wording added to Assessment 7. This would replace the current paragraph about what a program was and would give examples instead.

Assessment 8

It was noted that the Raters guide asks a question that isn’t reflected in the application instructions. Also the raters guide talks about a boilerplate renewal schedule.

It was suggested to use the word ‘comprehensive’ to account for mechanical systems that are so well maintained that they can be used past the scheduled renewal/replacement timeframe. Final changes included striking boilerplate and using comprehensive – or narrative with evidence. Also, to create sentence in the raters guide that asks, ”are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?” The next statement will then ask if they are grouped into logical capital projects.

It was agreed that because the committee was changing text, Tim will reword instructions to reflect the changes to the raters guide and instructions. He’ll incorporate all agreed upon comments and present them to the committee tomorrow.

Assessment 9

Bob requested clarification that if you have buildings 5yrs of age they have to be on the list. Tim said that the 5yr rule is generally where maintenance stops and capital renewal begins. He stated that if they are more than 5yrs old, they should show on the capital renewal list. The quality application will include this information to earn points.

There was further discussion of length of time and looking back at applications. Tim noted that right now this is all-or-nothing scoring but maybe in years to come the committee will see the need to change it.

Bob asked why the department has come up with 5yrs – he asked if 10 yrs of age wouldn’t be a better point to say “renewal items should now be happening.” He recalled that the PM Handbook included a replacement cycle, none of which kicked in prior to 10 years. All agreed that changing to a 10-year span would capture a better picture.

3:00p – Break

The committee reconvened at 3:20.

Dee had some detailed questions on the application itself she wanted to address. Mark asked her to proceed:

Pg 2 Application – Question #8 – surplus of buildings– is that right? Tim indicated that indeed, districts could surplus buildings as a part of a project.(no change)

Dee – and last part of the sentence ‘protection and disposal of properties’Tim explained that if a district was using a state-owned building, they had a responsibility to secure it for one year if they were surplusing it back to EED.(no change)

Dee – Page 3 referenced the inclusion of prior funding. She offered a discussion of the Anchorage/Muldoon elementary which apparently received a \$3 million grant ... Tim indicated that funding from various sources can happen but that our process only wants to record 14.11 appropriations—those project that were high on the department’s priority lists.

Dee noted that page 5, question #18 should reflect the 10th edition of the cost model. She also had grammatical corrections for the eligibility checklist, Item C and Item B. On page 5 of the Instructions, she suggested removing “for FY2004” as being too specific. She also questioned the word “currency in the first paragraph commenting that she thought of currency as money. On page 6 of the Instructions, she noted an unnecessary pluralization at “Question(s) #16”.

Dee asked about changes to the appendices for the application such as the definitions. The committee noted Tim already had changes written in – so no further changes were needed here.

Mark asked Carl for an overview of the JDHS high school tour of recent renovation. Carl said that it started at 4:30 and a reception would be held at MRV. Many others have been invited, including CEFPI and he hoped all would participate. All began to arrange rides and schedules.

Mark recessed the committee meeting at 3:50 and noted the next day’s start time to be 9:00a on the 22nd.

April 22, 2005 - 9:00 AM

Construction Standards

Eddy Jeans, chair, called the meeting to order and asked Harley to start with his construction standards report. Harley provided substantial documentation on CD and hard copy. He asked that the department look at them and asked for them to be posted on the web. Harley didn't think public input was necessary because the architects and engineers involved had a high level of expertise but he stressed the importance of a department level review. Harley noted he will also get with Mark for a review of the mechanical sections.

Mark mentioned references and numbering on CSI (the adopted format) changing but suggested the committee not go into that level of detail at this time. Harley said he still needed to write a summary of what was included. He added that references and standards change so this should be rewritten/updated every three years or so. Tim asked if each section had an overview. Harley said some do have "do's and don'ts" but not all – roofing, for example, included a lot of notes. In Section 1 he strongly encourages the move away from using wood in construction. He said the standard pushes to look more to steel and concrete. Eddy added that statute requires cost effectiveness and from a life cycle perspective, steel and concrete would likely be more viable all the way around.

Final CIP Application

Eddy asked Tim to go ahead with the CIP updates per yesterday's committee revisions. Since the committee retargeted the documents yesterday, Tim asked the committee to do a quality control session on all changes to the application, the instructions and the raters guide. He passed out revised documents that he believed captured the necessary changes.

Application Question 7: Carl asked about the effect of the change from 5 years to the 10 years on the 6-yr CIP plan. He wondered if this information for Q7 would just relate to permanent buildings over 10,000 sf? Tim stated that all Q7 information would be based on all insured values.

After questions from Eddy related to the use of district information for Q7 of the application, Tim explained that if the application has a different number than the audit then districts know there's an issue that needs to be cleared up. Eddy explained how the EED Chart of Accounts establishes a format that organizes the information in a uniform manner allowing uniform comparisons.

Bob pointed out that if the department already receives the information being requested in Q7, it would save him from going to the office and asking for numbers. Dee asked if it was taken out of the application and the department was going to pull the numbers for the district from another source, just how was a district going to get points for it? Tim said they'd still get points based of the amount of funding going to maintenance. Bob said that it would be easy to remove, break apart, renumber and check scoring because the committee just went all the way through the application yesterday. Tim said that if the committee wanted to remove this request for information from the application, the committee could take action then go back through and take another look at it overall. Eddy said he didn't think any of value/audit references should come out of the application or instructions because it provides the applicant with information that the department is going to be using and the sources to cross reference and get the numbers from the audits.

Dee confirmed the direction to create 7a and 7b now – make a statement and take out the dollars per year blanks. Eddy polled the group and there was no further concern.

Assessment 7 Review: Tim asked the committee to review the rewrite of assessment 7 – Dee thought it was really great. Tom reminded all that there must be “currency” of information. Don addressed the group and asked for Tim’s support and comment. He said that Kodiak counts the training that their people do on their own time for credit in the workplace – Tim and Eddy agreed that counted for training.

Assessment 8 Review: Minor edits including comas, parentheses were made.

Assessment 9 Review: There were questions on the use of the term ‘main school’ - Tim explained that the department’s web site explains what a ‘main school’ is and has a list that can be downloaded. Other members expressed concern about a building in the database showing in error – ex. A building that burned and was rebuilt with the same name would not be 10 yrs old anymore. Tim recognized that the database currently does not fully account for old facilities that have been remodeled. He stated this would be an important enhancement down the road and that in the interim, districts could identify such an error in data during the reconsideration period.

Assessment 4 Review: Tom asked to revisit the way the scoring for this assessment was reflected on the Objective Rating Form (item 9.A.3). He asked if the calculation on the rating form couldn’t be simplified – as a math teacher it took him awhile to figure out what they were doing –Tom wanted to do a % multiplied by 1.25 on the top line. This was agreed to and noted by staff.

Rater’s Guide Review: Tom asked what constitutes an emergency per the second page. He stated that if there’s an emergency, they’ll do what needs to get done and won’t wait to work through the application process. He asked for Tim to explain. Tim explained an instance of basketball hoops needing retightening and it was found that structure was rotten – all staff and students were moved out of school. With an emergency of this magnitude, the district found it couldn’t solve the problem and the project was put into a CIP application.

Dee made a motion to accept all FY07 CIP documents (application, instructions, subjective rating form, objective rating form, project eligibility checklist and guidelines for raters) as amended from Thursday and with the changes made today. The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.

10:00a – Break

Mark called the meeting back to order at 10:15a. Tim asked the committee to take a look at the Educational Specifications Handbook and the Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases.

Dee wanted to make sure Carl’s suggestion for Ed. Specs was implemented. She was assured that it was and referred to page 30. Several additional corrections and revisions were made as follows:

- Tom looked back to page 29 and asked why “...for that purpose.” was necessary at the end of the sentence talking about planning a facility for an educational program. The will

of the committee was to strike “for that purpose.” Next sentence, “Design of the <remove the word facility and insert SCHOOL>, however, should provide for use of the facility by the community to the extent possible.”

And , “The planning committee should keep in mind that IT IS...” <not ‘they are’> There was brief discussion of other small changes made on Page 30 but nothing further. Dee moved to adopt the Handbook to Writing Educational Specifications as amended. The motion carried.

Tim moved to Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases. The following revisions and corrections were discussed:

- Page 3, first paragraph, last sentence. Committee agreed to end the sentence at ‘school district’ and delete ‘in which the school facility.... ‘

- Create space before the heading “Technology Items”

- Page 7 – Note: (under table) capitalize “For...”

- Dee asked all to take a look at Page 6, second sentence, pointing out that it was much too long. After discussion the sentence was broken into two:

“Available desks, computers, calculators....should be added to the new equipment purchase.” and “This total should be no more than those appropriate to adequately provide for...”

- Page 9 after “Technology” – both plural so change “process” to “processes”

Bob moved that the committee approve the Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases as amended and directed the department to move forward with presenting the document to the state board. Tom seconded the motion. The motion carried.

10th Edition Cost Model

Tim moved the group on to the Program Demand Cost Model (agenda addition), and reminded the committee that this information is linked to the application so it will need committee approval. He added that the HMS person that did these cost models has moved on and there are questions as to who will be working on any future updates.

Members asked why the numbering of the worksheets skipped the number 10. Tim responded that in a previous edition, he recalled the 8th, EED had asked the consultant to provide a single file that could estimate both new construction and renovation. Previously worksheet 10 was an interim summary sheet for new construction projects. On its removal it seemed advisable to keep the pre-existing numbering scheme for the renovation estimates..

Dee talked about the need for the updated information due to rising costs. The fluctuating cost of OSB, for example, and the war we’re “not having” overseas and the lack of agreement with Canada for lumber. It was also mentioned that the cost of steel went up. Bob added that any district that did cost models off the 9th Edition for their bonds were now going to have to cut costs because of the cost factor change. Carl thought the committee should put something together showing project costs based on the 10th edition. Tim said that King Cove school was an example of size of school versus funds available – a direct relationship between cost factors and the project scope and size was shown. Kate added that even after they used the previous cost model and planned carefully they still went over estimates. Tim agreed that the department is going to see cost increases. We will also be able to refer to the Cost Model and be able to say to those that question the costs, or explain to the legislature that projected costs are real and the Cost Model is

based on an expert's opinion. Tim also wanted to clarify that these documents are resources for districts use in their planning as well as a way to validate costs.

Bob stated that a district should be moved to re-evaluate and re-submit applications with new numbers, if for nothing else than to rework cost estimates.

Carl returned to his thought that the department can do an appropriate adjustment for districts that reuse scores on projects Tim thought the department could easily do so and stated it was EED's responsibility.

Bob asked Tim when was the last time there was a Cost Model workshop for districts? Bob thought that maybe it would be helpful because of all the changes. Tim said it had been a while but there's a portion of time allowed for cost model review within the CIP Application Workshops. Tim added that upcoming workshops will have department staff available to target district specific projects. He agreed that there is a need for additional Cost Model training especially at the point where there's a 99.9-degree of confidence in this current cost model document.

Tim wanted the group to go back to the Geographic Cost Factor issues. He stated that although HMS had a process – it's been a challenge to determine a baseline. He noted that in the 9th Edition we moved to change the way geographic cost factors were being looked at. Rural schools were being built with same systems and materials as in Anchorage. It appeared that the only thing setting them apart was the type of foundation required by the area climate and soils. He explained that we had asked HMS in the 9th Edition to take out the foundation pieces but HMS couldn't locate the detail to isolate just the foundation costs. With the transition from the 8th to the 9th Edition, the department gave some calculations to the consultant to use. However, these were never "accepted" by them. As a result, the current geographic cost factors continue to be an interpolation from factors that HMS found in their files and progress that EED had since made. Tim indicated he had added a percent-of-change column and will send to HMS for their review. Tim said he'd make further notations and clarifications and that the department will continue to work with HMS.

Dee moved to approve the Program Demand Cost Model for Alaskan Schools, 10th Edition, and the attached documents (summary, introduction, instructions and tables). The motion carried.

Work Plan Review

The next BR&GR meeting was slated for August. However, in an effort to schedule the meeting in Kodiak, the committee agreed to change the date to July 14 and 15. There will be the traditional school report and tour of schools on Thursday (arrive at 1 or so) then the Friday meeting.

The draft agenda for the July meeting is as follows:

- PM Handbook
- Allowable Space Guidelines (this was at Mark's request to deal with a perception of inadequate space allowance.)

Note: this topic generated considerable other discussion regarding an EED requirement to build a wall cutting off a room for students because it was too much space. It just didn't

make sense. Tom added that rooms needed space for parent helpers in the classroom, and that we really needed to start planning for technology (i.e. space for computers). Computer labs are not the thing anymore, the computers are in the classroom. Kate wanted to address supplies that come in during summer and have to be stored, which takes space away from students until supplies are used/reorganized. Dee said that past discussion indicated that this topic really did need to be discussed further. Bob added inadequate space for storage as being a necessary point of discussion. Tom agreed. A suggestion of a village trip to see tight spaces, like Ouzinkie, was offered.

Tim said that he didn't think there was a need to dig up all the old references. Eddy said the CIP list is the estimated size of a building with estimated cost of construction. He said the funding is allocated and the district thinks it's 'their' money. He added that EED uses the space guidelines to determine what funding the district is eligible for and that there's a real need for give and take, for a balance. Mark countered that was fine but current space allocations are just too low to which Eddy responded they'll always be too low for some people.

Tim stated it was a given for projects such as JDHS and Kate's Bethel Regional HS, that the schools are too small but that it doesn't have anything to do with the space guidelines. Instead, the existing facilities are oversized and inefficient. Tom refocused the need on determining whether there was enough room to teach in the classrooms. Carl said that maybe we should look at what other states are doing. Tom said that classrooms can be too big...but the advent of technology now means we're having to have more than one computer in the classroom. He also gave an anecdote on ADA requirements where ripping out a concrete wall to create ADA access was done. Kathy Christy added that she wouldn't necessarily build computer rooms any more. She felt the current education delivery direction was project based learning and wondered how the space guidelines responded to that factor.

Tim agreed that staff would bring previous guidelines and current guidelines to the July meeting

Adjournment

Dee moved for adjournment. Motion carried and official business of the meeting closed at noon.