

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

**Date:** July 17, 2009

**Phone:** 465-6906

**File:** 2009-07-17 Staff Briefing

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

**Subject:** EED Facilities Overview

## **S T A F F   B R I E F I N G**

---

### **Staff Briefing**

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

The Preventive Maintenance State of the State report (attached) was updated on June 1, 2009, and reflects the FY09 district site visits the department has completed as of this date.

The Hoonah City school district submitted documentation on June 18 and the district now complies with the department's PM requirements. Reports are still pending from the Pelican City school district.

The department has produced its site visit reports for the Lower Kuskokwim, Lower Yukon, Saint Mary's, Bering Strait, Iditarod Area, Yukon Flats, and Yukon Koyukuk school districts. Of these visited districts, the department has identified three of which will be required to submit further information, namely the Iditarod Area, Yukon Koyukuk, and Yukon Flats school districts. The department contacted these districts and has issued a detailed list of what needs to be accomplished in order to gain compliance.

The department has site visits planned at the Kashunamiut and Yupiit school districts during the last week of August 2009.

Wayne has contacted all FY10 school districts with pending site visits: Kodiak Island, Aleutians East, Unalaska City, Cordova City, Yakutat City, Denali Borough, Nenana City, Tanana City, Kuspuk, Pribilof Island, and Kake City. Each district has been informed of the date of its planned site visit. These site visits will occur between October, 2009, and March of 2010.

This past winter has been harsh, by comparison to previous winters. There was much more snow than usual, and some the Alaska interior has experienced temperatures in excess of minus fifty degrees for three weeks straight. The cold temperatures have deeply frozen many of our great rivers with record ice thickness which resulted in dramatic ice dams and major damage to nearby communities during breakup. Fortunately, no severe damage to any of our schools were reported (confirmed by Yukon Flats and Yukon Koyukuk school districts, and I have not heard otherwise elsewhere).

The harsh conditions have created more emergency work for the maintenance teams as well as an increase in operating costs, both in labor and energy. Districts reported

spending many of their resources with emergency responses to teacher housing units. The reported price of heating fuel ranged between four to nearly eight dollars a gallon. There are huge disparities between districts when it comes to maintenance management. I have heard complaints ranging from: “the department keeps asking for more,” (though the requirements are the same as they were nearly a decade ago) to “there are insufficient local resources to do all of what is required.” (some districts put their students to work to assist in database entry, which is one of the most time consuming functions when running a preventive maintenance program). The decrease in student enrollment is another issue that was brought up during the visits. Granted, the funding decreases accordingly, but there is an argument to be made when not having as many occupants utilizing as large an area which decreases your operational costs as well, maybe not on a parallel basis, but it certainly does not increase it. Of course, as facilities age, the maintenance costs tend to increase slightly, if maintained properly, exponentially if not.

One thing seems to prevail in the level of maintenance performance: how motivated and involved the district leadership is in the overall maintenance of their schools. Unfortunately, I only saw minimal use of the maintenance reports as a tool to help districts guide their decisions making process. (If the Yukon Koyukuk had an efficient maintenance program, they would probably realize their lack of expertise –and high costs- in heating and favor hiring a heating specialist before considering a painter/carpenter as what was mentioned to me during the site visit.) It appears as though there is a lack of understanding that the maintenance program is most efficient when used as a managerial tool, not merely a hurdle to cross to receive funding from the department. A good preventive maintenance program helps you stay ahead, not simply fix what breaks as you go along, which equates at the differences between managers and operators. Just about anyone can keep things going if you give them an open wallet, but only managers can tell you where they stand, where they came from, and where they’re going by using their maintenance management program effectively.

Some of the complaints were that the department favors large districts over smaller ones, when it comes to meeting our department’s requirements. Of the seven visited districts, the smallest of all (Saint Mary’s) ranked amongst the best, both on paper and in the field. I also heard about districts not having much to work with, when it comes to human resources. There are numerous districts where some of their distant site employees have been around for numerous years; granted, their potential, talents, and capabilities varied from site to site. However, I believe that the combination of both training and motivational support can greatly enhance the performance of the employees in question. We both saw an example of this in Saint Mary’s. Iditarod Area has two great itinerant employees, but the managerial performance and enthusiasm at the district headquarters is somewhat low at this time. Good work is getting done in the field, but there is minimal performance in supporting the maintenance program. I do sympathize with the decrease in student enrollment, but it should not be an excuse to throw in the towel. They have as much talent and capabilities as other districts.

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

Since April, the department has not added any additional debt authorization.

As of June 30th, 2009, the total bond amount requested under House Bill 13/373 was \$390,871,263. The total amount approved by the department was \$356,284,221. The total voter approved amount was \$261,325,131. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$250,823,221. There is \$105,461,000 that is EED approved, but not approved by voters.

### ***Annual School Construction Reports***

**CIP Grant Requests and Funding History** – This report provides a historical perspective on the amount of funding requested by districts, as well as a historical record of funding (approval in the case of debt).

**Funded Projects by Fiscal year (FY 07 – FY10)** – this report lists all projects funded by the district since FY 2007.

### ***Regulation Project Update***

The attached regulation changes have been submitted to the Commissioner's office for consideration as part of a department wide regulation review project.

### ***Publications Update***

**Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Guide** – This document is in draft form. Staff continues to work on the document, and is approximately 60% through completion of the first draft. This document was originally envisioned as a complete rewrite of the Preventative Maintenance Handbook with a re-focus on overall management of district facilities, not only preventative maintenance issues.

**A/E Services Manual** – The A/E Services Manual project was started a number of years ago, and is approximately 90% complete. Staff continues to work on updating this document. The manual will provide school districts with guidance for selecting Architectural and Engineering consultants, and is a vital component of the reference documentation cited by the department in our project agreement.

The following list of publications is currently managed by the department. The listing includes the estimated revision priority, and the year of publication or latest draft:

1. Preventive Maintenance and Facility Management Guide (Preventative Maintenance Handbook (1999)); [Draft revision started in 2005]
2. A/E Services handbook (1999-Draft)
3. Outdoor Facility Guidelines (new)
4. Space Guidelines Handbook (1996)
5. Lifecycle Cost Analysis Handbook (1999)

6. Facility Appraisal Guide (1997)
7. Swimming Pool Guidelines (1997)
8. Site Selection Criteria Handbook (1997)
9. Condition Survey (1997)
10. Renewal & Replacement Guideline (2001)
11. Project Delivery Handbook (2004)
12. Equipment Purchase Guideline (2005)
13. Educational Specification Handbook (2005); and Educational Specifications Supplement (2009)
14. Capital Project Administration Handbook (2007)

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

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

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

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

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