

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Final Minutes
December 1, 2010
Department of Education and Early Development
Talking Book Library
Anchorage, Alaska

| Committee Members | EED Staff | Other Attendees |
|--|------------------|------------------------|
| Elizabeth (Sweeney) Nudelman - Chair | Sam Kito* | Jeff Jeffers* (DOT) |
| Senator Lyman Hoffman (Sandy* via phone) | Kim Andrews | Taylor Van Eaton (DOT) |
| Mary Cary | Wayne Marquis | Scott Thomas (DOT) |
| Robert Tucker | Michelle Norman* | Don Hiley (SERRC) |
| Carl John | | |
| Doug Crevensten | | |
| Dean Henrick | | |

*attended via teleconference

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

AMENDMENT of and APPROVAL of the AGENDA

DOT Site Selection Traffic Information criteria was to the top of the agenda.

Carl asked to be given time to speak on the issue he forwarded to Ms. Nudelman. This will be a discussion item rather than an action item which will be presented at 10:45.

Agenda approved as amended.

AMENDMENT of and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Sam requested that future minutes be summary minutes rather than verbatim. Also, rather than restating report information, the minutes will refer back to the specific report.

April 14, 2010 and July 23, 2010 minutes approved as amended with spelling corrections noted to Elizabeth (Sweeney) Nudelman and Senator Hoffman's names.

DOT PRESENTATION – Refer to attachment for details

SPECIAL TOPIC – DOT Presentation by Jeff Jeffers and Scott Thomas

DOT representatives explained their recommendation that the department consider traffic impacts as part of the site selection process. They provided background to their position including the higher costs associated with mitigating traffic issues at the end of a project or after construction vs. proactively planning traffic and access needs into the original project and budget. They explained the reason behind their draft scoring recommendation is not to impose rules or cost, but rather it was structured with the DOT priorities in mind as a tool to be utilized in site selection.

Mary Cary asked about incorporating the new EPA site selection guidelines into this as well. Sam will be forwarding the EPA draft proposal to all committee members for review and will take this information into consideration when updating the publication. This information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/schools/siting/>.

Kim suggested adding a graphic addressing an urban setting which was available at the meeting into the proposed publication. DOT advised they can make the graphic available. The committee agreed to move this publication up to publication review item 1 and would hope to review this at the next BRGR meeting if possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public Comments made.

STAFF BRIEFING – Refer to attachment for details

PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE

Sam discussed the districts which have recently been visited, and those scheduled to be visited for the remainder of the year. These districts are highlighted in bold on the PM State-of-the-State Report provided. The agenda notes there are 4 districts which are currently not certified. Kashunamiut, Pribilof and Tanana have expressed interest in securing certification; however, the department understands that the Aleutian Region School District has not sought CIP certification by choice as they feel they are not need of State EED funding.

Wayne advised that there are four districts which have provisional certification and he is working closely with them toward securing full certification. These districts are Cordova, Denali Borough, Kuspuk, and YKSD.

Committee members expressed concern that the districts which are not certified may not be properly maintaining their new facilities and that may only seek recertification when the need arises for a capital improvement project down the road.

Elizabeth cautioned against jumping to a legislative solution to this issue. She has found that often times it is more effective at trying to work with the district – much as Wayne has been working with the provisionally certified districts in accomplishing goals. Sam stressed that the program as a whole is working very well, there are only 4 districts not certified, with one by choice.

- BREAK -

STAFF BRIEFING (Continued)

DEBT REIMBURSEMENT FUNDING STATUS (HB 13/HB 373 Final Report, SB 237 Initial Report)

HB13/HB373 Debt Reimbursement Report

SB237 Debt Reimbursement Report

Initial CIP Lists

Summary Statistics

- Applications received from 38 of 53 districts
- School Construction – 32 projects totaling \$314 million

- Major Maintenance – 117 projects totaling \$275 million
Initial FY2012 CIP Priority Lists

FY2009 Additional Project Eligibility

One district which had been approved on the FY09 Major Maintenance List notified the department they would not be utilizing this funding. Legislative language allows the department to fund additional projects from the FY09 list. As a result, the department has completed and is negotiating Project Agreements for the following projects:

- Chatham School District, Gustavus K-12 School Major Maintenance for \$2,334,778 state share (#30 on the FY09 MM List),
- Haines School District, Haines School Renovation Completion for \$1,196,092 state share (#32 on the FY09 MM List),
- Copper River School District, Glennallen High School Upgrade for \$2,395,864 (#38 on the FY09 MM List),
- Copper River School District, Kenny Lake High School Upgrade for \$283,294 state share (#41 on the FY09 MM List),
- Lower Kuskokwim School District, M.E. Elementary Deferred Maintenance Phase 2, Bethel for \$5,999,773 (#39 on the FY09 MM List),
- Hoonah City School District, Hoonah Schools Major Maintenance for an amount that is being negotiated with the district (#40 on the FY09 MM List).

If Hoonah does not utilize their full amount, the department may have the ability to work further down the FY09 CIP list. Sam clarified that the language of the legislation allows the districts to accept the original funding amount – there is no escalation for inflation. They do have the ability to reduce the scope of a project, but they cannot expand the scope.

It was noted that the projects have not been funded numerically from the FY09 CIP list. Sam clarified that some projects were funded in CIP FY10, one school had utilized debt to fund their project, and another involved a school which has since been closed. The projects were funded right down the list for all eligible projects.

PUBLICATIONS UPDATE

The committee agreed to move the Site Selection Criteria Handbook from 8 on the priority list to number 1.

STAFF GOALS and OBJECTIVES

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

Database Review – The department is continuing to look at hiring a database professional to review and provide recommendations for consolidations of the department's Facilities database. Sam is looking to bring someone on Spring 2011.

Energy Efficiency Presentation – This will be presented during the work session, however, Sam wanted to introduce that he has begun the process for review of the

acceptance of a standard and adoption of a regulation. The process will be to coordinate with school districts, design professionals and other interested parties to try and adopt an energy efficiency standard that will apply and work statewide for school and school districts. Goal is to have a draft regulation by December 2011.

SET DATE and LOCATION OF FUTURE MEETINGS

March 16, 2011 in Juneau, tentative date for summer meeting set July 22, 2011 in Fairbanks, December 2011 meeting to be held again in Anchorage.

Carl John – Discussion on Department Philosophy of Categorizing Projects

Carl explained that he believes the additional language added to the Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application, “Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure or Code Compliance, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components should be considered as maintenance projects,” is overly restrictive. This language moves any projects which are located outside of the physical school facility to the Construction List and puts them outside of the possibility of ever receiving funding. Carl provided a highlighted list of projects at the bottom of the construction list which he believes should be part of the Major Maintenance (MM) List. On the Construction List, they fall well below the funding level; however, he believes many could stand a chance at funding should they be rated on the MM List. Prior to 2010, Carl believes there were playground structures, parking facilities and other structures outside the physical school building which were funded on the MM List. He does not believe the legislature intended in their language – the interpretation which the department has committed to in the language added in the Raters Guide.

Mary questioned whether or not codes related to the exterior of the buildings which require attention including traffic and access issues which were presented by DOT today, could be considered under the MM list.

There was great discussion over this issue and what the intent of the legislature may have been. Elizabeth clarified that the department does not currently consider this issue a priority and that the statutes and regulations are being interpreted by the department appropriately. It was decided that the committee should wait to see how things are funded by the legislature and to revisit this issue again next year if the committee feels it is warranted.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

No committee comments made.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Review of DOT addition to the site selection guideline is Sam has time to prepare.
- EPA Site Selection Guidelines – analysis & how these can be incorporated/taken into consideration by the department. Sam will send link to committee members for review.

MEETING ADJOURNED and members will meet back for a work session at 1:30.