

**BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Thursday, February 23, 2023 – 1:00 p.m. – 2:47 p.m.

Held via Videoconference

APPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

**Committee Members Present**

Elwin Blackwell, Chair  
Dale Smythe  
Randy Williams  
James Estes  
Kevin Lyon  
Branzon Anania  
Senator James Kaufman

**Staff**

Joe Willhoite  
Lori Weed  
Wayne Marquis  
Wayne Norlund  
Sharol Roys

**Additional Participants**

Larry Morris, Anchorage SD  
David Landis, SERRC  
M. Harvey

**February 23, 2023**

**CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL**

Chair Elwin Blackwell called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established to conduct business. David Kingsland was absent. The seat for a member of the House of Representative is vacant.

**AGENDA REVIEW / APPROVAL**

Kevin Lyon **MOVED** to approve the agenda as presented, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

**PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW / APPROVAL – December 1, 2022**

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve the minutes from December 1, 2022 as presented, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

A public comment period was offered, and Larry Morris stated he would give public testimony another time.

**FY2024 CIP APPLICATION TOTAL POINTS BALANCE REVIEW**

Lori Weed reviewed the briefing paper. Because some scoring changes were made and new categories added, this paper examines allocation of the available points in the CIP application to determine if the balance of the scoring remains in line with BR&GR Committee goals. The scoring criteria are shown as traditional formula-driven versus evaluative criteria in addition to being grouped into the following categories: need, safety, costing, planning, preventive maintenance, and consideration of alternatives. About two-thirds of the points are driven by need and safety, such as space considerations, operational cost savings, and life safety conditions.

Dale Smythe commented on declining enrollment and the unhoused student point total and asked if anyone thought that more points should be available more specifically for the age of facilities rather than being based on student population. Kevin Lyon suggested that the age of buildings

that have had a major remodel be reset from the date of original construction to the date of the remodel. Lori agreed that is a hot topic and stated that a contractor is working on a database to conglomerate the renewal and replacement schedules, and the department can propose a change once that is completed.

Kevin Lyon thought the paper showed a good scoring balance other than that one concern. Branzon Anania said that the fire marshal's definition of life and safety is sometimes not in line with the department's but said it's possible he was missing something in the scoring. Lori and he will examine that score category before the April meeting.

Randy Williams thought the unhoused student scoring was appropriate: if there are fewer unhoused student situations in the future, it should be a self-correcting issue. Dale replied that there was a time when unhoused students was the highest issue and had higher scores to avoid overcrowded schools. He noted that is not the current situation, so maybe the scoring should be adjusted to match the current situation of older schools rather than overcrowded ones.

Joe Willhoite asked if Dale had any examples of this situation or if it is anecdotal. Dale replied he could get some examples, he discovered that there are many more old schools than he thought. Some of the smaller districts have many outdated buildings that are getting more difficult to maintain. He added that, concerning Branzon's comments about the fire sprinkler situation, perhaps a list should be started because there are schools that should be sprinklered that are not. Kevin Lyon agreed that there are schools that are overcrowded, not sprinklered, and outdated.

Lori Weed agreed that the unhoused student situation is self-correcting to some extent. She asked whether unhoused student projects need to rise to the top of the list, or should they be more competitive with just a general bad building? She noted that regular renovations fall into major maintenance versus the school construction list for adding space and other life safety and instructional program improvements.

Dale Smythe noted that the risk to the state for cost is more in older facilities since they may not have the option for energy efficiency upgrades because of condition or age of equipment, and that might be a higher risk than overcrowding.

Dale asked how much relative scoring was related to unhoused students this last season. Lori said only a handful of projects get unhoused points, and there are about five projects on the construction list that are adding space. Dale would like to see further examination of this subject to see if there is a need to change the current scoring for next year's application.

Joe Willhoite mentioned that the comments to him about conditions of schools have centered on the age and the condition of the facilities, not on overcrowding.

Randy Williams said that he would support an adjustment to the point spread if it was warranted, but if there are fewer points being sought for unhoused students, it should self-correct.

Lori Weed continued the briefing paper review, with the breakout by typical project achievement:

- basic scoring elements that every project should be able to achieve,

- scoring elements that are designed to weigh projects of disparate scopes and needs, and
- scoring elements for targeted priority increases (bumps).

Lori then reviewed and commented the section entitled “By the Numbers” that shows the breadth of points used within categories such as life safety, cost estimate, operating cost savings, options, type of space, and inadequacy of space.

Senator Kaufman asked where he could find out more about the scoring process, and Lori directed him to the Facilities’ CIP Application and Support webpage, which not only gives a brief overview, but also provides links to the application, the instructions, the rater’s guide, and all the documents and tools to support the process.

Lori discussed the concern of how much bias the CIP application scoring has toward projects that are complete and seeking reimbursement through the grant process versus projects that are in the planning stages. She said that the application planning and design scoring category was limited to design development stage and since the FY2017 application the design development score had been capped at 5 points; and Kevin Lyon said that it is capped to avoid getting more done in the design phase and then not getting a pathway to finish the job.

Lori stated that in the last couple of years, about half of the projects that reached the top 10 were completed.

Elwin Blackwell asked if there were questions other than the problem of aging schools that may need to be replaced even though they do not have an unhoused situation because the student population is decreasing. He agreed that is a subject to review at some point.

Randy Williams asked if “in progress” projects in the table meant those are in construction. Lori responded that the Nome roof, Bethel campus fire pump house, and Nuniwaarmiut wastewater upgrades are still in design. Kevin Lyon said the Homer roof is in construction.

David Landis appreciated the discussion about the spread of the scoring and how that highlights what the funding levels should be.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Design Ratios**

Dale Smythe reported that at its last meeting, the subcommittee determined that the design ratios were ready for public comment, and if the committee agrees, then they need to decide what questions to put in the public memo. One thing Dale wants input on is the clarity of the definitions. Kevin Lyon said he liked the example of consideration of daylighting elements.

Wayne Norlund asked if the V:GSF ratio might be listed in reverse and should be GSF:V instead. That would be consistent with the way the other ratios pan out with the percentages.

Lori questioned the timeline for the public comment, committee review, and cover memo approval. Dale would like to see public comment as soon as possible with subcommittee review of the cover memo. That way, the committee can review public comment at the April meeting.

Dale Smythe **MOVED** that the design ratios be put out for public comment after some minor edits by the department and subcommittee concerning the inverted ratio of volume to gross square footage and then recommending comments for daylighting, definitions, and other specifics that may come from the BR&GR Committee or the subcommittee to be included in the cover memo, **SECONDED** by Kevin Lyon. Hearing no objections, the motion **PASSED**.

### **School Space**

Dale Smythe reported that the subcommittee had made progress around the limits of defining the measurement of gross square footage considering climate zone requirements and wall thickness.

The subcommittee will propose removing the K-12 space formula and focusing on elementary and high school formulas and the variances that might apply to those schools depending on location, water and wastewater treatment needs, and mechanical or storage related elements.

### **PUBLICATIONS: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SCHOOL CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Wayne Norlund directed the committee to review the new section regarding commissioning agents and to an added description of the value analysis process. He asked if these sections sufficiently addressed the expectations of the committee and if they were placed logically in the publication or if they would be better suited for another publication.

Randy Williams appreciated the effort, said it was really great, and thought it was ready to go out to public comment. Kevin Lyon agreed with Randy.

Dale Smythe asked if the value analysis was mentioned only in the schematic design services or if it appeared anywhere else in the publication. Wayne responded that it was primarily in that one area, and Dale then said he thought it was ready for public comment. Dale asked if the value analysis is described in any other publication, and Wayne responded that it is in the *Capital Project Administration Handbook* showing all four levels of value analysis and the deliverables expected at each level.

Joe Willhoite questioned the placement of the information and asked if it might be better in one document. Randy Williams said it is clearly intended to be part of schematic design services, and it also directs the user right to the *Capital Project Administration Handbook*. Kevin Lyon added that when on a project, both books are on the project manager's desk and are used regularly.

Randy Williams **MOVED** that the BR&GR Committee recommend the department amend the draft publication update of the Professional Services for School Capital Projects as shown in the packet and then open a period of public comment, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objections, the motion **PASSED**.

### **MEMBER RECRUITMENT**

Elwin Blackwell explained that there was a recruitment for three seats that will be vacant shortly.

Lori Weed thanked David Kingsland, the outgoing public member, and announced that he will be replaced by Douglas Hayman, a K-12 public educator from the Kenai area. She thanked Jim

Estes for his service and said he will be missed by the committee. He will be replaced by Larry Morris, Jr., who has a background in both Fairbanks and Anchorage. Randy Williams' term is expiring, but he reapplied for reappointment, and that was granted.

Elwin Blackwell thanked Jim Estes and David Kingsland for their service and said it had been a pleasure having them on the committee the last four years. Joe Willhoite said he appreciated all the applications and encouraged everyone to stay involved. He thanked David Landis for joining in the meeting today. Elwin Blackwell stated that public input is always valuable and has been very helpful over the years.

### **BR&GR WORK PLAN REVIEW & UPDATE**

Lori Weed reviewed both the annual work topics list and the master list. There have been no changes to the current list since the last meeting. Kevin Lyon asked if there would be any input or materials for the Cost Model at the April meeting since the due date is scheduled for May. Lori said there would be a short presentation at the April meeting with feedback from the committee, and then the final version would be available the first week in May.

She has not moved anything from the master plan to the current year, but some of the items in section 5, space issues, Rater's Guide matrices, and weighting factors will probably be brought up for next year. Randy Williams asked about the life cycle cost analysis publication, and Lori said a draft would be introduced in April. Randy noted that swimming pools and educational specifications were scheduled for 2024, but he asked about the items marked TBD. Lori replied that some of those need to be reviewed to see if they are still relevant.

### **SET NEXT MEETING DATE**

Lori Weed suggested the next meeting date be April 19th and 20th in Juneau so as not to conflict with the ALASBO maintenance training scheduled for April 13 – 14. Elwin Blackwell is available on the suggested dates but might not be chairing the meeting if a new division director is appointed; he will be retiring soon after 30 years with the department. Lori said the April meeting is usually a day-and-a-half, but with a light agenda it might just be a one-day meeting.

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

Elwin Blackwell said it was a pleasure having Senator Kaufman at the meeting today and thanked him for attending.

Dale Smythe said he would miss seeing Jim in April in Juneau and thanked him for serving with the board. He congratulated Elwin on his retirement and welcomed the new members.

James Estes said it had been a pleasure and a privilege to be a part of this committee and thanked everyone for the opportunity.

### **ADJOURN**

Randy Williams **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. Hearing no objections, the motion **PASSED**, and the meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.