

**Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee**  
**August 1 and 2, 2013**  
**Anchorage – Talking Book Library**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Committee Members Present**

Elizabeth Nudelman  
Doug Crevensten  
Mary Cary  
Mark Langberg  
Robert “Bob” Tucker

**Staff**

Stuart Gerger  
Elwin Blackwell

**Additional Participants**

Dave Herbert (St. Mary’s) telephone  
Don Hiley (SERRC) telephone  
Rachel Molina Lodoen (ASD) telephone  
Don Carney (Mat Su)  
Kevin Lyon (Kenai)  
Dave Norum (FBNS)  
David Tressler (KPBSD)

**August 1**

**Call to Order and Roll Call at 9:05am**

*Elizabeth Nudelman*, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 and a roll call was completed. *Senator Dunleavy*, *Dean Henrick*, and *Carl John* were not present. A quorum was established.

**Review and Approval of Minutes**

The May 8 - 9, 2013 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:

First paragraph: all members were not present. *Elizabeth* stated that each Legislative Session a letter is sent to the Senate and the House. A member has not been appointed from the House and that seat is vacant. It was agreed that it will be noted in the minutes.

A header and footer is needed on all pages of the minutes.

Page 50 - change “ineffective” to “in effect”.

Page 51 - last paragraph, second sentence is not a complete sentence. Staff will research and make correction.

Page 56 - change “for just” to “just for”.

*Mark* wanted to clarify whether the action items mentioned in the minutes were taken care of.

*Mark* made a motion to approve the minutes of May 8 - 9, 2013, as amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

**Agenda Addition**

*Elizabeth* made a motion to add a discussion of items from the previous minutes to the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

## **Discussion of Previous Minutes' Action Items**

*Mark* referenced page 52 of previous minutes, where *Kimberly Andrews* mentioned that it was a confidentiality issue to use school districts' actual CIP applications as examples. *Mark* suggested that the Department mark up some examples from an actual application, alter it so it is not known whose district it is, and use them at the CIP workshop. There can be good examples and bad examples as far as what is effective and less effective. *Elizabeth* wants to double check the use of the phrase "confidentiality" in light of the public information. Acknowledges desire for examples both good and those less successful or effective.

*Mark* referenced page 54 of 56, where the Department was going to look into the language of the debt program and get back with an answer. *Elizabeth* noted that she will go back and look and see what research was done and if there was a definitive answer and what the language says in the statute and regulations – many places in statutes say "district owned" buildings.

*Mark* referenced page 56, request that finalized list of action items be emailed, was that done? *Stuart* noted letter of June 7<sup>th</sup>, included in back of the committee packet.

## **Introduction of Work Session Goals**

*Stuart* presented the work session goals. He noted that changes to the CIP application are an ongoing process and that there is a goal of April 2014 to bring something to the table. *Elizabeth* clarified that, although there will be discussions of specific questions along the way, there won't be any ratifications or decisions until April and seeing where the BRGR Committee is at.

*Bob* asked whether the draft reorganization of the CIP application had gone out to the districts for review. *Stuart* stated that what went out to the Superintendents included an acknowledgement that the process was occurring, the call-in information, the agenda, and a link to the website to find the information. *Bob* expressed concern that there wasn't enough time to look at it, but mentioned it was good that the Superintendents at least got that email. *Stuart* acknowledged that it is a lot of information and that after public comment he will walk through the structure of what is in front of the committee.

## **Public Comment**

*Don Carney* stated that when he approached the Superintendent of his school district, she had not had an opportunity to review the email that went out from *Stuart*. *Don* expressed concern that most Superintendents probably didn't even get a chance to read that email and forward it to the respective person. He stated that it was extremely short notice with a high volume of material. *Don* asked that in the future people get more notice so that there is time for people to review and to buy an affordable ticket to send a representative. He appreciates the opportunity to be able to phone in, but it is not the same as having a person present.

*Bob* appreciated removing the ratification of items at the end of each meeting, and asked that for the next agenda we had a period of time for people to discuss the previous meeting for those that were not in attendance or have had time to think about what had been covered and have

something to say. *Elizabeth* agreed and stated that there will be several meetings discussing the application so there will be multiple opportunities for people to comment.

*Don Carney* asked whether CIP questions can be directed towards Department employees or whether everything needs to be discussed in front of the committee. *Elizabeth* clarified that if people have facility-specific questions they may direct them to Department employees but any discussion regarding the application changes would be in front of the committee.

*Dave Norum* stated that he is glad to hear that there are not going to be any changes and that this is an ongoing process and will be looked at as a whole at the end. He thanked the committee for that clarification.

*Don Hiley* agreed with the previous comments about the short notice and magnitude of the material. He stated that he would like to make an intelligent analysis and that would require a little more time. He would have made every effort to attend in person if he had more notice to make arrangements. *Don* commented that everything being talked about has not been put online.

*Stuart* responded that the Meeting Packet was posted online Tuesday, July 30, 2013: “work session materials” and “agenda” were posted at that time as well. *Don* clarified that the full BRGR packet is not on the website and asked if the people in the room had access to the packet. *Stuart* responded that only the committee members had the full packet, including the draft minutes and inter-committee memo.

### **Work Session Discussion: Walk Through**

*Elizabeth* clarified that what the committee has in their packet is the first efforts to make the application simple and easy for school districts to use. The current application contains a lot of quality information that shouldn't be lost, but efforts can be done to make the administrative process as easy as possible for the districts; the reorganization is just housekeeping to make that happen. *Elizabeth* stated that no decisions or votes will be made but rather that will occur in the December 2013 or Spring 2014 meeting.

*Stuart* noted there are three kinds of changes that are being made: moving a question within the application, reorganizing the way a question is presented, and tweaks to the language of a question without changing the intent. There are no wholesale changes being presented. Goal was to organize it in a way to make sense to an applicant and to align the flow of the Application, Instructions, and Rater's Guide. Realize that it is the content of the question that is important, and that it needs to be aligned with the statutes and that it be clear and transparent how the Department reviews and scores the application.

*Stuart* referenced page 4 of 56, which was an outline of the reorganization strategy used in the Application and Instructions. *Elizabeth* clarified that Section 6 and 7 headers will not stay the same. She explained that it was just a way to break things up and make sure that we are aligned with Statute and Regulation. *Stuart* noted that an appendix was added to the application to put all the statute and regulation references for the factors for rating in one place.

*Stuart* began to walk through the Application for Funding. *Bob* noted he appreciated that all the changes were laid out now, even the ones to be discussed later, so that people can see the entirety.

*Bob* questioned if there will be a time to discuss the primary purposes in the future, to decide whether to take changes to the Board. *Elizabeth* stated that Statute and Regulation directs us on the major components on the process and projects, like primary purpose, and any changes to Statute or Regulation needs to be brought to the Legislature. *Bob* would rather know now if there are changes that need to go into statute, so we can get them in instead of waiting and it being too late. *Stuart* reiterated that the direction from the committee and commissioner was to reorganize the application, and to leave room for other changes.

*Doug* stated his thought that this is an okay time to discuss the purposes and asked that we not exclude any changes that the committee feels might require a Statute or Regulation change. *Bob* agreed that the committee needs to try to tell the Legislature where and how it could be done better, but when to do that is the question.

*Mary* said that, so as not to distract from this process, the committee should note any wanted changes and set a date as to when it will be addressed. *Elizabeth* stated we should note adjustments to regulations and discuss those as we move through this process. She reiterated that Statute change is complex and that maybe an hour or two discussion can be added to a future meeting. *Bob* asked to continue to pursue the change to the primary purposes statute and that the committee keep a task list. *Mary* noted that statute and regulation review and recommendations would be on the task list; *Bob* agreed. *Doug* suggested the ongoing task list be public so people can comment for future meetings.

*Elizabeth* clarified that the committee set a task list to go through the application by question and topic and engage the public. The Department made a tight schedule to get that done.

*Bob* suggested that people send information and comments on the task list and then that information can be compiled by the Department for presentation when the topic comes up at a future meeting.

*Stuart* sought clarification that this collected information would not be for changes for this application reorganization process, but for a future discussion and process. There was general agreement from members.

*Doug* suggested parsing out what the main issues are and put it out on the webpage and gathering information as people give it.

*Elizabeth* noted all comments and questions should be emailed to *Stuart's* email address.

Task list to be "Future Discussion Topics and Possibilities" – add "Primary Purpose" and playgrounds. *Mary* stated that we have a huge list out there and that the list needs to be compiled. *Bob* suggested identifying the top 10 items on the list at the last BRGR meeting of this application process.

*Mary* noted that this application process was given to the committee as a priority to be done in lieu of everything else at this time.

*Stuart* continued to walk through the CIP draft application discussion. *Elizabeth* noted that we want the application to be a tool for the districts, to make for efficient and good projects.

*Elizabeth* explained that making Scope and Life Safety separate categories is a change, although it doesn't change the points. She asked that people give that change some thought and that it be recognized as one of the proposed changes.

*Bob* commented that it seems like the separation gives districts more areas to give raters more information than before, especially with more specific information; it prompts applicants to give more information to enable better rating.

*Stuart* explained that scope isn't a scored category, though it's a very important piece of information. Currently it is coupled with a scored category as one question, which may have led to point-slanted descriptions.

*Stuart* continued with the CIP draft application discussion. *Stuart* explained that the facility appraisal (in 4b, project description attachments) is on the list of items to reevaluate. *Elizabeth* asked that if there are comments on the facility appraisal, people please comment for future discussions.

*Stuart* continued with 4c, which is slightly redundant with the scope of work but is noted because there is a different requirement for already completed work.

*Bob* asked whether the description in 4c was written exactly as it is in 4 AAC 31.023(c)(2). *Stuart* answered no. *Elizabeth* explained that the Statue and Regulation really does not address completed projects. *Elizabeth* referenced how expenditures less than 3 years can be submitted for reimbursement, although if that project is funded, it is treated as if it is a project that is not completed; the Department is required to review all necessary documents. She noted that the draft language was to strike a balance between completed projects and not. She referred to a comment by *Carl John* that completed projects get more points due to being complete. *Bob* clarified that completed projects are not given a reward or extra points because the project is done, but they may score better because the application is complete and has good information. *Doug* asked if the question should be phrased as "The department allows for reimbursement of already completed work within the parameters set out in 4 AAC".

*Stuart* used an example of a district project that may not have been a thoroughly-planned decision yet it was rewarded because it was an already completed project. Those are the type of dilemmas *Stuart* believes the Department faces.

*Bob* stated that situations where school districts will use a completed project to move up the priority list have been happening for a while. *Doug* stated that if it's in Statute, then maybe that is a statutory change that should be put on the list of items to bring to the Legislature. *Elizabeth*

interjected that it's not clear in the Statute, beyond that you can place expenditures from up to three years prior. One interpretation is that if the Department has to approve things along the way, then there is no way to bring a completed project into CIP, but many people across the state feel that this is a necessary avenue.

*Bob* recognized that the real problem is that there is not enough funding for all the projects. *Doug* commented about whom the interpretation benefits: the districts with the larger tax base.

*Elizabeth* noted that Legislators asked about project ranking and it needs to be clear that completed projects go through the CIP process with the uncompleted projects. This can be a discussion for a future meeting.

*Stuart* stated that the Department recognizes value of districts that are proactive and complete projects that need to be completed.

*Doug* recommends keeping the first sentence of 4c and moving the second sentence to the Instructions with additional information.

*Stuart* continued to questions 4d and 4e. *Mary* asked about whether the words "on site" literally mean within the property line. *Stuart* responded that sometimes it can include a related site and that the Department has the authority to modify the application or scope of work. *Mary* noted that maybe the Instructions could clarify.

*Bob* asked that for the next meeting all the noted changes that were made could be highlighted so it is known what was changed from the original application; even one word can change meaning.

*Doug* asked whether 4e should have the words "on site" in the question. *Mary* proposed a hypothetical where a project may have districtwide impacts. *Stuart* suggested "facilities related to the project." *Elizabeth* further suggested "facilities within in the project scope". *Stuart* stated that what they're trying to do is have a reminder that a transition plan is useful and necessary. *Elizabeth* noted that it is important to take care of an old building that is being left behind and not leave them scattered across the state. *Bob* noted that he liked having it separate and not muddying the scope. The committee largely agreed that this question was important and that it may just require a wording change.

## **Public Comment**

*Don Carney* asked whether input will be allowed on the CIP application changes during the discussion periods, as the public comment time is not an efficient amount of time to contribute.

*Elizabeth* stated that there is flexibility and the committee may be able to take a few comments along the way. Additional public comment times can be added and any comments and/or questions can be emailed to *Stuart*.

*Don Carney* added that whatever is put in the application becomes a part of the project agreement and that school districts need to know that.

*Dave Norum* asked if there is an opportunity to comment when a certain question is brought up instead of commenting afterwards, as a comment or question may not make as much sense after the context of the discussion.

*Bob* agreed that as a committee member he would be okay with that as long as it doesn't get out of hand, that way people can comment by section, not by question. *Elizabeth* said there can be room for flexibility, but we cannot steer away from the committee rules.

*Dave Norum* questioned whether 4c should be in "Project Planning" instead of "Project Information". He also pointed out that his school district, Fairbanks North Star, does not do planning before funding is awarded. The reasoning is that sometimes by the time funding is awarded, planning has already changed. The district's lack of project planning prohibits them from being awarded those points.

*Don Hiley* stated that the example given for 4c was not an entirely accurate statement. Also, he noted that most of the time already completed projects are generally small projects and don't have a significant impact on budget funding. Maybe for the December meeting there would be a time set when more stakeholders would be available for interaction and questions.

*Kevin Lyon* worried that if a project won't score in Life Safety, then taking all the points from the project description (4a) gives a project zero points and is not balanced. Life Safety too is narrow in that it doesn't address security-type issues. 4e used to be required only for a state-owned or -leased facility; state entities have other processes for disposal of assets.

*Elizabeth* noted that we're still going through the run through and that Scope, Life Safety and Emergency will be delved into later in the meeting. Regarding Transition Planning, it is a good suggestion to note if a building is borough-owned; this is will be good thing to revisit in December. Department has good direction regarding state-owned buildings, but not for borough-owned buildings.

*Mary* said that maybe it should be fundamental information to note who owns it with building information.

*Bob* wanted to clarify whether *Kevin Lyon's* comment about taking points away from scope was accurate. *Stuart* noted that rater's gave points for life safety but they didn't rate the scope, and the separation was to clarify that.

### **Continued Work Session Discussion: Walk-Through**

*Stuart* continued introducing the CIP draft application with Section 5 "Project Planning". It is an extremely important part of a project, with a definite place according to statute and regulation as a scoring criterion. *Elizabeth* stated that Section 5 is a section the committee is really soliciting input on; it is a difficult place for the Department to assign points and we want it to be transparent. *Bob* asked that total points be put on the top of each section. *Stuart* noted that, officially, "planning" gets no points; the information gets points in other places of the application.

Last two sections, Sections 6 and 7, are about scoring and points and have the points identified.

This draft focuses mostly on code-related life safety conditions and is broken into different levels to help applicants and raters use as a guideline.

Section 7 introduced. *Bob* asked if potential points should be identified the earlier section and referred back to. *Elizabeth* stated that it is a good discussion to have; she liked breaking out the information for scope and eligibility, but once the planning information was asked for then she was looking for points. *Bob* reiterated that noting at the top of the information section that the information was going to be used for points in a later section is important so the applicant could focus on it. *Elwin* agreed that without a notation, maybe an applicant would be inclined to gloss or skip over a section thinking it would not gain them an advantage point-wise.

*Elizabeth* asked that all return at 1:00p. The committee recessed for lunch.

## **BREAK - Lunch**

### **Work Session Discussion: Emergency**

*Stuart* turned the focus to the CIP draft application starting with question 6a, Emergency Conditions. In the current application this is a one sentence question with a yes/no checkbox. Draft application seeks more specific information. *Mark* commented that he likes the breakdown of instructions and that it will help districts better achieve points. *Elizabeth* added that she likes the “yes” or “no” answers for this question, although it is important to convey the need for the districts to provide narrative into their answers. *Doug* suggested removing “please” and just state “describe in more detail the nature of the life safety conditions”. *Mark* agreed that “use this area to describe” may be preferred.

*Stuart* emphasized the note above 6a, which states that verifying documentation must be provided. *Bob* suggested bolding the language, *Mark* concurred. *Mary* recommended removing “please” throughout the document and direct applicants to “provide” in order to make it a directive and not optional. *Elizabeth* noted that sometimes raters can intuit that a situation is an emergency, but without substantiation it puts the raters in a difficult situation. *Elwin* added that when districts just check the box, in the past, it hasn’t automatically given the district points for that question, as per the Rater’s Guide. *Doug* asked clarification about how much narrative instruction is put in the upfront part, and how much is put into the Instructions.

*Mary* asked that the check box questions have line items so each can be referenced pretty easily.

*Stuart* stated that the list came from a matrix from an earlier BRGR meeting and then tried to be consistent in the breakdown between the Application, Instructions, and Rater’s Guide.

*Elizabeth* noted that previously there had not been a lot of points given on the Emergency question, and that that may still hold. There should still be room left for true emergencies, and not use up all the points on non-emergency conditions – leave points for those things that rarely, if ever, happen.



*Bob* noted that just by reading the Rater's Guide, districts could know going in about how they would score and that it was important to leave in the point spread for when it was really needed. Really likes how up front it is about how you can get points for potential failures and for complete failures.

*Doug* appreciated that the list read from worst case to less worst cases and thinks it helps establish the point range also.

*Bob* noted that something to look at was tying in the questions to the point categories. *Mary* stated that what was tough with the items on the list is that some are complete emergencies and some are component failures or building systems renewals; testing this model will be important.

*Mary* noted that "critical structural weakness" could be an overstressed roof with heavy snow loads or a code change. Discussion followed about "potential risk".

Discussion continued regarding potential scenarios and the order of items on the list. It was noted that the written description would flesh out the specific scenario, to justify more or less points.

*Elizabeth* asked if the questions in 6a directly relate to the point categories in the Instructions. *Mary* noted that numerous boxes could be checked depending on the projects and it should be in the narrative. *Mary* asked if points were cumulative. *Stuart* noted that projects could accumulate more than 50 if that was the case, but it is a point for discussion. *Mark* noted that at some point raters would have to make a subjective decision about how many point to assign, so trying to objectively assign points to each question wouldn't work.

*Bob* asked that there be an additional box to describe anything beyond what was checked in 6a and 6b: add an "Other" box, and emphasize that the text box is to provide documentation and to describe in depth the checkbox conditions. *Mark* asked whether districts were able to check more than one box if it applied, if so, change the question to allow more than one check box. The committee agreed that all boxes that apply should be checked and be described. *Stuart* asked how that would be scored. *Mary* noted that there is already a breakdown in place (actual, potential, etc.). *Elizabeth* expressed concern that this question is too inclusive and that this also contains some life safety concerns.

*Mark* asked if the goal of the question was to be subjectively or objectively scored. *Elizabeth* responded that she thought the goal was it was to be subjectively scored, but with strong guidelines so districts know what to expect. *Doug* observed that it will never be completely objective, but it is crafted in such a way that people can reach similar conclusions as to how bad the emergency is or isn't. Asked if 6a and 6b could be combined, listing the failing critical component portions under the building failure portion. *Stuart* responded that the draft's intent was to separate whole building failure from failing critical components; sometimes a critical component can fail in such a way to make a building not functional. *Stuart's* concern is that merging the lists would get confusing: going between building scoring and component scoring.

*Bob* asked whether it was possible to rate Emergency and Life Safety points for each application before ranking the rest of the applications so there is a clear idea where projects stand as far as

points. *Mark* added that it may be an idea to have each rater go through Emergency and Life Safety questions to determine the top ten projects. *Elizabeth* interjected that projects should get the same points if they are rated all the way through the application. What we are trying to do is establish a priority list using the different factors, without establishing an absolute priority for one factor.

Prompted by questions from *Doug*, *Elwin* explained the Department's process of rating applications.

*Bob* asked the committee to consider sending the draft back to the raters to look at the section and point values (and where they stop and start), and whether there are multiple boxes or a single box, and how this aligns with what has been done in the past. *Stuart* noted that historically few points are awarded in the Emergency question; some of the changes were to rebalance the question, so point awards were not going to be the same. *Elizabeth* commented that you should know an emergency if you see it and that a lot of projects are not emergencies and won't get points.

*Doug* asked that raters think about and discuss whether this draft would make the rating process easier or do they see some problems with it. *Bob* asked that that feedback be brought back to a future meeting. *Elizabeth* asked that the raters also consider whether all items belong in the question, are they clear and differentiated enough, are some items missing, and if the instructions and points are laid out in a workable way.

*Bob* encouraged the districts to run some of their projects through this and bring in comments for next meeting.

## **Public Comment**

*Dave Norum* expressed concern regarding changing point values for questions and how points are awarded. He referenced projects from last year's applications and how their Life Safety points were all the same across the board for the top projects, and down the list the points are close. Project priority on the list is primarily driven by planning, design, and cost points.

*Don Carney* expressed that current award of points for Emergency and Life Safety is too conservative.

*Kevin Lyon* would like to see Emergency points based on the size and need of the districts. For example, a small district's expense to replace a boiler is far greater than the effect it has on a larger district. Maybe add a point category for length of time on a project is unfunded on the list. Agrees there shouldn't be a lot of Emergency points.

*Don Hiley* stated that the matrix for Emergency and Life Safety looks a little busy. He would like for the check boxes (categories) to be more straight-forward.

## **BREAK**

## **Continued Work Session Discussion: Emergency**

*Bob* suggested that maybe there be an alignment of 10 questions with 10 point categories. *Bob* feels that projects that are already completed are no longer considered an emergency. Proposed that a completed project that had been an emergency received half the emergency points it would have otherwise received.

Discussion continued regarding assignment of points, alignment to categories, and presentation of description questions.

Members directed *Stuart* to review the draft's 6a and 6b to ensure that the questions correlate to the point categories.

*Mary* asked that there be more clarity on the application as to what would constitute an emergency (inability to use facility for education) or a life safety (potential risk to a user) situation.

Discussion followed regarding cross-over between emergency and life safety situations and historical background of split. Touched on where security safety could be incorporated.

*Elizabeth* stated that any question that is not in Statute or Regulation can be taken to the State Board of Education to be made a Statute or Regulation so districts can easily reference these while submitting an application. *Elizabeth* set a goal of June 2014 to bring any changes necessary to the State Board of Education.

*Mark* asked that in question 6b, the word "emergency" be replaced with the word "urgency".

*Elizabeth* asked whether question 6b had "code conditions" omitted intentionally. *Stuart* answered that "code conditions" had not been completed.

Discussion continued regarding definition of emergency and differentiating between Emergency and Life Safety conditions and points.

*Mary* noted that it may be something to take to the Legislature to change statute to allow for different pots of money, allowing for a "mini major maintenance" list as well. *Elizabeth* said that the Department is careful not to differentiate between districts or scale of projects. *Mary* asked that the districts weigh in on the topic.

*Mary* asked for clarification on, in situations like seismic code, how to balance when a building is not in code violation, but is substandard to current code. Major maintenance will trigger the need for compliance with current code.

*Bob* asked that more content and guidance be added in the Rater's Guide for Life Safety.

## **Public Comment**

*Don Hiley* reiterated that he prefers keeping it as simple as possible and to whittle it down to the essences.

*Don Carney* stated he was in favor of narrower ranges of points for each question. He believes that makes a rater more comfortable and allows for flexibility. This would allow for the elimination of that “conservative” mindset.

*Dave Norum* said he believes the committee is heading in the right direction. He believes that if a completed project is no longer an emergency, it discourages a district to be proactive. He stated his district has submitted projects as “design build”, this gets a good price but doesn’t get points for a district.

*Dave Herbert* commended the committee on streamlining the process. He believes the system in place does work, but encourages the committee to take public testimony from districts that have written applications and overseen projects in both rural and urban Alaska. He stated that many Superintendents he has spoken to were a little taken aback that this process was going on. He believes Superintendents need to be more involved.

*Kevin Lyon* would like to see emergency points pinned down more specifically since Life Safety is, and should remain, a very broad spectrum.

*Elizabeth* recessed the committee meeting at 4:30p and noted the next day’s start time to be 9:00am on the 2nd.

## **August 2**

### **Call to Order**

*Elizabeth* called the meeting to order. She stated that after every question presented there will be time for public comment, in addition to the set public comment times throughout the meeting.

### **Public Comment**

*David Tressler* asked if security and building configuration will be part of the life safety discussion.

### **Work Session Discussion: Life Safety**

*Stuart* began the day's discussion with a continuation from the previous day's meeting on the CIP draft application changes. *Elizabeth* stated the goal of evaluating the Life Safety is that we have to determine the severity of the life safety or code issue.

The topic of security was brought up and where it might be added into the application.

Task item was offered up to figure out how to integrate building security into the scoring procedure and also to see if it should be added to Statute or Regulation.

*Bob* noted that it appears security is currently being considered in Life Safety. *Mark* mentioned that 6e could include how space inadequacies affect security. The committee agreed that if and when security is added to the application, it needs to be clear to districts that it has been included and what verification or documentation should be provided.

Department needs to review whether a security program could be included as a new program under 6e.

*Elwin* added that, prior to two years ago, he hasn't seen any projects that include increased security in a consistent manner.

### **Public Comment**

*Don Carney* stated that he believes security belongs in the Life Safety question. He also discussed his district's situation where the security recommendation was to build a new entrance and they were forced to take from educational space because they were not eligible for anything additional.

*Bob* stated that if security was left in Life Safety question instead of creating a whole new question, there would be no reason to have to bring the topic of security to the Legislature. *Mark* added that it would be a good idea to have an adjustment made to have added square footage approved for security reasons so those projects can stay on the Major Maintenance list. *Mark* suggested that a sentence be added to the question clarifying that security is included and that a range of points be added as well.

Discussion followed regarding what the effect of allowing additional space for security could have on district allowable square footage.

### **Public Comment**

*Kevin Lyon* referenced his district, and how a project was submitted and received 14.33. He said that .33 points were awarded for space inadequacy, therefore, there are no points currently in Life Safety for security.

*Dave Norum* expressed his concern that districts will submit security issue projects during the CIP process, despite districts just received a portion of the \$25 million for security upgrades.

*Elizabeth* stated that the Department needs to go back and look at how it is currently being applied and look at what kind of priority districts have put on security projects.

### **Continued Work Session Discussion: Life Safety**

*Bob* likes what the draft currently has, but wants Department to vet and come up with something for security in Life Safety or wherever it should go after reviewing regulations, and also put point values to security and codes in Life Safety, per the Emergency section. Maybe add two sections for physical security for building configuration and physical security for infrastructure with points assigned to them.

Department needs to emphasize in the CIP workshop the importance of providing the information, descriptions, and narratives requested so that the raters can give districts full points.

*Mark* requested that the “Other” box be added to Life Safety, as it was under Emergency. Per previous discussion on Emergency Conditions, remove “please” and rewrite lead-in of descriptive box “Use this area for explanation of the impact and severity of the life safety condition”. *Mary* stated that the Instructions should note that this expands upon what is initially described in the Scope. The committee agreed that the word “cause” should be removed from the question.

The committee continued with the CIP application changes.

### **Future Discussion Items**

*Elizabeth* noted that as per the agenda the plan was to discuss Emergency, Life Safety, and Planning. Since the committee was ahead of schedule, it was decided that a list of pertinent topics to discuss in the future would be made:

*Mary* asked that square foot allotment, particularly as it applies to net vs. gross square footage, should be added to the list.

*Bob* added that gross square footage for mechanical, electrical, and maybe security – “operational” space, would need to be discussed. Previously he had desired to review vocational education space, resource rooms, and special education rooms.

*Doug* wanted to discuss primary purpose for playgrounds and parking lots under the school construction and major maintenance lists.

*Mary* also added that on her list was a discussion of major maintenance that permits education improvements and that if money is spent on a facility you can reconfigure or expand. Should there be a certain percentage you can add if it falls under mechanical or security, etc., that wouldn't take away from educational space, unless school is under capacity.

*Don Hiley* asked if we could add the discussion of lengthening the amount of time a condition survey is eligible.

## **BREAK**

### **Work Session Discussion: Project Planning**

*Stuart* focused the discussion of the CIP draft application starting on Section 5 "Project Planning". *Stuart* referenced Appendix D, which depicts changes in points for planning. Department is seeking to shift emphasis to the earlier stages of planning and points slightly shifted accordingly. Discussion of whether the information in the appendix should be moved in to the body of the Instructions and to shift the points information to the Rater's Guide as well. Change Appendix D to remove the requirements and points information and add construction document phase; make it into a big picture of capital improvement project phases. Further discussion of whether point values should be listed next to each question throughout the application. The committee suggested that the word "phase" be taken off the questions as it can be confusing to the reader. *Mary* stated that planning is a pretty sizeable expense to invest in without knowing whether that project will be funded. *Stuart* responded that the Department supports thorough, conceptual planning for a project they are looking to get funded. Discussion regarding hired consultant versus in-house work done and desire to reward good planning that will provide for good projects.

### **Public Comment**

*Don Carney* explained that some projects, a boiler replacement for example, require minimal planning, if any. It's hard for a district to get points for planning when there isn't much needed in the first place. He explained that sometimes when an application states that zero thru ten points can be awarded there is room for argument, whereas a zero or ten point question is easier to explain to the reader.

*Dave Norum* asked what the committee wants to drive the priority list: Life Safety and Emergency or Planning and Cost Estimate. Currently, top projects have high Planning and Cost Estimate points. Proposed that districts have learned what to focus on to make up or get more points.

*Rachel* was wondering if the Life Safety points could be weighted more heavily. She agreed that the Department is headed in the right direction.

*Don Hiley* said it would be a real mistake for the Department to devalue the design of a project. He also disagrees with the idea that an already completed project can't be considered an emergency anymore.

The committee recessed for lunch. *Elizabeth* asked that all return at 1:00p.

## **BREAK - Lunch**

### **Work Session Discussion: Project Planning**

*Mark* suggested that the application break out the points for not just the raters but the applicants as well. Discussion regarding how to incrementally score required planning documents, particularly in areas where not all documents are required. *Elwin* added that in the past, there has had to be some subjectivity in an objective question. He explained that awarding a range of points instead of a set certain points or no points, can be where some of the problem has arisen because there is a subjective call. *Elwin* explained that if any of the required items are missing, as of right now, they are not awarded any points. *Mary* asked that the condition survey be re-labeled as “pre-planning”. She also said that many line items in planning can be added to “pre-planning”. Discussion on whether points should be awarded if documents are not really needed for a project, even if submitting the documents is required.

*Elizabeth* pointed out that a drafted change is that there are 30 Planning points instead of the 40 points in the current application. The drafted change is the facility appraisal point value has been taken out. *Mark* pointed out that currently Appendix A is inaccurate. *Elizabeth* stated that the Department is suggesting as a draft that the condition survey is 10 points; conceptual pre-construction, ed-specs, and planning are 10 points; schematic design is 5 points; and design development is 5 points. *Stuart* noted that the Department was aiming for a scale-appropriate evaluation of the project.

*Elizabeth* asked *Elwin* to explain the value he sees in a condition survey while rating. *Elwin* explained that his thoughts are that the condition survey is a way to more fully grasp what the conditions in the building are as well as its severity. *Elwin* categorized the condition survey as a “pre-planning” element to a project, agreeing to what *Mary* had mentioned previously. *Elwin* stated that the condition survey is a great tool to go back and check to make sure the scope is in accordance to what the condition survey said needs to be fixed. *Bob* asked if *Elwin* had noted the age of the condition survey being an issue. *Elizabeth* clarified that although the condition survey should help the rater know what the scope is, the application should also have this in it as well; the condition survey should help the district plan.

### **Public Comment**

*Don Hiley* explained that a lot of smaller districts that do not have the qualified staff rely on contracting for services that they need.

*Dave Norum* is concerned that the matrix that is being used only allows for 33% for Emergency and Life Safety, that some of the scoring would be evened out.

*Kevin Lyon* likes how the points are being shifted to the early design. He believes that planning should be applicable for the size of the project.



## **Continued Work Session Discussion: Project Planning**

*Mary* stated that districts don't want to risk going past schematic design until there is assurance of or there is a secure funding stream. She believes that districts that go past schematic design before being funded seem to be penalized. *Bob* interjected that this is where the loop hole is for completed projects. He believes that more points should be awarded for pre-planning because that is the most fiscally responsible way of doing it. *Elizabeth* stated that completed projects on last year's CIP list that received high points were very low dollar amount projects. *Bob* proposed that more points be assigned to pre-planning and planning, beyond what is proposed in the draft. Discussion followed of whether to shift points out of design development and schematic design to pre-planning and planning stages.

### **Public Comment**

*Don Hiley* thinks that the completed project issue is a red herring and it doesn't seem to be a meaningful problem.

*Don Carney* agrees that planning should get the points, but at the same time he knows what that costs to do the pre-planning. He feels that the amount of money that is spent on 95% documents isn't worth it if you don't have secure funding and sometimes it takes years to get funded and by that time the drawings aren't useful. *Don* stated that he doesn't feel condition surveys need to be done by a licensed professional. He feels that a district's mechanic would know the building more than a person who does a walk through. He agrees with partial point awards.

*Bob* proposed that if the Department has a six-year CIP list, then condition surveys should be eligible for six years. Six years would give the districts a little more flexibility. He agrees with *Don* that condition surveys shouldn't have to be done by a licensed professional.

*Mark* proposed that what is currently called the "Condition Survey" phase be renamed to "pre-planning" or "project evaluation" and to state that an A/E is not required to do this phase but rather a qualified individual would be sufficient to do the survey. Perhaps move items 2 and 3 from "planning" up to "pre-planning". He proposed that Design Development be zero points, schematic design remain as 5 points, planning go up to 20 points, pre-planning go up to 15 points.

## **Continued Work Session Discussion: Project Planning**

*Mary* asked whether we would prorate those points and have them add up to 30, as previously discussed. *Mary* added that the purpose of this isn't to equalize the points, rather it's for the raters to have good numbers to know that the project is feasible.

The committee discussed the distribution of points. *Doug* asked why *Mark* valued pre-planning less than planning. *Mark* explained that dependent on the scope of the project, pre-planning could be as simple as a one page report. He explained that he did not want to give high points for something that simple. Mention of "double dipping" potential with cost estimate.

*Elizabeth* clarified that the BRGR Committee agrees that pre-planning should be weighted more heavily than design development. *Elizabeth* clarified that the consensus is to minimize the 95% construction document points.

*Bob* proposed pre-planning 15 points, planning 10 points, and schematic design 5 points, to remain at 30 points total. *Mary* clarified that purpose should be to give clarity to raters and districts, not provide a potential advantage to any district.

### **Public Comment**

*Don Carney* added that the Department spends money on updating the cost model each year and that this is a pretty accurate tool and also rather simple. The cost model is within 3% while the professional estimates are within 15%. He feels that if a couple more things were put into the cost model, it could be even more accurate and that the professional tool wouldn't be worth 30 points.

*Don Hiley* feels there is still value in professional estimates.

*Elizabeth* added that a cost estimate discussion will come up at a later meeting.

### **Future Meeting Date**

The committee discussed a meeting date. A tentative date is December 3 & 4, 2013, to be confirmed within 15 days.

*Elizabeth* explained that December will be when the Department brings back the re-drafted CIP application. At the December meeting, to assist with member review, *Stuart* will provide an initial briefing of the changes to the draft he made as a result of the current meeting, with no committee discussion at that time.

### **Final Notes**

*Mary* asked to add items to the task list: review Appendix C, discuss facility condition survey standard, and review past meeting minutes to add previous items to task list.

*Doug* asked to add a task of looking at the possibility of different processes/applications/funding streams for funding rural and urban projects. *Elizabeth* noted that funding is not what the BRGR Committee is charged with doing, but the concern can be noted.

### **Meeting Adjourned**