

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 14, 2021 – 1:00 p.m. – 4:18 p.m.

Thursday, April 15, 2021 – 1:00 – 3:19 p.m.

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present

Elwin Blackwell, Chair
Heidi Teshner - present day 2
Rep. Dan Ortiz - present day 2
Sen. Roger Holland - not present
Randy Williams
Dale Smythe
James Estes
Kevin Lyon
David Kingsland
Branson Anania

Staff

Tim Mearig
Lori Weed
Sharol Roys

Additional Participants

Larry Morris, Anchorage SD
Dana Menendez, Anchorage SD
Rachel Molina-Lodoen, Anchorage SD
Don Hiley, SERRC
Damien Hill, Lake & Peninsula Boro SD
Kent Gamble, HMS Inc.
Rob Brown, HMS Inc.
Aimee Smith, HMS Inc.
Gary Eckenweiler, Bering Strait SD
Caroline Hamp, Staff to Rep. Ortiz
Drake Goodsen, Staff to Rep. Ortiz

April 14, 2021

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Elwin Blackwell called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established to conduct business. Senator Holland and Representative Ortiz were excused.

CHAIR’S OPENING REMARKS

Chair Blackwell explained that Heidi Teshner had legislative issues to deal with today, so he is standing in for her as chair for today and possibly tomorrow. He extended his thanks and appreciation for all the members who have volunteered to be on the committee and also welcomed the new members. He mentioned that the discussion today would include the CIP (AS 14.11 Capital Improvement Project) application, which is a big step for school districts to receive funding for school construction and maintenance.

NEW BUSINESS, ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

Chair Blackwell added an agenda action item to approve the CIP application for FY’22 following the CIP briefing and discussion.

AGENDA REVIEW/APPROVAL

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve today’s agenda with two modifications: remove the action item for final design ratios for April 15 and add the CIP action item for today.

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

PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL – February 25 and March 17, 2021

Randy Williams **MOVED** to approve the minutes from the February 25 and March 17, 2021 meetings as amended, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and Lori Weed will make the administrative amendments.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Chair Blackwell welcomed the new members and recognized Dana Menendez and Larry Morris from Anchorage School District and Damien Hill from Lake and Peninsula School District.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period was offered, and no public testimony was provided.

DEPARTMENT BRIEFING

FY2022 CIP Reconsideration & Final Lists

Tim Mearig announced that there is a final FY'22 CIP list that the State Board of Education approved at its March 17th meeting. There are two lists: one that shows the project name and dollar amount, and one that shows total points. Also included in the packet is a ten-year history of projects and the total value of the state's share if all the projects were to receive funding. That page also shows a ten-year history of school funding.

PM State-of-the-State Update (incl. Retro-Commissioning Update)

Tim Mearig explained that in order for districts to be eligible for state aid for school capital, they must meet certain requirements for minimum maintenance and facilities management. The department makes final determinations every August.

Presently there are five districts ineligible for the FY'22 funding cycle. Two of those districts are working to pursue eligibility for CIP funding. Hydaburg is on track to be upgraded from non-compliant to provisional, and Lake & Peninsula has been offered a site-specific provisional compliance status. There has been no real activity from Aleutian Region, Skagway, or Yukon Flats to pursue a provisional or compliant status.

Provisional status is granted when a district has a compliant plan but must demonstrate adhering to that plan for 12 months. The following FY'22 provisional districts are on track to demonstrate 12 months of adherence: Chatham, Galena, Lower Kuskokwim, Nenana, Pelican, and Kake. Kodiak and Unalaska were not able to provide evidence of compliance. Both received a one-year waiver so remain eligible for FY'22, but unless they provide evidence of compliance, they will not be eligible for FY'23.

Wayne Marquis has been conducting online site visits with districts that are able to gather their data. Some districts have not been able to get their information together due to personnel changes, but the process is going well considering the difficulties of making assessments off site.

Tim reported that last November the department implemented regulatory provisions to require districts to achieve an additional element of maintenance compliance within the energy management program related to commissioning of existing buildings. Every district was

supposed to demonstrate compliance with the new requirements for the period November to June 1.

All 53 districts could have been non-compliant this year because no districts were carried over from the previous cycle. So far, 20 districts are in compliance, and that number is expected to rise since districts are diligently working to gather the documentation to demonstrate they have the ability to regularly evaluate their facilities for a need for commissioning. Fifteen districts do not have facilities to track because the buildings have aged beyond the system criteria.

This process is a result of a lot of collaboration between the department and the districts and is enabling the districts to evaluate energy use to determine whether a building needs attention.

Damien Hill asked if Tim could summarize the provisionally compliant strategy that Lake and Peninsula is in. Tim replied that the district needs to have the ability to track recovered heat at its sites. Normally, if one building is out of compliance, then the whole district is out. But for FY'23 the department had offered that individual school sites would be evaluated without impacting the entire district's compliance.

Dale Smythe asked if there were consistent themes or challenges that districts have faced in providing the required information. Tim replied that it can be challenging to monitor energy consumption from different utilities for each building month by month.

Don Hiley commented that some districts must make significant monitoring investments in order to comply. For example, some districts do not have electrical meters other than where the power came onto the site, so meters had to be retrofitted on each building.

Damien Hill said that a few of his district's schools receive heat from community generators at no cost, so they have not been monitoring waste heat. Tim commented that the requirement for building utility consumption measurement has been in place for 20 years but recognized that there are challenges associated with that.

Report: School Capital Project Funding Under SB 237

Tim Mearig stated the department is required to provide a funding analysis regarding grants and debt funding. The Institute for Social Economic Research (ISER) at UAA used this information to determine the status of adequate investment in school capital in Alaska. The report is available on the ISER website.

Among the legislative actions the department is tracking is the general obligation bond package (HB 93/SB 74) and an energy bill (SB 17). Summaries of legislative action are in the packet.

The Cost Model update draft has been completed and is being reviewed by the department. Tim is looking forward to meeting with representatives of HMS, Inc. to discuss some of the items in the Cost Model update.

The department hopes to be able to utilize funding in the Governor's supplemental to develop a database for forecasting school capital.

DEPARTMENT CIP BRIEFING

FY 2023 CIP Application & Support Materials

Tim Mearig reviewed the CIP briefing and application and support materials for the FY'23 CIP application. The hope is to formalize the package as the FY'23 application by the end of the meeting.

Tim said the department is considering using e-mail instead of the U.S. Mail return receipt method to determine the date of receipt of a reconsideration decision, which triggers the beginning of the appeal period. Branzon Anania was concerned that the e-mail addresses were current as there is a lot of turnover at the district sites. Lori Weed said that the e-mails go to the superintendent, and those addresses are kept current by the department's Assessments team. Dale Smythe had the same concern and suggested that the e-mail contacts be defined on the CIP application and should include the person who helped assemble the application.

Don Hiley mentioned that for all the CIP applications he has written, he has never been cc'd, and sometimes the notice stays in the superintendent's office until the reconsideration period has run.

Tim discussed a possible application changes relating to unhoused students so that a district could count anticipated future lost square footage, the preventative maintenance and facility management scoring, and a bullet list of miscellaneous application changes noted in the packet.

FY 2023 APPLICATION REVIEW

FY 2023 Application Instructions

Lori Weed referred to the summary of changes to the FY'23 CIP application and instructions and discussed each one as follows:

- Split mailing address versus physical delivery address.

This minor change makes it clear that the department does not receive mail at the physical address any longer, but still can receive deliveries from courier services.

- Add language providing regulatory guidance on timeline for submitting for reimbursement of project costs.

This minor change to question 3f of the instructions clarifies what costs a project can include when looking back to pick up expenses that were incurred prior to application submittal.

- Add notation on reduced percentage of projected unhoused points for projects utilizing imminent loss of facility.

This moderate change to question 5e was referenced in the packet, and Randy Williams asked if "environmental factors" was defined. Lori replied it was not, and she welcomed any input. Kevin Lyon commented that it should be made clear that mold is not an allowable environmental factor. Dale Smythe commented that the loss from environmental factors would be out of the control of anyone to stop it or change it. Lori pointed out that question 5g refers to "certain environmental factors like erosion."

Lori Weed also said that some things would be covered in the protection of structure/life-safety category, such as a foundation failure. This question applies to situations where there is nothing wrong with the school other than it is about to be lost to a river or ocean, for example. Tim was in favor of using restrictive language that could be broadened in the future if necessary.

Lori Weed summarized the change in question 5e to read, “Scoring for projected unhoused due to facility loss by external environmental factors (reference question 5g) is scored at half points.” The committee indicated agreement with that change.

Don Hiley questioned the rationale for half points and brought up the case of Napakiak whereby next summer the water is probably going to be under the door of the building. To him, two years is almost a current problem; even though the building is okay at the present time, it’s going to be lost. Lori replied that two years matched the timeline of a charter school that does not intend to renew its lease or find other lease space; it is open for committee input. Dale Smythe’s understanding of the intent of the half points was to place facilities further up the list to save the state money.

Tim Mearig said the reason this point category does not need full points is that when a facility is in this condition, it is also eligible for emergency points. Chair Blackwell agreed with the half points, and he said that in the past, the school would not get any unhoused students because the building still fit their needs. He also remarked that sometimes the dire predictions about erosion do not occur because rivers are unpredictable.

Randy Williams thought that the unhoused students category was specifically for population changes. Lori replied that was true, but the population percentage of capacity depends on square footage, and if the building is gone, then you have unhoused students.

Dale Smythe said that these are not instantaneous like a roof collapse or a school fire but something that has high potential for the future, like Napakiak where in the next few years the school will not be occupiable because the erosion is so close. These points allow preparation before the disaster happens. Branzon Anania understood that one of the ideas behind the half points was to give some advantage but not too much.

Randy Williams asked if this should be a separate category next year or if they should try to do that now. Dale replied that considering the timeline, he would vote to approve all of it as is but recognizes that there needs to be a more robust emergency category.

- Add guidance on existing space is used for calculating existing gross square footage and instruction for new inputs. Add language specifying that the existing GSF can be reduced based on environmental factors causing an imminent loss of buildings and providing certain conditions.

These are changes appearing in the packet in question 5g. The first and second paragraphs explain how the gross square footage (GSF) and average daily membership (ADM) are calculated and set out three new GSF inputs. Tim Mearig noted that this change is a minor cleanup and a way to tabulate the information.

Paragraph 3 contains instructions on how to document future unhoused projections based on imminent loss of a facility due to certain environmental factors like erosion. Randy Williams requested that the word “external” be added between the words “certain” and “environmental” to be consistent with the language in question 5e. The committee agreed with that change.

Randy was curious how much of an effect this scoring would have on a place like Napakiak and if it was going to be vaulted to the number 1 spot. Lori replied that even if the project was assigned 30 points, it would not outdo the amount of unhoused in Nunapitchuk, number 2.

There was discussion about points for Napakiak and Nunapitchuk and the placement on the list if it received 15 versus 30 points. Randy asked if there was a method to give more points the more imminent the danger is. Tim replied that they would get more emergency points in that situation. Dale added that more dedicated effort can be put into the emergency point scoring to consider the threat time frame and the school replacement time frame.

Lori Weed asked Dale if he wanted to add permafrost degradation as an example in addition to erosion as an external environmental factor. Dale replied that he would like that change because in his opinion, erosion and permafrost degradation are the main causes of facility loss.

- Update ASHRAE 90.1 reference to 2016 edition. Add clarification that prior building system standards must be adopted, not just a previously bid specification.

The proposed change reads, “Standard must be adopted by the entity; prior use of a system specification in a bid solicitation is not sufficient to meet the criteria.” After discussion, the decision was made to delete the first clause so the amendment reads, “Prior use of a system specification in a bid solicitation is not sufficient to meet the criteria.”

- Add note on cost estimate format.

This change is intended to inform people that if awarded a grant allocation, the cost estimates must be in the proper format.

- Add language identifying supplemental documents for each narrative; conforms to *Guidelines for Raters* draft PM matrices. Provide additional guidance on narrative development.

Lori mentioned that the committee reviewed the rater matrices at the February meeting and had a good debate about them but did not incorporate changes into the instructions. The matrices for the five-point category were itemized and added to the instructions. Only the top tier instructions were included with the caveat of “Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.” The incremental point reduction portion is in the Rater’s Guide.

FY 2023 Application

Referring to the packet, the proposed application changes are as follows:

- Correct Roof/Envelope 12-point condition “Windows, age >20” to “>30” (conforms to FY22 & FY23 Rater’s Guide).

Lori explained this was a typo in section 4a that should have been corrected last year.

- Add language regarding Sec. 9 supplemental preventive maintenance documents. This change is intended as a reminder that there are supplemental documents that are requested and should be attached to the application.

Randy Williams **MOVED** to accept the editorial changes to questions 5e and 5g that were made during discussion, **SECONDED** by Kevin Lyon. A roll call vote was started before any discussion. After discussion, Randy Williams **AMENDED** the motion for approval of the entire application as presented and edited during discussion, **SECONDED** by Kevin Lyon. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion **PASSED** unanimously.

DEPARTMENT CIP BRIEFING – LIFE-SAFETY MATRIX

Tim Mearig explained that the department was looking for a way to normalize and temper some of the gains from FY'20, '21, and '22 where the scores have been trending significantly upward because of weighting factors between code-related work and non-code-related work. Rather than comparing points to dollars, a more statistically certain and cohesive review of evaluating points to points and cost to cost was developed. There are three options in the briefing paper as follows:

1. Condition points modified by condition cost to total cost;
2. Condition points modified by condition points to total points; and
3. Condition points modified by condition cost to total cost with additional modifier of condition points to total points.

The department recommends option 2 as giving the best results as a weighting factor for the purpose of bringing scores down to a more normalized range. A need for an adjustment was apparent when high point, low dollar value situations were coming up to address code conditions. Option 2 basically keeps the lower scores the same, moderates the medium scores, and tempers the high scores down.

Chair Blackwell asked what is meant by a “minimum one point floor.” Tim replied that one point is the lowest score possible because there isn’t any advantage in scoring a fraction of one point, even though the calculations might have taken the score down to below one point. Randy Williams asked if there was still a 50-point cap, and Tim confirmed.

Lori Weed noted that this scoring method does not work well with renovations, which score an accumulation of issues and receive more points. That will be an issue to deal with in the future.

Randy Williams was curious what the plans are for checking how this performs in the next cycle. Tim replied that the scoring will be added to the ten-year running average of the top 20 scores, and then they will be able to see what happened. The expectation is that the scores will look similar to FY'19.

Don Hiley asked how this is going to relate to Napakiak versus new Nunapitchuk, which has about twice as many code life-safety points as Napakiak based on the current facility. Tim replied that the scoring is based on the current condition, not the forecasted condition, which could come in through other factors such as emergency. Don talked about the poor buildings in

Lower Kuskokwim and emergency points and unhoused student points and code-life-safety points and wondered how all that is factored in and how one school is balanced against another that is poor. Chair Blackwell commented that the balance between current need and emerging need is always going to be a problem, but priorities are made based on current information.

Randy Williams asked about the mechanics of how this formula gets deployed. Lori replied that each rater rates individually, but one rater completes a score sheet that provides a raw score and the costing. Then a formula is applied to get a weighted percentage, which is then input into the database and applied to all three rater scores. Tim referred to the evaluative rating guidelines in the packet where it states, per regulation, "Scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted."

Randy commented that the committee is ostensibly going to approve this change but was unclear what was being changed. Tim agreed and stated that he wanted every applicant to be able to score their own application, and they should know exactly how to do it. Chair Blackwell tabled this matter until after the Cost Model update tomorrow.

RECESS

The meeting recessed at 4:18 p.m.

April 15, 2021

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Blackwell called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established to conduct business. Drake Goodsen and Caroline Hamp were present on behalf of Representative Ortiz's office.

CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

Chair Blackwell said he would be chairing the whole meeting today. Heidi Teshner would probably stop in for part of the meeting to listen in.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public members wished to provide comment at this time.

COST MODEL UPDATE

Chair Blackwell asked Tim Mearig if he would like to comment on the new edition of the Program Demand Cost Model. Tim said the department is in receipt of the draft documents and will be reviewing against the scope of the work for the update and will share the results later.

Rob Brown from HMS stated that most of the changes in the Cost Model are from increased material costs due to COVID and similar factors. A few labor costs were updated due to changes in the database with RSMMeans, but the main focus for this year's changes was material cost, and overall the cost increased about 4 percent.

There were no changes to the Model School this year. A possible change to the exterior closure system with wood stud versus metal stud was discussed, but it was not justified because of the high price of lumber and the miniscule savings. There were a few changes to line items to correct some labor numbers and some materials that are not available any longer.

Tim Mearig shared a document outlining DEED requested modifications to the Demand Cost Model and stated that the primary role of the committee is to review and participate in changes to code, technology, general material, supply, and standard practice, so he was looking for input from the committee on the proposed modifications. Particularly, he wanted comments on standardization of an exterior wall assembly with some combination of dimensional and engineered lumber and whether the proposed standard is appropriate.

Dale Smythe asked if the intent of identifying a standard exterior wall assembly is so assumptions can be made based on building size. Tim said it was to standardize the Model School within the Cost Model so everyone knows what the baseline is and also to compare the costs between projects by using the same set of parameters and components.

Dale asked if the idea was to use components instead of a purchased system such as SIPs. Tim said that SIPs would be treated in an evaluation as an equivalent system that provides equivalent performance at a reasonably equivalent price. Dale shared specific concerns regarding the wall assembly.

Dale questioned the percentages of metal to something else, and Tim replied that the Cost Model is going to set out the quantity of exterior siding for the Model School and whether 80 percent would be at one price and 20 percent at another. This was also aimed at longer members and a higher wall, not just standing up an eight-foot wall.

Kent Gamble clarified that this assembly is meant to be a common type of wall assembly that will be adjusted based on the designer's judgment at the time and other factors such as location. A building on the North Slope is going to be different from one in Southeast. Tim agreed, stating that the Model School is in Anchorage. He said these assemblies are baseline and determine what are acceptable and unacceptable alternatives.

Gary Eckenweiler asked if the baseline could specify a wall that is equivalent to an R-value which would encompass SIPs or framing. Tim replied that the Model School is an actual building with actual cost components.

Rob Brown compared the Cost Model wall with the assembly on the list and concluded that they are roughly the same, the difference being a dimensional LSL versus the metal studs of the HMS model. He noted that from a construction standpoint, the quality of construction will be better using metal studs rather than wood, and the difference in cost is nominal.

Randy Williams shared his concern that the insulation in the stud space is not specifically listed. He noticed that ASHRAE 90.1 states that the minimum is R-13 batt plus minimum R-7.5 exterior or R-19 batt plus R-5 exterior. Rob Brown stated that R-19 is the current standard in the Cost Model.

There was a question about the price of lumber and metal, and Rob Brown said that lumber has increased a lot, but as of February, the price of metal studs had only gone up 5 to 7 percent. These prices were captured in the Cost Model for this year.

Dale asked why the type X 5/8 sheetrock and vapor retarder was excluded on the assembly, and Kent Gamble replied that it is typically part of the UniFormat from the exterior wall assembly from exposed face to finished face.

Dale wondered if it was important to have a gauge on the metal siding. Kent replied that metal siding can vary widely depending on the specification. It is priced now at \$7.50 a square foot for the panels, and that should provide a robust metal panel.

Tim said he appreciated the opportunity to have this discussion and thanked HMS for taking part.

Randy Williams noted that the ASHRAE 90.1 requirements for insulation are a little different for metal versus wood frame, and it is recommended that more of the insulation for the metal framing go on the outside of the studs. Branzon Anania shared his opinion that steel studs are better to start with than the wood because there are not many 8-foot walls in a school, and hanging steel is faster and more accurate than wood.

Dale asked if the challenges dealing with COVID are accounted for in this revision. Kent Gamble said that they are adding an additional 3-1/2 percent special market contingency to the projects to provide for unknowns associated with COVID. Hopefully, prices will start to level out, vaccines will start to catch up, and things will return to some kind of normal state.

Lori asked for a summary cost comparison, particularly those costs that might have the highest delta change. Rob Brown reviewed the list and noted that most changes are in the 2 to 5 percent category. The highest changes revolve around the increased lumber prices, notably in substructure and superstructure. The exterior closure appears to have decreased 22 percent, but that is misleading because the cost comparison is accomplished by comparing the draft with the draft rather than the final. Labor prices in last year's draft were corrected, and so if this year's draft was compared to last year's final, it would be in that 2 to 5 percent range. Electrical prices have gone up considerably and appear higher because of the proportion of materials involved. There was only a 3 percent increase, though, in electrical section 9.

ACTION ITEM: MODEL SCHOOL ESCALATION ELEMENTS

The Model School Subcommittee has looked at this area in the past. Each year there have been changes, but this year there were no changes to the Model School elements. Unless the committee has any changes, there are no recommended changes that are on the table to approve, and the department will do its regular due diligence in this area.

LIFE-SAFETY SCORING MATRIX

WORDING ON SCORE SHEET REGARDING FUTURE UNHOUSED

This item was tabled yesterday and is now taken up for consideration. Tim explained the new language related to the weighting factor calculation in the Rater's Guide. The proposed change is as follows:

Points for mixed-conditions can total more than the possible points. Combined points are weighted using a ratio of construction cost for correcting scored conditions to the total requested construction cost of the project except for any

code condition where the percentage of its cost to the total project cost is less than half of the percentage of its points to the total condition points. In that case, the weighting is shifted to the percentage of condition points to total condition points; in no case will less than 1 point be assigned to a condition.

One other change occurred in the score sheet for item 10 adding the language, “Unhoused due to loss of eligible square footage based on external environmental factors is scored at half of the points identified.”

Branzon Anania **MOVED** that both edits as presented today be accepted as presented, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion **PASSED** unanimously. Drake Goodsen noted for the record that Representative Ortiz was absent for this vote.

PUBLICATIONS UPDATE

Construction Standards for Alaska Schools

Chair Blackwell referred the committee to publication updates in the packet. Tim Mearig said there were not a lot of substantive changes to the document. Some things were taken out of the interior section that were duplicated in the equipment area, and there were some other cleanups. He invited comments and discussion from the committee, and he noted that the Model School Subcommittee needs a chairman.

Dale Smythe commented that the document could be more precise and more beneficial if the repeating of spaces that would be covered in an educational specification could be separated. The decision of what to include should be driven somewhat on cost experience to the state. Assuming that the basis is to control costs, those elements that have historically cost money in their repair should be a priority that is defined in a standard. He stated he would volunteer to be a part of the subcommittee but could not offer to be the chair.

Randy Williams is interested in the topic but doesn't think he has the expertise required to lead it. If there is an open seat, he would like to be a member of the subcommittee.

Tim said that Kevin and Jim had agreed to serve on the Model School Subcommittee, and industry partners from ASD and BDS are also currently being recognized as committee participants. Branston said he has an interest in the subcommittee and would be more of an asset once he understands a little bit more of the process.

Lori said that the committee chair does not have to know much about the topic involved but should be a good manager of time and agendas and able to run the committee well. Kevin Lyon said he would consider being the chair if needed.

Tim said that the role of the chair includes coordination and guidance and informing the committee about the subcommittee's progress. He added that the department is committed to helping and doing a lot of work for the subcommittee, and that the chair will have several resources at his disposal. The department handles the administrative work of the subcommittee such as scheduling, using their meeting platforms, and taking care of minutes. He thanked Kevin

for agreeing to be the chair and confirmed that Randy Williams would like to be invited to the subcommittee meetings.

Tim commented that both Kevin and Jim are associated with districts that have a fairly robust district standard, and that would be an asset to the subcommittee. He added that one of the goals is to avoid writing the same standard in multiple places and to try and hold it under a hundred pages. That will take an understanding of where it overlaps with code or local conditions. Some of that is going on now with system standards and how they work with design principles. Tim hopes to have something in September that is a recommendation to release for public comment.

Site Selection Handbook

This handbook discussion paper outlines the results of a survey of 17 participants. Tim Mearig summarized the results of the survey, which showed that the publication remains viable, and the tools are helpful. The department will be working on revising the handbook to increase the applicability for use in remote communities with limited site alternatives, parking area allocations, and updating the sample documents to comply with some regulation changes. The department has a goal of turning the publications over on five-year intervals, and the last time this handbook was revised was 2011.

Tim stated that if the committee is willing to schedule a July meeting, this document will be ready for the committee to review for public comment.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Ratios

Dale Smythe reported that he had intended to have final comments on the last ratio for consideration at this meeting, but that did not happen. He would like to have it finished by the end of May to have time to have a subcommittee meeting for review, but in any case, he wants it to be reviewed at the July committee meeting. Once the ratio is finalized, he would like to work on the space guideline discussion, to make some goals and a plan to get that done next.

BR&GR CALENDAR AND WORK PLAN REVIEW & UPDATE

Tim Mearig referred the committee to the July meeting on the last page and summarized the four publication updates anticipated to be on the agenda.

Scheduled for the September meeting, in addition to publication updates, is a briefing paper on reuse of plans and systems policy and whether it belongs in regulation as opposed to just the application.

SET DATES FOR NEXT MEETING

Meeting dates for July were discussed, and the July meeting was set for Wednesday the 21st from 1:00 to 3:00 or 3:30 p.m. After discussion, the September meeting was set for Wednesday the 8th from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Tim Mearig put forward a subject the department would like to bring up at a future meeting: A briefing paper on what happens when a grant is awarded that ends up not having sufficient funds to complete.

DEED WRAP-UP

Lori Weed asked if the Work Plan Master List item 3.3, Commissioning could be deleted as completed or does it need future review. Tim thought it could be taken off the list. Lori suggested in its place add “review commissioning system requirements and agent qualifications.” Randy proposed deleting the three sub-items and substitute “periodic effectiveness evaluation.”

Tim is hoping that the department receives funding for the capital forecasting database in the Governor’s supplemental. Randy asked, if there were any windfall money, how that would be allocated? Heidi Teshner said that it depends on how the money is allocated by the legislature. If the list is funded, then the projects are taken in order. If certain projects are chosen directly, then those projects are funded.

As for the federal funds under ARP and ESSER, those have to be allocated a certain way. The legislature has no flexibility to direct those funds. Each district’s application contains an assurance to the department that the funds will be used toward ventilation and other eligible projects to help mitigate the spread of COVID. The department is working on a short document that provides additional guidance of how districts could spend the federal money on facilities.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Dale Smythe thanked the committee members and everyone at the department for the work. He was also appreciative of the legislative members who attended and the public participation, and he encouraged others to call in.

Chair Blackwell thanked the committee members for taking the time to be here to work on these items and continue to work on different subcommittees.

Lori Weed asked if the Zoom platform was preferred by the members over WebEx. Committee members were very much in favor of using the new Zoom platform.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Heidi Teshner **MOVED** to adjourn, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and the meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.