

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 1, 2022 – 1:30 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Held via Videoconference

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present

Elwin Blackwell, Chair
Dale Smythe
James Estes
Kevin Lyon
Branzon Anania

Staff

Tim Mearig
Lori Weed
Sharol Roys
Wayne Norlund
Wayne Marquis

Additional Participants

Caroline Hamp for Rep. Ortiz
Clay Anderson, Fairbanks Boro.
David Moore, Architects Alaska
Jeff Good, Wrangell Boro.
Edie Knapp, Anchorage SD
Kim Sweet, Lower Kuskokwim SD

September 1, 2022

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Elwin Blackwell called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established to conduct business. Representative Ortiz, Senator Holland, Randy Williams, and David Kingsland were excused.

CHAIR’S OPENING REMARKS

Chair Blackwell welcomed everyone and thanked the members for attending the meeting today and said he appreciated the committee’s work.

AGENDA REVIEW / APPROVAL

Chair Blackwell requested changes to the agenda as follows:

- Change the chair from Heidi Teshner to Elwin Blackwell;
- Add a position paper for design ratios; and
- Add “Set Next Meeting Date”.

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

PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW / APPROVAL – June 27, 2022

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve the minutes from June 27, 2022 as presented, **SECONDED** by James Estes. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

PROTOTYPICAL DESIGN COMMITTEE POSITION PAPER UPDATE

Wayne Norland explained that, during the last meeting, the committee authorized changes in the guidelines to be sent out for public comment. The comments received were mostly directed toward what was removed from the previous version, and the department has prepared some

draft responses to the comments. No further changes are proposed. This new version focuses on the CIP application, and now the committee must decide whether the draft responses should be accepted and the guidelines approved, or propose some alternatives.

Dale Smythe asked if there was any consistent public comment and if there are proposed changes that would be an option. Wayne Norland stated that pages 18 and 19 of the packet show the proposed revisions, pages 16 and 17 show the comments, and there are no further revisions proposed at this time.

Tim Mearig stressed that this set of guidelines is a committee document, not one from the department. Kevin Lyon asked if the department has seen plans being forwarded as prototypical that are questionable. Tim said that was not the focus of the comments, which were more in the line of who determines what is a good prototypical design and what is the evaluation criteria.

Branzon Anania **MOVED** that the committee approve the proposed response to the public comments for the Guidelines for Prototypical Design as presented and that the committee approve proposed revision of the Guidelines for Prototypical Design, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD HANDBOOK

Tim Mearig stated that there were a few changes in regulation that needed to have corresponding changes to this publication, so this is basically a technical update with some changes to checklists to make the process and the state's evaluation criteria clearer.

Dale Smythe asked if there were any public comments to the handbook, how long the handbook has been available for use, and if there were any edits foreseen from recent construction challenges. Tim Mearig replied that the publication is about 20 years old and has been consistently updated through the years. This handbook arose from concerns the state had regarding the way people were approaching design-build, which were not prohibited under regulation, but neither was there great guidance.

Wayne Norlund said that the submittals for alternate project delivery for the past year have been well supported and followed the direction of the handbook. He likes the addition of the department's checklist at the end to allow people to make sure they have included everything required. He mentioned that he had not seen anyone using the template (revised in this edition from MSPublisher to MSWord).

Dale Smythe **MOVED** that the committee approve the department's proposed update of the *Project Delivery Method Handbook* for issuance and use by the department, **SECONDED** by Kevin Lyon. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

David Moore asked what the effective date would be of the implementation of the handbook. Tim Mearig replied that he thought the changes had to be approved by the state board as a regulation change. Lori Weed said that she did not know if it is specifically cited in regulation, but more pertinent is that nothing in the review or evaluation processes changed in this edition.

Elwin Blackwell said that if it did have to go before the state board that it could be several months before it becomes effective.

PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE HANDBOOK

Tim Mearig stated that this publication was last amended in 1999, and amendments have been brought before the committee many times since March of 2018. The structure of the current edition sets out the five major areas: Maintenance management, energy management, custodial program, training, and capital planning. Each of those areas is further broken down into three required areas of development, implementation, and actions required to sustain it. Some case studies are included in the document, and several areas that were not well developed were removed. Some comments were received during the previous comment period that ended in May, and draft responses are provided for committee review. He encouraged committee members to take the time to read the comments.

Dale Smythe asked if the removed content pertained to commissioning and retro-commissioning and requested that Tim talk a little bit about that. Tim stated that he was hoping to have some Alaskan examples of that, but there haven't been any of those kinds of projects in Alaska.

There are helpful appendices in the back. Appendix B is a list of anticipated life expectancies that aligns with a renewal and replacement schedule published by the department. That appendix will be updated prior to any public comment period.

Branzon Anania asked how the life expectancy figures were determined. Tim replied that there are industry standards and also just the experience of the collective wisdom of people in the industry, and there are also corresponding values reflected in the CIP application. Kevin Lyon commented that the numbers seem to be appropriate as the average age of buildings in his district is 46 years.

Wayne Marquis mentioned the diversity and challenges for each of the districts according to size and location, and it is challenging to develop a publication that is useful for all of the districts.

James Estes **MOVED** that the committee approve the department's final draft of the *Alaska School Facilities Preventive Maintenance & Facility Management Handbook* for a final period of public comment, **SECONDED** by Branzon Anania. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

POSITION PAPER FOR DESIGN RATIOS

Chair Blackwell stated that this position paper was sent to committee members a few days ago and asked Tim Mearig to explain. Tim Mearig said that completion of this paper has been stalled because the more detail that is received, the less clear things become in establishing the standards. He believes that the ratios in the document now are acceptable ranges for building cost-effective and efficient schools, and the final product is from the consultant running energy modeling and cost analyses and from Tim's amalgamation of information.

Two options identified were to either request DEED Facilities staff prepare draft language for review by the BRGR in December to incorporate O:EW, V:GSF and V:ES in regulation or direct the Design Ratios Subcommittee to conduct a validation and analysis of the proposed design ratios (targets and ranges) and prepare a summary report for review by the BRGR in December.

Dale Smythe suggested offering the ratios for public comment and have some language in the implementation of those that allows the design team to prove current design meets the intent. Tim supports the idea that the regulations allow a project to be evaluated under specific energy modeling that would result in an equally efficient building. He supports the opportunity to have a variance if it could be shown that the building was performing.

Branzon Anania asked if the envelope ratios could be addressed in the value-added analysis. Tim said that there is a statute that requires the department to establish design ratios for efficient design, and the normal way of doing that is through regulation. From a facility management perspective, it is very important to have something to show the people who are making funding decisions that there is a set of criteria for efficient design.

Dale Smythe asked what the next step would be in this process. Tim replied that he is not recommending it go to a comment period as it is laid out in the paper but would go to comments after some development of how it would look in regulation. Either of the two options suggest there is a path toward public comment. Dale was in favor of having the subcommittee review it, and Kevin Lyon agreed.

Chair Blackwell asked if there was consensus for choosing Option 2, noting that Dale and Kevin had already alluded to going down that path. Both Branzon Anania and James Estes were in agreement. Dale Smythe said he would commit to having a plan for December before the end of September.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

Committee members discussed potential meeting dates for a virtual meeting in December and addressed the potential for the State Board of Education meeting and the A4LE conference to conflict with any dates.

Lori Weed will send a committee poll asking about December 1st, pending no A4LE meeting, or the 14th as the backup option.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Blackwell thanked the committee members and the people who tuned in to listen. He thanked Dale Smythe for taking on the design ratio project and working on that in the next several weeks.

ADJOURN

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting. Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.