Application for Funding
Capital Improvement Project by Grant
or
State Aid for Debt Retirement

FY2026

PREPARING & SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION

For each funding request, submit **one complete hardcopy**, bound or in a binder, and **one complete electronic copy of this application and each attachment**. PDF files of all documents is required; provide on a compact disc (CD) or USB flash drive. The grant application deadline is September 1st.

When answering application questions, provide verifiable supporting documentation. Answers that cannot be verified will be considered unsubstantiated and may result in the department finding the application ineligible due to incompleteness.

The department will only score ten project applications from each district during a single rating period. In addition, a district can submit a letter to request reuse of an application's score for one year after the application was filed; or, if the project was substantially complete at the time of the application, the district can request reuse of the application's score for up to five years after the application was filed.

For instructions on completing this application, please refer to the department's Capital Improvement Project Application and Support webpage (education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html).

PROJECT INFORMATION

School District: _____

Community: _____

School Name: _____

Project Name: _____

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that the application has been prepared under the direction of the district school board and is submitted in accordance with law.

_____

Superintendent or Chief School Administrator Date

SEC. 1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE

1a. Type of funding requested. Choose only **one** funding source.

☐ Grant Funding ☐ Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

1b. Primary purpose of project. Choose only **one** category. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.[1]

School Construction (AS 14.11.135(6)):
- ☐ Health and life-safety (Category A)
- ☐ Unhoused students (Category B)
- ☐ Improve instructional program (Category F)

Major Maintenance (AS 14.11.135(7)):
- ☐ Protection of structure (Category C)[2]
- ☐ Building code deficiencies (Category D)
- ☐ Achieve operating cost savings (Category E)

1c. Phases of project to be covered by this funding request. Indicate **all** applicable phases:

☐ Planning (Phase I) ☐ Design (Phase II) ☐ Construction (Phase III)

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

Questions 2a-2e require a "yes" response, with substantiating documentation as necessary, in order to be eligible for review and rating.

2a. Has a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) been approved by the district school board? ☐ yes ☐ no

(Refer to AS 14.11.011(b), and 4 AAC 31.011(c); attach a copy of the 6-year plan.)

2b. Does the school district have a functional fixed asset inventory system? ☐ yes ☐ no

2c. Has evidence of required insurance been submitted as required to the department *or* is evidence attached to this application? ☐ yes ☐ no

Districtwide replacement cost insurance for the last five years will be gathered by the department from annual insurance certification and schedule of values.

[1] The department's authority to assign a project to its correct category is established in AS 14.11.013(c)(1) and in AS 14.11.013(a)(1) under its obligation to verify a project meets the criteria established by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee under AS 14.11.014(b).

[2] AS 14.11.100(j)(4), authorizing debt reimbursement project needs, does not expressly allow a primary purpose of protection of structure.

2d. Is the project a capital improvement project and not part of a preventive maintenance program or custodial care? ☐ yes ☐ no

(Supporting evidence must be outlined in the project description, question 3d. Reference AS 14.11.011(b)(3))

2e. Is the district's preventive maintenance program certified by the department? ☐ yes ☐ no

SEC. 3. PROJECT INFORMATION

3a. Priority assigned by the district. (Up to 30 points)
What is the rank of this project under the district's six-year Capital Improvement Plan?

Rank: _____

3b. School facilities within scope (Up to 30 points)
What buildings or building portion (i.e., original building or addition) will be included in the scope of work of the project? (Add additional rows as needed to include all affected buildings or building portions.)

(The department will utilize GSF records to establish project points (up to 30) in the "Weighted Average Age of Facilities" scoring element. For facility number, name, year, and size information on record, refer to the DEED Facilities Database (education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm).

DEED Facility #	Building or Building Portion	Year Built	GSF
TOTAL GSF			

3c. Facility status. Does this project change the status of any facility within the project scope to one of the below? The existing building(s) will be (check all that apply):

☐ renovated ☐ added to ☐ demolished ☐ surplused ☐ other

NOTE: If the project changes the current status of a facility to "demolished" or "surplused," a transition plan is required as part of this application. For state-owned or state-leased facilities, the transition plan should describe how surplused facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. See instructions.

3d. Project description/Scope of work. The project description and scope of work narratives are a required elements of this application (Reference AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)). Ensure project aligns with selected funding category.

Project description

In the space below, provide a clear, detailed description of the project. At a minimum, include the following:

- Facilities impacted by the project
- Age of facility/system(s)
- Facility/system conditions requiring capital improvement
- Explain why this project is not preventive maintenance
- Other discussion describing project

Scope of work

In the space below, provide a clear, detailed, and itemized description of the scope of work that addresses the items in the project description. At a minimum, include the following:

- Work items to be completed with this project
- Work items already completed (if any)
- Other discussion pertaining to scope of work

3e. Project schedule. Provide estimated or actual dates for the following project milestones.

Estimated receipt of funding date _____

Contract with design team _____

Begin design _____

Design work 100% complete _____

Project out to bid _____

Begin construction _____

Complete construction _____

Provide additional information regarding the project schedule, if needed (including whether an alternative project delivery method is anticipated).

3f. Is the work identified in this project request partially or fully complete? ☐ yes ☐ no

If the answer is yes, attach 2 copies of documentation that establishes compliance with the department's requirements for bids and awards of construction contracts. (Reference 4 AAC 31.080)

Provide DEED recovery of funds project number: # _____

3g. Will this project require acquisition of additional land or utilization of a new school site? ☐ yes ☐ no

If the answer is yes, attach site description or site requirements. If a new site has been identified, attach the site selection analysis used to select the new site. Note the attachment on the last page of the application.

3h. If the project is a multiple-school or districtwide project, provide justification for cost-effectiveness and how the district intends to award as a single contract.

SEC. 4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety (Up to 50 points)

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and/or life safety conditions; attach supporting documentation. Check the box of the specific scoring conditions corrected by the scope of the project and where the supporting documentation is located in the attachments.

NOTE: Code violations documented and cited by the appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority may receive a 3 pt increase. See Guidelines for Raters.

Structural

- ☐ Seismic - no restrictions (3 pts)
- ☐ Foundation/Floor - no PE eval (4 pts)
- ☐ Seismic - minimal restrictions (6 pts)
- ☐ Upper Floor Structure - no PE eval (9 pts)
- ☐ Vertical Structure - no PE eval (9 pts)
- ☐ Roof Structure - no PE eval (10 pts)
- ☐ Foundation/Floor – PE eval (15 pts)
- ☐ Seismic - moderate restriction (15 pts)
- ☐ Upper Floor Structure - PE eval (20 pts)
- ☐ Vertical Structure – PE eval (20 pts)
- ☐ Roof Structure - PE eval (24 pts)
- ☐ Seismic/Gravity Partial Closure (28 pts unless does not qualify for space, then 15 pts)
- ☐ Seismic/Gravity Full Closure (50 pts unless does not qualify for space, then 15 pts)

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Seismic or Seismic/Gravity, Foundation/Floor, Upper Floor Structure, Vertical Structure, and Roof Structure.

Provide description of structural-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Roof/Envelope

- ☐ Siding Failure, age <25yr (2 pts)
- ☐ Siding Finish (2 pts)
- ☐ Doors, age >20yr (3 pts)
- ☐ Roof, age >Warranty +5yr (3 pts)
- ☐ Roof, age >Warranty +10yr (6 pts)
- ☐ Roof Leaks, WO <3/yr (8 pts)
- ☐ ASHRAE 90.1 Windows (8 pts)
- ☐ ASHRAE 90.1 Insulation (10 pts)
- ☐ Siding, age >25yr (12 pts)
- ☐ Windows, age >30yrs (12 pts)
- ☐ Siding Failure, age >25yr (15 pts)
- ☐ Roof Leaks, WO >3/yr (15 pts)
- ☐ Doors w/Egress issues (15 pts)
- ☐ Roof Leaks affect space, with WOs (25 pts)

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Siding, Doors, and Roof. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions. Violations documented and cited by the appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority may receive a 3 pt increase. If condition is based on ASHRAE 90.1 code deficiency, provide existing R-value or code violation of system.

Provide description of roof or building envelope-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Architectural/Interior/ADA

ADA - 1 category (1 pts)	☐	Elevator Issues (3 pts)	☐
ADA - 2 categories (2 pts)	☐	ADA - 4 categories (4 pts)	☐
DEC Sanitation (2 pts)	☐	Floor Finishes >15yr (4 pts)	☐
ADA - 3 categories (3 pts)	☐	Elevator Violations (7 pts)	☐
Ceiling Finishes age >25yr (3 pts)	☐	Building Egress (10 pts)	☐
Wall Finishes age >25yr (3 pts)	☐	Rated Assemblies (12 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: ADA and Elevator.

Provide description of architectural, interior, or ADA-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Mechanical

Controls, DDC Deficiency (3 pts)	☐	Heating, WO >3/yr (11 pts)	☐
Mech. System, age >30yr (4 pts)	☐	Ventilation, Codes (12 pts)	☐
Ventilation, WO <3/yr (5 pts)	☐	Plumbing, Codes (12 pts)	☐
Plumbing, WO <3/yr (6 pts)	☐	Heating, Codes (13 pts)	☐
Heating, WO <3/yr (7 pts)	☐	Boilers, 1 of 2 Non-op (13 pts)	☐
Controls, Pneumatic (8 pts)	☐	HVAC age >40yr (15 pts)	☐
Ventilation, WO >3/yr (9 pts)	☐	Boilers, 2 of 3 Non-op (18 pts)	☐
Plumbing, WO >3/yr (10 pts)	☐	Mechanical System, WO >5/yr (21 pts)	☐
		Heating Failure (25 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Boilers, Controls, Heating, Plumbing, and Ventilation. "Mechanical System" may be inclusive of Heating, Plumbing, or Ventilation with regard to age or work orders per year. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of mechanical-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Electrical

Lighting, age >25yr (2 pts)	☐	Egress/EM lights, WO >3/yr (8 pts)	☐
Electrical, age >30yr (4 pts)	☐	Intercom Issues, WO >3/yr (8 pts)	☐
Power, WO <3/yr (4 pts)	☐	Lighting, Codes (10 pts)	☐
Lighting, WO <3/yr (4 pts)	☐	Power, Codes (10 pts)	☐
Egress/EM lights, WO <3/yr (5 pts)	☐	Intercom Failure (10 pts)	☐
Back-up Generator In-operable (5 pts)	☐	Electrical, age >40yr (15 pts)	☐
Power, WO >3/yr (7 pts)	☐	Lighting, Levels < 50% of code (16 pts)	☐
Lighting, WO >3/yr (7 pts)	☐	Electrical System, WO >5/yr (21 pts)	☐
		Power Failure (25 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported Electrical System condition will be assigned points: Egress/EM Lights, Electrical, Intercom, Lighting, and Power. Max Intercom condition is Failure. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of electrical-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Fire Alarm/Sprinkler

Fire Alarm, age >15yr (2 pts)	☐	Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >40yr (10 pts)	☐
Sprinkler, >30yr (2 pts)	☐	Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >3/yr (15 pts)	☐
Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >30yr (5 pts)	☐	Fire Alarm Non-op, <3 floors (17 pts)	☐
Sprinkler Coverage Gaps (5 pts)	☐	Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >5/yr (20 pts)	☐
Fire Alarm, Non-addressable (6 pts)	☐	Fire Alarm Non-op, >3 floors (25 pts)	☐
Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, WO >1/yr (8 pts)	☐	Sprinkler Non-op (30 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Fire Alarm and Sprinkler. If condition is based on an average number of work orders per year ("WO"), provide work orders. Average is over prior three years. See application instructions.

Provide description of fire alarm or sprinkler-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

Site

Vehicle Surfaces (3 pts)	☐	Power Issues (15 pts)	☐
Walkways and Surfaces (4 pts)	☐	Wastewater Issues (15 pts)	☐
Drainage Issues (6 pts)	☐	Water Issues (16 pts)	☐
Playground Code (12 pts)	☐	Wastewater Failure (24 pts)	☐
		Water Failure (25 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: Water and Wastewater.

Provide description of site-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

UST/AST/HazMat

HazMat (all) Low Exposures (3 pts)	☐	UST/AST Leak (7 pts)	☐
UST age >30yr (2 pts)	☐	UST/AST USCG/40 CFR Cite (10 pts)	☐
AST age >40yr (5 pts)	☐	HazMat (all) Mod Exposures (10 pts)	☐
Sewage Lagoon Failure/Exposure (5 pts)	☐	HazMat (all) High Exposures (22 pts)	☐

NOTE: Categories for which only the highest scoring supported condition will be assigned points: AST, HazMat, and UST.

Provide description of UST, AST, or HazMat-related conditions and specific references to title and page of support documents.

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED

NOTE: If this project is classified as Major Maintenance (Category C, D, or E) and is not including any new space, skip to 5j. **All applications requesting new or replacement space, or classified as School Construction (Category A, B, or F), must provide the information requested in this section.** For the purposes of this section, gross square footage is calculated in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020(e). Worksheets to be completed are available at the department's website at: Education.Alaska.Gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html.

5a. Indicate the student grade levels to be housed in the proposed project facility: _____

5b. Is there any work (other than this project) within the attendance area that has been approved by local voters, or has been funded, or is in progress that houses any student grade levels included in the proposed project? ☐ yes ☐ no

If the answer is yes, in the table below, identify the project and provide information about size, grades to be served, and student capacity.

Project Name	GSF	Grades	Student Capacity

5c. Are there school facilities within the attendance area that house any student grade levels included in the proposed project? ☐ yes ☐ no

If the answer is yes, in the table below, identify the school and provide information about size, grades served, and student capacity.

School Name	GSF	Grades	Student Capacity

In lieu of data in the format above for questions 5b and 5c, we are providing detailed attachments. ☐ yes ☐ no

5d. What is the anticipated date of occupancy for the proposed facility? _____

5e. Unhoused students (Up to 80 points)

In the table below, provide the attendance area's current and projected ADM:

Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM			
School Year	**K-6 ADM**	**7-12 ADM**	**Total ADM**
2023-2024			
2024-2025			
2025-2026			
2026-2027			
2027-2028			
2028-2029			
2029-2030			
2030-2031			
2031-2032			
2032-2033			

5f. Were the ADM projections used by the district based on the department's worksheets? ☐ yes ☐ no

Attach calculations and justifications.

5g. Confirm space eligibility:

Total Existing SF _____
Remaining Existing SF _____
Total Eligible SF _____
Qualifies for _____ additional SF
Applying for _____ additional SF

5h. Regional community facilities (Up to 5 points)

List below any alternative regional, community, and school facilities in the area that are capable of meeting all, or part, of the project needs. Identify the facility by name, its condition, and provide the distance from current school. If attached documentation is intended to address this question, note the attachment on the last page of the application.

5i. Are educational specifications attached? ☐ yes ☐ no

ALL PROJECTS CONTINUE FROM THIS POINT

5j. Project space utilization (Up to 30 points)

Completion of this table is **mandatory for all projects that add space or change existing space utilization**. If the project does not alter the configuration of the existing space, it is not necessary to complete this table. Use gross square feet for space entries in this table.

Table 5.2 PROJECT SPACE EQUATION

Space Utilization	A Existing Space	I Space to remain "as is"	II Space to be Renovated	III Space to be Demolished	IV New Space	B Total Space upon Completion
Elem. Instructional/Resource						
Sec. Instructional/Resource						
Support Teaching						
General Support						
Supplementary						
Total School Space						

SEC. 6: PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN

NOTE: Reference Appendix B of the instructions for required elements. More developed design documents can be attached in lieu of previous documents.

6a. Condition/Component survey (0 to 10 points)

1. Is a facility or component condition survey attached? ☐ yes ☐ no

   Document title: _____

   Date prepared: _____

6b. Use of prior school design (up to 10 points)

1. Is the district proposing to use a previously department-approved school construction design for this project? ☐ yes ☐ no
2. If yes, in addition to the space eligibility analysis in Section 5, has the district attached design plans and a cost analysis that includes both design and construction costs demonstrating how the use will result in cost savings for the project? ☐ yes ☐ no

6c. Use of building system design standard (up to 10 points; 2 points per qualified system)

1. Is the district proposing to use one or more previously approved building system design standard for this project? ☐ yes ☐ no
2. If yes, provide supporting documentation on each specific system showing that the building system(s) conform to a published district or municipal building standard.

6d. Planning/Concept design (0 or 10 points, all elements required for 10 points)

1. Has an architectural or engineering consultant been selected (as required)? ☐ yes ☐ no
2. Are concept design studies/planning cost estimates attached? ☐ yes ☐ no
3. New construction projects: are educational specifications, site selection analysis, and student population projections attached (as required)? ☐ yes ☐ no

6e. Schematic design - 35% (0 or 10 points, all elements required for 10 points as applicable to the project)

1. Are complete schematic design documents attached? Schematic design documents include approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations, and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines. If the answer is no and project is complete, provide a justification for why documents are not needed. ☐ yes ☐ no
2. Is a schematic design level cost estimate attached? ☐ yes ☐ no

6f. Design development - 65% (0 or 5 points, all elements required for 5 points as applicable to the project)

1. Are design development documents attached? Design development documents include dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans. If the answer is no and the project is complete, provide justification as to why documents are not needed. ☐ yes ☐ no
2. Is a design development cost estimate attached? ☐ yes ☐ no

6g. Planning/Design team

List parties who have contributed to the evaluation and/or design services thus far for this project. When applicable, a district employee with special expertise should be listed, along with the basis for his or her expertise.

Provider	Expertise

SEC. 7: COST ESTIMATE

Cost estimate for total project cost (Up to 30 points)

7a. Project cost estimate: Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development's current Cost Model edition or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is mandatory.

Percentages are based on construction cost. See Appendix C for additional information. If the project exceeds the recommended percentages, provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding the percentage. The total of all additive percentages should not exceed 130%. If the additive percentages exceed 130%, a detailed explanation must be provided, or the department will adjust the percentages to meet the individual and overall percentage guidelines.

Table 7.1. TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	I Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant [1]	2 - 4%				
Land [2]	n/a				
Site Investigation [2]	n/a				
Seismic Hazard [3]	n/a				
Design Services	6 - 10%				
Construction [4]	n/a				
Equipment & Technology [2,5]	up to 4%				
District Administrative Overhead [6]	up to 9%				
Art [7]	0.5% or 1%				
Project Contingency	5%				
Project Total	**up to 130%**				

1. Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: $0-$500,000 – 4%; $500,001- $5,000,000 – 3%; over $5,000,000 – 2%).
2. Include only if necessary for completion of this project; address need in the project description (Question 3d). Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the cost estimate discussion (Question 7c) and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.
3. Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant and should not be estimated based on project percentage.
4. Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if project is new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
5. Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department's publication, *Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases* for calculation methodology (2016). Technology is included with Equipment.
6. Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project (for maximum indirect percentage based on project cost, see 4 AAC 31.023); this budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost, reduced for CM percentage.
7. Only required for renovation and construction projects over $250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d)).

Table 7.2 CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE						
	New Construction			Renovation		
Construction Category	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost	Cost	GSF	Unit Cost
Base Building Construction [1]						
Special Requirements [2]		n/a			n/a	
Sitework and Utilities		n/a			n/a	
General Requirements		n/a			n/a	
Geographic Cost Factor		n/a			n/a	
Size/Dollar Adj. Factor		n/a			n/a	
Contingency		n/a			n/a	
Escalation		n/a			n/a	
Construction Total						

1. If using the Cost Model, Base Construction is equal to Divisions (1.0+2.0) for new construction, and Division 11.00 for Renovation, otherwise, Base Construction is equal to the total construction cost less the costs that correspond with other cost categories in the table.
2. Explain in detail and justify special requirements in Question 7c.

7b. Cost estimate source. Identify and describe as needed the specific source of the costs provided in Table 7.1 (e.g., professional estimators, solicited vendor quotes, paid invoices).

7c. Cost estimate discussion & justifications. Identify and explain cost estimate assumptions, lump sums, and percentages in excess of the recommended percentages in Table 7.1. Provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding a recommended percentage.

SEC. 8: ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

Emergency conditions are those that pose a high level of threat for building use by occupants.

8a Is this project an emergency? (Up to 50 points) ☐ yes ☐ no

Has the district submitted an insurance claim? ☐ yes ☐ no
If no, explain below.

If the project is an emergency, describe below in detail the nature, impact, and immediacy of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions.

Categorize the issues described and explained above by checking the boxes that apply to the building condition(s).

Category of Conditions	Applicable
Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. (50 points)	☐
Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. (25-45 points)	☐
Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. (5-25 points)	☐
A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. (5-45 points)	☐
A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. (25-45 points)	☐
A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed but has been repaired and may have limited functionality. If the component fails, the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. (5-25 points)	☐

8b. Inadequacies of existing space (Up to 40 points)

Describe how the inadequacies of the existing space impact mandated instructional programs or existing or proposed local programs and how the project will improve the existing facilities to support the instructional programs.

8c. Other options (Up to 25 points)

Describe, in addition to the proposed project, at least two or more viable and realistic options that have been considered in the planning and development of this project to address the best solution for the facility.

Major maintenance projects should include consideration of project design options, material or component options, phasing, cost comparisons, or other considerations. New school construction or addition/replacement of space projects should include a discussion of existing building renovation versus new construction, acquisition or use of alternative facilities, a life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis, service area boundary changes where there are adjacent attendance areas, or other considerations.

8d. Annual operating cost savings (Up to 30 points)

Quantify the project's annual operational cost savings, if any, in relation to the project total cost.

8e. Prior funding (Up to 30 points)

Provide AS 14.11 administered grants that have been appropriated by the legislature or allocated by the department for which additional funds are being requested.

Applications seeking funds for change in scope or other actions not noted in the original application or legislative appropriation will not be considered eligible for these points.

DEED grant #: _____

8f. Is the district applying for a waiver of participating share? ☐ yes ☐ no

Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than $200,000 are eligible to apply for a waiver of participating share. REAA's are not eligible to request a waiver of participating share.

(If the district is applying for a waiver, attach justification. Refer to AS 14.11.008(d) and Appendix F of the application instructions.)

SEC. 9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

District preventive maintenance and facility management (60 points possible)

Ensure that documents related to the district's maintenance and facility management program have been provided with district CIP submittals. Include management reports, renewal and replacement schedules, work orders, energy reports, training schedules, custodial activities, and any other documentation that will enhance the requirements listed in the instructions; these are district eligibility attachments, only two copies are required regardless of the number of applications submitted by the district. Include the following documents:

9a. Maintenance Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

9b. Maintenance Labor Reports (Up to 15 Formula-Driven Points)

9c. PM/Corrective Maintenance Reports (Up to 10 Formula-Driven Points)

9d. 5-Year Average Expenditure on Maintenance. Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last 5 years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)

9e. Energy Management Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

9f. Energy Consumption Reports (Up to 5 Formula-Driven Points)

9g. Custodial Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

9h. Maintenance Training Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

9i. Capital Planning Narrative (Up to 5 Evaluative Points)

SEC. 10. DISTRICT CONTACT INFORMATION

The department has the authority to determine a project eligibility, change a project's primary purpose, and modify a project's scope and budget. If a change is made, the department will notify the Superintendent or Chief School Administrator of the district.

The district may request the department include the following additional persons (up to three) in the correspondence regarding changes to this project application:

Name	E-mail

ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

Note all attachments included with the application. Each attachment must be provided in a single hardcopy and an electronic file in a portable document file (pdf) format.

Project eligibility attachments: Eligibility item is required on all projects.

- ☐ Six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (question 2a)

District eligibility attachments:

- ☐ Preventive maintenance and facility management narratives and supplemental documents: sample work orders, custodial plan(s), training schedules and logs, renewal and replacement schedules (questions 9a, 9e, 9g-9i)
- ☐ Preventive maintenance reports (questions 9b, 9c, 9f)

Project description attachments: List all attachments referred to or noted in the application. Some items may not be applicable to a specific project.

- ☐ Transition plan for state-owned or state-leased properties (question 3c)
- ☐ Alternative project delivery request or approval; solicitation documents (question 3e)
- ☐ For fully or partially completed projects: documentation establishing compliance with 4 AAC 31.080, including solicitation documents (question 3f)
- ☐ Site description, site requirements, and/or site selection analysis (question 3g)
- ☐ Condition support documents *(e.g., maintenance work orders, warranties, etc.)* (question 4a)
- ☐ Facility condition survey (question 6a)
- ☐ Published district building system design standard (question 6c)
- ☐ Facility appraisal (question 6d)
- ☐ Educational specification (question 5i, 6d)
- ☐ Concept design documentation (question 6d)
- ☐ Schematic design documentation (question 6e)
- ☐ Design development documentation (question 6f)
- ☐ Cost estimate worksheets (question 7a)
- ☐ Appropriate compliance reports *(i.e., Fire Marshal, AHERA, ADA, etc.)* (questions 4a, 8a)
- ☐ Cost/benefit analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- ☐ Life cycle cost analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- ☐ Value analysis (questions 8c, 8d)
- ☐ Justification for waiver of participating share (question 8f)
- ☐ Capacity calculations of affected schools in the attendance area/areas (question 5e)
- ☐ Enrollment projections and calculations (question 5e)
- ☐ Other:_____ _____

Instructions for completing the Application for Funding for a Capital Improvement Project

FY2026

These instructions support DEED Form #05-24-044
Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant or State Aid for Debt Retirement.

PREPARING & SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION

Answer all questions: Each question on the application form must be answered in order for the application to be considered complete. **Only complete applications will be accepted. Incomplete applications will be considered ineligible and returned unranked**. If a question is not applicable, please note as NA. The department has the authority to reject applications due to incomplete information or documentation provided by the district. The grant application deadline is September 1st (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable).

Project name to be accurate and consistent: The project name on the first page of the application should be consistent with project titles approved by the district school board and submitted with the six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The project name should begin with the name of the school and type of school (ex: K-12 School, High School). Multi-school projects should list the schools that are part of the scope unless the work is districtwide at most or all school sites in the district.

Limited to ten applications: The department will only score up to ten individual project applications from each district during a single rating period. In addition, a district can submit a letter to request reuse of an application's score for one year after the application was filed; or, if the project was substantially complete at the time of the application, the district can request reuse of the application's score for up to five years after the application was filed.

The department may adjust parts of the application: Project scope and budget may be altered based on the department's review and evaluation of the application. The department will correct errors noted in the application and make necessary increases or decreases to the project budget. The department may decrease the project scope, but will not increase the project scope beyond that requested in the original application submitted by the September 1st deadline.

Authorizing signature: The application must be signed by the appropriate official with an original or certified electronic signature. Unsigned applications cannot be accepted for ranking.

Application packages should be submitted to:
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Division of Finance & Support Services, Facilities

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

Physical Deliveries
333 Willoughby Avenue, 9th Floor
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

For further information contact:
School Facilities Manager

1. CATEGORY OF FUNDING AND PROJECT TYPE

1a. Type of funding requested.

Check **one** box to indicate which type of state aid is being requested.

Grant Funding: applications are submitted to the department by September 1st of each year, or on a date at the beginning of September designated by the department in the event that the 1st falls on a weekend or holiday (postmarked or shipped on or before September 1st is acceptable).

Aid for Debt Retirement: applications can be submitted at any time during the year if there is an authorized debt program in effect. **To verify if there is an authorized debt program in effect, contact the department.**

1b. Primary purpose.

Check **one** box in the appropriate column to indicate the primary purpose of the project. Each application should be for a single project for a particular facility, and should be independently justified. The district may include work in other categories in a proposed project. These projects will be reviewed and evaluated as mixed-scope projects. Refer to Appendix A of these instructions for descriptions of categories and the limitations associated with grant category C, category D, and category E projects. Application of scoring criteria will be on a weighted basis for mixed scope projects. The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.[1]

1c. Phases of project.

Check the applicable phase(s) covered by this funding request. Refer to Appendix C for descriptions of phases.

2. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

2a. District six-year plan.

Attach a current six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the district. Use DEED Form 05-19-051. The project requested in the application must appear on the district's six-year plan in order to be considered for either grant funding or debt reimbursement. For grant funding, the project must appear in the first year of the district's six-year plan.

2b. Fixed asset inventory system.

The district does not need to submit any fixed asset inventory system information to the department as part of the CIP application. The department will verify the existence of a Fixed Asset Inventory System during its on-site Preventive Maintenance program review every five years. The department will annually review the district's most recently submitted annual audit for information regarding its fixed asset inventory system. School districts that

[1] The department's authority to assign a project to its correct category is established in AS 14.11.013(c)(1) and in AS 14.11.013(a)(1) under its obligation to verify a project meets the criteria established by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee under AS 14.11.014(b)

do not have an approved fixed asset inventory system, or a functioning fixed asset inventory system (i.e., cannot be audited) will be ineligible for grant funding under AS 14.11.011.

2c. Property insurance.

The department may not award a school construction grant to a district that does not have replacement cost property insurance. AS 14.03.150, AS 14.11.011(b)(2) and 4 AAC 31.200 set forth property insurance requirements. The district should annually review the level of insurance coverage as well as the equipment limitations of the policy, and the per-site and per-incident limitations of the policy to assure compliance with state statute and regulation.

District facility insurance data is required to be provided by each district to the department under AS 14.03.150 and 4 AAC 31.200. Insured replacement value will include all district facilities reported in the department's School Facility database:

https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm

Note: This information is used in calculating scores for question 9d. The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide.

2d. Capital improvement project.

AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires a district to provide evidence that the funding request should be a capital project and not part of a preventive maintenance or regular custodial care program. Refer to Appendix F for an explanation of maintenance activities. Scope of work will be modified by the department during review of the application to remove items deemed to be preventive maintenance or custodial.

2e. Preventive maintenance program.

Under AS 14.11.011(b)(4), a district must have a certified preventive maintenance program to be eligible for funding. Initial notification of district certification is provided by June 1; final determination of a district maintenance program is issued August 15. For more information contact the department.

3. PROJECT INFORMATION

3a. Priority assigned by the district. (30 points possible)

The district ranking of each project application must be a unique number approved by the district school board and must place each discrete project in priority sequence. The project having the highest priority should receive a ranking of one, and each additional project application of lower priority should be assigned a unique number in priority order. The department will accept only one project with a district ranking of priority one. The ranking of each application should be consistent with the board-approved six-year Capital Improvement Plan. Refer to AS 14.11.013(b)(2). Both major maintenance projects and school construction projects should be combined into a single six-year plan. There are up to

30 points available for a district's #1 priority. Points drop off in increments of 3 for each corresponding drop in district priority ranking. If the application score is requested to be reused in a future year, the reused score will be adjusted based on a change in the project ranking on the associated future year's six-year plan.

The district should provide a listing of *projects anticipated for the full six years* of the district's six-year plan, not just the first year of the plan.

3b. School facilities within scope. (30 points possible)

This question requests information on the year the facility was constructed and size of each element of the facility to establish the "weighted average age of facilities" score. If a project's scope of work is limited to a portion of a building (i.e., the original or a specific addition), the age of *that building portion* will be used in the "weighted average age of facilities" point calculation. If the project's scope of work expands to multiple portions of a building, the ages of *all building portions receiving work* will be used in the "weighted average age of facilities" point calculation. *Year built* refers to the year the original facility and any additions were completed or were first occupied for educational purposes. If a date of construction is not available, use an estimate indicated by an (*). *Gross square footage (GSF)* of each addition should be the amount of space added to the original facility. *Total size* should equal the total square footage of the existing facility. There are up to 30 points possible depending on the age of the building. Facility number, name, year built, and size are available online at:

http://education.alaska.edu/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm

Department data will be used for calculations, if there is an error in the database, contact the department prior to September 1.

3c. Facility status.

The response to this question should be consistent with column III of the space utilization table in question 5i. Projects that will result in demolition or surplusing of existing owned or leased facilities must include a detailed plan for the transition from existing facilities to replacement facilities. If a facility is to be demolished or surplused, the project must provide for the abatement of all hazardous materials as part of the project scope. The transition plan should describe how surplused state-owned or state-leased facilities will be secured and maintained during transition. The detailed plan for demolishing or surplusing state-owned or -leased properties should incorporate a draft of the department's Form 05-96-007, Excess Building. For the CIP process, furnish building data and general information; signatures and board resolutions may be excluded.

3d. Project description/Scope of work.

Describe the scope of work of the entire project. The project description/scope of work should include: (1) a detailed description of the project, (2) documentation of the conditions justifying the project, and (3) a description of the scope of the project and what the project will accomplish. The scope should also contain sufficient quantifiable analysis to show how the project is in the best interest of both the district and the state.

The description of project scope should include information that will allow the department to evaluate the criteria specified in AS 14.11.013, including conformance with the currently adopted ASHRAE 90.1 energy efficiency standard and the *Alaska School Design and Construction Standards* published by DEED and incorporated as Appendix B of these instructions; ensure project aligns with selected category. Project scope should be sufficiently defined to assure bidding a single contract. If proposing a "districtwide" project, applicant should provide justification in question 3h of how it is more cost-effective to combine multi-site (multi-community) projects.

It is helpful to identify the question number if you are providing detail to support another application question in the project description.

Question 2d: AS 14.11.011(b)(3) requires the district to provide sufficient evidence that the funding request should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance (including routine maintenance) or custodial care. Refer to Appendix F of these instructions for information regarding the definitions of maintenance terms related to this question.

Question 3b: If the project impacts multiple facilities, the project description shall identify the facilities impacted and describe how each will be impacted. For facilities with both Original and Addition space, identify the discrete section(s) of the portion being impacted. For "districtwide" projects, a detailed description and scope is required for each facility.

Question 3c: Projects that will result in demolition or surplusing of existing owned or leased facilities must include a detailed plan for the transition from existing facilities to replacement facilities.

Question 3g: Site description should include location, size, availability, cost, and other pertinent information as appropriate. If a site selection and evaluation report is attached, the information can be referenced with a brief summary, rather than being reproduced in this section.

Question 3f: If project is complete or partial complete, identify which scope elements have been completed.

Question 5c: If this project will (1) result in renovated or additional educational space, and (2) serve students of the same grade levels currently housed or projected to be housed in other schools, the project description should indicate the:

- attendance areas that will be impacted (i.e. will contribute students) by this project,
- current and projected student populations in each facility (school) affected by the project, and
- DEED gross square footage for each affected facility (school) in the attendance area.

Question 6a-6d: If a facility condition survey, facility appraisal, schematic design, and/or design development documents are attached, they can be summarized and referenced, rather than reproduced in the description of project need, justification, and scope. If project is

complete, and schematic design or design development documents are not attached, provide a justification for why documents are not needed.

Question 8c: When a new, renovation, new-in-lieu-of-renewal, or Category E project is proposed, the project description should include a brief discussion of the cost/benefit and life cycle cost principles which guided this project solution. The detailed cost/benefit analysis and life cycle cost analysis documents shall provide data documenting conditions that justify the project [AS 14.11.011(b)(1)]. If these documents are attached, they can be referenced and summarized, rather than reproduced in the project description.

3e. Project Schedule.

Provide an estimated project timeline that includes, at a minimum, the estimated date for receipt of funding, estimated construction start date, and estimated construction completion date. Identify any additional project schedule milestones or special circumstances that are applicable to the project. Include any schedule changes anticipated if alternative delivery is considered for the project. An alternative project delivery method is required to be approved by the department. If an alternative project delivery method is proposed for the project (including in-house), provide completed request or department approval with application, including any bid documents, etc.

3f. Complete or partially completed project.

Indicate whether the work identified by the project request is partially or fully complete. In question 3d, clearly identify which scope elements have been completed. If the construction work is partially or fully complete, attach documentation that establishes that the construction was procured in accordance with 4 AAC 31.080.

- Competitive sealed bids must be used unless alternative procurement has been previously approved by the department.
- Projects under $100,000 can be constructed with district employees if prior approval is received from the department. For projects that utilized in-house labor, attach the DEED approval of the use of in-house labor [4 AAC 31.080(a)]. If a project utilized in-house labor, or was constructed with alternative procurement methods, and does not have prior approval from the department, the project's construction budget will be reduced [4 AAC 31.080(e)].
- For construction contracts under $100,000, districts may use any competitive procurement method practicable. Provide an explanation of circumstances requiring selected procurement method with attachment.

For projects with contracted construction services, attach construction and bid documents utilized to bid the work, advertising information, bid tabulation, construction contract, and performance and payment bonds for contracts exceeding $100,000. Projects shall be advertised three times beginning a minimum of 21 days before bid opening. The bid protest period shall be at least 10 days. Construction awards must NOT include provisions for local hire. Provide bid documents and bid tabulations as projects attachments.

If district has been working with the department for approval of project delivery method, design, and construction, provide the DEED recovery of funds project number in the space provided.

A district can submit for reimbursement of project costs for work completed up to 36 months prior to the initial submission of the application with a substantially identical scope. This can include costs in any phase: planning (e.g. condition survey), design, and construction. A district can submit for reimbursement of costs for site acquisition approved under 4 AAC 31.025 and incurred up to 120 months before the initial submission of the application with a substantially identical scope.

3g. Acquisition of additional land.

Acquisition of additional land refers to expansion of an existing school site using property immediately adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the existing school site. Land acquisition may result from long-term lease, purchase, or donation of land. *Utilization of a new school site* refers to use of a site previously acquired by the district, or a new site acquired as a result of this application and not previously utilized as a public school.

If the project site is not yet known, the site description should be the district's best estimate of specific site requirements for the project, and it should be included in the project description. The department's 2011 publication, *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook*, may be useful in responding to this question. A site selection study is required for those projects involving new sites in order to qualify for schematic design points (reference Appendix C).

3h. Multiple-school or districtwide project.

Explain how a multiple site project is cost effective and in the state's best interest and how the district will provide for a single contract in either design or construction. Provide justification of need for multiple contracts.

4. CODE DEFICIENCY / PROTECTION OF STRUCTURE / LIFE SAFETY

4a. Code deficiency / Protection of structure / Life safety. (Up to 50 points)

Describe in detail the issue, impact, and severity of code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety conditions being addressed by the project scope in question 3d; attach supporting documentation. If construction of a new school is proposed, describe any code issues at existing facilities in the attendance area that will be relieved by the project.

Code deficiency, protection of structure, and life safety-related categories:

Code Deficiency: Deficiencies related to building code conditions where there is no threat to life safety. This includes compliance with various current building and accessibility codes.

Protection of Structure: Deficiencies that, when left unrepaired, will lead to new or continued damage to the existing structure, building systems, and finishes resulting in a shortened life of the facility.

Life Safety: Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions threatening the health and life safety of students, staff, and the public. For example, required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative posing a life safety risk.

Note: Complete or imminent building failure caused by code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions resulting in unhoused students may be viewed as a more critical project.

The project could contain a single severe condition or multiple moderate conditions. Multiple conditions will be rated collectively, but may not necessarily rank as high as a single severe condition. For projects, such as districtwide projects, that combine critical and non-critical work, points for the critical portion of the project will be weighted proportionally.

The scoring matrix for this category (ref. Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application) is reproduced in the application, and groups deficiencies into the following eight categories: Site, Structural, Roof/Envelope, Arch/Interior/ADA, Mechanical, Electrical, Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, and UST/AST/Hazmat. Identify the condition from the matrix and provide a relevant description of the conditions with references to supporting documentation. While extensive, the discrepancies listed in the matrix may not be exhaustive. If a deficiency is not listed, note that in the description and use the listed deficiencies as a context for determining appropriate documentation. Note that only the highest supported scoring condition will be assigned points for a given issue corrected by the project scope.

As indicated in the matrix, code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions scoring incorporates ranges based on the established severity ranges of the conditions and upon the documentation provided to support the reported severity. Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, third party communications, maintenance work orders, or other records verifying the conditions. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the building or component condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

For matrix scores based on average number of work orders over time, include copies of the relevant work orders. Work order detail should match that required under 4 AAC 31.013(a)(1).

Supporting documentation elsewhere in the application can be summarized and referenced, rather than reproduced in the narrative. When citing information elsewhere in the application or application attachments, provide the specific location of the referenced information.

5. REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE TO BE ADDED OR REPLACED

NOTE: Gross square footage entries in this section should reflect the measurements specified by 4 AAC 31.020. Space variance requests not already approved by the department must be submitted in accordance with 4 AAC 31.020 by the application deadline in order to receive consideration with the current request. The department will not consider space variance requests during the application review process for work proposed in the application.

5a. Project grade levels.

The response to this question should reflect the grade levels that will be served by the facility at the completion of the project.

5b. District voter-approved projects.

Any additional square footage that is funded for construction or approved by local voters for construction should be listed with a descriptive project name, additional GSF, grade levels to be served, and anticipated student capacity. Include these projects in any capacity/unhoused calculations provided in the year of anticipated occupancy.

5c. Other school facilities.

List all schools in the attendance area that serve grade levels equivalent to those of the proposed project. If the project includes any elementary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving elementary students are to be listed. If the project includes any secondary grades, all schools in the attendance area serving secondary students are to be listed. For each school listed, include its size, the grades served, and the school's total student capacity. Use the department's "2017 Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations" MS Excel worksheet to calculate the total student capacity for each school. A link to this form and the "Attendance Areas" report can be found under at http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html

5d. Date of anticipated occupancy.

The date provided here should be the anticipated date the facility will be occupied. This will be the starting point for looking at five-year post-occupancy population projections. If a project schedule is available, it should be provided to substantiate the projected date.

5e. Unhoused students. (80 points possible)

All projects that are adding new space or replacing existing space must complete Table 5.1 ATTENDANCE AREA ADM and provide copies of the student population projection methods used. The department tool for determining projections and space eligibility is the MS Excel workbook, "Attendance Area ADM & GSF Calculations" found under "Space Guidelines" at http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html. Include copies of the worksheets "ADM", "Current Capacity", and "Projected Capacity" with the application. The department may adjust the submitted ADMs and allowable space as necessary for corrections.

The points for this question are based on the following formulas:

1. Current Unhoused Students: If current capacity is at or below 100%, 0 points will be

awarded. If current capacity is over 100%, then one point for every 3% percent over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a current capacity over 250%, the full 50 points will be awarded.

2. Unhoused Students in Seven Years: If capacity five years post-occupancy is at or below 100%, 0 points will be awarded. If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 5% over 100% capacity will be awarded. For projects that have a capacity five years post-occupancy over 250%, the full 30 points will be awarded.
   Scoring for projected unhoused due to facility loss by external environmental factors (reference question 5g) is scored at half points: If capacity five years post-occupancy is over 100%, then one point for every 10% over 100% capacity will be awarded.

5f. ADM projection method.

Identify the method(s) that were utilized to determine the student population projections listed in Table 5.1. The department will compare the projections to historic growth trends for the attendance area. The department will revise population projections that exceed historical growth rates, show disparate growth between elementary and secondary populations, or are unlikely to be sustained as an attendance area's overall population grows.

Inclusion of a charter school population housed in lease space due to terminate within two years may be included; include a copy of the lease as an attachment to the application. The application should include student population projection calculations and sufficient demographic information (e.g., housing construction, economic development, etc.) to justify the project's population projection.

5g. Confirm space eligibility.

Existing space is determined as all permanent facility gross square footage (GSF) within an attendance area as reported in the DEED School Facility Database; for attendance areas with multiple main schools serving a type of school (elementary, secondary, K-12, mixed grade) this will include more facilities than are reported in question 3b "school facilities within scope" or included in question 5j "project space utilization" (Table 5.2).

Utilize data from the ADM projections/GSF calculations workbook to complete this question. For "Total Existing SF", enter all GSF from permanent facilities serving the same school type within the attendance area. For "Remaining Existing SF", subtract any square footage that will be demolished or disposed of from the "Total Existing SF" and enter the remainder. For "Total Eligible SF", enter the total of the square footage calculation based on the school's average daily membership (ADM). For "Qualifies for additional SF", enter the amount of additional qualified square footage by subtracting the "Remaining Existing SF" from the "Total Eligible SF". For "Applying for additional SF", enter the amount of additional square footage that will be added in this. The amount of square footage that is applied for may be the same or less than the amount of the qualified square footage.

A district may submit a future unhoused projection based on an imminent loss of a facility due to certain external environmental factors like erosion. To support the projection, the

district must provide credible evidence and documentation that the facility will be lost or unsafe for occupancy within two years. A district would also need to provide a specific plan for how it will accommodate students without the facility, should the facility become incapable of housing students, and address how the facility will be disposed of in the transition plan (question 3c).

5h. Regional community facilities. (5 points possible)

Statutes require an evaluation of other facilities in the area that may serve as an alternative to accomplishing the project as submitted. Information regarding the availability of such facilities and the effort (e.g. cost, time, etc.) required to make the facility usable for the school needs represented by the project should be provided. The area is not restricted to the attendance area served by the project.

Projects in Category F, which may not relate to providing alternate facilities for unhoused students, should describe existing community facilities (parking, sporting, or outdoor recreation areas) related to the project scope.

There are up to 5 points available for an adequate description showing that the district has considered alternatives to the proposed project for housing unhoused students or providing the desired feature.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(4), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(5)

5i. Educational Specifications.

A district planning a project to add or reconfigure space is required to develop an educational specifications document and provide it to the department for review. [See AS 14.07.020(11), 4 AAC 31.010] For projects adding or reconfiguring space, an educational specification is a required planning document in Appendix C for planning/concept design points.

5j. Project space utilization. (30 points possible)

Table 5.2 Project Space Equation summarizes space utilization in the proposed project expressed in gross square feet. Space figures represented should tabulate to match the gross building square footages reported in question 3b as well as those shown in Table 7.2 of the cost estimate section. Report of demolition, including support facilities being partially or completely demolished, should be consistent with question 3c.

The worksheet at Appendix E lists types of school space that fit in each category. The sum of columns I (space to remain "as is"), II (space to be renovated), and III (space to be demolished) should equal column A (existing space). The sum of columns I, II, and IV should equal column B (total space upon completion). There are up to 30 points possible on the school construction list for the type of space being constructed.

6. PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN

There are four distinct items in this question. Each one has the potential to generate points.

6a. Condition/Component survey. (0 to 10 points possible – refer to Rater Guidelines for scoring criteria)

A *facility condition survey* is a technical survey of facilities and buildings, using the department's Guide for School Facility Condition Survey or a similar format, for the purpose of determining compliance with established building codes and standards for safety, maintenance, repair, energy efficiency, and operation. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural and engineered systems including site assessment may be completed by an architect, engineer, or personnel with documented expertise in a building system. For project scopes that are component or system renovations, a condition survey of the component or system is acceptable.

A facility condition survey is required for major rehabilitation projects to receive further planning and design points. Projects with scopes that warrant identification of in-depth examination of deteriorated systems will require a scope-specific facility or component condition survey to receive points beyond Phase I Planning/Concept Design. Condition surveys should be clearly identified and establish a specific date or date range when the survey occurred or was produced.

The department does not consider submittal of a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan as a condition survey for fuel tank or fuel facility projects. In addition, an energy audit, although useful and informative, will not receive condition survey points if the project's scope warrants additional facility condition survey data.

6b. Use of prior school design (10 points possible)

Statutes require that the department shall encourage school districts to use previously approved school construction design if the use will result in a cost savings for the project. Provide the following information regarding plan availability and the costs to revise the plan to meet the needs of the current project:

- Complete documents of the proposed reused school plans.
- Evidence of ownership of proposed reused school plans.
- An analysis of the anticipated deviations and revisions from the proposed reused school plans along with an estimated cost of those deviations (+ or -).
- An estimate of the design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans along with an estimate of the cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design. If a district does not own the school plan proposed for reuse, estimate must include cost of purchasing design or of another arrangement.

Five measures are identified to determine the range of effectiveness in using a prior school design:

1. The district's ownership and legal ability to effectively use the prior design.
2. The age of the prior design.
3. The amount of change to the prior design anticipated to be needed in the current project.
4. The estimated cost savings in construction costs achieved by the reuse.
5. The estimated cost savings in design services achieved by the reuse.

Up to 10 points are available (2 points for each of the identified measures) for a project that reuses a department-approved school design. This point category is only applicable to school construction projects (primary purpose Category A, B, or F).

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(a)(4) and (b)(7)

6c. Use of prior building system design (10 points possible)

Statutes require that the department shall encourage school districts to use previously approved building systems if the use will result in a cost savings for the project. Five building system categories are available for evaluation of prior design use: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power. A project application can receive points for capital renewal of: a complete system, a subsystem, or a component of system, once in each of these categories when evaluated against whether it is part of a published district or municipal facility standard that meets ASHRAE 90.1-2016 requirements; prior use of a system specification in a bid solicitation is not sufficient to meet the criteria.

The ASHRAE-compliant district or municipal standard must be provided with the application in order for the department to evaluate this criteria.

There are up to 10 points possible for a project that provides support for using a cost-effective building system standard; up to 2 points per qualified system category. This point category is not applicable to projects receiving scores for use of a prior school design.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(a)(4) and (b)(7)

6d. Planning / Concept design. (0 or 10 points possible)

Planning work includes the items listed under planning in Appendix C of this document. At the planning phase, existing conditions may be assumed based on standard life expectancies and other industry norms. Condition/component surveys are only required for projects proposing major rehabilitation. Some projects may not require the services of an architect or engineer; typically these projects are limited in scope where drawings and extensive technical specifications are not necessary in order to issue an Invitation to Bid. Provide a justification in question 6e if no consultant was selected. Some projects do not require concept design or educational specifications. Reference Appendix C for projects which require these planning documents. The department's Program Demand Cost Model is acceptable as a planning/concept level cost estimate. There are 10 points possible for completed planning/concept design work.

If design has progressed further than planning/concept design, then schematic design (35%) design development (65%), or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of concept design documents.

A *facility appraisal* is an educational adequacy appraisal following the format or similar formats of the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International "Guide for School Facility Appraisal". An appraisal is optional; however, an appraisal document is useful to the department in evaluating the overall merits of the project request.

6e. Schematic design – 35%. (0 or 10 points possible)

Schematic design work includes the items listed under schematic design in Appendix C of this document. There are 10 points possible for completed schematic design work.

Project development to schematic design on most projects requires a condition/component survey to assess existing conditions. Condition/component surveys are required for projects proposing major rehabilitation and may be required for other projects if necessary to adequately support the scope of the proposed work.

Some projects may not require a schematic design in order to issue an Invitation to Bid. Typically these projects are limited in scope where drawings and extensive technical specifications are not necessary. Provide a justification if schematic design documents were not needed. The department's Program Demand Cost Model is not an acceptable Schematic level estimate.

If design has progressed further than schematic design (35%), then design development (65%) or construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of schematic design documents.

6f. Design development – 65%. (0 or 5 points possible)

Design development work includes items listed under design development in Appendix C of this document. There are 5 points possible for completed design development work.

Project development to schematic design on most projects requires a condition/component survey to assess existing conditions. Condition/component surveys are required for projects proposing major rehabilitation and may be required for other projects if necessary to adequately support the scope of the proposed work.

Construction level drawings and cost estimates may be submitted in lieu of design development documents.

6g. Planning / Design team.

The application needs to identify the district's architectural or engineering (A/E) consultant for the Condition Survey, Planning, Schematic Design and Design Development work. Certain projects of limited scope may not require consultant selection to qualify for planning/concept level design point, but may be required for schematic design or design development levels, depending on project complexity. If there is no consultant, the district must provide a detailed explanation of why a consultant is not required for the project. For others besides licensed design professionals currently registered in the State of Alaska, provide the qualifications for design team members that the district accepted. For example, if one is a school board member who is also an electrician, please note both. Likewise, note a district employee with X years as a licensed roofing contractor, or a maintenance person with X years as the lead mechanical custodian for the district.

Identify any additional consultants hired for pre-construction work, including independent value analysis or commissioning agent, as required.

7. COST ESTIMATE

Cost estimate for total project cost. (30 points possible)

7a. Project cost estimate.

For all applications, including those for planning and design, cost estimates should be based on the district's most recent information and should address the project being requested. Refer to Appendix D for descriptions of elements of the total project cost. The cost estimate should be of sufficient detail that its reasonableness can be evaluated. If a project is projected to cost significantly more than would be predicted by the Department's current Program Demand Cost Model, provide attachments justifying the higher cost. If there are special requirements, a detailed explanation and justification should be provided in question 7c.

Table 7.1 Total Project Cost Estimate.

In Table 7.1, all prior AS 14.11 funding for this project should be listed by category and totaled in Column I. If a grant has not been issued, but an appropriation has been made, use the appropriated amount plus participating share in lieu of the issued grant or bond amount. Column II should list the amount of funding being requested in this application, by category and in total. Column III should show a percentage breakdown for the total project allocated costs as a percentage of the total construction cost. Column IV should list the total project cost estimate from inception to completion, all phases. Calculate the percent of construction for all cost categories except Land, Site Investigation, and Seismic Hazard. To calculate the percent of construction, divide the category costs by the Construction cost and multiply by 100%. Use Column IV costs to calculate the percent of construction. Other categories should be within the ranges listed. Construction Management (CM) by consultant must be less than 4% if the total project cost is less than or equal to $500,000; 3% for project costs between $500,000 - $5,000,000; and 2% for projects of $5,000,000 or greater [AS 14.11.020(c)]. The percent for art, required for all renovation and construction projects with a cost greater than $250,000, and which requires an Educational Specification, is given a separate line. Project Contingency is fixed at 5%. The total project cost should not exceed 130% of construction cost, excluding land and site investigation. If the project exceeds the recommended percentages, add a detailed justification in question 7c.

Seismic Hazard costs include the costs required to assess, design, and perform special construction inspections for a school facility. These costs include the costs for an assessment of seismic hazard at the site by a geologist or geotechnical engineer with experience in seismic hazard evaluation, an initial rapid visual screening of seismic risk, investigation of the facility by a structural engineer, design of mitigation measures by a structural engineer, third party review of seismic mitigation measures, and special inspections required during construction of the seismic mitigation components of the project. The costs associated with this budget item must be prepared by a licensed professional engineer with experience in seismic design. The district should refer to the Peak Ground Acceleration information for various areas of the state available on the department's CIP website (education.alaska.gov/Facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html)

Table 7.2 Construction Cost Estimate.

This summarization of construction costs is structured to be consistent with the DEED cost model. Other estimating formats may not provide an exact correlation; however, the following categories **MUST** be reported to allow adequate comparisons between projects: basic building, site work and utilities, general requirements, contingency, and escalation. Do not blank out or write over this table. If the application includes a cost estimate from a designer or professional cost estimating firm, Table 7.2 must still be filled out as described above.

Note: Cost estimates are preferred in the DEED *CostFormat*. Alternative formats will not impact points assigned but could impact the project's eligible amount for cost estimate expenses. Although not required for a project application, cost estimates provided as a submittal for a project awarded a grant allocation will need to conform to the DEED *CostFormat*.

Up to 30 points are possible for reasonableness and completeness of the cost estimate provided in support of the project.

7b. Cost estimate source.

Identify the source of the cost estimate. A cost estimate could be from a professional design or estimating firm, vendor quotes, actual invoices, or based on the documented costs of a similar project in the district.

7c. Cost estimate discussion and justifications.

Provide sufficient information to support meaningful evaluation of the project cost and the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Though basic cost information is incorporated into Tables 7.1 and 7.2, many cost elements reported in standard estimates will require further explanation or support. Please refer to Appendix D for guidelines covering project cost estimate percentages for factored cost items. Provide justification for any lump-sum elements used in the cost estimate, including site work and utilities. If the project exceeds a recommended percentage for a specific category or if the project is requesting more than 30% in additional percentage costs, provide a detailed justification. The project scope and cost estimate should be increasingly detailed as project phases advance.

Identify attachments with additional information regarding project cost that may aid in evaluating the reasonableness of the cost estimate. Documents may include a life cycle cost analysis, cost benefit analysis, bid documents, actual cost estimates, final billing statement for completed projects, and any additional supporting documentation justifying project costs.

8. ADDITIONAL PROJECT FACTORS

8a. Emergency conditions. (50 points possible)

Emergencies are conditions that pose a high level of threat for building use by occupants. An emergency exists when students are currently unhoused due to the loss of the facility, or damage to the facility due to circumstances associated with the emergency. An emergency also exists when the district's ability to utilize the facility is impacted or there is an immediate or high probability of a threat to property, life, health, or safety.

Not all systems or components that have reached the end of their useful life or are starting to fail are considered to be emergencies. A system or component that has reached the end of its useful life or has started to fail, but routine or preventive maintenance prolongs the life of the system or component, is not considered to be an emergency. Example: A roof that has started to leak and the leaking is stopped with routine maintenance would not constitute an emergency. A roof that is leaking, where rot has been found in the structure of the roof and routine maintenance no longer prevents water from entering the building, could be considered an emergency.

Describe in detail the nature, impact, and immediacy of the emergency and actions the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions. At a minimum, include the following:

- the nature of the emergency,
- the facility condition related to the emergency,
- the threat to students and staff,
- the consequence of continued utilization of the facility,
- the individuals or groups affected by the condition,
- what action the district has taken to mitigate the emergency conditions, and
- the extent to which any portion of the project is eligible for insurance reimbursement or emergency funding from any state or federal agency.

Supporting documentation of the conditions is critical. Documentation that supports the conditions can be documents such as: condition surveys, photos, third party communications, insurance claims, or other records verifying the conditions. This is not an exclusive list and applicants are encouraged to provide other sources of quantitative information to support the emergency condition. The primary purpose of this documentation is to present objective, primary, specific, and verifiable data.

The emergency descriptions with check boxes contained in question 8a are to help the applicant identify the type of emergency the project is resolving. The applicant must provide a description of the particular emergency in the application and include all relevant documentation that supports the immediacy or high probability of the threat or emergency. An application that checks an emergency building condition box without a description of the emergency will receive no points.

The matrix below incorporates the emergency conditions categories listed in the application with supporting examples.

Building
Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. Example: A flood or fire event has destroyed or left the building so structurally compromised that the building must be demolished.

Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. Example: The roof of a school came off in a severe wind storm with water damage to interior finishes.

Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. Example: It is discovered that the building does not meet current specified safety standards and the building will need to be made current with the standards within the next 90 days. Documentation substantiating the order needs to be supplied.

A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. Example: The roof leaked over a classroom causing structural damage to the walls, which restricts the use of the room until the repairs are made.

Components or Systems
A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. Example: The heating plant has completely failed leaving the building unusable to the student population and susceptible to freezing and further damage.

A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and has limited functionality. If the component fails, the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. Example: A fire alarm system has a history of components failing and given the age of the system, parts are no longer available. The system has a high probability of failing completely and district may have to vacate the building.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(1)

8b. Inadequacies of space. (40 points possible)

Describe how the project will improve existing facilities to support the instructional program. The response should address how the inadequacies of the facility impact the instructional program and whether that instructional program is a mandatory, existing local, or a proposed

new local program. Types of inadequacies addressed may include the quality of space, amount of space, or configuration of the space.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(4)

8c. Other options. (25 points possible)

In an effort to support the project submitted as the best possible, districts should consider a full range of options during planning and project development.

- A cost/benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, or other evaluative processes used by the district in reaching its design solution should be included. See also Item I, Project Eligibility Checklist, which requires a life cycle cost analysis, a cost benefit analysis, or any other quantifiable analysis, when needed, to demonstrate that the project is in the best interest of the district and the state.
- A project that proposes component replacement should discuss the merits of alternative products, material options, construction methods, alternative design, or other solutions to the problem as applicable.
- A project that proposes roof replacement should discuss the merits of different roofing materials, the addition of insulation, or altering the roof slope and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.
- A project that includes major rehabilitation or renovation to multiple systems should provide and discuss an option to construct a new facility in lieu of the proposed scope.
- If the proposed project will add new or additional space, districts may consider options such as double shifting, service area boundary changes, and any space available in adjacent attendance areas that are connected by road. In districts that contain adjacent attendance areas, at least one of the options considered must be an evaluation of potential boundary changes.
- Projects that propose construction of a new school should discuss other options, such as renovation of the existing building or acquisition of alternative facilities, and provide an explanation as to why these options were not selected.
- Scoring in this area will be related to factors such as: the range of options, the rigor of comparison, the viability of options considered, and the quality of data supporting the analysis of the option. Options also need to consider the results of cost benefit analysis, life cycle cost analysis, and value analysis as necessary.

There are up to 25 points available for a documented comprehensive discussion on the options considered by the district that would accomplish the same goals as the proposed project.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b)(6), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(6)

8d. Annual operating cost savings. (30 points possible)

Information (and evaluation points) related to operational costs is not limited to Category E projects. Explain and document ways in which the completion of the project would reduce current operational costs. This analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis. Consider energy costs, costs related to wear-and-tear, maintenance of existing facilities costs, and costs incurred by current functional inadequacies at the facility

and attendance area level. Provide benchmark values such as fuel costs, specific labor costs affected by the project, and historical record of problems to be addressed by this project.

For new facilities, discuss design choices that will provide periodic and long-term savings in the operation and maintenance of the facility. Although the addition of square footage may increase overall operational costs, project descriptions for this category of project should include information on methods and strategies used to minimize operational costs over the life of the building. Include cost benefit analyses that were accomplished on building systems and materials.

Up to 30 points are possible based on the projected cost savings payback with a full and complete description.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference: AS 14.11.013(b), 4 AAC 31.022(c)(3)

8e. Prior funding. (30 points possible)

Prior state funding refers to **grant funds appropriated by the legislature to the department and administered under AS 14.11.** Any amounts noted here should also be included in Table 7.1 of the Cost Estimate, question 7a. No other fund sources apply, including debt retirement. There are up to 30 points available if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11, and the project was intentionally short funded. There are 15 points available if a project includes previous grant funding under AS 14.11, the project has gone out to bid, and the district is seeking supplemental funds due to increases in construction bid, whether the district has awarded the bid or not.

8f. Participating share waiver.

Waivers of participating share should be in accordance with AS 14.11.008(d). Justification should be documented. See Appendix G in the attachments to these instructions for detailed information. Only municipal districts with a full value per ADM less than $200,000 that are not REAAs are eligible to request a waiver of participating share. Contact the department for a district's most recent full-value per ADM calculation.

9. DISTRICT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE & FACILITY MANAGEMENT

District preventive maintenance and facility management. (60 points possible)

AS 14.11.011(b)(1) and 4 AAC 31.011(b)(2) require each school district to include with its application submittals a description of its preventive maintenance program, as defined by AS 14.11.011(b)(4), AS 14.14.090(10), and 4 AAC 31.013. Refer to Appendix F for details.

The scoring criteria for this area reflect efforts beyond just preventive maintenance. For each element of a qualifying plan outlined in 4 AAC 31.013, documents, including reports, narratives, and schedules, have been identified for nine separate evaluations. These documents will establish the extent to which districts have moved beyond the minimum eligibility criteria and have tools in place for the active management of all aspects of their facility management. The documents necessary for each evaluation are listed below. They

are grouped according to the five areas of effort established in statute and are annotated as to the type of evaluation (i.e., evaluative or formula-driven). Refer to the Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application for additional information on scoring.

Up to 60 points possible for a clear and complete reporting of the district's maintenance program.

Only two sets, one of which may be an electronic copy, should be provided by the district, regardless of the number of submitted applications.

Maintenance Management

9a. Maintenance management narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the effectiveness of your work order-based maintenance management system along with supporting documents. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- A narrative fully describes the maintenance management (MM) program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom; how component work order history and trends are used.
- Provides sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials. Work orders provided as part of application support for question 4a may be used by raters to assess this narrative.
- Provides sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance.
- Provides sample routine or corrective work orders showing progression of scheduling from initial response to completion or deferral.
- Provides a component report for a minimum of 10% of main school facilities showing the date of installation and date of scheduled renewal or replacement; includes components from each building system listed in DEED's R&R schedule.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

9b. Maintenance labor reports (Formula-Driven) (up to 15 points available)

Item A: Produce a districtwide report showing total maintenance labor hours collected on work orders by type of work (e.g., preventive, corrective, operations support, etc.) vs. labor hours available by month for the previous 12 months.

Item B: Produce a districtwide report that shows a comparison of completed work orders to all work orders initiated, by month, for the previous 12 months.

Item C: Produce a districtwide report showing the number of incomplete work orders sorted by age (30 days, 60 days, 90 days, etc.) and status for the previous 12 months (deferred, awaiting materials, assigned, etc.).

These reports will demonstrate a district's ability to manage maintenance activities related to the level and scope of labor requirements. Recommended to review management reports to ensure that the reports make sense – internally consistent and reflective of work performed. Discuss discrepancies in narrative, Question 9a.

9c. PM/corrective maintenance reports (Formula-Driven) (up to 10 points available)

Item A: Provide a districtwide report that compares scheduled (preventive) maintenance work order hours to unscheduled maintenance work order hours by month for the previous 12 months.

Item B: Provide a districtwide report with monthly trend data for unscheduled work orders showing both hours and numbers of work orders by month for the previous 12 months.

These reports support the district's ability to manage maintenance activities related to scheduled (preventive) maintenance and unscheduled work (repairs). One factor in determining the effectiveness of a preventive maintenance program is a comparison of the time and costs of scheduled maintenance in relation to the time and costs of unscheduled maintenance.

9d. 5-year average expenditure for maintenance (Formula-Driven) (5 points available)

Districtwide maintenance expenditures for the last five years will be gathered by the department from audited financial statements. (Costs for teacher housing, utilities, or expenditures for which reimbursement is being sought will be excluded.) The department will calculate these items based on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Uniform Chart of Accounts and Account Code Descriptions for Public School Districts, 2018 Edition annual audited district-wide operations expenditure as the sum of Function 600 Operations & Maintenance of Plant expenditures in Fund 100 General Fund, excluding Object Code 430 Utilities, Object Code 435 Energy, Object Code 445 Insurance, all expenditures for teacher housing, and capital projects funded through AS 14.11. In addition, expenditures included in this calculation will not be eligible for reimbursement under AS 14.11.

The five-year average expenditure for maintenance is divided by the five-year average insured replacement value, districtwide. Insured value will include all district facilities reported in the department's facility database:
https://education.alaska.gov/Facilities/SchoolFacilityReport/SearchforSchoolFac.cfm

No information need be submitted with the application for this question.

Energy Management

9e. Energy management narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the district's energy management program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Energy Management program including all of the following energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, benchmarking, energy audits and assessments, and implementation/execution of energy efficiency measures (EEMs).
- Provide data showing the program tracks energy by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility over the prior five years-by energy type.
- Provides an energy management guideline or manual, which is clearly identified as being issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items above.

- Provides a report showing a five-year history of implemented EEMs. Provides a complete set of energy consumption records for question 9f.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

9f. Energy consumption reports (Formula-Driven) (5 points available)

Item A: Provide site-specific reports that compares monthly consumption for energy and utilities for all main schools over the previous 5 years.

These reports support the district's ability to manage energy use and establish the ability to evaluate usage trends over time in support of building performance.

Custodial Program

9g. Custodial narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the district's custodial program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, and performance verification/quality control.
- Provides custodial program guideline or manual, which is clearly identified as being issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items above.
- Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on the industry practice. Lists staffing requirements for the facility based on these metrics and industry standards for productivity.
- Provides a report which tabulates the preceding information (types and quantities of information, etc.) for all main schools in the district, including staffing requirements. OR Provides no less than two facility examples each year of submission with no repeats within a five-year period. If the district operates fewer than 10 schools, provided one-third of all facilities each year.
- Provides at least 5 work orders generated by the custodial program in the previous 12 months.
- Provides completed sets of quality control and inspection checklists for no less than two facilities for the previous fiscal year period.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

Maintenance Training

9h. Maintenance training narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the district's training program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, training scheduling and tracking, and measurement of program effectiveness.
- Identifies individual training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported, identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis.
- Provides a sample analysis of job functions (e.g., driving, work order management, etc.) and required building system knowledge (e.g., boiler tuning, lock-out/tag-out, etc.) for at least one job classification.
- Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type.
- Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual.
- Provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the training program which, at a minimum includes data on scheduled versus completed training.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

Capital Planning (Renewal & Replacement)

9i. Capital planning narrative (Evaluative) (up to 5 points available)

Provide a narrative description of the district's capital planning program along with supporting documentation. Full points will be assigned where the following is provided:

- Narrative fully describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification (condition assessments, user input and maintenance work order history/trends, etc.), development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans, identification of capital project resources and funding.
- Provides capital planning report issued/updated within the past 12 months and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan and includes capital projects programmed from all fund sources, local, state, and federal.
- Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a facility condition assessment not older than five years. Where FCI equals the cost of current and deferred renewal divided by the current replacement value.
- Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district.
- Provides a condition assessment for every project requesting state-aid in the first year of the 6-yr CIP plan.
- Provides a districtwide trend for combined FCI for a minimum of five prior years and tracks districtwide capital expenditures for main schools for a minimum of five prior years.

Scores will be reduced incrementally where information or supporting documents are not provided.

10. DISTRICT CONTACT INFORMATION

The district may provide names and e-mails for up to three additional persons besides the Superintendent or Chief School Administrator to whom the department will include in correspondence regarding changes made to the project application within the department's authority to determine a project eligibility, change a project's primary purpose, and modify a project's scope and budget. This includes any notification at the time the initial rankings are published and any determination based on district requests for reconsideration.

11. ATTACHMENTS CHECKLIST

Eligibility and project description attachments.

An application must include adequate documentation to verify the claims made in the application. The department may reject an application that does not have complete information or adequate documentation. See AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1). The eligibility and project description attachments checklist is provided to identify required materials and additional materials that are referenced in support of the project. The eligibility attachments are required for all projects. Projects with missing eligibility attachments will not be ranked. Check to see that your application is complete and indicate additional attachments the department should be referencing while evaluating the project.

APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES OF GRANTS

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 20, 2023

AS 14.11.013(a)(1) - annually review the six-year plans submitted by each district under AS 14.11.011(b) and recommend to the board a revised and updated six-year capital improvement project grant schedule that serves the best interests of the state and each district; in recommending projects for this schedule, the department shall verify that each proposed project meets the criteria established under AS 14.11.014(b) and qualifies as a project required to:[1, 2]

A. "Avert imminent danger or correct life threatening situations." This category is generally referred to as "Health and Life Safety." A project classified under "A" must be documented as having unsafe conditions that threaten the physical welfare of the occupants. Examples might be that the seismic design of structure is inadequate; that the required fire alarm and/or suppressant systems are non-existent or inoperative; or that the structure and materials are deteriorated or damaged seriously to the extent that they pose a health/life-safety risk. The district must document what actions it has taken to temporarily mitigate a life-threatening situation.

B. "House students who would otherwise be unhoused." This category is referred to as "Unhoused Students." A project to be classified under "B" must have inadequate space to carry out the educational program required for the present and projected student population. Documentation should be based on the current Department of Education & Early Development Space Guidelines. (Refer to 4 AAC 31.020)

C. "Protection of the structure of existing school facilities." This category is intended to include projects that will protect the structure, enclosure, foundations and systems of a facility from deterioration and ensure continued use as an educational facility. Work on individual facility systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed $50,000. The category is for major projects, which are not a result of inadequate preventive, routine, and/or custodial maintenance. An example could be a twenty-year-old roof that has been routinely patched and flood coated, but is presently cracking and leaking in numerous locations. A seven-year-old roof that has numerous leaks would normally only require preventive maintenance and would not qualify. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.

D. "Correct building code deficiencies that require major repair or rehabilitation in order for the facility to continue to be used for the educational program." This category, Building Code Deficiencies, was previously referred to as "Code Upgrade." The key words are "major repair." A "D" project corrects major building, fire, mechanical, electrical, environmental, disability (ADA), and other conditions required by codes. Work on individual facility

[1] Projects can combine work in the different categories with the majority of work establishing the project's type. For the purpose of review and evaluation, projects which include significant work elements from categories other than the project's primary category will be evaluated as **mixed scope** projects [4 AAC 31.022(c)(8)].

[2] Projects will be considered for replacement-in-lieu-of-renewal when project costs exceed 75% of the current replacement cost of the existing facility, based on a twenty-year life cycle cost analysis that includes disposition costs of the existing facility.

systems may be combined into one project. However, the work on each system must be able to be independently justified and exceed $50,000. An example could be making all corridors one-hour rated. Making one or two toilet stalls accessible would not fit this category. Replacement or rehabilitation of elementary playground equipment or fall protection surfacing that corrects a code deficiency would fit this category. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.

E. "Achieve an operating cost saving." This category is intended to improve the efficiency of a facility and therefore, save money. Examples that might qualify are increasing insulation, improving doors and windows, modifying boilers and heat exchange units for more energy efficiency. The project application must include an economic analysis comparing the project cost to the operating cost savings generated by the project. In addition, no new space for unhoused students is permitted in this category, limiting its ability to be combined with other project types.

F. "Modify or rehabilitate facilities for purpose of improving the instructional unit." Category "F", Improve Instructional Program, was previously referred to as "Functional Upgrade." This category is limited to changes or improvements within an existing facility such as, modifications for science programs, computer installation, conversion of space for special education classes, or increase of resource areas. It also covers improvements to outdoor education and site improvements to support the educational program that are not correcting elementary playground equipment or fall protection surfacing code deficiencies.

G. "Meet an educational need not specified in (A)-(F) of this paragraph, identified by the department." Any situation not covered by (A)-(F), and mandated by the Department of Education. (Currently, there are no such mandates.)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

APPENDIX B: REGIONALLY BASED MODEL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 20, 2022

AS 14.11.014(b) requires the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review (BRGR) Committee to "(3) develop criteria for construction of schools in the state; criteria developed under this paragraph must include requirements intended to achieve cost-effective school construction." These standards and criteria are considered by the department in its development and updating of regionally based model school construction standards that describe acceptable building systems and anticipated costs and establish school design ratios to achieve efficient and cost-effective school construction under AS 14.1.017(d). The department must consider these construction standards when evaluating applications.

The BRGR Committee has developed, reviewed, and approved the construction standards published by the department as the Alaska School Design & Construction Standards, dated April 20, 2022, for use evaluating CIP applications beginning with FY2024, with exceptions for projects completed prior to September 1, 2023, projects eligible for reuse of scores, and projects scoring 20 points or more in planning and design (combined scoring for questions 6d, 6e, 6f) prior to September 1, 2023.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

APPENDIX C: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASES

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 20, 2023

The application form requires designation of the phase(s) for which the district requests funding. Below is a basic scope of effort for each phase. Items marked **Required** are mandatory (where project scope dictates) in order for projects to receive planning, schematic design and/or design development points. Required documents must be submitted by September 1st.

CONDITION/COMPONENT SURVEY (0 to 10 points possible)

PHASE I - PLANNING/CONCEPT DESIGN (0 or 10 points possible)

1. Select architectural or engineering consultants (4 AAC 31.065) - (**Required if necessary to accomplish scope of project**)
2. Prepare a school facility appraisal (optional)
3. Include a condition/component survey as referenced above - (**Required if project is a major rehabilitation**[1])
4. Identify need category of project - (**Required**)
5. Verify student populations and trends - (**Required for new facilities and additions to existing facilities**)
6. Complete education specifications (4 AAC 31.010) - (**Required for new facilities, additions, and for projects that reconfigure or repurpose existing space**)
7. Complete concept design studies - (**Required for new facilities, additions, and for projects that reconfigure or repurpose existing space**)
8. Complete planning cost estimate – (**Required**)
9. Identify site requirements and potential sites - (**Required for new facilities**)

PHASE IIA - SCHEMATIC DESIGN – 35% (0 or 10 points possible)

1. Perform site evaluation and site selection analysis (4 AAC 31.025) - **(Required for new facilities)**
2. Prepare plan for transition from old site to new site, if applicable - (**Required for new facilities**)
3. Accomplish site survey and perform preliminary site investigation (topography, geotechnical) - (**Required for new facilities**)
4. Obtain letter of commitment from the landowner allowing for purchase or lease of site - (**Required for new facilities**)
5. Complete schematic design documents including development of approximate dimensioned site plans, floor plans, elevations and engineering narratives for all necessary disciplines - (**Required if necessary to adequately scope and complete the project**)
6. Complete preliminary cost estimate appropriate to the phase - (**Required**)
7. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - (**Required if project is a major rehabilitation**[1] **or is necessary to adequately scope and complete the project.**)

[1] Under 4 AAC 31.900(7): "rehabilitation" means adapting an existing facility to improve the opportunity to provide a contemporary educational program; and includes major remodeling, repair, renovation, and modernization with related capital equipment.

PHASE IIB - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT – 65% (0 or 5 points possible)

1. Complete required elements of planning/design not finished in the previous phases - (**Required**)
2. Review and confirm planning (4 AAC 31.030)
3. Select commissioning agent (4 AAC 31.065; 4 AAC 31.080) - (**Required for new facilities or additions over 5000GSF, or rehabilitation of facility over 10,000GSF**)
4. Accomplish a condition/component survey relevant to scope - (**Required if project is a major rehabilitation**[1] **or is necessary to adequately scope and complete the project.**)
5. Obtain option to purchase or lease site at an agreed upon price and terms - (**Required for new facilities**)
6. Complete design development documents, including dimensioned site plans, floor plans, complete exterior elevations, draft technical specifications, and engineering plans - (**Required if necessary to adequately scope and complete the project**)
7. Prepare proposed schedule and method of construction
8. Prepare revised cost estimate appropriate to the phase - (**Required**)
9. Commissioning plan
10. Energy consumption and cost report
11. Value analysis report

PHASE III - CONSTRUCTION

1. Complete required elements of planning and design not previously completed - (**Required**)
2. Prepare final cost estimate - (**Required**)
3. Complete final contract documents and legal review of construction documents (4 AAC 31.040)
4. Advertising, bidding and contract award (4 AAC 31.080) - (**Required for contracts over $100,000**)
5. Submit signed construction contract
6. Construct project
7. Procure furniture, fixtures, and equipment, if applicable
8. Substantial completion
9. Commissioning report
10. Final completion and move-in
11. Post occupancy survey
12. Obtain project audit/close out

Construction Management (CM) by a private contractor. Costs may include oversight of any phase of the project by a private contractor. Construction management includes management of the project's scope, schedule, quality, and budget during any phase of the planning, design and construction of the facility. The maximum for construction management by consultant is 4% of the total project cost as defined in statute [AS 14.11.020(c)].

Land is a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include actual purchase price plus title insurance, fees, and closing costs. Land cost is limited to the lesser of the appraised value of the land or the actual purchase price of the land. Land costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Site Investigation is also a variable unrelated to construction cost and should include land survey, preliminary soil testing, and environmental and cultural survey costs, but not site preparation. Site investigation costs are excluded from project percent calculations.

Design Services should include full standard architectural and engineering services as described in AIA Document B141-1997. Architectural and engineering fees can be budgeted based upon a percentage of construction costs. Because construction costs vary by region and size, so may the percentage fee to accomplish the same effort. Additional design services such as educational specifications, condition surveys, and post occupancy evaluations may increase fees beyond the recommended percentages.

Recommended: 6-10% (Renovation, complexity of scope, and scale might run 2% higher)

Construction includes all contract work as well as force account for facility construction, site preparation, and utilities. This is the base cost upon which others are estimated and equals 100%.

Equipment/Technology includes all moveable furnishing, instructional devices or aids, electronic and mechanical equipment with associated software and peripherals (consultant services necessary to make equipment operational may also be included). It does not include installed equipment, nor consumable supplies, with the exception of the initial purchase of library books. Items purchased should meet the district definition of a fixed asset and be accounted for in an inventory control system. The Equipment/Technology budget has two benchmarks for standard funding: percentage of construction costs and per-student costs as discussed in DEED's *Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases*. If special technology plans call for higher levels of funding, itemized costs should be presented in the project budget separate from standard equipment.

Recommended: 0-4% of construction cost **or** between $2,300 - $3,800 per student depending on school size and type.

District Administrative Overhead includes an allocable share of district overhead costs, such as payroll, accounts payable, procurement services, and preparation of the six-year capital improvement plan and specific project applications. The maximum for non-project specific indirect administrative costs is 3%, as defined in regulation [4 AAC 31.023(c)(7)]. In-house construction management should be included as part of this line item. The total of in-house construction

management costs and construction management by consultant should not exceed 5% of the construction budget.

Recommended: 2-9%

Percent for Art includes the statutory allowance for art in public places. This may fund selection, design/fabrication and installation of works of art. One percent of the construction budget is required except for rural projects which require only one-half of one percent. For this category, projects are rural if they are in communities under 3,000 or are not on a year-round, publicly-maintained road system and have a construction cost differential greater than 120% of Anchorage as determined in the Cost Model for Alaskan Schools. The department recommends budgeting for art.

Project Contingency is a safety factor to allow for unforeseen changes. Standard cost estimating by A/E or professional estimators use a built in contingency in the construction cost of ± 10%. Because that figure is included in the construction cost, this item is a project contingency for project changes and unanticipated costs in other budget areas.

Recommended: 5% Fixed

Total Project Request is the total project cost, as a percent of the construction cost; except in extreme cases, should average out close to the same for all projects, when the variables of land cost and site investigation are omitted. This item is the best overall gauge of the efficiency of the project.

Recommended: Not to exceed 130%

APPENDIX E: TYPE OF SPACE ADDED OR IMPROVED

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 20, 2022

Category A - Instructional or Resource

General Use Classrooms
Pre-K and Kindergarten
Elementary
Secondary
Special Education
Art
Science
Bi-Cultural/Bilingual
Consumer Education
Computer/Technology Lab
Music/Drama
Career and Technical Education
Library/Media Center
Gymnasium

Category B - Support Teaching

Teacher Workroom/Office
Teacher Breakroom
Counseling/Testing
Educational Resource Storage
Quiet Room

Category C - General Support

Administration
Conference Room
Parent/Community Schools
Nurse/Clinic
Cafeteria
Kitchen/Food Service
Student Store
Fitness Room
Locker Room/Showers
Student Commons
Multipurpose Room
Auditorium (& Stage)
Pool

Category D - Supplementary

Corridors/Vestibules/Entries
Stairs/Elevators
Restrooms/Toilets
Custodial
Supply/Food Storage
Refer/Freezer
Maintenance/Receiving
Mechanical/Electrical
Telecom/Server Room

APPENDIX F: DEFINITIONS OF MAINTENANCE

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 20, 2022

Building System(s)
An assembly of components created to perform specific functions in a facility (ref. DEED *CostFormat* for descriptions of 11 standard building systems).

Capital Renewal or Replacement
A scheduled and anticipated systematic upgrading or replacement of a building system or component, anticipated based on life-expectancy, to establish its ability to function for a new life cycle—typically at least five years.

Commissioning
A systematic process of testing buildings systems to ensure that a building performs in accordance with the design intent, contract documents, and the owner's operational needs. Retro-commissioning is commissioning of building systems that occurs on a facility that has never been commissioned, or occurs after an initial commissioning, to recalibrate building performance to ensure optimal systems performance.

Component
An item within a building system that provides a function distinct from other elements in that system.

Corrective Maintenance
Unscheduled maintenance or repair in response to system or component failures that are accomplished at an operational level.

Custodial Care
The day to day and periodic cleaning of building surfaces and fixtures needed to maintain a facility in safe, clean, and orderly condition; includes the replacement of disposable supplies and building items.

Deferred Maintenance
Maintenance or capital renewal that is postponed for lack of funds, resources, or other reasons.

Energy Audit and Assessment
An assessment of a building that review current energy consumption and identifies energy efficiency measures that you can conduct to make the building more energy efficient.

Energy Benchmarking
Measuring building energy performance against its own past performance or against other buildings with a similar function/use.

Energy Consumption Monitoring
Measuring, recording, and tracking use of energy utilities by a building. Required to be done on a monthly basis.

Energy Efficiency Measures
Upgrades, retrofits, or repairs of systems or software or a practice that, when implemented, results in reduced energy use while maintaining the same or higher level of service.

Major Maintenance

Facility renewal that requires major repair or rehabilitation to protect the structure, correct building code deficiencies, or achieve an operating cost savings, and shall exceed $50,000 per project, per site. It must be demonstrated, using evidence acceptable to the department that (1) the district has adhered to its regular preventive, routine, and/or custodial maintenance schedule for the identified project request, and (2) preventive maintenance is no longer cost effective.

Preventive Maintenance

The regularly scheduled activities that carry out the diagnostic and corrective actions necessary to prevent premature failure or maximize or extend the useful life of a facility and/or its components. It involves a planned and implemented program of inspection, servicing, testing, and replacement of systems and components that is cost effective on a life-cycle basis. Programs shall contain the elements defined in AS 14.11.011(b)(4) and 4 AAC 31.013 to be eligible for funding.

Routine Maintenance

Light maintenance and inspection tasks performed at regular intervals (daily, weekly, monthly, etc.). Differentiated from preventive maintenance by level of complexity, specialized skill, and duration of effort.

APPENDIX G: INFORMATION REGARDING PARTICIPATING SHARE & IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS OR REQUEST FOR FULL WAIVER

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee
April 23, 1999

Current law – AS 14.11.008(d) - requires that a district provide a participating share for all school construction and major maintenance projects funded under AS 14.11. The department administers all funds for capital projects appropriated to it under the guidelines of AS 14.11 and 4 AAC 31. The following points should be considered by those districts requesting a waiver of the local participating share.

1. A district has three years before and after the appropriation to fulfill the participating share requirement.

A review of the annual financial audits and school district budgets indicate that no district is in a financial condition which warrants a full waiver. Local dollars are available to fund all or a portion of the match during the six years. Districts continue to generate and budget for, local interest earnings, facility rental fees, and other forms of discretionary revenue adequate to fund some or all of the required local match. If properly documented and not already funded by AS 14.11, prior expenditures for planning, design, and other eligible costs may be sufficient to meet the match requirement.

2. Both the administration and the Legislature have strong feelings that local communities should at least be partially engaged in the funding of projects.

In recognition of the inability of some communities to levy a tax or raise large amounts of cash from other sources, the legislation provides an opportunity for in-kind contributions, in lieu of cash. All districts need to make a directed effort to provide the local match, utilize fund balances and other discretionary revenue, consider sources of in-kind contributions, document that effort, and then request a full or partial waiver, as necessary.

3. All waiver requests require sufficient documentation.

Requests should be accompanied by strong, compelling evidence as to overall financial condition of the school district and in the case of a city/borough school district, the financial condition of the city/borough as well. The attachments should include, at a minimum, cash account reconciliations, balance sheets, cash investment maturity schedules, revenue projection, cash flow analysis and projected use of all fund balances and documentation in support of attempts to meet the local match. Historical expenditures do not provide sufficient evidence of future resource allocations. Consideration should be given to new and replacement equipment purchases, travel, and other expenditures that support classroom activity, but may be delayed until the local match is funded. Each district has an opportunity to help itself and provide a safe, efficient school facility through shared responsibility.

4. Districts may request consideration of in-kind contributions of labor, materials, or equipment.

Under regulation 4 AAC 31.023(d), in-kind contributions are allowed. This also affords an opportunity for community participation through contributions to the art requirements for new buildings or other means. This option should be fully explored, as well as the documentation mentioned above, prior to requesting a waiver of all or part of the participating share.

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Capital Improvement Project Application
Project Eligibility Checklist

Date:

District: Project:

Is the project eligible based on below checklist? Yes ☐ No ☐

The following items are requirements for projects to be eligible for grants or bond reimbursement as required by statute or regulations. Please check YES or NO if project application is in compliance or not.

Item	Primary Application Question(s)	Eligibility Item Description	Yes	No
A	All	The application is complete and all questions are fully answered – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A)		
B	2a	The district's CIP-6 year plan has been submitted – AS 14.11.011(b)(1) Project is identified in the current CIP year of the plan.		
C	2b	The district has an auditable fixed asset inventory system – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)		
D	2c	Evidence of replacement cost property insurance – AS 14.11.011(b)(2)		
E	8f	If the district has requested a waiver of participating share, is the request attached? (If not applicable, leave blank) – AS 14.11.008(d)		
F	2d & 3d	Evidence that project should be a capital improvement project and not preventive maintenance or custodial care – AS 14.11.011(b)(3)		
G	3d	Evidence that project meets the criteria of one of the A-F categories – AS 14.11.013 (a)(1)		
H	3d, 4a, & Sec. 7	A detailed scope of work, project budget, and documentation of need – AS 14.11.011 (b)(1)		
I	3d, Sec. 7, & 8c	The scope of work should include all information requested in the application instructions and should include life cycle cost analysis, cost benefit analysis or any other quantifiable analysis, as needed, which demonstrates that the project is in the best interest of the district **AND** the state – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(C)		
J	5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, & 5g	For projects requesting additional space, evidence of space eligibility based on supported 2-year and 5-year-post-occupancy student population projection data – 4 AAC 31.021(c)(1)&(c)(3)		
K	3d, 4a, 5h, 8b, & 8c	Evidence that the existing facility can not adequately serve or that alternative projects are in the best interest of the state – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(B)		
L	5h & 8c	Evidence that the situation can not be relieved by adjusting service area boundaries and transportation – 4 AAC 31.021(c)(2) & AS 14.11.013(b)(6)		
M	2e & Sec. 9	DEED certification that the school district has a facility management program that complies with 4 AAC 31.013 and a description of the district's preventive maintenance program – AS 14.11.011(b)(1)		
N	All	Adequate documentation supporting the project request – AS 14.11.013(c)(3)(A) and 4 AAC 31.022(d)(1)		

Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application

Introduction

The Department of Education & Early Development is charged with the task of compiling a prioritized list of projects to be used in preparing a six-year capital plan for submittal to the governor and the legislature (AS 14.11.013(a)(3)). The criteria for accomplishing the priorities are established in statute (AS 14.11.013(B)) and are awarded points based on a scoring system developed by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee under its statutorily imposed mandate (AS 14.11.014(b)(6)).

The guidelines provided here are to assure that raters are using a common set of terms and standards when awarding points for the evaluative scoring criteria.

Basis for Rating Applications

The following positions will define the base philosophy for rating applications.

Since districts are required to submit a request for a capital project no later than September 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which they are applying, no rater shall review, rank, or give feedback regarding scoring a project prior to this deadline.

Applications will be ranked based on the information submitted with the application, or applicants may use information submitted to the department in support of a project, provided the submission occurs on or before September 1 and is identified as an attachment to an application. Each rater shall arrive at the initial ranking of each project independently. Raters will be expected to go through each application question by question. They will also review all attachments for content, completeness, and bearing on each scoring element. Consistency in scores from year-to-year shall be considered. It is expected that projects will demonstrate different levels of completeness in descriptions and detail depending on the stage of project development.

Projects are prioritized in two lists, the School Construction List and the Major Maintenance List, and reflect the two statutory funds established for education capital projects. Under the definitions provided in statute and regulation, projects which add space to a facility are classed as School Construction projects and must fall in categories A, B, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (categories C, D, and E) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure, Code Compliance, or Achieve an Operating Cost Savings, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components, should be considered as maintenance projects.

Each rater should have an eligibility checklist available during rating. Eligibility items A, F, G, I, J, L, and N will be evaluated by each rater. Other eligibility items will be the responsibility of support team members doing data input and capacity/allowable calculations. Discussion regarding project eligibility should be brought to the attention of the rating team as soon as it becomes an issue in one person's mind.

Evaluative Rating Guidelines

For each of the evaluative rating categories, raters will consider the factors listed when evaluating and scoring applications. The list is not exclusive, nor exhaustive. As raters read and evaluate projects, review of the listed elements is to be done for referential purposes. Raters should also refer to the Application Instructions for each question.

Code deficiencies / Protection of structure / Life safety

(Application Question 4a; Points possible: 50)

- Points will be assigned for code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions when the application documents the deficiency, the need for correction, and how the project corrects the deficiency. A condition may only receive points in one scoring condition area.
- Simply identifying a condition in the application will not necessarily generate points. A well-described and documented condition that provides for full evaluation and point awards will include specificity, with attached documentation to support the narrative.
- Age of building system is considered based on the calendar year in which the project would receive funding.
- A project can address a single condition or multiple conditions. Evaluate the severity of each condition. Incremental point adjustments from those provided in the below matrix may be provided for the age of the system, severity, the nature of the item, and effect on the school facility.
- A 3-point increase should be provided if a code deficiency is documented and cited by an appropriate qualified entity or enforcement authority. The most common conditions are noted with an asterisk ("*") in the matrices.
- Does the project scope combine severe and non-severe or critical and non-critical conditions? Inclusion of unrelated non-severe or non-critical conditions in a project will reduce the overall score of the project based on a percentage of project cost.
- 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 average of cost of all conditions is less than half of the percentage of its points to the average of all condition points. In that case, the weighting is shifted to the percentage of the condition cost to the total project cost increased by a percentage of condition points to total condition points. In no case will less than 0.5 point be assigned to a condition.
- Per 4 AAC 31.022(c)(8), scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted.

Points will be assigned using the following suggested guidelines.

Structural Condition Issue	Pts
Seismic - no restrictions	3
Foundation/Floor - no PE	4
Seismic - minimal restrictions	6
Upper Floor Structure - no PE	9
Vertical Structure - no PE	9
Roof Structure - no PE	10
Foundation/Floor - PE	15
Seismic - moderate restriction	15
Upper Floor Structure - PE	20
Vertical Structure - PE	20
Roof Structure - PE	24
Seismic/Gravity Partial Closure[1]	28
Seismic/Gravity Full Closure[1]	50

Roof/Envelope Condition Issue	Pts
Siding Failure, age <25yr	2
Siding Finish	2
Doors, age >20yr	3
Roof, age >Warranty +5yr [3]	3
Roof, age >Warranty +10yr [3]	6
Roof Leaks WO <3/yr [2]	8
ASHRAE 90.1 Windows [4]	8*
ASHRAE 90.1 Insulation [4]	10*
Siding Material, age >25yr	12
Windows, age >30yrs	12
Siding Failure, age >25yr	15
Roof Leaks, WO >3/yr [2]	15
Doors w/ Egress issues	15*
Roof Leaks affect space, w/ WO documentation	25

Arch/Interior/ADA Condition Issue	Pts
ADA - 1 category	1
ADA - 2 categories	2
DEC Sanitation	2
ADA - 3 categories	3
Ceiling Finishes age >25yr	3
Wall Finishes age >25yr	3
Elevator Issues	3
ADA – 4+ categories	4
Floor Finishes >15yr	4
Elevator Violations	7
Building Egress	10*
Rated Assemblies	12*

Mechanical Condition Issue	Pts
Controls, DDC Deficiency	3
Mech. System, age >30yr	4
Ventilation, WO <3/yr^2	5
Plumbing, WO <3/yr^2	6
Heating, WO <3/yr^2	7
Controls, Pneumatic	8
Ventilation, WO >3/yr^2	9
Plumbing, WO >3/yr^2	10
Heating, WO >3/yr^2	11
Ventilation, Codes	12*
Plumbing, Codes	12*
Heating, Codes	13*
Boilers, 1 of 2 Non-op	13
HVAC age >40yr	15
Boilers, 2 of 3 Non-op	18
Mechanical System, WO >5/yr^2	21
Heating Failure	25

Electrical Condition Issue	Pts
Lighting, age >25yr	2
Electrical age >30yr	4
Power, WO <3/yr^2	4
Lighting, WO <3/yr^2	4
Back-up Generator In-operable	5
Egress/EM lights, WO <3/yr^2	5
Power, WO >3/yr^2	7
Lighting, WO >3/yr^2	7
Egress/EM lights, WO >3/yr^2	8
Intercom Issues, WO >3/yr^2	8
Lighting, Codes	10*
Power, Codes	10*
Intercom Failure	10
Electrical, age >40yr	15
Lighting Levels, <50% of code	16
Electrical System, WO >5/yr^2	21
Power Failure	25

Fire Alarm/Sprinkler Condition Issue	Pts
Fire Alarm age >15yr	2
Sprinkler >30yr	2
Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >30yr	5
Sprinkler Coverage Gaps	5*
FA Non-addressable	6*
FA/Sprinkler, WO >1/yr^2	8
Sprinkler Heads Failing, age >40yr	10
FA/Sprinkler, WO >3/yr^2	15
Fire Alarm Non-op, <3 floors	17
FA/Sprinkler, WO >5/yr^2	20
Fire Alarm Non-op, >3 floors	25
Sprinkler Non-op	30

Site Condition Issue	Pts
Vehicle Surfaces	3
Walkways and Surfaces	4
Drainage Issues	6
Playground Code	12
Power Issues	15*
Wastewater Issues	15*
Water Issues	16*
Wastewater Failure	24
Water Failure	25

UST/AST/HazMat Condition Issue	Pts
HazMat (all) Low Exposures	3*
UST, age >30yr	2
AST, age >40yr	5
Sewage Lagoon Failure/ Exposure	5
UST/AST Leak	7
UST/AST USCG/40 CFR Cite	10
HazMat (all) Mod Exposures	10*
HazMat (all) High Exposures	22*

Definitions:
PE = documented by a Professional Engineer
No PE = not documented by a Professional Engineer
WO = Work Orders provided w/ application

Notes:
[1] If district does not qualify for space, points limited to 15.
[2] Average of prior 3 years, provide work orders. See application instructions.
[3] Provide copy of roof warranty.
[4] Provide existing R-value or code violation of system.

Regional community facilities
(Application Question 5h; Points possible: 5)

- Is a community "inventory" provided?
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there documentation with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Consider the effort/results in identifying alternative facilities and the rationale behind the viability of the alternative facility.
- Were judgments about the viability of alternate facilities made with "institutional knowledge", professional assessment, third party objectivity, and/or economic analysis?
- Are facilities listed in a narrative discussion or are they documented with supplemental data such as photos, maps, facility profile, etc.?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc. The narrative discussion is documented with photos, maps, facility profiles, etc.	5 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc.	4 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided.	3 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified.	2 points
A community inventory is provided.	1 point
Question has not been answered	0 points

Cost estimate for total project cost
(Application Questions 7a - 7c; Points possible: 0-30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- Primary evaluation should test both the "reasonableness" and the "completeness" of the cost estimate (i.e., How well can this estimate be used to advocate for this project?).
- Check for double entries, including factored items, cost after adjustment for geographic factor, and percentages and justification (with backup) when percentages exceed DEED guidelines.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate including lump sum or actual construction costs.
- Rating considers the full range of estimates: from conceptual to detail design to actual construction costs. It should be noted that because this scoring element covers the full range of estimate possibilities, it is anticipated that conceptual estimates score less than more detailed construction estimates and actual construction cost documentation.
- Completed project costs are supported by competitive selection documentation, and DEED-approval of in-house labor or an alternative procurement method, as needed.

Points reflect the reasonableness and completeness evaluation and will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on construction document level cost estimate, bid tabulations, or actual invoices.	27-30 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 65% design development level specifications and drawings.	23-26 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 35% schematic design level documents.	18-22 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on concept design level documents. The DEED demand cost model is acceptable as a planning/ concept level cost estimate.	12-17 points
The cost estimate is not adequately developed to support concept level costs. Components may not be present to confirm scope of work, reasonableness and completeness or other elements. Project may be at an early preliminary stage.	6-11 points
Construction costs are not supported or many cost elements are missing.	1-5 points

Emergency conditions
(Application Question 8a; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency, points will not be awarded.
- Consider the ranking of the project on the district six-year plan.
- Consider the "level of threat" to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider the "impact" on the use of the facility due to the emergency condition.
- Consider the "immediacy" of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the level of description and documentation provided.
- Consider whether the description provided is congruent with other application elements.
- Does the project scope include non-emergency conditions? Scoring of mixed-scope projects, which address both emergency and non-emergency conditions, should be weighted based on the amount of emergency work that is included in the project.
- Nothing in this scoring element should restrict a system with premature failures from being assigned points when the conditions for assigning points in that category are met.

Points will be assigned in increments according to the level of threat using the following suggested guidelines. High threat emergency projects with high emergency points are infrequent.

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the loss of the building, and that the students are currently unhoused.	50 points
Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	25-45 points
Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation from the local or state official providing the date when the repairs need to be completed. The documentation addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	5-25 points
A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy for the emergency, the circumstances surrounding the damaged portion of the building, and the portion of the building that is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the failure, and that the students are currently unhoused.	25-45 points
A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and may have limited functionality. If the component fails the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the high probability of the failure and documents the requirement to restrict use of the building until corrected.	5-25 points

Inadequacies of Existing Space
(Application Question 8b; Points possible: 40)

- Scoring is based on the described and documented inability of existing space to adequately serve the instructional program. Points are not awarded for code violations.
- Consider the adequacy of the space in terms of both form and function, crowding, and upgrades to space that support the instructional program.
- Balance consideration of educational adequacy of physical arrangement versus functional factors.
- Scoring should take into consideration whether the inadequate space is for a mandatory instructional program or a new or existing local program.
- Does the project include improvements to functionally adequate space? Scoring of projects with functionally adequate space and inadequate space should weight the amount of work improving inadequate space that is included in the project.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The existing space as described and documented is significantly inadequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility is severely overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	25-40 points
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility is moderately overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	11-24 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility has minor or no overcrowding, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space.	1-10 points
A major maintenance project that describes and documents the inadequacy of the existing space that is an additional condition being addressed in the project.	0-5 points

Other options
(Application Question 8c; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed. Does the discussion provide alternatives and details that support a strong vetting of the project options?
- Consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other. Does the comparison of options support the project chosen?
- Scoring should increase in accordance with the amount of detailed information; graduated into three levels of: 1) unsupported narrative, 2) well supported narrative, and 3) detailed cost analysis.
- Consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For installed mechanical equipment, was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new?
- For over-crowding, was double shifting or other alternatives considered?

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Were the options considered viable alternatives? The options are fully described viable options that are supported by a life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefits analysis that compare the cost of the options; an explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	21-25 points
The options are fully described viable options that include cost comparisons between options. An explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option; however, no life cycle cost analysis is included. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	11-20 points
A description is included for each option; however, the options are not supported with additional documentation or cost analysis. The options contain the proposed project and at least one other viable option.	1-10 points

Annual operating cost savings
(Application question 8d; Points possible: 30)

- This should be rated based on information provided which specifically address this issue.
- Evaluation should be based on district provided data and analysis rather than opinion.
- Top scores should be reserved for those projects that can demonstrate a payback within a relatively brief period of time.
- Should be consistent with life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis (if provided). This may have either a positive or a negative relationship to justification of a project.
- Evaluation may reward efforts to contain or reduce operating costs even if the project doesn't save money or have a payback (i.e. – utilizing LEED or CHPS standards for construction).

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of 10 years or less.	21-30 points
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of between 10 and 20 years.	11-20 points
A summary analysis that includes a projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The projected operational cost savings documents efforts to contain or reduce operating costs and has a payback that exceeds 20 years.	6-10 points
Stated opinion regarding estimated cost savings that could be achieved with the project.	1-5 points

District preventive maintenance and facilities management
(Application Questions 9a, 9e-9h; Points possible: 25 evaluative)

Maintenance Management Narrative

(Application Question 9a; Points possible: 5)

- Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine?
- How well does the program work for each individual school?
- Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil? (Note: components as used here and below may also be referred to as 'equipment'.)
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the maintenance management (MM) program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom; how component work order history and trends are used. Provides sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials. Provides sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance. Provides sample corrective work orders showing progression of scheduling from initial response to completion or deferral. Provides a component report for a minimum of 10% of main school facilities showing the date of installation and date of scheduled renewal or replacement; includes components from each building system listed in DEED's R&R schedule.	5 points
Narrative describes the MM program and all of the following: maintenance structure and staffing, the work order program and process including work order classification, scheduling, tracking, and completion or deferral; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor and materials (where applicable). Sample component-based work orders (with component ID) that include component-specific checklist of preventive and/or routine maintenance.	4 points
Narrative describes the MM program and all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification, tracking and completion; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing PM, routine maintenance, and corrective work; includes cost of labor on those work orders, and cost of materials on at least one corrective work order.	3 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Minimal narrative that partially describes the MM program but not all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification; how work orders are initiated and by whom. Sample work order types showing some, but not all of the types: PM, routine maintenance and corrective work.	2 points
Minimal narrative that partially describes the MM program but not all of the following: the work order program and process including work order classification; how work orders are initiated and by whom. No sample work orders.	1 point
No narrative or an abbreviated narrative that provides no information of how the maintenance management program works. No sample work orders.	0 points

Energy Management Narrative

(Application Question 9e; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities?
- Is a comprehensive set of methods being used?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?
- Is there a method for evaluating existing facilities' need for commissioning?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, benchmarking, energy audits and assessments, and implementation/execution of energy efficiency measures (EEMs). Provides data showing that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility over the prior five years—by energy type. Provides an energy management guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above. Provides a report showing a five-year history of implemented EEMs. Provides a complete set of energy consumption records (Application Q.9f).	5 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure including roles, and responsibilities, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring, and examples of energy efficiency projects or initiatives. Provides data showing that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type. Provides an energy management guideline or manual, issued/updated within the past five years, covering the items. Application includes the complete set of energy records was provided for Q.9f.	4 points
Narrative describes the Energy Management program including all of the following: district energy policy, program structure, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring. Shows that the program tracks energy usage by facility and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each main school facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type. Provides an energy management guideline or manual covering the items above. Provides a complete set of energy consumption records (Application Q.9f).	3 points
Narrative has useful description of the Energy Management program including some of the following: program structure, occupant comfort and safety standards, energy consumption monitoring. Shows that the program tracks energy usage by facility (not by campus) and calculates an energy use intensity (EUI) for each facility requiring an RCx analysis over the prior five years—by energy type. A complete set of energy records is not provided (Application Q.9f).	2 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Energy Management program but is not complete; a complete set of energy records is not provided (Q.9f). OR No narrative, but complete set of energy records was provided (Q9.f).	1 point
No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Energy Management program. No energy records are provided (Q.9f).	0 points

Custodial Narrative

(Application Question 9f; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district's custodial program complete?
- Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice?
- Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is the written custodial plan(s) attached?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, and performance verification/quality control. Provides custodial program guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above. Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on industry practice. Lists staffing requirements for the facility based on these metrics and industry standards for productivity. Provides a report which tabulates the preceding information (types and quantities of information, etc.) for all main schools in the district, including staffing requirements. OR Provides no less than two facility examples each year of submission with no repeats within a five-year period. If the district operates fewer than 10 schools, provided one-third of all facilities each year. Provide at least 5 work orders generated by the custodial program in the previous 12 months. Provides completed sets of quality control and inspection checklists for no less than two facilities for the previous fiscal year period.	5 points
Narrative describes the Custodial program including all of the following: custodial policy and purpose, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, integration with district maintenance processes, worker and occupant safety, adopted custodial standards, performance verification/quality control. Provides custodial program guideline or manual issued/updated within the past five years covering the items above. Includes information or supplements that are specific to each main school facility and that list types and quantities of surfaces and fixtures to be cleaned, and frequency of care for each based on industry practice; provides no less than two facility examples of the facility-specific information. Provides samples of quality control and inspection checklists.	4 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative describes the Custodial program including all of the following: district custodial policy, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, and adopted custodial standards. Provides custodial program guideline or manual that is general in nature and not site specific.	3 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Custodial program including some of the following: district custodial policy, program structure including staffing, roles, and responsibilities, and adopted custodial standards.	2 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Custodial program but is not complete.	1 point
No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Custodial program. No written custodial program guideline or manual.	0 points

Maintenance Training Narrative

(Application Question 9g; Points possible: 5)

- Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff?
- Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems?
- Are training schedules attached?
- How is Training Recorded?
- How is effectiveness measured?

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, training scheduling and tracking, and measurement of program effectiveness. Identifies individual training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported; identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis. Provides a sample analysis of job functions (e.g., driving, work order management, etc.) and required building system knowledge (e.g., boiler tuning, lock-out/tag-out, etc.) for at least one job classification. Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type. Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual. Provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the training program which, at a minimum includes data on scheduled versus completed training.	5 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the Training program including all of the following: training policy, program structure including roles and responsibilities, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, and training scheduling and tracking. Identifies training needs based on job functions, and building systems supported, identifies training methods and types, and assigns training on an individual basis. Provides a training plan, by individual, for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and method or type. Provides a log of completed training (last 3 years), by individual.	4 points
Narrative describes the Training program including some of the following: training policy, identification of training needs for custodians and maintenance personnel, training methods and types, and training scheduling and tracking. Provides a training plan for training scheduled in the current school year, by training title and/ or type. Provides a log of completed training but not by individual.	3 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Training program but is not complete. Provides training logs that show minimal maintenance or custodial training, primarily HR/OSHA training.	2 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Training program but is not complete. OR Training logs with no actual maintenance or custodial training. Only HR/OSHA training. *Training Logs with only HR/OSHA training can never exceed 1 point.	1 point
No narrative or an abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Training program. No training logs	0 points

Capital Planning Narrative

(Application Question 9h; Points possible: 5)

- Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs?
- Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?
- Does the system involve building occupants and users?
- Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?
- Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?
- Does review of projects on six-year plan show evidence of use of capital planning process, including renewal and replacement scheduled.

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative fully describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification (condition assessments, user input, maintenance work order history/trends, etc.), development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans, and identification of capital project resources and funding. Provides capital planning report issued/updated within the past 12 months and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan and includes capital projects programmed from all fund sources, local, state, and federal. Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a facility condition assessment not older than five years where FCI has the following formula. $FCI = \frac{\text{Cost of Current and Deferred Renewal}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}$ Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district. Provides a condition assessment for every project requesting state-aid in the first year of the 6-yr CIP plan. Provides a districtwide trend for combined FCI for a minimum of five prior years and tracks districtwide capital expenditures for main schools for a minimum of five prior years.	5 points

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Narrative describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy , capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal and program/population changes, forecast verification based on condition assessments, and development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans. Provides capital planning report and 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan. Provides a Facility Condition Index (FCI) for every main school based on a current DEED Renewal & Replacement Schedule, where FCI has the following formula. $FCI = \frac{\text{Cost of Current and Deferred Renewal}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}$ Provides a student population projection for a minimum of five years beyond the current fiscal year for every attendance area in the district.	4 points
Narrative describes the Capital Planning program including all of the following: district capital planning policy, capital planning responsibilities, structure, and staffing, capital needs forecasting based on system renewal, development of CIP projects and 6-yr plans. Provides a 6-yr CIP plan with at least one project in every year of the plan.	3 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Capital Planning program but is not complete. Provides R&R documents for all facilities in which state-aid for CIP is listed in the 6-yr plan.	2 points
Narrative has some useful description of the Capital Planning program but is not complete; R&R documents not provided for all required facilities. OR No narrative, but provides R&R documents for all required facilities.	1 point
No narrative or abbreviated narrative with no useful description of the Capital Planning program. Lacks R&R documents for all required facilities.	0 points

Formula-Driven Guidelines

Condition/Component survey

(Application question 6a; Points possible: 0-10 – non-evaluative)

- Condition/component survey age is relative to the earlier of either the application submittal deadline or the project's substantial completion.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
Condition/component survey is a comprehensive product that informs the project. It includes a full description of existing systems, including code deficiencies, and provides recommendations for upgrades related to all deficiencies described. Costs associated with each deficiency and upgrades are provided as applicable. Supplements may be included such as special inspections, engineering calculations, photographs, drawings, etc. Floor plans, with building area designations and room identifications, are encouraged. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural engineered systems, may have been completed by an architect, engineer, or persons with documented expertise in a building system. It is less than 6 years old.	10 points
Condition/component survey contains many of the required elements as listed above, but not all. It is less than 10 years old.	8 points
Condition/component survey informs the project. Supplements such as special inspections, engineering calculations and drawings that would further document conditions justifying the project are not provided or documentation is not substantial. It is less than 10 years old.	5 points
Condition/component survey is more than 10 years old, but may still contain some relevant building information pertaining to the project.	3 points
Condition/component survey has not been submitted or does not inform the project.	0 points

Use of prior school design
(Application Question 6b; Points possible: 10)

- Are complete documents of the proposed reused school plans provided?
- Is evidence of ownership of proposed reused school plans provided?
- Has an analysis been done of the anticipated deviations and revisions from the proposed reused school plan been accomplished? Is an estimated cost of those deviations (+ or -) been computed?
- Have design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans been estimated along with an estimated cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
1. The district or municipality owns the reused school plans. 2. The reused school plans are less than 5years old or have been updated within the prior 5 years. 3. A supported estimate of planned deviations from the reused school plans is less than 1% of the estimated cost of construction. 4. A supported estimate of construction cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of construction costs of a new school plan alternative. 5. A supported estimate of design cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of design services costs of a new school plan alternative.	10 points
Any four of the above factors are achieved.	8 points
Any three of the above factors are achieved.	6 points
Any two of the above factors are achieved.	4 points
Any one of the above factors is achieved.	2 points
None of the above factors are achieved.	0 points

Use of prior building system design
(Application Question 6c; Points possible: 10)

- Up to two points are available for capital renewal of a complete system, a subsystem, or a component renewal in each of the following systems: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power.
- Has evidence been provided that the identified building system is part of a written standard that meets ASHRAE 90.1-2016 prescriptive requirements?
- This point category is not applicable to projects receiving scores for use of a prior school design.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
The reused building system design is part of a provided written municipal or school district building system standard.	2 points

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Capital Improvement Project Application
Formula-Driven Rating Form

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: _____ Project Title: _____
Fund: _____
Rater: _____ CIP ID Number: _____ Category: _____
Date: _____ Ineligible: _____

Formula Driven Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
1. Preventive maintenance program (Questions 9b - 9d, 9f)		
A. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters (9b) 15 points	/15	/15
B. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters (9c) 10 points	/10	/10
C. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. (9d) 5 points If % < 4, then (% x 1.25); If % > 4, then 5	/5	/5
D. Energy consumption reports (9f) 5 points	/5	/5
2. District ranking (Question 3a) Only eligible project requests are used to calculate ranking points Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less	/30	/30
3. Weighted average age of facility (Question 3b) A. 0-10 years = 0 points B. > 10 ≤20 years = .5 / year in excess of 10 years C. > 20 ≤30 years = 5 + .75 per year in excess of 20 years D >30≤40 years = 12.5 + 1.75 per year in excess of 30 years E. > 40 years = 30 points	/30	/30
4. Condition/Component Survey (Question 6a) Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points	/10	/10
5. Use of Prior Design Plans or Buildings System Design (Questions 6b-6c) A. Prior Design Plan (school construction only) (6b) = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 points OR B. District standard = Two points each system: Building Envelope, Plumbing, HVAC, Lighting, Power	/10	/10
6. Planning & design phase has been completed (Question 6d-6g and Appendix B) A. All required elements of planning = 10 points B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points	/25	/25
7. Prior AS 14.11 funding for this project (Questions 8e & 7a) Phased funding = 30 points, Supplemental funding = 15 points, No previous funding = 0 points	/30	/30
8. Unhoused students today (Questions 5a-5g) A 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points	/50	N/A
9. Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy) (Questions 5a-5g) Unhoused due to loss of eligible square footage based on external environmental factors is scored at half of the points identified. A 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points	/30	N/A
10. Type of space added or improved (Question 5j) A. Instructional or resource 30 points B. Support teaching 25 points C. Food service, recreational, and general support 15 points D. Supplemental 10 points	/30	N/A
Formula-Driven Total Points	**/280**	**/170**

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
Capital Improvement Project Application
Evaluative Rating Form
Formula-Driven Rating Form

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: _____ Project Title: _____
Fund: _____
Rater: _____ CIP ID Number: _____ Category: _____
Date: _____ Ineligible: _____

Note: Points for elements two through eight will be weighted to apply to each specific category of a mixed-scope project.

Evaluative Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Narrative (9a)	/5	/5
B. Energy Management Narrative (9e)	/5	/5
C. Custodial Narrative (9g)	/5	/5
D. Maintenance Training Narrative (9h)	/5	/5
E. Capital Planning Narrative (9i)	/5	/5
2. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions (Question 4a)	/50	/50
3. Reasonableness & completeness of cost or cost estimate (Questions 7a-7c)	/30	/30
4. Emergency conditions (Question 8a) Did application check "yes"? ☐ Did discussion support emergency status? ☐	/50	/50
5. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs (Question 8b)	/40	/5+
6. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project (Question 8c)	/25	/25
7. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings (Question 8d)	/30	/30
8. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project (Question 5g)	/5	N/A
Evaluative Total Points	**/255**	**/215**