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The BR&GR Consists of 9 Members:

- **Elizabeth Nudelman** – Commissioner’s Designee and Chair
- **Vacant** - Representative Member (Appointed by House Speaker)
- **Senator Dunleavy** – Senate Member (Appointed by Senate President)
- **Mary Cary** - Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction
- **Mark Langberg** - Professional Degrees & Experience in School Construction
- **Doug Crevensten** – Public Representative
- **Dean Henrick** – Public Representative
- **Robert Tucker** - Experience in Urban or Rural Schools Facilities Management
- **Carl John** - Experience in Urban or Rural Schools Facilities Management
THE BR & GR WAS ESTABLISHED BY AS 14.11.014

- AS 14.11.014 cites that the commissioner shall establish the committee for the purpose of eight specific tasks.
  - One of those tasks is to establish a form for grant applications.
The CIP Process

Why do we have a CIP process?
- Established in statute
- Application covers grant and debt funding
- Grant applications are rated and prioritized annually
Application Updates

- Concerns by end-users initiated conversations in February 2012;
- At the April 2012 BR&GR Committee Meeting re-design of the CIP application and process was initiated by the Department to help make the application:
  - more transparent;
  - better align with current Statutes and Regulations;
  - more fluid in an effort to help alleviate confusion and allow the application to flow better;
  - easier to understand and use by providing additional instruction within the application;
  - easier for the end-users to identify rating standards by documenting standards and establishing rating rubrics for evaluative rated questions.
Application

- Questions are reorganized for clarity.
- Additional clarification is added to inform question completion.
- The project scope description (3d) and code deficiency/protection of structure/life safety (4a) questions are separated.
- For project planning section (6a-6d) of the application, check boxes are added to ensure that all applicable required planning and design elements have been completed.
- Check boxes are included in the emergency question to identify the type of emergency or conditions described in the application.
Instructions

- The instructions follow the reorganized application.
- Helpful expanded guidance is included throughout.
  - For example, the code deficiency, protection of structure, life safety (4a) question includes descriptions on the types of conditions that are evaluated.
- Users will find expanded explanations for the emergency question.
Guidelines for Raters

- Additional clarifying information is added to the Guidelines.
- Matrices are added to provide evaluation transparency.
- Component surveys may now be submitted.
- Condition/component surveys older than 4 years are now eligible for point consideration.
- The code deficiency/protection of structure/life safety question is updated to provide guidance to raters. The expectation with the incremental points is that scores will be higher than in previous years.
- The regional community facilities question (5h), valued at 5 points, is removed from major maintenance scoring.
Points

- Adequacy of Documentation scoring element was dropped from the FY2014 Application;
- Facility Appraisal has been removed as a scoring element in the application;
- More emphasis on upfront planning is provided in the FY 2017 Application with the development of a scoring matrix that will allow up to 10 points maximum depending on the completeness and age of a condition survey.
- Less emphasis on Design Development in an effort to promote upfront planning. Points for this category have been reduced to 5 points.
- Total points possible decreased from 525 points to 520 points.
Scoring Guidelines
Question 4a. Code Deficiencies / Protection of Structure / Life Safety (up to 50 Points)

- Question 4a. was added in order to provide more clarity to Code Deficiency/Protection of Structure / Life Safety applications.
- Point structure was developed in order to add clarity for the writer of the application and provide guidelines for the raters at the time of department review.
4a. Code Deficiencies / Protection of Structure / Life Safety (up to 50 Points) (cont.)

- **Building Code Deficiencies**: Deficiencies related to building code violations where there is no threat to life safety. These issues include compliance with various current building and accessibility codes. (0 to 35 points)

- **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. (0 to 35 points)

- **Health and Life Safety**: Deficiencies representing unsafe conditions potentially threatening the health and life safety of students, staff and the public; unforeseen disasters such as fire, earthquakes, floods; and building/fire code violations potentially impacting health and life safety. (0 to 35 points)

- **Complete or imminent building failure resulting in unhoused students.** (35 to 50 points)
Question 5h. Regional Community Facilities

The regional community facilities question (5h), valued at 5 points, is removed from major maintenance scoring; it is only applicable for school construction projects.

Points range from 5 to 0;

- 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 pts.)

- Question has not been answered (0 pts)
Question 6. Project Planning (up to 35 Points)

- 6a. Condition survey (0 to 10 points) - Has a facility or component condition survey been completed?
- 6b. Planning / Concept design (0 or 10 points) Has work been completed on planning?
- 6c. Schematic design (0 or 10 points) Has work been completed on schematic design?
- 6d. Design development (0 or 5 points) Has work been completed on design development?
**Question 6a. Condition / Component Survey**

- Comprehensive surveys that inform the project, include a full description of existing systems, code deficiencies, related costs, supplemental information, engineering calculations, photos, etc. and is less than 6 years old may receive 10 points.

- Portions of the condition survey may be completed by an architect, engineer, or persons with documented expertise in a building system.

- Surveys not as complete as that above and less than 10 years old may receive 8 points.

- Survey that informs the project but are not as complete as or documentation is not as substantial as those above and are less than 10 years old may receive 5 points.

- Surveys more than 10 years old, still containing some relevant information may receive 3 points.

- Surveys not submitted or do not inform the project receive 0 points.
Question 7a. Cost Estimate for Total Project Cost

- 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 is based on 65% design development level specifications and drawings; (23 – 26 points)

- The estimate is based on 35% schematic design level documents; (18 – 22 points)
Question 7a. Cost Estimate for Total Project Cost (cont)

- 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)
Question 8. Additional Project Factors

8a. Is the Project an Emergency? (up to 50 pts.)

- Building destroyed? (50 points)
- Building demonstrably unsafe and has been vacated? (25 to 45 points)
- Building official emergency order? (5 to 25 points)
- Critical structural weakness? (5 to 45 points)
- Subject to event that would trigger building failure? (25 to 45 points)
- District preparing to vacate the building? (5 to 25 points)
Question 8b. Inadequacies of Space

- The existing space is significantly inadequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility is severely overcrowded; (25 – 40 points)
- The existing space is not adequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility is moderately overcrowded; (11 – 24 points)
- The existing space is not adequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility has minor or no overcrowding; (1 – 10 points)
- A major maintenance project that describes inadequacy of existing space; (0 – 5 points)
Question 8c. Other Options

- Were the options considered viable alternatives? The options are fully described viable options that are supported by a life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis and conclusion with at least two other viable options; (21 – 25 points)

- Same as bullet point above not including life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis; (11 – 20 points)

- A description is included for each option; however, the options are not supported with additional documentation or cost analysis. Only provides one additional option; (1 - 10 points)
Question 8d. Annual Operating Cost Savings

- A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost that is consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis; payback of 10 years or less; (21 – 30 points)

- Same as bullet point above but a detailed payback of between 10 and 20 years; (11 – 20 points)

- Similar to first bullet point but 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)
Thank you for your attendance.

- If you have further questions regarding the CIP application, please view the Department of Education & Early Development website at the following link: www.eed.alaska.gov/facilities.html

- Also, please attend the Department’s CIP Workshop held in the Spring.