

## BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 - 1:00 p.m. – 4:16 p.m.

### APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

#### Committee Members Present

Heidi Teshner, Chair  
Rep. Dan Ortiz  
Randy Williams  
Dale Smythe  
James Estes  
Don Hiley  
David Kingsland

#### Staff

Wayne Marquis  
Tim Mearig  
Sharol Roys  
Lori Weed

#### Additional Participants

Larry Morris, Anchorage SD  
Gary Eckenweiler, Bering Strait SD  
Kevin Lyon, Kenai Peninsula Boro SD  
Laura Stidolph  
Dr. Lisa Skiles Parady, AK Council of  
School Administrators  
John Bitney

**December 2, 2020**

#### **CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL at 1:00 p.m.**

Chair Heidi Teshner called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Roll call and introduction of members present; Senator Cathy Giessel and William Glumac not present. Quorum of seven was established to conduct business.

#### **CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS**

Chair Teshner thanked everyone for joining the meeting today and hoped everyone had a wonderful Thanksgiving.

#### **AGENDA REVIEW/APPROVAL**

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve the agenda, **SECONDED** by James Estes. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

#### **PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL – June 16, 2020**

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve the minutes as presented, **SECONDED** by James Estes. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and the minutes were approved as presented.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

#### **DEPARTMENT BRIEFING**

##### ***FY'22 CIP Report***

Tim Mearig directed members of the committee to the initial priority list published in early November for the FY'22 CIP. He stated that after the initial list, there was a period of reconsideration that ran until November 30<sup>th</sup>, and three districts requested reconsideration for either the priority or point values the department assigned on a total of three projects. Tim stated that the department will be evaluating those requests, and the determination deadline is 15 workdays after November 30<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Teshner thanked department staff for all of their work on these efforts and directed committee members to the suggested motion in the packet. Dale Smythe noted that in looking at the list, he thought it was significant that there were zero ineligible applications.

Committee members asked to hold on the motion until they heard further information throughout the course of this meeting. Tim Mearig pointed out that the list is prepared under the guidance of statute, regulations, and this committee. He stated that the motion is an acknowledgement that the department followed the processes in place.

### ***School Capital Project Funding Report***

Tim Mearig noted that although the funding for REAA and Major Maintenance was vetoed by the Governor, the department was able to combine the remaining balances in those funds to allocate funding to the St. Paul K-12 school replacement project, which was the No. 1 project on the FY'21 CIP priority list.

Tim noted that there are some debt reimbursement project applications that are working their way through the approval process right now, three from Fairbanks, one from Kodiak, and one from Anchorage.

Tim Mearig explained that there are three funds available through statute to the department: School Construction Grant fund – current balance of \$1,337,564; Major Maintenance – current balance of \$0.20; REAA fund – current balance of \$439,881.

Rep. Dan Ortiz asked if it was correct that there was no school bond debt reimbursement that went forward due to legislative appropriation because the Governor did veto what the legislature attempted to do in terms of appropriating for school bond debt reimbursement. Tim Mearig stated that yes, that is correct. Through the actions that happened in the legislative session and following at the Governor's office, none of those funds were distributed to the municipalities for debt reimbursement this past FY'21.

### ***Preventative Maintenance (PM) Update***

Wayne Marquis reported that districts not currently certified include:

- Aleutian Region – At first no interest, then some interest but it never got off the ground.
- Hydaburg – Spoke with the superintendent, and they may reach provisional status within the next six months.
- Lake & Peninsula – Coming back into provisional status.
- Skagway – Lack PM reports and had been placed on provisional. Facilities look great and have been taken care of, but the documentation needs to show the PM work.
- Yukon Flats – Will be reaching back out to the district to discuss their interest in being recertified.

Districts granted provisional certification and working with the department to develop a full year of evidence of plan adherence include:

- Bristol Bay Borough – working on energy monitoring
- Chatham – working on energy monitoring
- Kake City – working on energy monitoring
- Kusuk – issues with the PM program, energy, and custodial care

- Lower Kuskokwim – energy consumption is still challenging for them
- Nenana City – working on energy
- Pelican City – working with Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) and making good headway
- Yakutat – energy monitoring.

Tim Mearig noted that four of the provisional districts are also struggling with meeting the minimum requirements for a training program.

Wayne Marquis noted that site visits scheduled for the past year that were postponed due to disruption of travel caused by COVID-19 will be conducted for Kodiak Island Borough and Unalaska City. Pribilof Island will forgo an in-person visit this cycle. Virtual reports of all districts were completed this year, and Pribilof Island is doing remarkably well.

Wayne directed committee members to the list of site visits scheduled for this next year in their packet. He noted that he kept November and December of this year open for site visits as well as spending time one-on-one with districts for the launch of the retro-commissioning regulations and assisting in that process.

Based on a question from Rep. Ortiz, Wayne Marquis and Lori Weed confirmed that Wrangell had mistakenly been included in the list of districts not currently certified in the packet. Rep. Ortiz further asked what the real difference is for districts being not certified or provisionally certified. Wayne explained that when a district is provisionally certified, it can still submit for a capital improvement project. Tim Mearig added that the statute requires a district to demonstrate it has a plan and that it is adhering to the plan. What the department had found is that if a district had failed to produce a qualified plan, it could fix that relatively easily, but the district couldn't produce evidence that it had been adhering to the plan because it wouldn't yet have 12 months of data. This provisional status in regulation allows the districts time to collect the data to demonstrate it is adhering to the plan.

Rep. Ortiz further asked if in non-COVID times, does the move from provisional to fully certified require a site visit from the department? Wayne Marquis reported that it doesn't require an on-site visit. The department tries to operate within its budget, so they have to carefully consider the necessity to travel. He also noted that there probably wouldn't be much benefit to being on site if a district has managed to prove themselves over 12 months.

### ***Regulations Updates***

Wayne Marquis explained that in November a memorandum went to school districts across the state that stipulated there was a new update on the energy regulation requiring school districts that have qualifying facilities eligible for retro-commissioning to have in place a plan to demonstrate that to the department. The policy memorandum can be found in the packet. In the two weeks following distribution of the memorandum, Wayne personally contacted each school district and has been in touch with 90 percent of districts at the time of this meeting. He stated that districts will need to assess whether a facility meets six criteria to determine if it qualifies as requiring retro-commissioning energy monitoring. Wayne includes this information and tools the department developed in his e-mail communications with districts. He stated that districts

can develop their own energy unit index or they can use the department spreadsheet to determine an energy index unit through time. A third option is to use the EPA's Portfolio Manager.

Tim Mearig further explained that they are doing this to make sure the department is helping districts do everything they can to keep their buildings tuned up and operating well, and retro-commissioning can help with that. He has asked Wayne to keep a running spreadsheet of districts so the department can track it for the CIP process. Future committee meeting packets will include this status spreadsheet.

Dale Smythe stated that it sounds like the two main issues in districts not complying with PM is with staffing and energy monitoring. Wayne stated that those aren't the only issues. Training is also a big issue as is following up with and utilizing their preventative maintenance plan.

Dale Smythe appreciated how cooperative Wayne and the department are in communicating with districts and making sure they understand the importance and how to do all of the retro-commissioning things. As far as with this new regulation and the challenges of meeting the PM issues and the retro-commissioning, he wanted to get the department's perspective on how this will play out as they move forward. Wayne stated that it is not very difficult for districts that have a fully certified program right now to meet the retro-commissioning requirement. What they are looking at is mostly energy consumption, and that has been in place for about 20 years.

Dale Smythe also asked what resources were available for districts that want to get the preventative maintenance portion up but don't have the staff or money now to try to meet the requirements. Wayne stated that a little more than half of the districts use SERRC's help for their PM programs. He noted that Dude Solutions is also a software program that is being used by many districts. He thinks a lot of it has to do with the capability at the district for people wanting to use computer programs. Over the last ten years he has seen some progress being made, with younger people coming into the maintenance field and being more comfortable with computer systems.

Randy Williams was curious if there was a common theme for questions from districts regarding the retro-commissioning and if it was something the committee should start thinking about addressing. Wayne Marquis responded that the theme that comes up most is people don't quite understand the six parameters that are in place. He noted many people are pretty quick about wanting to input their data to see what the results are going to be. Overall, the feedback has been positive, and he believes the fact that districts were provided with pre-formatted spreadsheets, and the department making itself readily available for questions has helped.

***Energy Efficiency Standard:***

Tim Mearig noted that the updated version of ASHRAE 90.1 has been adopted and is officially through the Lt. Governor's office.

***Cost Model Update***

Tim Mearig stated that their five-year contract with HMS is over, and this committee will play an active role as they move into the annual update, which should be underway by the end of January.

### ***Department Staffing Update***

Tim Mearig noted that they have an empty position created by the departure of Larry Morris that they hope to fill in the summer of 2021.

### ***Committee Member Update***

Tim Mearig highlighted the list of committee members whose terms will be expiring at the end of February 2021. All are welcomed to apply for an additional four-year term during the open solicitation. Applications will be collected for the commissioner's review in January.

## **BRIEFING PAPERS**

### ***FY2022 CIP Issues and Clarifications***

Tim Mearig reported that statistically, this was a reasonably good year for CIP; however, the number of participating districts regressed down to 30 from 34 last year. The districts that did participate wrote some great applications, and there were multiple applications from most districts. None of the districts or submitted projects were ineligible.

Tim remarked that every year the department collects six-year plans from districts as part of their statutory responsibility. Those are compiled into a document that is sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). That document is included in the packet.

Tim stated that as far as specific rating issues, one big one was the ability to dial in the code and life safety points, especially as relating to weighted scores from projects that had both code and non-code issues. He referred to tabulations of high scores over the last 20 years in this category. He noted that in 2019 and 2020 a new scoring rubric was developed, which helped define things quite a bit more. Last year the department noticed a 9-point uptick in the average score so, with the committee's help, a new weighting formula was devised. It was a struggle in applying that this year because there were things happening with the weighting formula that were not anticipated. The net result was yet another small incremental change in higher points being given in this category than was expected. This issue will be coming back to the committee for further review.

Tim Mearig stated that emergency scoring continues to be a challenge, but there wasn't anything unique for this year. Under certain conditions each rater has the liberty to give emergency points or not, independent of the other raters. The department has tracked this occurrence as an indicator of whether the criteria are clear, and found that the scoring remains within acceptable boundaries under that analysis.

Tim stated that district preventative maintenance and facility management have subjective scoring. The department has introduced opportunities to the committee for a scoring rubric to move that into more of a non-subjective scoring element.

Tim noted that the state's ranking process works very well. When he attends conferences and describes our prioritization process to other state officials, it is always well received, and often noted as being significantly more than others are considering as they try to do a similar prioritization.

Lori Weed added that for the prior use of design and adopted building system standards, a couple more districts submitted to get evaluated under those criteria. The most common submittal was a statement saying that the designs anticipated being used for these projects are the same or similar to a previously used project design, and that is not the standard that the committee adopted when it put this scoring criteria into place. They are looking for a school board or municipal adoption of a building standard. Tim noted that the department has not awarded any points to districts in this new category. He also reminded committee members that a couple of years ago they approved additional energy consumption reports, and this year 25 districts were evaluated for this scoring, with 18 of them able to get points.

Rep. Dan Ortiz asked if all districts are ineligible until they meet their preventative maintenance energy management requirements; and by their ineligibility, does that mean they are ineligible for all school construction and maintenance grants? Tim Mearig stated that in a nutshell, that is correct. Lori Weed clarified that the eligibility being talked about is for the next application cycle -- FY'23, two capital budgets from now. Tim further noted that districts are still getting capital aid. If a district is in a grant right now, it still gets grant payments. Likewise, if there were to be an appropriation or some residual fund balance available for FY '22, any of the districts on the list would be able to receive the grant funds.

Rep. Ortiz asked if this requirement is hard to meet in many situations throughout the state for any reason, including COVID. Tim stated that when they established these minimum requirements, it was intended to be a relatively low bar. As Wayne Marquis explained earlier, the information that is needed in order to achieve compliance is 90 percent available in every district that is currently compliant. All of the districts can do it, but they will have to find the time and the person or consultant, if necessary, to help them actually make it happen. Rep. Ortiz appreciated the clarifications. What comes to mind for him is that rural districts with less students have less personnel to dedicate toward these kinds of tasks. He was thinking it would be a situation where rural and smaller districts in particular would have a harder time complying with this requirement than more centrally located and larger school districts. Tim added that this committee is spending a lot of time talking about this retro-commissioning requirement. The department recognizes it's a huge deal, but districts being not eligible for CIP is a significant problem. Districts need to be able to have access to at least getting their projects noticed, so they are going to spend a lot of time on this between now and June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Don Hiley strongly agrees with Rep. Ortiz's concerns. He feels they are increasingly moving to a situation where the larger urban districts are going to have an advantage over the smaller rural districts in this process, not only in the retro-commissioning facet, but in a number of places in the CIP application process. He felt it didn't used to be as concerning, because most of the larger districts were primarily funding projects through bonded debt reimbursement, so wasn't as high a participation on the grant list as the committee is seeing now. Obviously, the personnel issues for small, single-site districts with maybe one maintenance person will have a much bigger burden to keep the school running and do all this paperwork in order to meet the department requirements. There are a number of areas in the process that, as these requirements and expectations ramp up further and further, more is being heaped on these small districts in a sort of a corporate versus mom-and-pop way. This is a one-size-fits-all system, and it's much easier for the larger districts and more burdensome to the smaller ones. He added that at SERRC, he works with probably 30 to 35 school districts, most being on the smaller end of the spectrum. In

a year like this with the COVID situation where people and money are stretched thin, what typically gets hit hardest is the maintenance program. In summary, he believes that it does hit harder on these smaller districts than it does the larger districts. Those districts just don't have the economy of scale that the other districts have, so unfortunately that burden is larger.

Dale Smythe stated that his personal opinion is that there is much more risk in not implementing these things than there is in dismissing it. They are trying to build facilities that are more resilient to serve their communities, and if things like this aren't done, the state, the schools, and the facilities will be put in a more difficult position further down the road. He believes everyone recognizes that everything in the smaller districts is more difficult, but recognizing the importance of preventative maintenance and energy monitoring is a bigger deal. While it comes with some first pain, he thinks there is really no other choice; it will be interesting to see it evolve. Don doesn't disagree with that, but he is concerned with the reality of it. There are a number of problems in the schools, and there are a number of schools that need a lot of work. Projects have not been funded and issues are backing up. He knows a number of schools that could benefit from retro-commissioning, but money and time has to be there.

Dr. Lisa Skiles Parady concurred strongly with the concerns that Don Hiley and Rep. Ortiz shared. She recognized that there need to be appropriate processes, but she is not sure that this process has been done as openly or as robustly as it could have been. This is adding an additional barrier to school districts at a time where they are really trying to navigate a worldwide crisis and are concerned about their ability to respond. What this looks like is that those with capacity will comply and benefit, and those who don't have this capacity will struggle and be challenged to see CIP dollars that are desperately needed. She would love to see this revisited and will be following up after this meeting so that they can ensure that if this stays in place, the notice will be broadcasted far and wide through the Alaska Council of School Administrators to those that need to have their attention called to it.

### ***FY'22 CIP Report, Continued***

Given that additional discussion was held regarding this issue, Chair Teshner asked the committee to reconsider the motion as proposed on page 13 of the packet.

Dale Smythe **MOVED** that the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee recommend the State Board of Education and Early Development adopt the department's fiscal year 2022 list of projects available for funding under the School Construction Grant fund and the Major Maintenance Grant fund, **SECONDED** by David Kingsland. Hearing no objection or further discussion, the motion **PASSED**.

### ***Cost Model as Cost Control***

Tim Mearig reported that this is part of a process the committee started with the department in mid-2017. At the end of that calendar year, the department provided a report to the legislature from the committee identifying ways to ensure cost-effective school construction. One of the items considered was whether the state should have a resource allocation or a resource limitation tool that was based on a maximum cost per square foot for a school. In subsequent years, this issue has been revisited a few times, and today the department is presenting the committee with a recommendation from the department and the Model School Subcommittee as to the value of

establishing a cost per square foot limit for schools, the challenges with that, and whether or not there is a reasonable tool with which to achieve that if they think that is the right thing to do.

Tim Mearig stated that this is not an uncommon metric or resource benchmark for states to have, but it is generally a challenge to implement consistently and well. The summary in the briefing paper states that upon extensive review, the idea of developing a resource allocation based on a cost per square foot has more challenges and difficulties than it does positives. He reviewed the options as listed in the briefing paper and discussion was held.

### ***Discussion***

Dale Smythe was thankful the Model School Subcommittee came to the realization that option 1 would be a recommendation. He fully agrees the concept of a maximum square foot cost for Alaska schools is flawed, and he was glad the subcommittee took the energy to investigate it further. He believes option 1 is the only reasonable option.

Don Hiley agrees with Dale. He believes it would be very problematic to try to implement something like that as a cost control and is fully behind the recommendation for option 1.

Randy Williams agreed with both Don and Dale, as did Gary Eckenweiler.

Hearing no further comments or objection, Chair Teshner stated that the department can proceed forward with option 1: Close the Model School Subcommittee task (3.2.1) of evaluating using the Cost Model as a cost control tool. Continue pursuing updates to the Cost Model as they pertain to evaluating cost effective school construction.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### ***Model Schools***

Don Hiley stated that the report for the Model Schools Subcommittee consists of the topic that was previously discussed regarding the cost per square foot recommendation as well as the School Construction Standards Manual.

Don stated that the department provided drafts for some of the sections of the School Construction Standards Manual that still need to be completed. They are hoping to have a working draft by the February goal they had established before committee members turn over. They are actively trying to recruit additional members from A4LE, but unfortunately with the COVID situation, that has kind of fallen by the wayside. He is still hoping to get some people involved as well as other BR&GR Committee members that have been freed up from other subcommittee work. They are continuing to work toward the goal of having something available by February that can potentially go out for public comment in the spring.

Tim Mearig added that they have a lot of work to do to get the section 3 portion of the draft document finalized before February. He is looking forward to the work with all of the additional people that are willing to chip in.

### ***Design Ratios***

Dale Smythe reported that design ratios has been a multiple-year effort. After the Opening to Exterior Wall area ratio was completed, the committee reconvened to study the remaining three



ratios, which all dealt with volume and the importance of compactness. After further analysis, it became fairly clear that it would be just as valuable to focus on one, the Volume to Gross Square Footage, V:GSF. The main points for Dale are that it was reinforced by the results of the modeling and what they perceived as the optimum range. They are hoping to get approval of the one ratio versus three. He stated that the proposed range is 16 to 20 with a target of 18.

Randy Williams stated that his concern was that the range was wide enough that pretty much every project was going to comply, so the net effect is that it becomes a ratio with no teeth. Dale noted that if they look at the existing schools, they did have a maximum of 21.5. He also added that there is a lot of good design in the state happening without being regulated, and he perceives this as one component to try and improve cost-effective school construction and recognize the impact of operations and maintenance. He stated that the intent of the range was to make sure they're controlling the extremes.

Tim Mearig asked for some clarification. He noted that early in the process in the original report to the legislature, they had identified four potential ratios. Somewhere along the way, because of some challenges of not seeing a lot of opportunity to move the needle positively on the footprint area to GSF (which was all about whether or not they should go to two-story schools and which situations does that make sense) that had sort of fallen off as a committee recommendation. Dale Smythe stated that in conversations, they did recognize some of the results of the modeling effort, and specifically to the two-story version, the modeling effort didn't point to the kind of savings they were anticipating. They couldn't find a way that would allow them to implement a ratio that could cover two story, one story, big, small, and everything else. They took No. 4 in the report and changed it from Volume to Net Square Footage to Volume to Gross Square Footage to align with the way that schools are already measured per statute, and then they made a recommendation based on that ratio.

Tim Mearig also asked if the discussion item bullet point 1 is a recommendation that the committee approve this subcommittee no long working on ratios 3 and 5. Dale Smythe confirmed that is correct. Tim finds that discontinuing work on 3 is relatively easy to support, but the differences between the volume to square footage and the volume to exterior surface are quite different in terms of what is being measured. One is measuring a compactness efficiency ratio on the the volume of the interior spaces of the building. The other one is measuring basically the efficiency of how the envelope of the building encloses the said volume. It's quite different for him, and he is a little unsure as to how it has left the field, so to speak. Randy Williams explained that the results don't actually bear that out. The exterior surface area actually tracks pretty closely to the net floor area, and therefore, the ratios track closely to each other. The main difference is if they have all spaces that are only one story, like gyms and other large areas like that. But for the data that was presented, there wasn't a lot of difference between the two ratios. Adopting one or the other of them captures both of them. He understands what Tim is saying, but that is not what they observed in the report. Tim noted that he will have to go back and look at the study.

Randy further explained that the exterior surface area contribution to the energy loss of the building is actually quite small as a percentage of the overall energy use of the building. They talked about this a little bit in the subcommittee, how the ventilation load is really what drives the energy use, and they were seeing that in the result on the energy analysis, that the surface

area changes had very little impact on the overall energy use because there are much more efficient construction assemblies than have been in the past. It doesn't mean they should allow crazy shaped buildings; it just means that the net effect is not large, and it's sufficiently captured by just looking at the overall compactness of the building. Gary Eckenweiler agreed and recommended sharing that report that was quite in-depth on the different shapes of buildings.

Tim Mearig guessed that a higher percentage of the efficiency cost in the ratio of exterior surface to volume is going to be related to construction costs versus energy when compared to the other ratio of volume to area versus volume to skin. He noted that the energy modeling study assessed construction costs along with energy costs, and what he has heard so far is that the energy costs don't change. That doesn't answer the question on construction costs.

Tim further commented that when they look at ratios associated with the volume to area, they have the opportunity to apply those to at least 11 current designs beyond the model design, and they found a lot of variety in those. Were they able to do the same analysis of exterior surface to volume on many or a few existing schools so they have not only the model study but also the reality? Dale agreed that was a great point. There were gaps in the information for all the ratios, and then some of the information was from cost estimates and some information was from old drawings or from the architect, so they took it with a grain of salt. He would love it if they could spend more time looking at existing schools in the different climate zones, because they could then compare cost, form, and actual operating costs to the results, and they didn't get to do that.

Chair Teshner directed members of the committee to the recommendation found in the packets. Tim Mearig asked if there is anything the subcommittee has with these recommendations, target, or range that needs additional study to validate them, or does Dale feel like it was well validated by today's discussion? Dale stated that he doesn't know that they need to continue studying it, but he might recommend that they bracket this, and then it needs to be tested and tracked. If it appears it's doing what it is intending to do, flagging projects that might be grossly inappropriate volume, then it could be implemented into regulation or another way.

Tim asked for other committee members' perspectives. He stated that when the department, on the recommendation of the BR&GR, publishes these standards and starts evaluating projects, if somebody wants to dispute that, they will need to have all the necessary and reasonable evidence needed to demonstrate that these are, in fact, appropriate targets and ranges. Randy Williams stated that this is the best target they could come up with using the information that they have. He would like to see more granularity, but he doesn't foresee that happening. He also wants to be wary of studying it to death, so this seems like a middle-ground solution. He is not sure that he can say it passes the defensibility test, but it definitely uses the information they have to adequately corral the designs into a bucket that is acceptable.

Tim Mearig asked about the difference in the target of 18 and 18.5. Why would one or the other be more appropriate? Dale Smythe stated that he chose the 18 to keep it straightforward and simple. The 18.5 matches more of what was identified as the optimum within the modeling efforts. Randy stated that with the 18.5, he was trying to match the guidance and have it be a little more defensible. Tim noted that 18 would allow less volume per square foot and would therefore be a more efficient building for both first costs and operating costs.

Tim Mearig and Chair Teshner thanked the subcommittee for all their work in progressing the ratios forward.

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to set a target of 18.5, **SECONDED** by Randy Williams. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

Randy Williams **MOVED** to accept the range of 16 to 20, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

Tim asked about the possibility of changing the range down to 17 to 19 if they wanted to make a future change for some reason. Lori Weed noted that they were originally thinking that the 16 to 20 encompassed all but some of the outliers, and the smaller schools would have a hard time reaching those lower numbers. It might be worth putting in the guidance a note to the department that larger schools should target a lower end of the range for consideration of the committee. Randy Williams thought that additional guidance would be a good idea. He doesn't think the information they currently have is sufficient to develop those guidelines yet though. He also noted that going from the 16 to 20 range to something tighter in the future is much easier than going the other way.

### ***School Space***

Dale Smythe stated that this subcommittee was put on hold to get the design ratios done. His intentions are to move directly into school space and reengage people who were interested in participating.

## **PUBLICATION UPDATES**

### ***Alaska School Facilities Preventative Maintenance Handbook***

Tim Mearig stated that this update has been in progress for a couple of years and is being brought back before the committee with some minor updates. Tim reviewed the updates with committee members.

### **ASHRAE 90.1 – 2016 UPDATE**

Tim Mearig stated that this update has been fully promulgated through regulation, and everybody is supposed to be measuring their energy standard according to ASHRAE 90.1-2016. A checklist was developed internally and is probably acceptable for use immediately, but there may be some value to having it reviewed by members of the design industry. The department asked for direction from the committee on moving this forward either immediately implementing or opening a public comment period.

Randy Williams asked what purpose the public comment would have. Tim stated that the purpose would be to help verify the checklist as being appropriately updated to the new standard. Randy noted that the previous version of the checklist went through a public review process, and he asked if the concern is only about the updates to that checklist that resulted from the change to the new version of 90.1. Tim stated that is correct. He knows that based on Larry Morris's work, the document is 99 percent there. Randy stated he trusts Larry's work, and the spot checks he has completed are all spot on. He didn't see a need to put this out for public comment. He asked how hard it would be to make a correction if an error or omission was found later. Chair Teshner noted that this is an internal process and is not in regulation, so an update could be

relatively easy. Tim added that the checklist gets modified to project specifics by the district's consultant, so if there seems to be something that didn't get caught, a discussion can happen at that point as well. The tool is more fluid than a lot of the department's other tools.

Randy Williams **MOVED** for no period of public comment and approve for department use, **SECONDED** by James Estes. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

### **WORK PLAN REVIEW**

Chair Teshner directed committee members to review the work plan, particularly the projected meeting dates and activities. The next meeting is scheduled for February 25 as a teleconference.

Tim Mearig advised that the Design Ratio Subcommittee not walk away from the volume to exterior surface ratio just yet. Dale Smythe stated that the intent wasn't to totally stop it, and they can continue with that work and can have that ratio by the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

Dale Smythe thanked everyone for all the work, particularly subcommittee members helping him.

David Kingsland thanked committee members and department staff for keeping small school districts in mind for their capacity to collect, record, and report data out for their CIP applications. It is very tough with some of the districts, and some of the places are just hard to provide or get accurate data.

Don Hiley agreed with everyone's comments and put in a plug for people who may be interested in getting involved with the Model School Subcommittee.

James Estes thanked everyone for their work.

Randy Williams thanked Wayne Marquis for his work on reaching out for the retro-commissioning aspect. It sounds like there is still some education needed based on some of the comments received. He also noted that he disagrees with the comment made that this was a surprise and a large impact. He believes they have all done a good job making this process smooth and well known, and they have followed through with the end users in trying to get them on board.

Chair Teshner thanked the committee members for their participation in the meeting as well as in their subcommittee work. She also thanked the staff for the CIP work and Wayne Marquis for the retro-commissioning work he has done. She wished everyone a happy and safe holiday season.

### **MEETING ADJOURNED**

Randy Williams **MOVED** to adjourn, **SECONDED** by David Kingsland. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and the meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.