

**ATTACHMENT D: ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**CAPITAL REQUEST ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**TIME/DATE:** 1:00 PM, September 20, 2001  
**LOCATION:** Anchorage School District Board Room  
**PREPARED BY:** Simonne Lundvall, Administrative Assistant

**ATTENDEES:**

Voting Members and Alternates

Gary Dale	Chugiak High School Representative
Joan Diamond	Service High School Representative
Diane Etter	Anchorage Council of PTAs
Pat Healow	Bartlett High School Alternate Representative
April Jensen	Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
Crystal Kennedy	Chugiak High School Alternate Representative
Kimberly Kinville	Special Education Advisory Committee
Chris Larson	Associated Builders and Contractors
Ken Legacki	West High School Representative
Mary Marks	Minority Education Concerns Committee
Lael Marlow	Bartlett High School Representative
Michael Melielo	Chugiak/Eagle River Chamber of Commerce
Kitte' Miller	Area-wide Schools and Programs Representative
Boyd Morgenthaler, P.E.	Alaska Professional Design Council
Jackie Ohlson	Dimond High School Representative
A.L. Tamagni, Sr.	Federation of Community Councils

Non-Voting Members

Ray Amsden	ASD Facilities
Marilyn Barbeau	ASD Facilities
Rick Barrier	ASD Facilities
Carol Comeau	ASD Superintendent
Ed Conyers	ASD Maintenance
Michelle Egan	ASD Public Affairs
Susan Fison	MOA Planning Department
Mike Franks	ASD Facilities
Mike Henry	ASD High School Education
Pat McDowell	ASD Assistant Superintendent Instruction
Patricia McRae	ASD Elementary Education
Mark Premo	Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility
Mike Price	ASD Facilities
Gail Opalinski	ASD Middle School Education
Jerry Sjolander	ASD Special Education
Janet Stokesbary	ASD Chief Financial Officer
George Vakalis	ASD Assistant Superintendent of Support Services

Visitors

Jimmie Daniels	ASD Principal Ptarmigan Elementary School
Patti Paiz	Ptarmigan Elementary School

## **Meeting Called to Order by George Vakalis**

Welcome to the second Capital Request Advisory Committee meeting. Today's meeting is to discuss the 2002 Bond plan. The next meeting to discuss the Six Year Capital Improvement Plan is scheduled for November 14, 2001 beginning at 1:00 p.m. in the ASD Board Room.

### **Introductions**

Roll Call by Ray Amsden

Each voting member was provided with a voting card. Only one representative from each attendance area may vote.

A brief overview of the documents that were handed out was given. These included a draft 2002 Bond Proposition for the committee to use as a starting point in its deliberations.

There were two changes to the agenda: the first was to add the approval of the minutes from the previous meeting, and the second was to move Item 8 before Item 6.

### **Review of 2001 Bond Proposition, with discussion of construction budget estimates and possible updates prior to 2002 bond proposition submittal, by Ray Amsden**

The 2001 Bond Proposition was previously distributed to the members. It will be necessary to update the budgets for those items that are carried forward to the 2002 Bond Proposition.

### **Review of FY03 EED Grant Applications, by Marilyn Barbeau**

There were sixteen (16) Major Maintenance and Capital Projects submitted to EED for grant funding, as listed in ASD Memorandum #6. These projects, including multiple phases of the high schools projects, were submitted, encompassed all the currently identified projects from the Six Year CIP that had enough definition to prepare budget estimates and project scopes. There is the possibility that the Legislature will fund some of these projects with General Fund capital funds or else through a General Obligation Bond issue next fall.

### **Review of High School Renewal overall project budgets, by Rick Barrier**

When these projects were first considered in the 1997 CIP, the estimated budgets were in the \$20 million range. Once new high school Educational Specifications were approved and the initial planning for these projects were completed, the estimated costs were in the \$30-40 million range. This was reflected in the 1999 CIP. Now that the initial phases are underway or complete, experience is showing that costs are much higher than originally projected by the District's consultants. Due to asbestos removal, unforeseen structural and code issues, increases in construction costs, and in some cases better definition of project scopes, the current overall project costs for East, Bartlett and Service are now estimated to be in the \$50-67 million range. The committee needs to be aware of these new cost figures, so that can be factored into their planning. The committee has three basic options in developing its recommended bond package. 1) Maintain the current course of action- continue with existing phasing; 2) Examine the cost and feasibility of building new, rather than renovating existing facilities; 3) Evaluate the scope of future phasing relative to the ed specs to see if project scopes could be revised to allow for a lower cost renovation package.

### **Chugiak Eagle River High School by Mike Price**

The proposed school will be an 800 student High School with the capacity to expand to 1,600, off Hiland Road in Eagle River. The School Board has authorization the use of Dimond High School Replacement as a prototype. The design effort needs to start this fall in order to have the school open in the year 2005, assuming that bond funds are available in 2002 for construction. If design efforts are delayed so would school opening (2006).

Carol Comeau spoke about overcrowding at Chugiak High School. The community does not want an addition at that school. The enrollment is already at 2,000. Busing to Bartlett High School would not work as that school is almost at capacity. The long term solution for Chugiak High School will be a new school in Eagle River. A question was raised by the committee, "What is so special about Chugiak that is different from other high schools?" Carol's response was that Chugiak/Eagle River is a separate community and can not solve its school population issues through redistricting, as the larger Anchorage funding community can. Gary Dale added that it is a question of timing and speculative growth in the Chugiak/Eagle River, and that there are some severe special limitations to increasing Chugiak High School. There are currently sixteen portables Chugiak High School. These are immediate concerns. George Vakalis stated that overcrowding will continue at Chugiak until this issue is resolved.

Kitte Miller stated that the population figures in the Six-Year CIP do not show the anticipated population growth in Chugiak. Significant growth is anticipated by area leaders. Ray Amsden commented that history from other districts shows that where there was some anticipated growth, and then the growth happened, the schools often were overcrowded and it took time to respond with new construction.

In regard to new construction vs renovations, at what point is renovation no longer feasible? George Vakalis commented that when a renovation is done, everything is brought up to code, so in all practicality, the school functions as a new school. There is no particular dollar point at which renovation is no longer feasible.

#### **Review of working draft of 2002 Bond Proposition, by Ray Amsden**

Eagle River High School is not on the draft bond proposition, this is not to suggest this is not an important project or that the District is not supportive of this project. Corrections to the draft bond proposition were: Major Maintenance Heavy Equipment, \$710,000 was left off the list and should be included; Ursa Minor Project for \$10,000 should be deleted, since that school is not yet eligible for bond funding; and Bartlett High School is listed at \$11,790,000 and should be \$17,071,000.

The staff developed a draft bond proposition for discussion purposes only. The goal of the committee is to develop and transmit its own recommendations to the Superintendent.

#### Districtwide Major Maintenance

The Major Maintenance list has priorities A, B and C. The staff used their best judgment in prioritizing the list and pulled those items to bring forward for bond recommendation.

Boyd Morgenthaler asked what does it take to bring us up to speed on Major Maintenance projects? Essentially it is the total of A, B and C priority lists. Ed Conyers responded that maintenance that does not get done now is deferred and then becomes a Major Maintenance project. Without the staff, work cannot be performed. Why are all major maintenance projects not on the list? Mike Franks has gone through Major Maintenance projects, he has updated the information, based upon last year's list and new information from the schools and the Maintenance section. Some projects have been added, and some of the projects have been completed by using operating funds.

George Vakalis further clarified that there are three maintenance programs; preventative maintenance in the operating budget; major maintenance budget that does not require bonding, (in some cases a roof repair would fall under the operating budget and not bond); and bonding of all major maintenance projects that require capital funding for completion.

A.L. Tamagni asked When are projects carried out as maintenance versus bonding for Major Maintenance? Ray Amsden responded that where we have been unsuccessful in getting operating funds for smaller projects, these are grouped together for a Districtwide bond proposition.

A.L. Tamagni asked how long would we fund the bonds for projects? Janet Stokesbary responded that this depends on the life expectancy of the project.

King Career Center project cost estimate last year was \$3.5 million. After completing an extensive engineering review of the building, this estimate has increased to \$7,300,000, which is reflected in the draft bond proposition. Additionally, a new project of replacing sprinkler heads is included in the draft bond proposition. There has been a recall of sprinkler heads that have been used widely in District project. The manufacturer will be providing the sprinkler heads, but the District will be obligated for the installation.

A.L. Tamagni asked about projects identified 2 years from now. Mike Franks responded that the District does maintain an ongoing list as needs are identified. The District is currently in the process of developing a six-year plan for Major Maintenance projects, which will incorporate a comprehensive replacement schedule for major building components. .

George Vakalis asked for last call for Major Maintenance questions.

#### Proposition 2 – School Renovations/Additions/Replacement

A significant change will be required in the Ptarmigan Elementary School Classroom and MPR Addition project. After developing a comprehensive renovation design for this school, the District is now proposing a 10 classroom addition at a estimated cost of \$6 –7 million. For the high school phases, costs estimates are increasing. Mike Price spoke regarding the inflation, discovering more hazardous materials, hidden structural deficiencies, material increases, substantial amount of work on the market, which increases costs in the range of 10 – 15 %. The phasing costs will be updated before a final bond package is submitted. Ray Amsden added that other projects to consider include a public water project in Girdwood, and public sewer for Chugiak/Birchwood. These were placed on the list as discussion items.

Floor was opened for discussion:

Gary Dale spoke regarding Chugiak High School: Septic system has had significant major breakdowns for the last two winters. Gary Dale spoke of seeing extensive equipment in the area of the septic systems. Ray Amsden responded they had a plugged line leading into the tank, that the tanks had been opened for inspection, cleaned and returned to service, and that there was work in this area related to House 2 and House 3 construction that may have given the appearance of a problem with the operation of the septic system. The District continues to work with AK DEC to monitor the system to ensure it continues functioning properly. The septic is working properly and there is no imminent health danger.

George Vakalis added that the District, at this point in time, does not feel that this sewer issue is of such urgency to place on the bond. However, there has been a lot of concern by the public and it was placed on the table for consideration. We need to come up with a package so that the voters will pass the bonds. We are looking for guidance and recommendations from everyone.

Gary Dale noted that he has had his questions satisfied.

What kind of additional money would it take for the sewer project? Mark Premo stated that each project has 4 – 5 phases, about \$14 –15 million total.

Question raised about Chugiak project, Phase 3. Would it be appropriate to add funding for completion of phase 3? Mike Price responded that what is preventing us from completing the deferred items in phase 3, is funding availability. Phase 4 has been revised to incorporate the deferred items.

A.L. Tamagni asked what is the Master Plan of Polaris K-12? Ray Amsden answered that the District has underway the development of the Educational Specifications. A.L. suggested that it be removed from list until the process is finished.

Boyd Morgenthaler stated that propositions should include administrative fees and design costs. Ray Amsden responded that the District is working through comprehensive plans, even though certain phases of schools have not been advanced. Boyd pointed out that the design process often takes a year or more. He asked whether there should be additional funding added to the bond for design. The problem we have now is we are trying to finish the pending phases and are a year behind when there is a bond failure.

Projects are bonded in April, but design is not complete until the following spring or summer. Ray clarified that a lot of the projects currently are designed but are on hold pending funding. Boyd suggested that design fees be placed on the 2003 bond.

George Vakalis asked to wrap up questions so that the committee can move on to its deliberations.

Diane Etter commented that Chester Valley Elementary feels they have been overlooked.

Motion made by Diane Etter:

To add Chester Valley to 2002 Bond Proposition. Chester Valley needs a separate gym and lunch room; there is no art room, and they are lacking a number of other items. The motion was seconded. There was discussion on the total dollar value:

Kitte Miller pointed out that Chester Valley is listed in the current Six-Year CIP.

Ray Amsden pointed out that this project is now undergoing planning, and the current estimate is \$9.6 million; it is listed as Item 22 in the Six-Year CIP.

Boyd Morgenthaler asked whether this falls back into the category where we would ask for design funds? Mike Price responded that if it was determined as a priority, then this would be a time to add design funding.

The Motion was amended to add design funding only to the bond list for Chester Valley. Mike Price responded that design would be approximately \$800 thousand, but this amount would need to be determined.

Boyd Morgenthaler: What about design for four schools, Chester Valley, Birchwood, Sand Lake Whaley. Ray Amsden: The placeholder numbers in the Six-Year CIP will be revised based upon the cost estimates. It is Facilities recommendation that we finish the planning process and bring the dollar amount forward next year.

The Motion was withdrawn and is not being placed on the list.

Motion made by Jackie Ohlson:

Mears Middle School, funds to resurface existing courts and have 2 additional courts. The Motion was moved and seconded. Discussion: Currently the students are being bused for tennis practice. Motion failed.

Motion made by A.L. Tamagni:

To remove Polaris K-12 Renovation from list, Motion was seconded. Discussion: Kitte' Miller stated that there are very crowded conditions and Polaris needs to have the addition. Gail Opalinski commented that we have been planning all along and now are trying to get the plan to fit into what we have and what we need to do. Ray Amsden stated that clearly the Polaris proposed funding was inadequate for the total project, and that is why the project is being broken into two phases.

The Motion failed. Polaris K-12 stays on list.

Motion made by Joan Diamond:

To adjourn meeting, the Motion was seconded. Discussion: What is the future meeting date?

Motion amended:

To adjourn meeting pending future meeting date

Amended Motion amended:

The next meeting date to be held during the week of October 1, 2001; to be determined by the Facilities Department. The Motion was seconded.

Moved and seconded to adjourn and designate a meeting date for the week after next.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm