#### Fiscal Note State of Alaska Bill Version: HB 141 2025 Legislative Session Fiscal Note Number: () Publish Date: Identifier: HB141-DOT-DFS-04-12-2025 Department: Department of Transportation and Public Facilities Title: PUBLIC BUILDINGS: CHANGING FACILITIES Appropriation: Division of Facilities Services **CARRICK** Sponsor: Allocation: **Facilities Services** Requester: House Health & Social Services OMB Component Number: 3195 Expenditures/Revenues Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below. (Thousands of Dollars) Included in FY2026 Governor's FY2026 **Out-Year Cost Estimates** Appropriation Requested Request FY 2029 FY 2030 **OPERATING EXPENDITURES** FY 2026 FY 2027 FY 2028 FY 2031 FY 2026 Personal Services 75.0 Travel 100.0 Services Commodities Capital Outlay **Grants & Benefits** Miscellaneous 175.0 **Total Operating** 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 **Fund Source (Operating Only)** 1004 Gen Fund (UGF) 175.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total 175.0 **Positions** Full-time Part-time **Temporary** Change in Revenues None Total 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2025) cost: 0.0 (separate supplemental appropriation required) Estimated CAPITAL (FY2026) cost: 0.0 (separate capital appropriation required) Does the bill create or modify a new fund or account? no (Supplemental/Capital/New Fund - discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section) ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? ves If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed? 10/01/26 Why this fiscal note differs from previous version/comments: Initial version, not applicable.

Prepared By:	Andy Mills, Legislative Liaison	Phone:	(907)465-3900
Division:	Commissioner's Office	Date:	04/12/2025
Approved By:	Dom Pannone, Director	Date:	04/12/25
Agency:	Program Management and Administration	_	

Printed 4/14/2025 Page 1 of 3 Control Code: oQuLI

### FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

# STATE OF ALASKA 2025 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 141

## **Analysis**

HB 141 would require all state public facilities under the Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) to install universal changing stations when designing/constructing a new facility and when \$30.0 in remodeling costs to an existing facility that meets the criteria occurs (the vast majority of facilities modifications fall over this threshold).

Currently there are 0 (zero) Division of Facility Services (DFS) owned/managed facilities equipped with a Universal changing station. All 706 facilities owned by DFS would meet the definition of a "public building" within this bill and be subject to passed legislation. Of the 706 facilities, 38 are multi-agency occupied and experience a higher level of public traffic. The remaining 668 facilities are buildings that solely and directly support the mission of the department of transportation. While all DOT facilities would meet the definition of a public building, most are maintenance & operation facilities (maintenance stations, equipment storage buildings, mechanic shops), remote by nature and not designed to have public traffic. DFS also manages leases in approximately 220 private owned buildings that likely also fit the requirements of this legislation depending on the interpretation of the verbiage.

Every restroom is unique in its capacity, design and capability to be altered. To understand the implications of this bill and what existing restrooms would be applicable, regulations and design standards will need to be developed. These standards would allow us to produce an analysis of our facilities and their restrooms to identify which ones are practicable, as allowed by the current language, for implementation. It is imperative that decisions of evaluation are based in clear and equitable regulations. Development of regulations and standards would be developed by a combination of DFS engineering staff and a contracted architectural consultant for expertise on building code analysis and creation of standardized basis of designs, applications, and specifications.

DFS design and construction management personnel are primarily funded by I/A and CIP authority which is dependent upon appropriation of available capital funds. To complete a regulations and standards package we would need an appropriation of \$75.0 for personal services of the engineering, contracts and legal teams as a one time item (OTI). The cost of an architectural consultant would be estimated at an additional \$100.0 as a OTI.

As an example project to illustrate costs associated with this proposal, DFS recently completed a project at the Ted Stevens International Airport (ANC) where the scope of the project was specifically to add a "universal changing table" to a restroom. To accomplish the task an additional 50 sqft was added to an existing single-use restroom so the changing table could be installed and bathroom remain in ADA compliance. The project was completed using our "job order construction contract" (JOCC) for approximately \$75.0. A JOCC is generally an efficient way to deliver construction tasks as the contracted vendor has in-house engineering/design capability that helps to streamline the design & construction phases of a project. For the purpose of this analysis, the department is using this recent experience to assume that the additional fiscal impact to any restroom remodel would be a minimum of \$75.0 with more remote locations costing more given shipping and labor rates.

Additionally to provide a full fiscal analysis for policymakers, here are some potential circumstances that would impact of the cost:

- Each building's restrooms are highly unique compositions which will vary the degree of affected spaces and altered systems.
- Minimum of 50 sqft of space is needed for install and use of a universal changing table. Most existing restrooms do not have that space without increasing the footprint or sacrificing fixtures (toilets, sinks, etc). The number of fixtures is based on occupancy so there is limited flexibility to reduce the number of fixtures.

(continued on page 3)

(Revised 9/6/24 OMB/LFD) Page 2 of 3

### FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

# STATE OF ALASKA 2025 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 141

## **Analysis**

• Many SOA facilities are of an older vintage and therefore potentially contain haz-mat within their building materials (asbestos, lead, etc). If a bathroom remodel requires changing the footprint it is more likely to encounter haz-mat materials and abatement would be required, resulting in higher costs.

For potential range of rough order of magnitude (ROM) capital costs for implementation at DOT&PF DFS Facilities, the following assumptions can be made:

- "In-scope" facilities prospectively include 38 multi-agency facilities plus 220 leased facilities for approximate total of
- Implementations would occur over time, in circumstances when remodels are contemplated at the respective facility, and when those remodel projects are funded via capital or other designated appropriation.
- A minimum threshold is assumed of \$75.0 per restroom installation. One installed at a male restroom. One installed in a female restroom, for approximate minimum of \$150.0 per facility. Or if facility is equipped with existing uni-sex restroom, then \$75.0 in similar to the ANC example.
- Projected minimum overall increase of capital costs associated with the changing table installations, should all locations be determined practicable for modification => (Qty of facilities) x (Cost per installation) = \$19.4M \$38.7M

Overall, implementation will result in an increase to construction project costs to provide this improvement to applicable public facilities managed by DFS. Along with this improvement, it is reasonable to assert that increased capital improvement requirements and associated costs will result in an overall lower quantity of funded projects should this be adopted.

Other agencies under DOT&PF that would utilize DFS analysis, expertise and implementation experience are the Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS) with 12 locations/terminals that have restrooms (24 in total) that would require an evaluation and potential installation including Auke Bay (Juneau), Cordova, Haines, Homer, Hoonah, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Sitka, Skagway, Valdez, Whittier, Wrangel, and Kake as state owned terminals. While improvements to these locations would potentially be included in the provided exemption language, an analysis with the assistance of DFS and DOT&PF Civil Rights Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance staff,would need to occur as part of each terminal improvement. Likewise, our Statewide Aviation staff would utilize DFS experience to evaluate every improvement to rural airport facilities that would fall into the same considerations and potential exemptions depending on the implementation of regulations and standard developed. It is uncertain from the language if such facilities as maintenance and operations (M&O) facilities of DOT&PF would require this evaluation as they are a government facility with restrooms but are not built for non-staff purposes nor intended for use by the public.

It is important to underscore in this analysis that the current open nature of the the exemption language in this legislation requires thoughtful and thorough analysis to define application and implication of a standard, particularly given the direct inclusion of a civil action clause that opens the state to damages through judicial action should that standard defining "practicable" and remaining compliant with existing accessibility requirements be determined insufficent by a member of the public.

Additional capital costs would also be applicable for the public facilities of other departments or political subdivisions of the state meeting the criteria of HB141, using similar analysis above.

(all numbers in thousands unless specified otherwise)

(Revised 9/6/24 OMB/LFD) Page 3 of 3