

SCR

19

HFIN

FILE

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(11)

Date Referred to Committee: March 4, 1998

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Date of Committee Action: 3/09/98

The FINANCE Committee considered:

CSSCR 19(FIN) am

CS FOR SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 19(FIN) am

PROTOTYPE SCHOOL DESIGN

Relating to the use of prototype designs in public school construction projects.

recommends it be replaced
with the following committee substitute

HCS CSSCR 19 (FIN)

the same title
 a new title

additional referral to _____ Committee

attached amendment(s)

ADOPTS: _____ Letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): _____ (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: _____ (Dept/Date)

fiscal note(s) _____

fiscal note(s) DOE, 2/16/98

zero fiscal note(s) _____

zero fiscal note(s) _____

SIGNING WITH RECOMMENDATIONS		DF	DNP	NR	AM
<i>Gene Therriault</i>	Therriault	X			
<i>Mark Hanley</i>	Hanley	X			
<i>Don Mulder</i>	Mulder	X			
<i>Tom Martin</i>	Martin	X			
<i>Jack Davies</i>	Davies	X			
<i>Ben Grussendorf</i>	Grussendorf			X	
<i>Charles Moses</i>	Moses	X			
<i>David Davis</i>	Davis			X	
<i>Pete Kelly</i>	Foster Kelly	X			

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE

Gene Therriault *Mark Hanley*

cc - chair

Hanley

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1998 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

No. 1
BILL NO. SSR 19(HESS)
(S) Publish Date: 2/6/98

Title: <u>Prototype School Design</u>	Dept. Affected <u>Education</u>	
Sponsor <u>Senate Rules</u>	BRU <u>School Finance</u>	
Requester <u>Senate HESS</u>	Component <u>Educational Facilities</u>	
	Support <u>Support</u>	
	Component Serial No. <u>1957</u>	

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	*	*	*	*	*	*
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
TOTAL	*	*	*	*	*	*

Estimate of any current year (FY98) cost:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)
 The fiscal impact of this resolution is indeterminate at this time. Total costs for either portion of the resolution for either portion of the resolution require further definition before costs may be determined. This includes definition of the types of incentives that might be utilized, as well as a clarification of the meaning of "core school functions".

Prepared by <u>Michael Morgan, FMP</u>	Phone <u>465-1858</u>
Division <u>Education Support Services/Facilities Section</u>	Date <u>1/27/98</u>
Approved by <u>Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D.</u>	Date <u>1/27/98</u>
Agency <u>Commissioner</u>	

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

*Adopted
3/9/98*

0-LS1357P
Ferd
2/27/98

HOUSE CS FOR CS FOR SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 19()

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTIETH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY

**Offered:
Referred:**

Sponsor(s): SENATE RULES COMMITTEE BY REQUEST OF THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE TASK FORCE

A RESOLUTION

1 Relating to the use of prototype designs in public school construction projects.

2 BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

3 WHEREAS art. VII, sec. 1, Constitution of the State of Alaska, requires the state to
4 establish and maintain a system of public schools to meet the educational needs of children
5 throughout the state; and

6 WHEREAS the Alaska State Legislature recognizes the crucial role that local school
7 districts serve in the state in meeting this most important constitutional responsibility; and

8 WHEREAS the Alaska State Legislature understands the challenges school districts
9 face to ensure Alaska's children have skilled teachers, quality curriculum, and safe schools;
10 and

11 WHEREAS continued growth is projected in the state's school age population that will
12 increase the need for new schools and place further pressure on school district budgets; and

13 WHEREAS prudent stewardship of state resources requires that every effort be made
14 to get the best value for each state dollar spent; and

15 WHEREAS use of prototype school designs has enabled the Municipality of
16 Anchorage, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Kenai Peninsula Borough, and Matanuska-Susitna
17 Borough school districts to more quickly respond to their district's need for new schools while

1 realizing cost savings; and

2 **WHEREAS** the use of prototype school designs reduces future maintenance cost by
3 improving a school district's maintenance program through the use of standardized building
4 components, systems, and products; and

5 **WHEREAS** school districts experience substantially fewer problems during the school
6 year in a prototype school, thereby reducing the school district's costs and improving the
7 learning environment for teachers and students; and

8 **WHEREAS** public facilities should be designed to accurately reflect the unique needs
9 of our subarctic and arctic environments, and northern design principles can help minimize
10 annual operating and maintenance costs;

11 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Alaska State Legislature encourages school districts to
12 use prototype school designs wherever feasible so future school classrooms can be constructed
13 more quickly and funds maximized; and be it

14 **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Governor is requested to direct the Department of
15 Education to develop prototype school designs in consultation with engineering and
16 architecture design professionals, including their statewide and regional organizations, who are
17 familiar with the unique regional climatic conditions in this state as well as other conditions
18 that affect application of appropriate school designs; and be it

19 **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Governor is requested to direct the Department of
20 Education to identify components within prototype building designs that can be standardized
21 and can be incorporated into the school design in those instances where a prototype design
22 may not be appropriate; and be it

23 **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Governor is requested to direct the Department of
24 Education to consult with the bond reimbursement and grant review committee established
25 under AS 14.11.014 in developing incentives for school districts to use prototype school
26 designs in school construction funded through the educational facilities maintenance and
27 construction fund (AS 37.05.560); and be it

28 **FURTHER RESOLVED** that, if statutory changes are necessary to implement these
29 incentives, the Department of Education is requested to report suggested statutory changes to
30 the legislature by April 1, 1998, so the changes can be considered by the Second Regular
31 Session of the Twentieth Alaska State Legislature.

1 **COPIES** of this resolution shall be sent to Shirley J. Holloway, commissioner of
2 education, to the Alaska State Board of Education, and to the school board of each school
3 district.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Rep. Eldon Mulder, Co-Chair
Rep. Kim Elton
Rep. Richard Foster
Rep. Jeannette James
Rep. Beverly Masek
Rep. Gail Phillips



Sen. Tim Kelly, Co-Chair
Sen. Loren Leman
Sen. Georgianna Lincoln
Sen. Robin Taylor
Sen. Gary Wilken
Sen. Mike Miller

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE TASK FORCE

Capitol Building, Room 501 • Juneau, Alaska 99801 • Phone (907) 465-2647 • FAX (907) 465-3518

Sponsor Statement

Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

*House Finance Committee Substitute
(version 0-LS1357/P 2/27/98)*

Use of Prototypical Designed Schools

This proposed CS is identical to HCR 24 as it passed House Finance, except the report date has been extended to April 1, 1998.

The Deferred Maintenance Task Force received testimony on the cost savings and operational advantages of prototypical schools. Several communities use them today. The Task Force found that the savings in design cost and the ease of maintaining several identical physical plants offered the opportunity to fund more schools as the savings are achieved.

The resolution recognizes the success several school districts have had with prototype schools, the savings that can be achieved, and the need to recognize the unique climates in Alaska.

This resolution requests the Department of Education work with architects and engineers to develop prototype schools and with the bond reimbursement and grant review committee to develop incentives for districts to use them. The Department of Education is requested to report to the legislature by April 1, 1998, any statutory changes that may be needed to accomplish this goal.

One rural school district has expressed great interest in using a prototype designs for schools in its district. They are currently in discussions with the Fairbanks School District to learn from the Fairbanks experience.



Prototype School Design – SCR 19

This bill deals with prototypical designs for schools. Currently, school designs are the responsibility of each local school district. There are some districts in Alaska who have made good use of prototypical designs and this use may have resulted in some cost savings in the construction costs of the schools using these designs. In looking at the use of prototypical designs and their possible use as a means of controlling costs of school construction attention has been focused on the use of prototypical designs in Anchorage and Fairbanks. It is useful to note that implementation of prototypical design in these areas has been limited to elementary schools. The use of prototypical designs has been successful in these areas for several reasons. These include:

- Similar site conditions (i.e., topography, soils, climate)
- Facilities are being used under the same educational program
- The same contractor group bid the jobs, utilizing an experienced labor pool
- Staff and community input was limited due to previous acceptance of the design

If the primary motivation for developing and using a prototype (or, series of prototypes) in the state, part of the investigation should consider all aspects of the costs which would accrue to prototype use. This should include a review of the problems associated with state use of a stock plan implemented in the 1970's in rural Alaska.

This bill considers two requirements:

1. "that the Department of Education is requested to develop a prototype school designs for core school functions that could be used by school districts; and
2. "that the Department of Education is requested to develop incentives for school districts to use prototype school designs in school construction funded through the educational facilities maintenance and construction fund (AS 37.05.560).

These two requirements offer several challenges. The challenges involve issues the breadth of the scope desired by the legislature and what is meant by "core school functions".

The request to develop "...a prototype designs for core school functions..." appears to focus on a concept presented in a department briefing paper on prototypes presented to the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee. The paper discusses the conditions where prototypes have been successful and suggests that use of prototypical components might be appropriate for Alaska. If a prototype design is to be developed, there are several factors which might effect the successful use of the design. Two of these are:

- There are at least three major climatic regions of the state, southeast, central and arctic, which require unique design considerations.
- There are also varying size requirements required by schools districts around the state. These vary from the 600 student elementaries being built in Anchorage and Fairbanks to the 25