

SCR

19

SFIN

FILE

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 2/6/98

FURTHER: 2/24/98

DATE TURNED
IN TO OFFICE: 2/25/98

Finance Committee considered

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 19

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

and recommends:

be replaced with CS SCR 19 (FIN)

adopt previous CS ()

attached amendment(s)

adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee

further referral to the _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- same title
- new title
- House Bill:**
- same title
- technical title
- new: SCR# _____

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	NR	DNP	AM
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓	<i>[Signature]</i>	✓		
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓	<i>[Signature]</i>	✓		
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				
Co-Chair: <i>[Signature]</i>		Co-Chair:			
Co-Chair: <i>[Signature]</i>		Co-Chair:			

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department Date Zero Fiscal

DOE/School Finance	2/6/98		***

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):*

Department Date Zero Fiscal

APPROPRIATION -- no fiscal note

*include fiscal notes accompanying Governor's bill

FISCAL NOTE

REPORTED OUT OF
2/24/98
BILL NO. CS SCR 19

STATE OF ALASKA
1998 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: 2/6/98

Title: Prototype School Design

Dept. Affected

Education

BRU

School Finance

Component

Educational Facilities

Sponsor

Senate Rules

Support

Requester

S (FIN)

Component Serial No.

1957

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

Michael Morgan, PMP

Phone

465-1858

Division

Education Support Services/Facilities Section

Date

2/6/98

Approved by

Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D.

Date

2/6/98

Agency

Commissioner

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office



Prototype School Design – CS 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



student K-12 school needed in Healy Lake. The size requirements could be considered in terms of a series of ranges (e.g., 0-50, 51-250, 250-500, and 500 and over). However, this still leaves a large number of design options to be considered when coupled with the three climatic regions.

- Is the project a new totally new project, or is it an addition to an existing school?

Just these three factors begin to frame the challenges of designing a single prototype to be used across the state. The concept becomes more feasible when considering that the Deferred Maintenance Task Force may have been suggesting use of prototypical components. If the concept is applied to the "core school functions" specified in this Resolution, components could be identified, e.g., mechanical room, office/teacher preparation areas, multipurpose rooms, library/multi-media center/computer lab areas. These could then be configured and sized for population ranges similar to those noted earlier in this discussion.

The second requirement of the Resolution is a request to develop incentives for districts to use prototype school designs. The types of incentives to be developed are not specified and could range from point awards, which might effect the priority of projects ranked by the department to financial incentives. Certainly any incentives developed would need to be applied equally to all districts. The challenge in developing these incentives is in first assuring that the concept of prototype use is applicable to all districts. If, as has been suggested in several nationally published papers, prototypes only work well in a homogeneous environment of moderate to high growth, then they may only work in the three large districts in Alaska: Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Mat-Su.

As the concept of using prototypical components is explored, the design of each component will need to include the flexibility to support a variety of configurations. This will allow designs to adapt to meet the demands presented by the site, wind driven rain or drifting snow, and unique programmatic demands.

The requirement to develop incentives is dependent upon how the issue of prototypes is developed. Design development costs for total prototypical schools could vary depending on the number of factors considered.

Further development of the range options and application for an Alaskan prototype will allow definition of the potential costs.

AMENDMENT

SCR 19

On page 2, line 15:

delete the word "elementary"

moved BY ADAMS
w/o objection, adopted

SENATE FINANCE
COMMITTEE

Amendment Number: 1

Bill Number: SCR 19

Sponsor: Adams Date: 2/9/98

Logged In By: J. Saltari

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE SENATE
TO: CSSCR 19(HES)

moved BY SENATOR TORGERSON
w/o objection, adopted

- 1 Page 2, line 20, following "committee":
- 2 Insert "established under AS 14.11.014"

SENATE FINANCE
COMMITTEE

Amendment Number: 2
Bill Number: SCR 19(HES)
Sponsor: Torgerson Date: 2/10/98
Logged In By: J. Salton