

**Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the
Need for Teacher Housing in
Rural Alaska**

*Prepared by:
NANA Pacific*

*Prepared for:
Denali Commission
&
United States Department of Energy
&
Denali Commission Teacher Housing Work Group*

Summary and Analysis Report

8/16/2004

Acknowledgements

The authors of this study would like to thank Michelle Anderson & Al Ewing with the Denali Commission, members of the Teacher Housing Work Group, James Wiedle with Alaska Housing and Finance Corporation, and Eddy Jeans with the Alaska Department of Education and Early Childhood Development for their support to this project.

The various housing authorities were also helpful in providing background and input on the issue and survey design.

We would also like to thank and acknowledge the individual school districts administration for their availability and interest in responding to the survey questionnaire.

Executive Summary

Background

Teacher housing has become increasingly important in the delivery of quality education in rural Alaska. Educators, school administrators, rural development agencies, and policy makers have increasingly recognized the importance of having quality housing available for teacher recruitment, retention, and job satisfaction purposes. Recently, testimony was heard on this subject before the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, underscoring the issue's policy importance.

To address this issue, the Denali Commission established the multi-agency Teacher Housing Work Group to facilitate collaboration. The challenge to policy makers is the lack of relevant data highlighting the availability, quality, and affordability of teacher housing in rural Alaska. Thus, a Teacher Housing Survey study was subsequently commissioned to evaluate, quantify, and prioritize the need for teacher housing in rural Alaska.

Methodology

The teacher housing survey was developed and implemented in May and June of 2004. The survey's methodology utilized key informant interviews of rural school superintendents, business managers, and facility managers. The surveyors achieved a 100% response rate by receiving responses from all 51-targeted rural school districts.

Survey Results

The primary means used to screen the need for teacher housing in rural Alaskan school districts was housing impact on teacher attrition. The screening process allowed school districts to be placed into limited, moderate, and high need teacher housing categories.

The survey allowed for the prioritization of 109 of the high need category communities, using the following prioritization criteria.

- Ratio of teachers to available housing;
- Condition of housing;
- Teacher attrition; and
- School enrollment trends.

The following results highlight the data collected.

- **Survey Respondents.** Thirty-six percent (36%) responding were superintendents, 20% responding were assistant superintendent/other administrator, and 36% were business managers.
- **Teacher Recruitment and Retention.** Fifty-seven percent (57%) of the school districts reported having difficulties attracting and retaining teachers and 33% reported that housing was a factor in influencing teacher's resignation.
- **School District Categorization.** Fifty-three percent (53%) of the school districts can be categorized as limited teacher housing need, 29% as moderate need, and 17% as high need.

- **Population Change.** From 2000-2003, the percentage change in population for high need category school districts was +.17%.
- **Enrollment Change.** From 1999-2003, the percentage change in enrollment for the communities in the high need category was -5.61%.
- **Housing Unit Quality.** Sixty-five percent of the housing units owned by the high need school districts are in need of major repairs or need to be replaced.
- **Expressed Need for Teacher Housing.** The gap between expressed need and housing availability was 33% in the high need school districts.
- **Rental Rates.** The reported rental rates ranged from \$250-\$1,150, with a mean rental rate of \$625.
- **Rental Subsidies.** Thirty-one percent of those school districts with actively managed teacher-housing units reported charging below market rents of the schoolteachers.
- **Housing Unit Ownership.** Seventy-eight percent of the homes designated for teacher housing in the high need school districts are owned by the school district.
- **Retrofit Cost.** Two hundred thirty units (230) in the high need category need to be repaired at an estimated \$5, 900,000.
- **Total Development Costs- New Construction.** Total development costs for new teacher housing construction are estimated at \$100,489,104 in the high need category.

Conclusions

The following recommendations and conclusions were developed for consideration.

- Study the role that the private sector plays in the provision of housing in rural Alaska.
- Provide school districts with technical assistance for working with private sector entities.
- Assess the capacity of local housing providers to provide housing in rural Alaska.
- Identify other foundational obstacles to the provision of teacher housing in rural Alaska.
- Focus efforts on high need category school districts for future programming of teacher housing resources.
- Develop a monitoring and evaluation system that can track and assess progress made on the teacher housing issue.
- Encourage involvement of *Housing Authorities* and *Village Corporations* in the design and implementation of teacher housing programs.
- Improve marketing efforts of existing teacher housing programs.
- Tailor the teacher housing program intervention to the needs of the individual school district.
- Recognize the contribution of homeownership in community development.
- Recognize the complexity and multiplicity of factors that can influence teacher attrition in rural Alaska.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Table of Contents	5
Table of Figures & Tables.....	6
Acronyms	6
Introduction	7
Survey Goals & Objectives	7
Background on Teacher Housing in Alaska	8
Survey Findings.....	10
Survey Methodology	10
Strengths and Weakness of Data Collection.....	11
Survey Findings.....	11
Prioritization Criteria	11
Person Responding to Questionnaire.....	12
Housing Impact on Teacher Recruitment and Retention	13
Description of Housing Need Categories	13
Population and Enrollment Trends	15
Condition & Availability of Housing	15
Teacher Housing Policy Options.....	16
Prioritized List of Schools & Communities.....	18
Cost Estimate: Retrofit	19
Cost Estimate: New Construction.....	20
Recommendations and Conclusion	20
References	23
Appendix A: Prioritization Criteria Questionnaire.....	25
Appendix B: People Contacted.....	26
Appendix C: General List of Prioritized Criteria.....	27
Appendix D: School District Questionnaire.....	28
Appendix E: School/Community Questionnaire	29
Appendix F: School District Data	30
Appendix H: Map for High Teacher Need Category.....	35
Appendix I: School/Community Data Sets.....	36
Appendix J: Community Score and Prioritization- High Need Category.....	44
Appendix K: Cost Estimate- Retrofit by Community	48
Appendix L: Cost Estimate New Construction.....	53

Table of Figures & Tables

Table 1 Community Prioritization Criteria.....	12
Table 2 Descriptions & Scoring of Teacher Housing Units	12
Table 3 School District Official Responding to Questionnaire	13
Table 4 Housing Roles in Teacher Attrition Rates	13
Table 5- School District Screening Criterion	13
Table 6- School Districts Degree of Teacher Housing Need.....	14
Table 7 Population & Enrollment Trends: High Need School District Communities	15
Table 8 Population Enrollment Trends: High Need School District Communities	15
Table 9 Condition of School District Controlled Units	15
Table 10 Teacher Housing Availability vs. Expressed Need	16
Table 11 Average Age of Housing Units in High Need Category per community	16
Table 12 School District Housing Policies	17
Table 13 Most Favorable Teacher Housing Option.....	17
Table 14 Rental Rates-High Need Category	17
Table 15 School District Rental Subsidies	18
Table 16 Legal Ownership of Designated Housing Units	18
Table 17 Criteria Scoring	19
Table 18 Major Cost Repairs/Retrofit Estimate per unit	19
Table 19 Generalized Cost Estimate- New Construction	20

Acronyms

AHFC	Alaska Housing and Finance Corporation
AVCP/HA	Association of Village Council Presidents Housing Authority
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
DC	Denali Commission
DCRA	Department of Community and Regional Affairs
DEED	Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
DOLWD	Department of Labor and Workforce Development
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Field Policy and Management.
NP	NANA Pacific
NOFA	Notice of Funding Availability
UAA/ISER	University of Alaska Anchorage Institute of Social and Economic Research
USDA/RD	United States Department of Agriculture & Rural Development
REAA	Rural Education Attendance Area
THWG	Teacher Housing Work Group
TDC	Total Development Costs
UA	University of Alaska

Introduction

Teacher housing in rural Alaska has become an increasingly important issue as educators, school administrators, rural development agencies, and policy makers recognize the importance of housing in teacher recruitment, attrition, and job satisfaction. In recent years, there has been increasing emphasis placed on retaining rural teachers.

The challenge to decision makers is a gap in relevant data and information, resulting in unanswered questions, such as:

- To what extent does teacher housing influence teacher attrition?
- What are school district's teacher housing policies?
- How is teacher housing provided at the school district level?
- What is the availability, affordability, and condition of housing in each community
- How much new housing construction needs to occur?
- What is the anticipated cost for both new construction and retrofit?

A multi-agency, Teacher Housing Work Group (*THWG*) was established by the Denali Commission (DC) to facilitate collaboration. Member agencies include United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA/RD), State of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED), housing authorities, and Alaska Housing and Finance Corporation (AHFC).

Consequently, THWG identified the need for relevant teacher housing data as a fundamental issue and a *Teacher Housing Survey* was commissioned.

Survey Goals & Objectives

The goal of the teacher housing survey is to evaluate, quantify, and prioritize the need for teacher housing in rural Alaska.

The objectives of the *Teacher Housing Survey* include:

1. Development of an assessment tool to be used by community to identify the following:
 - Total number of housing units required;
 - Number of housing units designated for teacher housing;
 - Ownership of the housing units designated for teacher housing;
 - Average age and condition of existing housing units;
 - Current rent for each housing unit and the source of the rent funds;
 - Average annual cost for maintaining each unit;
 - Community total population and K-12 population.
2. Development of rural teacher housing prioritization criteria;
3. Prioritization by community the need for teacher housing and construction;
4. Development of a report that summarizes and communicates the survey's findings, including:

- Methodology employed to assess needs;
- Summary of all information, assumptions, and conclusions;
- Prioritized list by community prioritizing their need for teacher housing construction, including both retrofit and new construction.

Instructions on Use

The presentation of this work is organized as follows:

- **Summary and Analysis Report.** Includes summary and analytical information, methodology, analysis, findings, data synthesis, data calculations, and recommendations.
- **Primary Data Sources.** Includes copies of all school district and community questionnaires, providing the reader with community specific information.
- **Secondary Data Sources.** Includes copies of secondary data sources collected and consulted. A copy is available at the Denali Commission.

Background on Teacher Housing in Alaska

The state of Alaska has 55 school districts with over 8,000 teachers serving over 132,000 students. Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks, and the Mat-Su Borough, have urban, on the road school districts and minimal problems with teacher housing. The remaining 51 school districts are largely rural school districts, having experienced teacher-housing problems to some degree in the past.

Teacher housing in rural Alaska has been recognized as an endemic problem over the years. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)¹ homes dating back to the 30's & 40's can still be found. In the 60's, BIA ceded responsibility of their housing and education programs to the *State of Alaska*. In 1974, the *State of Alaska* ceased state sponsored teacher housing programs indicating that this was a local responsibility. Since this time, minimal teacher designated housing has been built directly by the *State of Alaska*.²

Alaska State Statutes indicate that school districts can provide rental-housing to teachers by leasing existing housing, entering into contractual arrangements with a local agency or individual, or can use state aid for construction of housing.³ Regional school boards can provide prospective employees with information on the availability of housing in rural areas. There is no legal requirement, however, to subsidize or provide teacher housing⁴.

¹ BIA had education construction jurisdiction in many rural communities.

² Denali Commission Briefing Paper-Teacher Housing Rural Alaska.

³ Alaska State Statutes Sec. 14.08.100 (9).

⁴ Alaska State Statutes Sec 14.08.111 (10)

In December 2002, a study entitled *Retaining Quality Teachers for Alaska* was prepared for the University of Alaska (UA) and DEED, highlighting the myriad of factors influencing teacher attrition, including job satisfaction, personal/family reasons, dissatisfaction with administrative support, desire for better salaries, and desire for better living conditions. The study indicated that the desire for more affordable housing was important to 41% of the rural teachers who left their previous position, while 38% of the rural movers cited the desire for better housing.

Furthermore, the base level of salaries of teachers in high-turnover districts are just modestly higher than salaries in urban school districts, creating difficulty in housing markets where rent is considerably higher than urban Alaska. The study suggested that salary levels maybe critical in efforts to attract teachers to remote, high turnover school districts. The study indicated that high turnover school districts have smaller populations, less teachers, less students, highest per pupil expenditures, more poverty, and higher unemployment rates.

In the 1980's, AHFC, in conjunction with the former Department of Community and Regional Affairs (DCRA) managed a rural teacher housing loan program. Since the early 1990's, the rural loan office activities and rural loan program have decreased.⁵

Most recently, AHFC researched the extent of the rural teacher-housing problem in developing its current teacher-housing program. AHFC queried 19 school districts and found that over 50% of the school districts considered teacher housing an important issue; 25% considered it as their highest priority. In larger communities, such as Bethel and Dillingham, a rental subsidy was provided by the school district. In smaller communities, the district might lease from local entities.

AHFC's survey indicated that school districts are most likely to operate as the owner and manager of the teacher housing units. Few school districts indicated that teacher home ownership was viable. The most pressing issue appeared to be affordability, with supply and quality as second and third most important factors. Finally, the survey indicated that school districts recognize that teacher housing availability influences teacher attrition but many have decided against intervening.

AHFC has three current programs that could possibly address the teacher housing issue, including their AHFC Multi-Family Development Long-Term Take-Out Loans, AHFC Rural Loan program, and the AHFC Interest Rate Reduction Program.

AHFC issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) in late 2003 outlining the requirements for the current *Teacher and Health Professional Housing Grant Program*. Current projects include the Northwest Arctic School District, Bering Straits School District, Traditional Council of Togiak/Southwest School District, and Association of Village Council Presidents/Lower Kuskokwim School District.

⁵ Brean Conversation, AHFC.

In July of 2003, the Alaska senatorial delegation announced the Alaska Project, which included a FY 2004 earmark of \$10 million and potential funding of \$50 million up until 2013 for teacher housing.⁶

Testimony was also heard before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs in 2004. Salient themes included the lack of available, quality, and affordable housing for teachers and its impact on teacher attrition and student achievement scores. Testimony was also heard on the importance of strategies to recruit local community members into the teaching profession⁷

Survey Findings

Rural teacher attrition is high due to multiple factors, making it difficult to identify a single policy or programming intervention. However, improved teacher housing is a viable option to consider in efforts to decrease teacher attrition. Thus, policy makers need to know the extent of the teacher-housing problem and its impact on teacher attrition.

Survey Methodology

The methodology employed to assess the needs of teacher housing was a survey-based approach of key informant contacts in the school district. The opinions and perspectives of other key-informants (THWG, housing authorities, and agency personnel) were also incorporated into the methodology. The methodological steps of this needs assessment include:

1. **Information & Resource Inventory.** Gathering of information from key informants and agency personnel involved with housing and rural education to identify possible prioritization criteria for development of the survey instrument. A pre-questionnaire⁸ was developed and used to guide the pre-survey, interview process.
2. **Development of Survey Instrument.** Research was undertaken on the internet and with housing providers⁹ to identify housing survey/questionnaires. The resulting survey instrument had two parts, including school district practices on teacher housing and community specific information on teacher housing.¹⁰
3. **Target population.** The key informants identified were school district superintendents, business managers, administrators, and maintenance managers. Teachers were not interviewed due to timing of data collection. The resulting sample size was 51 of the 55 total Alaskan school districts.¹¹
4. **Timing of Survey and Data Collection.** Survey instrument development and data collection occurred between May 8, 2004 and June 24, 2004.

⁶ Denali Commission Briefing Paper- Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska.

⁷ Field Hearing Before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on S.1905 "No Teacher Left Behind" A Bill to Improve Living Conditions in Alaska Native Villages.

⁸ Refer to appendix A for copy of pre-questionnaire and a listing of those contacted.

⁹ American Housing Survey, AHFC 1988 Rural Housing Needs Assessment Study, and questionnaires from the HUD website

¹⁰ Refer to Appendix D & E for survey instruments.

¹¹ Anchorage, Fairbanks North Star, Mat-Su Borough, and Juneau Borough School Districts were not interviewed

5. **Response Rate.** The response rate via e-mail resulted in a (19%) response rate. The remaining (81%) of the school districts were surveyed telephonically, resulting in a (100%) response rate.
6. **Data Analysis.** The data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel functions of descriptive statistics, cross tabulations, and frequencies.
7. **Screening & Prioritization of School Districts and Communities.** Using the different teacher attrition criteria available, a prioritized list of the high need school districts was undertaken. A weighted approach was then used to prioritize the communities.
8. **Estimation of Cost.** Cost estimates for both retrofit and new construction were undertaken. For new construction, the total development costs (TDC) in AHFC's most recent NOFA was used. For retrofit, an estimate was done using AHFC's experience with weatherization retrofits.

Strengths and Weakness of Data Collection

The following points indicate some strengths and weaknesses with the methodology and data collection.

- The majority of the respondents were positive, patient, and willing to provide requested information, resulting in a rich and varied data set.
- School districts' administrators were the primary stakeholders questioned.
- Teachers were not available to be interviewed.
- Respondents had difficulty evaluating private sector housing units and were unable to provide relevant information.
- Requested information was voluminous and difficult to provide for those school districts managing many teacher-housing units.
- Differences in accounting procedures created problems in comparing operations cost, maintenance costs, rental rates, and utility rates.
- Different and non-existent record keeping practices made estimating the age of individual homes difficult, resulting in general estimates.
- The survey design could not identify the differences and reasons why certain school districts had teacher housing problems and others did not.

Survey Findings

The degree to which teacher housing influences attrition with school districts and the ability to prioritize school districts into limited, moderate and high need categories provides the analytical foundation of this paper.

Prioritization Criteria

Prioritization criteria¹² were identified and validated through interviews and meetings with the THWG. General responses included program design, sustainability, community needs, and capacity. The criteria and weights found in Table 1 were those ultimately selected for community prioritization.

¹² Refer to Appendix C for a generalized list of prioritization criteria.

Table 1 Community Prioritization Criteria

Criteria		Weight
1	Ratio of teachers to available housing	0.5
2	Condition of Homes	0.3
3	Teacher Attrition	0.1
4	Population Growth and enrollment trends	0.1
Total		1

1. **Housing Availability Ratio.** Housing availability per community was recognized as the most important criteria and assigned a weight of (.5). This is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{\# of teachers in community}}{\text{\# of houses designated for teacher housing.}}$$

2. **Condition of Homes.** The quality of teacher-housing units and its systems were assessed using the descriptors found in Table 2 and assigned a weight of (.3). The housing condition score by community was then calculated using the following calculation:

$$\frac{\text{Sum (score house(1) + score house(2).....score house(n))}}{\text{\# of housing units in community}}$$

Table 2 Descriptions & Scoring of Teacher Housing Units

Description	Score	Comments
Like New/Minor Repair	1	General operations and maintenance.
Major Repair	2	Significant repair needs.
Needs to be replaced	3	Beyond useful life and/or overly costly to repair.

3. **Teacher Attrition.** Teacher attrition rate is a self-reported rate for each school district and assigned a weight of (.1).
4. **Enrollment Trends:** The percentage change in enrollment¹³ from 1999-2003 for schools and communities is the final criteria and was assigned a weight of (.1).

Person Responding to Questionnaire

The school superintendent was the point of entry into the school district. Details regarding quality, availability, affordability, and impact on teacher attrition were generally referred to subordinates. Table 3 indicates responding school district personnel.

¹³ DEED Sources.

Table 3 School District Official Responding to Questionnaire

Person Responding to the Questionnaire	Total Respondents (%)
Superintendent	36.21%
Assistant Superintendent/Other Administrator	20.69%
Business Manager	36.21%
Maintenance Director	6.90%
Total	100.00%

Housing Impact on Teacher Recruitment and Retention

The survey design placed emphasis on how housing availability, affordability, and quality influences teacher attrition. The survey design had a self-screening component, whereby respondents were obligated to identify those particular communities where a teacher-housing problem exists.

Table 4 indicates the overall role that teacher housing plays in the selection, retention, and attrition of teachers in all of the school districts.

Table 4 Housing Roles in Teacher Attrition Rates

Description	% Yes	% No
Attracting and retaining teachers	57%	43%
Housing Role in influencing teacher's departure	33%	67%

The criterion found in Table 5 was used to screen the degree to which housing influences teacher attrition.

Table 5- School District Screening Criterion

Criterion
Problems attracting and retaining teachers due to housing
Housing as the #1 issue for teacher attrition
Housing as a contributing factor in teacher attrition.

Table 6 highlights the results of this screening by placing school districts in limited, moderate, and high need categories.

Description of Housing Need Categories

Limited Need. School districts in the limited category may have teacher housing problems, such as affordability and availability, but these problems are not adversely affecting teacher attrition. Chugach School District, Kodiak Island Borough School District, Aleutian Region Schools, and Aleutian East Borough appear to have well functioning, actively managed teacher-housing programs. The other school districts generally have a sufficient quality and supply of teacher housing units provided by the private sector.

Moderate Need. At least 1 of Table 5 criteria was affirmatively reported. Cost (rental and construction) is a prevailing housing concern for these school districts. Teachers rely on the private sector for seven of these school districts but private sector was not completely meeting the needs of the teachers. The three remaining school districts have designated teacher-housing units, which are in good condition. A common problem encountered is that size of a housing unit may not correspond with family needs. Alaska Gateway’s schools are on the road system, facilitating logistics and maintenance programs for this school district.

High Need. Affordability, quality, and availability of housing are common concerns. 2-3 of the screening criteria were affirmatively reported. School districts have actively managed teacher-housing programs, but rely on the private sector due to inadequate supply. These school districts serve remote, off-road communities, creating logistical and maintenance difficulties.

Table 6- School Districts Degree of Teacher Housing Need

Limited	Moderate	High
Aleutians East Borough Schools	Alaska Gateway School	Bering Strait Schools
Aleutian Region Schools	Lake and Peninsula Borough Schools	Chatham Schools
Alyeska Central School	North Slope Borough Schools	Iditarod Area Schools
Bristol Bay Borough Schools	Annette Island Schools	Kuspuk Schools
Chugach Schools	Nome City Schools	Lower Kuskokwim Schools
Copper River Schools	Alaska Gateway School District	Lower Yukon Schools
Cordova City Schools	Kenai Peninsula Borough Schools (Port Graham, Nanwalek, & Tyonek only)	Northwest Arctic Borough Schools
Craig City Schools	Dillingham City Schools	Southeast Island Schools
Delta/Greely Schools	Galena City Schools	Southwest Region Schools
Denali Borough Schools	Haines Borough Schools	Saint Mary's Schools
Hoonah City Schools	Unalaska City Schools	Tanana Schools
Hydaburg City Schools		Pribilof Schools
Kake City Schools		Yupit Schools
Kashunamiut Schools		Yukon Flats Schools
Ketchikan Gateway Borough Schools		Yukon/Koyukuk Schools
Klawock City Schools		
Kodiak Island Borough Schools (rural schools only)		
Nenana City Schools		
Petersburg City Schools		
Sitka Borough Schools		
Skagway City Schools		
Valdez City Schools		
Yakutat City Schools		
Alyeska Central School		
Mt. Edgecumbe High School		
Wrangell City Schools		
Pelican City Schools		

Population and Enrollment Trends¹⁴

Table 7 and 8 describes population and enrollment trends for high need school districts. The following points highlight some of these patterns:

- The minimum population change (-10%) is Sleetmute, while the maximum is Portage Creek (15.9%) between the years of 2000-2003.
- Nauketi saw the largest drop (-57.4%) in school enrollment; while Klakwon's school enrollment (225%) more than doubled from 1999-2003.
- Median population growth was (.55%), while the mean population growth was (.17%) for all communities.
- Enrollment decreased while the population generally increased from 1999-2003 for high need category communities.

Table 7 Population & Enrollment Trends: High Need School District Communities

Descriptor	Population Trends	Enrollment Trends
Minimum	-10.00%	-57.40%
Maximum	15.90%	225.00%
Median	0.55%	-6.87%
Mean	0.17%	-5.61%

Table 8 Population Enrollment Trends: High Need School District Communities

Descriptor	Population Trends	Enrollment Trends
Decreasing (%)	39.25%	61.68%
Increasing (%)	59.81%	35.51%
No Growth (%)	0.01%	0.03%

Condition & Availability of Housing¹⁵

In general, the majority (65%) of housing units owned by the school districts are in need of major repairs or needs to be replaced¹⁶. Table 9 highlights the repair breakdown needs of those units owned by the school district.

Table 9 Condition of School District Controlled Units

Type of Repair	#	%
Like new /Minor repair	220	35%
Major Repair (no foundation work)	64	10%
Major Repair (Foundation work)	166	26%
Units to be Replaced	185	29%

¹⁴Self-reported, DEED enrollment trends and DOLWD population trends are found in Appendix I.

¹⁵ For the purposes of analysis, those school districts found in the high need category are analyzed and discussed in this paper.

¹⁶ For specific information on communities, refer to questionnaires and Appendix J of this document.

Table 10 highlights the gap between the number of teachers and available housing. Compounded by limited private sector availability, teacher designated housing is in short supply in most of the communities in the high need category.

Table 10 Teacher Housing Availability vs. Expressed Need

Housing Units	Number	%
# of Units available	635	66.98%
Un Met Need	313	33.02%
Expressed Need	948	100.00%

Table 11 indicates a general estimate of age of housing units. Actual age is unavailable due to inconsistencies in record keeping.¹⁷ Average age can suggest overall quality of an individual housing unit, but should not be used as an absolute measure due to school district operations and maintenances variances.

The oldest average housing stock is found in Tenekee Springs (1930); while the newest is in Crooked Creek (2002). The mean year of construction was (1977) and median is (1978).

Table 11 Average Age of Housing Units in High Need Category per community

Age of Housing Units	
Oldest average age	1930
Newest Average age	2002
Median	1978
Average	1977
Mode	1965

Teacher Housing Policy Options

Per Alaska statute, most school districts assist new teachers with information and referral to existing rental units as needed. Many school administrators reported maintaining housing lists for referral purposes. Table 12 provides some perspective on housing policies. Generally, most school districts would prefer if other providers were involved in the teacher housing programs. School districts continue with housing programs due to lack of viable alternatives.

Several school districts reported positive benefits of good relationships with private sector housing providers. These housing providers rely on rent revenue and the school district relies on strong community support of the schools. One school district reported the possibility of negative community reaction if a school district sponsored housing program was ever implemented. The provision of school district sponsored teacher housing depends upon private sector availability and the availability of teacher controlled housing.

¹⁷ Refer to appendix I for information on a per community basis.

Table 12 School District Housing Policies

School District Housing Policies	Total Responses	%
School District does not provide housing but assists with information and referral.	25	49.02%
School District has limited housing available for some teachers.	8	15.69%
School District provides housing for all teachers who need it.	18	35.29%
Total	51	100.00%

Table 13 provides a summary of possible housing preferences. The preference of teacher owned vs. teacher rented options is inversely proportional to whether a school district is categorized as limited, moderate, or high need. Thus, a teacher housing program design should be tailored to the categorization and specific needs of the school district.

Table 13 Most Favorable Teacher Housing Option

Degree of Teacher Housing Need	Teacher Owned	Teacher Rented
Aggregate	45%	55%
Limited Problems	66%	34%
Moderate Problems	36%	64%
High Problem	20%	80%

The ownership and source of rental funds of teacher housing units vary by community. Private sector and local government owned units, like the model used in the Lake and Peninsula Borough school district, play important roles in the provision of housing for teachers.¹⁸

Table 14 highlights the rental rates found in the high need category. The maximum average rent per community is found in Kotzebue in the amount of (\$1,150). The median and average rent was (\$625) per month. School districts calculate rents based on the number of bedrooms, on square footage, or have a fixed rent charged to all teachers. No school district reported a formal housing subsidy/rental assistance program in place. One community reported that rent was partially bartered in exchange for work on the house.

Table 14 Rental Rates-High Need Category

Rental Rates	
Minimum	\$250
Maximum	\$1,150
Median	\$625
Average Rent	\$625
Mode	\$600

¹⁸ For ownership and breakdown of rental funds for individual school districts and communities, refer to questionnaires and Appendix I.

However, if a rental subsidy can be defined as payment of rent below market rates, (31%) of the school districts are providing rental assistance. Table 15 highlights rental subsidy breakdown using this definition. If school districts are actively managing teacher housing, rent is generally deducted from the teacher’s salary with an automatic payroll deduction.

Table 15 School District Rental Subsidies

School District Subsidies	Number	%
Rental subsidy	16	31%
No Rental Subsidy	28	55%
Unclear	7	14%
Total	51	100%

Table 16 highlights the breakdown of legal ownership for teacher designated housing. (78%) of the homes in the high need category are legally owned by school district. In addition, school districts leased (18%) of the homes from the private sector and local government entities, while a small percentage reported teacher homeownership. School administrators had limited knowledge of private sector contractual arrangements.

Table 16 Legal Ownership of Designated Housing Units

Ownership of Teacher Housing Units	%
School District	78.76%
Private Sector	11.99%
Local Government	7.89%
Other	1.37%
Total	100.00%

Generally speaking, school districts do not provide housing in the hub communities of Bethel, Dillingham, Kotzebue, Nome, and Barrow.

Prioritized List of Schools & Communities

Three prioritization/screening exercises were undertaken to identify school districts and communities in greatest need of teacher housing.

1. **Self-Identification.** Respondents to the questionnaires were asked to identify and report on high teacher-housing problem communities.
2. **Housing impact on teacher selection, retention, and attrition.** This prioritization was done using self-reported housing driven impact on teacher attrition, resulting in the categorization found in Table 5.
3. **Prioritization Criteria.** The final screening and prioritization strategy was to rank/order school/ communities found in the high need category using Table 1 prioritization criteria. Communities were rank ordered from high need to low need for teacher housing.

These criteria have different types of values (percentage and numerical). Thus, the data was translated into the same numeric value by dividing the listing of each criteria into 5 sub-groups and assigning a score based upon the descriptors in Table 17.

The score of each community was calculated and rank ordered as found in in Appendix J.

Table 17 Criteria Scoring

Score	Description
1.000	Low Importance
2.000	
3.000	Important
4.000	
5.000	High importance

Cost Estimate: Retrofit

Respondents were asked if each unit were like/new, major repair, or needs to be replaced. Like new/minor repair categories will not be considered in this cost estimation exercise as this is the operations and maintenance obligations of the legal owners.

The cost estimate calculation for retrofit was done using AHFC’s weatherization model of retrofitting homes and was undertaken with a representative from AHFC’s research and rural development department. Table 18 highlights the cost estimates results of this exercise.

These estimates can provide information for generalized analysis and policy discussion only. Actual costs will vary depending on a variety of design, procurement, and other construction variables. An engineer’s estimate is required to assess actual costs for each respective housing unit project.

Table 18 Major Cost Repairs/Retrofit Estimate per unit

Category of Repair	Low-Estimate	High-Estimate
Foundation Work	\$2,000	\$4,000
Heating system (Toyostove)	\$1,750	\$1,750
Insulation & Siding	\$2,600	\$2,600
Floor Insulation	\$1,000	\$1,000
Air-seal Attic	\$1,000	\$1,000
Doors and Windows	\$3,000	\$4,000
Lights and Refrigerator	\$800	\$800
Electrical System	\$2,000	\$5,000
Plumbing System	\$2,000	\$2,000
Replace flooring with new vinyl	\$1,250	\$1,250
Replace cabinets	\$3,000	\$4,000
Exhaust Fan	\$200	\$200
Total Estimate	\$20,600	\$27,600

Using these cost estimates, an estimated (230) units in the high need category of the school districts need to be repaired at an estimated (\$5, 900,000).¹⁹

¹⁹ Refer to Appendix K for retrofit cost estimates by community.

Cost Estimate: New Construction

The guidelines used for estimating new construction are based upon AHFC’s NOFA: Teacher and Health Professional Grant Program guidelines.

It is assumed that there will be a much higher demand for (1-2) bedroom homes than (3-4) bedroom homes. Thus, a 70% (1-2) bedroom and 30% (3-4) bedroom split is used.

A general estimate of total development costs (TDC) is provided in Table 19.

- **TDC: Replacement of Housing Units:** If those units identified by school administrators to be replaced are indeed replaced, the estimated Total Development Cost (TDC) would be (\$100,489,104) for new home construction.
- **TDC: No Replacement of Housing Units:** If those units identified as need to be replaced are not replaced and still used for teacher housing, the TDC would be (\$65,983,809) to meet expressed need.

Table 19 Generalized Cost Estimate- New Construction

# of Bedrooms	Max TDC/unit ²⁰	% of units to be built	Units to be built (No replacement)	Units to be built (Replacement)	
				TDC	TDC
1	\$159,781	35%	114	\$18,286,935	\$27,849,828
2	\$194,292	35%	114	\$22,236,719	\$33,865,096
3	\$251,348	20%	65	\$16,438,159	\$25,034,261
4	\$275,902	10%	33	\$9,021,995	\$13,739,920
		100%	327	\$65,983,809	\$100,489,104

Recommendations and Conclusion

The following recommendations and conclusions are provided for consideration.

- **Study the role that the private sector plays in the provision of housing.** The experience was mixed throughout Alaska on collaborative efforts on private sector teacher housing provision. Furthermore, the study did not fully capture the role that private sector housing providers play in the provision of teacher housing. In general, school administrators had incomplete information regarding the availability, affordability, and quality of housing provided for teachers by private sector providers.
- **Provide rural school districts with a “tool-box” for working with private sector entities.** This could include model leases, strategies in negotiation, workshops, strategies on private/public partnerships, and other topics to encourage improved private sector collaboration.
- **Assess the capacity of local providers (housing authorities, school districts) to provide housing in rural Alaska.** The scope of this study was unable to assess the organizational capacity of various housing providers.

²⁰ Refer to AHFC NOFA 9-23-04.

- **Identify other foundational obstacles in the provision of teacher housing in rural Alaska.** Analyze the barriers that exist to the provision of teacher housing in rural communities by doing an in-depth problem analysis.
- **Focus teacher housing program development on high need school districts.** The school districts in this category have a demonstrably higher level of need than the other school districts. Thus, a higher potential for program impact is possible.
- **Develop a monitoring and evaluation system that can track and assess progress made on the teacher housing issue.** It is important to measure progress as a teacher-housing program evolves. Possible annual monitoring indicators could include number of new construction houses completed; number of retrofits completed, number of new policy initiatives undertaken, and amount of fiscal resources allocated.

Potential impact indicators could include improvement in the quality of housing stock, improvement in the ratio of number of teachers to number of units available, and increase in the overall number of homes available. A reasonable timeframe (3-5 years) should be respected before an impact survey undertaken.

- **Encourage involvement of *Housing Authorities* and *Village Corporations* in the design of teacher housing programs.** Involving the professional and creative talents of these organizations could improve the teacher-housing problem. These organizations are well placed, have the necessary expertise, and have access to other capital sources.
- **Improve marketing efforts of existing teacher housing programs.** General school district knowledge on the existing teacher housing programs were mixed. Outreach efforts to superintendents, business managers, and facility managers could increase knowledge on existing programs.
- **Tailor the teacher housing program intervention to the needs of the individual school district.** It is clear that when the data is disaggregated, school districts in the high need category prefer rentals vs. teacher owned. School districts in the low need prefer teacher owned housing options. This discrepancy suggests different types of teacher housing programs for different types of school districts.
- **Recognize the power of homeownership in community development.** When appropriate, encourage teacher-owned homes in targeted rural communities by developing appropriate incentive programs.

- **Recognize the complexity and multiplicity of factors that can influence teacher attrition in rural Alaska.** Craft policies and programs that encourage long-term teacher retention by fully incorporating the multiplicity of factors that adversely affect teacher attrition. Housing availability is one of many factors that influence teacher attrition.

References

Alaska State Statutes. School District Responsibilities: Teacher Housing. www.legis.state.ak.us.

Alaska Housing and Finance Corporation. Teacher Housing: Current Issues and Challenges (Draft).

AHFC. Notice of Funding Availability- Teacher and Health Professional Housing Grant Program. (September 2003).

Alaska Education Statistics. Alaska Department of Education and Early Development. www.educ.state.ak.us.

Alaska Population Statistics. Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. www.labor.state.ak.us.

Allen, Bill. (2004) USDA/RD. Personal Communication.

Field Hearing Before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on S. 1905. No Child Left Behind, a Bill to Improve Living Conditions for Teaches in Alaska Native Villages. (March 2004).

Anderson, Michelle. "Housing Survey." (December 2003).

Anderson, Michelle. "Briefing Paper- Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska." (March 2004).

Anderson, Michelle. "Briefing Paper- Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska." (January 2004).

Anderson , Michelle. (2004). Denali Commission. Personal Communication.

Brean, Bob. (2004) AHFC. Personal Communication.

Davis, Deborah, (2004) USDA/RD. Personal Communication.

Dobrzynski, Gene. (2004) HUD. Personal Communication.

Dunleavy, Michael. (2004) REAA. Personal Communication.

Jeans, Eddy. (2004) DEED. Personal Communication.

Mcdiarmid, G. Williamson. Retaining Quality Teachers in Alaska. (December 2002). University of Alaska.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Total Development Costs for Affordable Housing Units under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 1996. (June 2003).

Department of Community and Regional Affairs. 1988 Rural Housing Needs Assessment. (March 1988).

Romick, Mark. (2004) AHFC. Personal Communication.

Waterman, Scott. (2004) AHFC. Personal Communication.

Wiedle, James (2004) AHFC. Personal Communication.

Vogt, David.(2004) HUD. Personal Communication.

Appendix A: Prioritization Criteria Questionnaire

Pre-Questionnaire
NANA Pacific

Name	
Organization	
Position	
Phone	
Email	
Address	

- 1. What criteria should be used to prioritize the need for teacher housing in rural Alaska? Please list 6-8 possible criteria.*
- 2. What suggestions do you have in the development and implementation of this survey?*
- 3. General comments regarding this program.*

Appendix B: People Contacted

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Michelle Anderson | DC |
| 2. Bill Allen | USDA/RD |
| 3. Deborah Davis | USDA/RD |
| 4. Dan Fauske | AHFC |
| 5. Mark Romick | AHFC |
| 6. James Wiedle | AHFC |
| 7. Bob Brean | AHFC |
| 8. Barbara Baker | AHFC |
| 9. Scott Waterman | AHFC |
| 10. Michael Dunleavy | REAA |
| 11. David Vogt | HUD |
| 12. Wayne Mundy | HUD |
| 13. Gene Dobrzynski | HUD |
| 14. Eddy Jeans | DEED |
| 15. Charles Huss | Northwest Inupiat Housing Authority |
| 16. Arvin Hull | AVCP Housing Authority |
| 17. David McClure | Bristol Bay Housing Authority |
| 18. Gus Adams | Baranoff Island Housing Authority |
| 19. Heather Arnett | Association of Alaska Housing Authorities |
| 20. Representatives from 51 School Districts | Refer to questionnaires |

Appendix C: General List of Prioritized Criteria

The following criteria were generated through discussions with members of the *Teacher Housing Work Group*. Quality of housing, ratio of available housing in villages to teachers, teacher attrition, and enrollment trends of targeted villages were chosen for prioritizing communities.

General List of Criteria	
Existing Infrastructure	Enrollment trend of Village School
Status of existing stock owned/leased by District	Population based coefficient
Sub-Standard Housing	Reasonable costs associated with the project
Existing housing stock	Design type
Quality of Housing Stock available	Fair Market rents
Degree of need	Who is going to build
Lack of housing stock available	How it it is going to be built
Existing housing stock	Synergy & ability to coordinate with projects coming down the construction pipeline.
No housing stock	Sustainability of the project
Ratio of available housing in village to teachers	Capacity to repay debt
Commitment from teacher's to buy	Estimated cost
Community involvement	Commitment of School District to enter into long term lease.
Local stakeholder motivation, willingness, & contribution.	Standardized achievement scores
Community readiness	Teacher turnover
Stakeholder contribution, willingness, and motivation;	School District involvement
Administrative capacity of applicant/owner/management agent.	School district plan on improving education..
Local capacity for implementation of the project	Financial Reserves/capacity of District
Teacher attrition	
Designation of the no-child is left behind.	

Appendix D: School District Questionnaire

Appendix E: School/Community Questionnaire

Appendix F: School District Data

Key for School District Data Set-

Data Set	Value	Data Set	Value	Data Sets	Value
School District Housing Policies		Problems Attracting/retaining teachers due to housing		Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district	
School District does not provide housing. SD assists with information and referral.	1	Yes	1	Yes	1
School District has limited housing available for some (but not all) teachers	2	No	2	No	2
School District provides housing for all teachers who need it.	3	Housing Availability influence school districts to assign a teacher to a community.		Person responding to questionnaire	
Most favorable housing option.		Yes	1	Superintendent	1
Single family unit owned by the teacher.	1	No	2	Assistant Superintendent/Other Administrator	2
Single family unit owned by an entity other than the teacher.	2	Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district		Business Manager	3
Multi-family unit owned by an entity other than the teacher.	3	Yes	1	Maintenance Manager	4
Condominium style units owned by the teacher.	4	No	2	Personnel Manager	5
Multi-family units (duplex, zero lot line) owned by the teacher.	5	Teachers who cite housing as contributing reason why they left the school district			
Other (Please List):	6	Yes	1		
School Districts Subsidy Housing		No	2		
Yes	1				
No	2				
Unclear	3				

Low Need School Districts

School District Name	Person Responding	School District Housing Policies	School districts subsidizes rents	Housing Option most favorable to teachers	# teachers	Problems Attracting/retaining teachers due to housing	Housing Availability influence school districts to assign a teacher to a community.	Teacher Attrition (#/year)	Teacher Attrition (%/year)	Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district	Teachers who cite housing as contributing reason why they left the school district	Housing role in teachers decision to depart from the school district	
Aleutians East Borough Schools	3	3	1	1	2	36	2	2	7.2	20%	0	0	2
Aleutian Region Schools	1	3	1	2	3	5	2	2	2	40%	0	0	2
Bristol Bay Borough Schools	2	1	2	1	2	20	2	2	0	0%	2	2	1
Alyeska Central School	3	1	2	1	4	13	2	2	0	0	2	2	2
Chugach Schools	3	3	1	1	2	20	2	2	2	10%	0	0	2
Copper River Schools	3	1	2	1	2	41	2	2	2	5%	0	0	2
Cordova City Schools	3	1	2	1	4	33	2	2	0	0%	0	0	2
Craig City Schools	3	1	2	1		40	2	2	2	5%	0	0	2
Delta/Greely Schools	2	1	2	1		72	2	2		0%	0	0	2
Denali Borough Schools	3	1	2			38	2	2	4	11%	0	0	2
Hoonah City Schools	1	1	2	1		15	2	2	0	0%	0	0	2
Hydaburg City Schools	3	3	1	1		10	2	2		0%	0	0	2
Kake City Schools	1	1	2	2		14	2	2	1	7%	0	0	2
Kashunamiut Schools	3	3	1	1	2	30	2	2	4	13%	0	0	2
Ketchikan Gateway Borough Schools	1	1	2	1		54	2	2	3	6%	0	0	2
Klawock City Schools	1	2	3			17	2	2	0.85	5%	0	0	2
Kodiak Island Borough Schools (rural schools only)	2	3	1	1		204	2	2	40.8	20%	0	0	2
Nenana City Schools	3	1	2	1	3	15	2	2	0	0%	0	0	2
Petersburg City Schools	2	1	2	1	2	50	2	2	1	2%	0	0	2
Sitka Borough Schools	2	1	2	1		115	2	2	9.2	8%	0	0	2

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District Name	Person Responding	School District Housing Distribution	School districts subsidizes	Housing Option most favorable to # teachers	Problems Attracting/retaining teachers due to housing	Housing Availability influence school districts to assign a	Teacher Attrition (#/year)	Teacher Attrition (%/year)	Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district	Teachers who cite housing as contributing reason why they left the	Housing role in teachers decision to depart from		
Skagway City Schools	3	1	2	1	13	2	1	0	0%	0	0	2	
Valdez City Schools	1	1	2	1	5	63	2	2	3.15	5%	0	1	2
Yakutat City Schools	3	1	2	1	2	15	2	2		0%	0	0	2
Alyeska Central School	3	1	2	1	4	13	2	2		0%	0	0	2
Mt. Edgecumbe High School	1	1	2	1	3	17	1	2	0.17	1%	0	0	2
Wrangell City Schools	1	1	2	1		26	2	2	0.26	1%	0	0	2
Pelican City Schools	3	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	0	0%	0	0	2

Moderate Need School Districts

School District Name	Person Reponding to Questionnaire		School District Housing Policies	School districts subsidizes rents	Housing Option most favorable to teachers		# teachers	Problems Attracting/retaining teachers due to housing	Housing Availability influence school districts to assign a teacher to a community.	Teacher Attrition (#/year)	Teacher Attrition (%/year)	Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district	Teachers who cite housing as contributing reason why they left the school district	Housing role in teachers decision to depart from the school district
Alaska Gateway School	1		2	2	2	5	37	1	2	5		0	0	2
Lake and Peninsula Borough Schools	1		2	2	2		52	2	1	10.4	20%	0	0	2
North Slope Borough Schools	2	4	3	1	2		230	2	1	35	15%	1	1	1
Annette Island Schools	1	3	1	2	2	4	34	1	2	7	20%	3	4	1
Nome City Schools	3		1	2	1	3	56	1	2	6	11%	0	0	2
Alaska Gateway School District	1		2	2	2	5	37	1	2	5	14%	0	2	2
Kenai Peninsula Borough Schools (Port Graham, Nanwalek, & Tyonek only)	2	4	3	1	2	3	12	1	1	7.2	60%			1
Dillingham City Schools	1		1	2	2	5	41	1	1	6	15%	0	6	1
Galena City Schools	1		1	2	2	3	35	1	1	6	17%	3	6	1
Haines Borough Schools	1		1	2	1		24	1	1	2.5	10%	0	0	2
Unalaska City Schools	1		1	2	3	1	30	1	2	3	10%	0	0	2

High Need School Districts

School District Name	Person Responding		School District Housing Policies	School districts subsidizes rents	Housing Option most favorable to teachers		# teachers	Problems Attracting/retaining teachers due to housing	Housing Availability influence school districts to assign a teacher to a community.	Teacher Attrition (#/year)	Teacher Attrition (%/year)	Teachers who cite housing as #1 reason why they left the school district	Teachers who cite housing as contributing reason why they left the school district	Housing role in teachers decision to depart from the school district
Bering Strait Schools	3		3	3	3		210	1	1	42	20%	31.5	31.5	1
Chatham Schools	1		3	3	1		20	1	1	5	25%	1	1	1
Iditarod Area Schools	1		2	3	2	3	33	1	1	11.88	36%	3	1	1
Kuspuk Schools	1	3	2	3	2	3	35	1	1	11.55	33%	4	8	1
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	2		3	3	1	2	300	1	1	51	17%		30	1
Lower Yukon Schools	3	4	3	1	3		150	1	1	49.5	33%			1
Northwest Arctic Borough Schools	2		3	1	1	3	180	2	2	63	35%	10	10	1
Southeast Island Schools	3		2	1	1	2	23	1	1	5	22%	0	0	2
Southwest Region Schools	2	3	3	3	2	3	90	1	1	18	20%	0	0	2
Saint Mary's Schools	1		3	1	3		15	1	1	9	60%			1
Tanana Schools	1		2	2	1	2	6	1	1	3	50%	0	1	1
Pribilof Schools	1		3	1	2	3	12	2	2	1.2	10%	0	0	2
Yupit Schools	4		3	1	3		42	1	1	8.4	20%	4.2	4.2	1
Yukon Flats Schools	2	3	2	1	2	3	33	1	2	9	27%	0	0	2
Yukon/Koyukuk Schools	2		3	1	2	3	53	1	1	15	28%	5	10	1

Appendix H: Map for High Teacher Need Category

Appendix I: School/Community Data Sets

School District	School District Teacher Attrition Rate (Self-Reported)	School/Communities	Total Population (self-reported)	K-12 Population (self-reported)	% Change 2000-2003 (DOLWD)	Enrollment %change 1999-2003 (DEED)	# teachers	# of Units available	Ratio of # teachers to available housing
Bering Straights	20.00%	Brevig Mission K-12	314	104	4.00%	4.00%	11	5	0.455
		Diomedea K-12	129	41	-3.80%	-13.00%	6	3	0.500
		Savoonga-Hogarth Kingeekuk K-1 School	704	203	2.80%	-4.04%	19	9	0.474
		Shishmaref K-12	594	200	1.70%	-5.03%	17	9	0.529
		St. Michael- Anthony A. Andrews K-12	413	136	3.50%	6.40%	13	8	0.615
		Stebbins-Tukurngailnguq K-12	570		1.30%	0.51%	19	10	0.526
		Unalakleet K-12	741	196	0.20%	-16.52%	47	35	0.745
Chatham	25.00%	Angoon	600	112	-3.80%	-21.92%	11	10	0.909
		Tenekee Springs	100	13	0.60%	-20.00%	1	1	1.000
		Klakwon	250	40	-6.10%	225.00%	4	1	0.250
		Gustavus	400	44	0.60%	-7.14%	4	1	0.250
Iditarod	36.00%	Anvik	104	24	1.20%	-7.69%	2	1	0.500
		Grayling	194	58	-4.80%	-10.14%	6	4	0.667
		Holy Cross	227	60	-2.50%	-1.85%	6	5	0.833
		Lime Village	50	15	-2.10%	-14.29%	2	1	0.500
		Nikolai	100	19	7.30%	23.08%	2	2	1.000
		Shageluk	129	35	-0.18%	-25.00%	3	2	0.667
		Kuspuk Schools	33.00%	Kalskag	900	160	0.00%	2.70%	12
		Aniak	650	130	-1.20%	-25.00%	9	1	0.111
		Stony River	55	12	-6.70%	-14.52%	2	1	0.500
		Sleetmute	80	13	-10.00%	-15.00%	1	0	0.000
		Crooked Creek	120	50	2.00%	16.28%	4	3	0.750
		Red Devil	30	12	-4.80%	-31.25%	2	1	0.500
		Chuathbaaluk	120	35	-4.70%	-15.28%	3	2	0.667
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	17.00%	Atmautluak	294	74	-1.60%	-16.67%	8	7	0.875
		Chefornak	394	142	3.00%	8.15%	12	7	0.583
		Eek	280	85	1.10%	3.49%	8	5	0.625

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	Teacher Attrition Rate (Self-Reported)	School/Communities	Total Population (self reported)	K-12 Population (self-reported)	% Change 2000-2003 (DOLWD)	Enrollment %change 1999-2003 (DEED)	# teachers	# of Units available	Ratio of # teachers to available housing	
Lower Kuskokwim		Goodnews Bay	230	57	1.90%	-19.72%	7	5	0.714	
		Kasigluk-Akula	243	85		-5.00%	9	5	0.556	
		Kasigluk-Akiuk	300	61		-11.76%	7	7	1.000	
		Kipnuk	644	214	0.20%	14.93%	17.5	7	0.400	
		Kongiganuk	359	112	3.40%	-3.54%	10	8	0.800	
		Kwethluk	713	203	3.40%	-3.54%	17	11	0.647	
		Kwigillingok	338	103	0.50%	-3.77%	9	4	0.444	
		Mekoryuk	210	44	-0.70%	-29.82%	6	4	0.667	
		Napakiak	353	103	2.30%	5.77%	10	6	0.600	
		Napaskiak	390	122	2.20%	5.79%	11.5	8	0.696	
		Newtok	321	108	0.80%	10.89%	10	6	0.600	
		Nightmute	208	67	2.80%	7.94%	7	5	0.714	
		Nunapitchuk	466	151	2.00%	13.67%	13	10	0.769	
		Oscarville	61	20	0.50%	10.53%	2	2	1.000	
		Quinhagak	555	160	1.30%	10.81%	14	7	0.500	
		Toksook Bay	532	182	2.20%	14.53%	16	11	0.688	
		Tuntutuliak	370	110	0.90%	13.27%	11	6	0.545	
		Tununak	325	104	-2.10%	2.58%	10	8	0.800	
	LowerYukon Schls	33.00%	Marshall	349	121	0.90%	26.04%	10	7	0.700
			Russian Mission	296	99	1.40%	-6.60%	10	9	0.900
		Mountain Village	755		-0.20%	5.86%	34	30	0.882	
		Scammon Bay	465	199	0.30%	3.28%	15	7	0.467	
		Hooper Bay	1014	396	2.90%	0.51%	28	18	0.643	
		Alakunuk	652	225	0.70%	12.18%	18	14	0.778	
		Nunam Iqua	250		1.80%		6	6	1.000	
		Emmonak	767	235	-0.20%	-7.17%	18	13	0.722	
		Kotlik	591	196	0.90%	-1.52%	15	10	0.667	
		Pilot Station	550	192	0.80%	-6.34%	15	10	0.667	
		Pitka's Point	125	42	-4.80%	7.69%	4	4	1.000	
35.00%		Buckland	400	155	0.30%	3.90%	15	9	0.600	
		Deering	150	50	-1.20%	11.36%	6	4	0.667	
		Kivalina	300	120	0.90%	-9.84%	13	7	0.538	
		Kobuk	120	55	4.20%	8.57%	6	5	0.833	
	Kotzebue	3500	800	-0.10%	-24.68%	76	76	1.000		

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	Teacher Attrition Rate (Self-Reported)	School/Communities	Total Population (self-reported)	K-12 Population (self-reported)	% Change 2000-2003 (DOLWD)	Enrollment %change 1999-2003 (DEED)	# teachers	# of Units available	Ratio of # teachers to available housing
NW Arctic Bor. Schls.		Selawik			1.90%	-7.30%	24	14	0.583
		Ambler	400	125	-1.80%	-16.49%	13	3	0.231
		Kiana	550	130	1.50%	-21.58%	13	6	0.462
		Noatak	450	140	2.80%	14.81%	14	10	0.714
		Noorvik	700	190	0.70%	-14.81%	20	13	0.650
		Shungnak	250	82	0.90%	-26.32%	10	6	0.600
Southeast Island Schools	21.74%	Thorne Bay	528	90	-4.60%	-19.05%	7	7	1.000
		Hollis	30	20	7.60%	-41.38%	2	2	1.000
		Kasand	40	11	10.50%	-15.38%	1	1	1.000
		Nauketi	50	17	-6.60%	-57.40%	2	2	1.000
		Howard Valentine	75	28	-4.50%	0.00%	2	3	1.500
		Whale Pass	30	11	4.40%	0.00%	1	2	2.000
		Hyder	25	11	-7.10%	0.00%	1	1	1.000
		Port Alexander	30	14	-4.50%	-42.86%	1	1	1.000
		Port Protection	40	18	-3.10%	-31.82%	2	2	1.000
Southwest Region Schools	20.00%	Aleknagik	130	34	1.90%	-7.89%	4	4	1.000
		Manokotak	500	165	0.50%	2.36%	14	9	0.643
		Clarks Point	40	15	-3.90%	-35.00%	2	2	1.000
		New Stuyahok	700	165	1.40%	3.03%	15	11	0.733
		Ekwok	90	26	-0.50%	-38.24%	3	3	1.000
		Togiak	700	219	0.60%	-17.49%	23	13	0.565
		Koliginek	300	61	2.90%	-13.70%	7	7	1.000
		Twin Hills	30	14	2.60%	-12.50%	1	1	1.000
		Portage Creek	20	10	15.90%	11.11%	1	1	1.000
Saint Mary's Schools	60.00%	St. Mary's	500	165	4.80%	16.28%	15	10	0.667
Tanana Schools	50.00%	Tanana	300	60	-1.90%	-32.26%	6	5	0.833
Pribilof Schools	10.00%	St Paul Island	500	105	0.40%	-11.57%	10	8	0.800
		St George	125	20	-0.60%	-51.28%	2	4	2.000
Yupit Schools	20.00%	Akiak	275	87	2.70%	-10.00%	9	11	1.222
		Akiachak	550	175	2.40%	18.71%	15	14	0.933
		Tuluksak	500	135	2.50%	10.22%	15	15	1.000
Yukon Flats Schools	27.27%	Venetie	200	50	-0.50%	13.04%	5	2	0.400
		Arctic Village	225	38	2.70%	-28.00%	4	1	0.250

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	Teacher Attrition Rate (Self-Reported)	School/Communities	Total Population (self-reported)	K-12 Population (self-reported)	% Change 2000-2003 (DOLWD)	Enrollment %change 1999-2003 (DEED)	# teachers	# of Units available	Ratio of # teachers to available housing
		Chalkytsik	100	22	1.10%	31.58%	2	4	2.000
		Beaver	50	14	-7.80%	-46.15%	2	2	1.000
		Central	55	11	-5.20%	-41.18%	1	1	1.000
		Fort Yukon	650	120	-1.10%	-18.06%	12	12	1.000
		Stevens Village	100	17	-0.40%	-11.11%	2	2	1.000
		Circle	150	26	-1.30%	-34.29%	3	3	1.000
Yukon/Koyukuk Schools	28.30%	Allakaket	102	44	1.60%	-10.20%	5	4	0.800
		Hughes	65	15	-5.60%	-6.25%	2	2	1.000
		Huslia	291	71	-0.20%	-14.63%	9	3	0.333
		Kaltag	229	42	-0.10%	-44.00%	5	6	1.200
		Koyukuk	111	1	2.90%	-4.55%	2	1	0.500
		Manley	73	14	0.40%	36.36%	2	1	0.500
		Minto	234	74	-3.00%	-3.85%	8	4	0.500
		Nulato	342	101	0.50%	-21.37%	10	1	0.100
		Ruby	169	48	-3.30%	-27.27%	5	3	0.600

School/Community Specific Data Continued

Data Keys					
SD	School Distric	LG	Local Government	O	Other
PS	Private Sector	T	Teacher		

School District	School/Community	Expressed Housing Need	Average Year Built	Average Age	Average Monthly Rent for the units in the village	Average Condition of units	Per Housing Unit Source of Rent Funds (Frequencies)					Ownership of Homes (Frequencies)						
							SD	PS	LG	T	O	SD	PS	LG	T	O		
Bering Straights	Brevig Mission K-12	6	1965	39	\$949	2.60				5		5						
	Diomedea K-12	4	1987	17	\$1,073	2.00				3		1	2					
	Savoonga-Hogarth K-1 School	12	1973	31	\$909	3.00				8				8				
	Shishmaref K-12	12	1974	30	\$966	2.55				8		4	4					
	St. Michael-Andrews K-12	9	1983	21		2.30				9		3	3	3				
	Stebbins-Tukurngailnguq K-12	10	1977	27		2.60				10		6		4				
	Unalakleet K-12	35	1963	41	\$763	1.94				35		10	5	20				
Chatham	Angoon	7	1950	54	\$500	3.00				10		10						
	Tenekee Springs	2	1930	74	\$550	3.00				1							1	
	Klakwon	3	1980	24	\$550	1.00				1		1						
	Gustavus	1	1940	64	\$600	2.00	1					1						
Iditarod	Anvik	1	1983	21	\$450	2.00				1			1					
	Grayling	6			\$581	1.25				4			4					
	Holy Cross	6	1977	27	\$517	2.00				6		3	3					
	Lime Village	2			\$500	2.00				1		1						
	Nikolai	2			\$600	1.50				2			1	1				
	Shageluk	3			\$500	1.00				3		2					1	

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Community	Expressed Housing Need	Average Year Built	Average Age	Average Monthly Rent	Average Condition of units	Per Housing Unit Source of Rent Funds (Frequencies)					Ownership of Homes (Frequencies)				
							SD	PS	LG	T	O	SD	PS	LG	T	O
Kuspuk Schools	Kalskag	6	2000	4	\$750	1.30				3	3					
	Aniak	10	1965	39	\$800	1.00				1	1					
	Stony River	2			\$300					1		1				
	Sleetmute	2			\$900	1.00				2		2				
	Crooked Creek	4	2002	2	\$750	1.00				3	3					
	Red Devil	2	1980	24	\$700	2.00				1	1					
	Chuathbaaluk	3			\$1,000	2.00				1		1				
Lower Kuskokwim	Atmautluak	8	1979	25	\$768	1.00				8	8					
	Chefornak	12	1973	31	\$528	1.86				7	6	1				
	Eek	8	1976	28	\$705	1.60				5		5				
	Goodnews Bay	7	1985	19	\$625	1.40				5	5					
	Kasigluk-Akula	9	1994	10	\$764	1.40				5	3	2				
	Kasigluk-Akiuk	7	1964	40	\$674	2.28				7	5	2				
	Kipnuk	18	1978	26	\$761	1.00				7	6	1				
	Kongiganuk	10	1986	18	\$512	1.50				8	8					
	Kwethluk	17	1961	43	\$800	2.09				11	11					
	Kwigillingok	9	1986	18	\$688	1.75				4	4					
	Mekoryuk	6	1978	26	\$785	1.00				4	4					
	Napakiak	10	1980	24	\$846	2.67				6	6					
	Napaskiak	12	1970	34	\$539	1.50				8	2	6				
	Newtok	10	1989	15	\$629	2.17				5	6					
	Nightmute	7	1997	7	\$669	1.40				5	3	2				
	Nunapitchuk	13	1970	34	\$768	1.40				10	10					
	Oscarville	2	1962	42	\$796	2.00				2	2					
Quinhagak	14	1980	24	\$780	1.43				7	7						
Toksook Bay	16	1981	23	\$787	1.27				11	6	4	1				
Tuntutuliak	11	1987	17	\$706	2.17				6	6						
Tununak	10	1970	34	\$734	1.13				8	8						
Lower Yukon	Marshall	10	1984	20	\$475	1.86				7	7					
	Russian Mission	10	1991	13	\$499	1.39				9	9					
	Mountain Village	34.000	1979	25	\$512	1.88				30	30					

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Community	Expressed Housing Need	Average Year Built	Average Age	Average Monthly Rent for the	Average Condition of units	SD	PS	LG	T	O	SD	PS	LG	T	O
	Scammon Bay	15	1976	28	\$510	2.14				7	7					
	Hooper Bay	28	1964	40	\$472	2.42				18	18					
	Alakunuk	14	1982	22	\$493	2.36				14	14					
	Nunam Iqua	6	1965	39	\$509	3.00				6	6					
	Emmonak	18	1968	36	\$491	2.23				13	13					
	Kotlik	15	1965	39	\$468	1.90				10	10					
	Pilot Station	15	1991	13	\$506	1.50				10	10					
	Pitka's Point	5	1978	26	\$418	2.00				6	6					
Northwest Arctic Borough	Buckland	13	1995	9	\$625	1.11				9	9					
	Deering	6	1998	6	\$550	1.00				4	2	2				
	Kivalina	10			\$750	2.00										
	Kobuk	6	1998	6	\$650	1.00				5	3	2				
	Kotzebue	76			\$1,150	1.00										
	Selawik	22	1975	29	\$650	1.00				14	11		3			
	Ambler	6			\$625	1.00				3	1	2				
	Kiana	8	1965	39	\$650	1.00				6	5	1				
	Noatak	10	1965	39	\$650	1.00				12	10				2	
	Noorvik	13	1970	34	\$650	1.00				13	13					
	Shungnak	6	1967	37	\$650	1.00				6	6					
Southeast Island	Thorne Bay	10	1978	26	\$314	2.14				7	7					
	Hollis	2	1985	19	\$250	1.00				2	2					
	Kasand	1	1970	34	\$250	3.00				1	1					
	Nauketi	2	1970	34	\$250	3.00				2	2					
	Howard Valentine	2	1974	30	\$275	2.33				3	3					
	Whale Pass	1	1970	34	\$250	3.00				2	2					
	Hyder	1								1	1					
	Port Alexander	1				1.00				1					1	
	Port Protection	2			\$600	1.00				2		2				
Southwest Region	Aleknagik	4	1975	29	\$862	2.00				4	4					
	Manokotak	12	1974	30	\$694	3.00				9	9					
	Clarks Point	2	1982	22	\$895	3.00				2	2					

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Community	Expressed Housing Need	Average Year Built	Average Age	Average Monthly Rent	Average Condition of units	SD	PS	LG	T	O	SD	PS	LG	T	O	
Southwest Region	New Stuyahok	15	1974	30	\$750	2.27				11		11					
	Ekwok	3	1959	45	\$977	3.00				3		3					
	Togiak	20	1978	26	\$668	2.53				13		13					
	Koliginek	6	1984	20	\$704	2.29				7		7					
	Twin Hills	1	1981	23	\$645	2.00				1		1					
	Portage Creek	1	1985	19	\$635	1.00				1		1					
Saint Mary's Schools	St. Mary's	14	1983	21	\$350	1.70				11		11					
Tanana Schools	Tanana	5	1979	25	\$356	3.00				5		5					
Pribilof Schools	St Paul Island	10	1985	19	\$600	3.00				8		8					
	St George	2	1985	19	\$600	2.50				4		4					
Yupit Schools	Akiak	12	1981	23	\$645	2.00				11		4		7			
	Akiachak	17	1971	33	\$715	2.17				14		9		5			
	Tuluksak	17	1979	25	\$645	2.31				16		16					
Yukon Flats Schools	Venetie	5	1965	39	\$600	1.80				2						2	
	Arctic Village	3	1959	45	\$600	1.00				4		1	3				
	Chalkytsik	2	1961	43	\$600	1.00				2	2	4					
	Beaver	0	n/a		n/a	n/a				2			2				
	Central	0	n/a		n/a	n/a				1			1				
	Fort Yukon	12	n/a		n/a	2.00											
	Stevens Village	2	1978	26	\$562	2.00				2						2	
	Circle	3	1962	42	\$600	1.00				3		1	2				
Yukon/Koyukuk Schools	Allakaket	5	1983	21	\$475	1.00				4		4					
	Hughes	2	1975	29	\$950	3.00				2		2					
	Huslia	8	1988	16	\$466	1.66				3		3					
	Kaltag	5	1975	29	\$491	2.33				6		6					
	Koyukuk	2	1980	24	\$500	2.00				1		1					
	Manley	2	1980	24	\$500	2.00				1		1					
	Minto	8	1985	19	\$525	2.00				5		5					
	Nulato	10	2000	4	\$450	1.00				1		1					
	Ruby	5	1997	7	\$466	1.33				3		3					

Appendix J: Community Score and Prioritization- High Need Category

Ranked in Order of Highest to Lowest need

#	Community	Enrollment Trend			Ratio of teachers to available housing			to Condition of Homes			Teacher Attrition			Score Total
		Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	
1	Brevig Mission K-12	4	0.1	0.4	4	0.5	2	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	4.1
2	Savoonga-Hogarh Kingeekuk K-1 School	3	0.1	0.3	4	0.5	2	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	4
3	Gustavus	3	0.1	0.3	5	0.5	2.5	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	4
4	Kalskag	4	0.1	0.4	5	0.5	2.5	2	0.3	0.6	5.00	0.10	0.5	4
5	Scammon Bay	4	0.1	0.4	4	0.5	2	4	0.3	1.2	4.00	0.10	0.4	4
6	Anvik	3	0.1	0.3	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.7
7	Manley	5	0.1	0.5	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.7
8	Stebbins-Tukurngailnguq K-12	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.6
9	Klakwon	5	0.1	0.5	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.6
10	Lime Village	2	0.1	0.2	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.6
11	Manokotak	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.6
12	Huslia	2	0.1	0.2	5	0.5	2.5	2	0.3	0.6	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.6
13	Shishmaref K-12	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.5
14	Sleetmute	2	0.1	0.2	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.5
15	Red Devil	1	0.1	0.1	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.5
16	Napakiak	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	5	0.3	1.5	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.5
17	Hooper Bay	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	4	0.3	1.2	4.00	0.10	0.4	3.5
18	Ambler	2	0.1	0.2	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.5
19	Koyukuk	3	0.1	0.3	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.5
20	Minto	3	0.1	0.3	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.5

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

#	Community	Enrollment Trend			Ratio of teachers to available housing			Condition of Homes			Teacher Attrition			Score Total
		Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	
21	Togiak	2	0.1	0.2	3	0.5	1.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.4
22	Aniak	1	0.1	0.1	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.4
23	Kipnuk	5	0.1	0.5	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.4
24	Venetie	5	0.1	0.5	4	0.5	2	2	0.3	0.6	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.4
25	Diomedea K-12	2	0.1	0.2	4	0.5	2	3	0.3	0.9	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.3
26	St. Michael- Anthony Andrews K-12 A.	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	4	0.3	1.2	2.00	0.10	0.2	3.3
27	Tuntutuliak	5	0.1	0.5	3	0.5	1.5	4	0.3	1.2	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.3
28	Quinhagak	5	0.1	0.5	4	0.5	2	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.2
29	Kivalina	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.2
30	Arctic Village	1	0.1	0.1	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.2
31	Nulato	1	0.1	0.1	5	0.5	2.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	3.2
32	Newtok	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	4	0.3	1.2	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.2
33	Chuathbaaluk	2	0.1	0.2	3	0.5	1.5	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.1
34	Alakunuk	5	0.1	0.5	2	0.5	1	4	0.3	1.2	4.00	0.10	0.4	3.1
35	Tanana	1	0.1	0.1	2	0.5	1	5	0.3	1.5	5.00	0.10	0.5	3.1
36	Kwethluk	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	4	0.3	1.2	1.00	0.10	0.1	3.1
37	Kwigillingok	3	0.1	0.3	4	0.5	2	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	3
38	Buckland	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	5.00	0.10	0.5	3
39	St. Mary's	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	5.00	0.10	0.5	3
40	Emmonak	3	0.1	0.3	2	0.5	1	4	0.3	1.2	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.9
41	Angoon	1	0.1	0.1	2	0.5	1	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.9
42	Kiana	1	0.1	0.1	4	0.5	2	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.9
43	Grayling	2	0.1	0.2	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.8
44	St Paul Island	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	5	0.3	1.5	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.8
45	Nunam Iqua	4	0.1	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.8
46	Kotlik	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.8
47	Pilot Station	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.8
48	Deering	5	0.1	0.5	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.8
49	New Stuyahok	4	0.1	0.4	2	0.5	1	4	0.3	1.2	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.8
50	Holy Cross	3	0.1	0.3	2	0.5	1	3	0.3	0.9	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.7

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

#	Community	Enrollment Trend			Ratio of teachers to available housing			Condition of Homes			Teacher Attrition			
		Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	#	Community	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	#
51	Stony River	2	0.1	0.2	4	0.5	2		0.3	0	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.7
52	Toksook Bay	5	0.1	0.5	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.7
53	Whale Pass	4	0.1	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.7
54	Chefornak	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.6
55	Eek	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.6
56	Napaskiak	4	0.1	0.4	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.6
57	Akiachak	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	4	0.3	1.2	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.6
58	Selawik	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.6
59	Hughes	3	0.1	0.3	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.6
60	Tenekee Springs	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.5
61	Kasigluk-Akiuk	3	0.1	0.3	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.5
62	Marshall	5	0.1	0.5	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.5
63	Noorvik	2	0.1	0.2	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.5
64	Kasand	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.5
65	Ruby	1	0.1	0.1	3	0.5	1.5	2	0.3	0.6	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.5
66	Shageluk	1	0.1	0.1	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.4
67	Mountain Village	4	0.1	0.4	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.4
68	Shungnak	1	0.1	0.1	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.4
69	Nauketi	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.4
70	Howard Valentine	4	0.1	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.4
71	Tuluksak	5	0.1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.4
72	Clarks Point	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.3
73	Ekwok	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	5	0.3	1.5	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.3
74	Crooked Creek	5	0.1	0.5	2	0.5	1	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.3
75	Russian Mission	3	0.1	0.3	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.3
76	Noatak	5	0.1	0.5	2	0.5	1	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.3
77	Nunapitchuk	5	0.1	0.5	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.2
78	Kobuk	4	0.1	0.4	2	0.5	1	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.2
79	Thorne Bay	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.2
80	Koliginek	3	0.1	0.3	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	2.00	0.10	0.2	2.2
81	Pitka's Point	4	0.1	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	4.00	0.10	0.4	2.2
82	Nikolai	5	0.1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	2	0.3	0.6	5.00	0.10	0.5	2.1

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

#	Community	Enrollment Trend			Teacher Attrition			Condition of Homes			Teacher Attrition			#
		Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	#	Community	Score	Weight	Sub-Total	Score	Weight	
83	Nightmute	4	0.1	0.4	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2.1
84	Kaltag	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	3.00	0.10	0.3	2.1
85	Unalakleet K-12	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	2.00	0.10	0.2	2
86	Kasigluk-Akula	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	1.00	0.10	0.1	2
87	Kongiganuk	3	0.1	0.3	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	2
88	Mekoryuk	1	0.1	0.1	3	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	0.3	1.00	0.10	0.1	2
89	Oscarville	5	0.1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	1.00	0.10	0.1	2
90	St George	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	4	0.3	1.2	1.00	0.10	0.1	1.9
91	Goodnews Bay	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	1.9
92	Aleknagik	3	0.1	0.3	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	2.00	0.10	0.2	1.9
93	Fort Yukon	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.9
94	Stevens Village	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.9
95	Allakaket	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.8
96	Twin Hills	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	2.00	0.10	0.2	1.8
97	Akiak	2	0.1	0.2	1	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.9	2.00	0.10	0.2	1.8
98	Chalkytsik	5	0.1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.6
99	Atmautluak	2	0.1	0.2	2	0.5	1	1	0.3	0.3	1.00	0.10	0.1	1.6
100	Hyder	4	0.1	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.5
101	Portage Creek	5	0.1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	2.00	0.10	0.2	1.5
102	Kotzebue	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	5.00	0.10	0.5	1.4
103	Hollis	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.2
104	Port Alexander	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.2
105	Port Protection	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.2
106	Circle	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3	3.00	0.10	0.3	1.2
107	Tununak	4	0.1	0.4		0.5	0	2	0.3	0.6	1.00	0.10	0.1	1.1
108	Beaver	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.3	0	3.00	0.10	0.3	0.9
109	Central	1	0.1	0.1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.3	0	3.00	0.10	0.3	0.9

Appendix K: Cost Estimate- Retrofit by Community

School District	School/Communities	# of Units-minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate-Minor Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair High	Total Estimated Costs for Retrofit
Bering Straights	Brevig Mission K-12	0		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Diomedea K-12	0		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Savoonga-Hogarth Kingeekuk K-1 School	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Shishmaref K-12	0		0	0	20,600	0	4	27,600	110,400	110,400
	St. Michael-Anthony A. Andrews K-12	0		0	0	20,600	0	5	27,600	138,000	138,000
	Stebbins-Tukurngailnguq K-12	0		0	0	20,600	0	4	27,600	110,400	110,400
	Unalakleet K-12	3		0	5	20,600	103,000	26	27,600	717,600	820,600
Chatham	Angoon	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Tenekee Springs	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Klakwon	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Gustavus	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
Iditarod	Anvik	0		0	1	20,600	20,600	0	27,600	0	20,600
	Grayling	3		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Holy Cross	0		0	3	20,600	61,800	2	27,600	55,200	117,000
	Lime Village	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Nikolai	1		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Shageluk	2		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Kuspuk Schools	Kalskag	2		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Aniak	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units-minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate-Minor Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair High	Total Estimated Costs for Retrofit
	Stony River	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Sleetmute			0		20,600	0		27,600	0	0
	Crooked Creek	3		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Red Devil	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Chuathbaaluk	2		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Lower Kuskokwim	Atmatluak	7		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Chefornak	1		0	0	20,600	0	6	27,600	165,600	165,600
	Eek	2		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Goodnews Bay	3		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Kasigluk-Akula	3		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Kasigluk-Akiuk	0		0	0	20,600	0	5	27,600	138,000	138,000
	Kipnuk	7		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Kongiganuk	5		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Kwethluk	2		0	0	20,600	0	6	27,600	165,600	165,600
	Kwigillingok	1		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Mekoryuk	4		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Napakiak	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Napaskiak	4		0	0	20,600	0	4	27,600	110,400	110,400
	Newtok	0		0	0	20,600	0	5	27,600	138,000	138,000
	Nightmute	4		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Nunapitchuk	7		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Oscarville	0		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Quinhagak	5		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Toksook Bay	8		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Tuntutuliak	2		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Tununak	7		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
Lower Yukon	Marshall	2		0	3	20,600	61,800	1	27,600	27,600	89,400
	Russian Mission	2		0	7	20,600	144,200	0	27,600	0	144,200

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units-minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate-Minor Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair High	Total Estimated Costs for Retrofit
	Mountain Village	1		0	20	20,600	412,000	0	27,600	0	412,000
	Scammon Bay	0		0	4	20,600	82,400	0	27,600	0	82,400
	Hooper Bay	0		0	5	20,600	103,000	3	27,600	82,800	185,800
	Alakunuk	0		0	6	20,600	123,600	0	27,600	0	123,600
	Nunam Iqua	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Emmonak	0		0	4	20,600	82,400	4	27,600	110,400	192,800
	Kotlik	2		0	0	20,600	0	7	27,600	193,200	193,200
	Pilot Station	7		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Pitka's Point	0		0	0	20,600	0	5	27,600	138,000	138,000
Northwest Arctic Borough Schools	Buckland	8		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Deering	4		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Kivalina	7		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Kobuk	5		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Kotzebue	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Selawik	14		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Ambler	3		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Kiana	6		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Noatak	12		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Noorvik	13		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Shungnak	6		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Southeast Island Schools	Thorne Bay	3		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Hollis	0		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Kasand			0		20,600	0		27,600	0	0
	Nauketi	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Howard Valentine	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Whale Pass	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Hyder	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units-minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate-Minor Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair High	Total Estimated Costs for Retrofit
	Port Alexander	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Port Protection	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Southwest Region Schools	Aleknagik	2		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Manokotak	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Clarks Point	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	New Stuyahok	0		0	0	20,600	0	8	27,600	220,800	220,800
	Ekwok	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Togiak	2		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Koliginek	0		0	0	20,600	0	5	27,600	138,000	138,000
	Twin Hills	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Portage Creek	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Saint Mary's Schools	St. Mary's	4		0	5	20,600	103,000	0	27,600	0	103,000
Tanana Schools	Tanana	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Pribilof Schools	St Paul Island	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	St George	0		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
Yupit Schools	Akiak	3		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Akiachak	3		0	1	20,600	20,600	4	27,600	110,400	131,000
	Tuluksak	4		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
Yukon Flats Schools	Venetie	2		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Arctic Village	1		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Chalkytsik	4		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Beaver	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Central	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Fort Yukon	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Stevens Village	2		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units-minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate-Minor Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair	# of Units-Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)	Cost Estimate-Major Repair High	Total Estimated Costs for Retrofit
	Circle	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
Yukon/Koyukuk Schools	Allakaket	1		0	0	20,600	0	3	27,600	82,800	82,800
	Hughes	0		0	0	20,600	0	0	27,600	0	0
	Huslia	1		0	0	20,600	0	2	27,600	55,200	55,200
	Kaltag	0		0	0	20,600	0	4	27,600	110,400	110,400
	Koyukuk	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Manley	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Minto	1		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Nulato	0		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Ruby	2		0	0	20,600	0	1	27,600	27,600	27,600
	Total	220		\$0	64		\$1,318,400	166		\$4,581,600	5,900,000

Appendix L: Cost Estimate New Construction

The following estimate assumes that all units identified to be replaced are replaced. For calculation purposes, the TDC for a 2 bedroom construction was used in all cases. Actual construction depends upon school needs.

School District	School/Communities	# of teachers	# of Units available	# of Units to be Replaced	Total Available Units	Expressed Housing Need	# of units needed	Unit Cost- (2 Bedroom AHFC NOFA)	Total Cost- Construction
Bering Straights	Brevig Mission K-12	11	5	3	2	6	4	194,292	777,168
	Diomedea K-12	6	3	0	3	4	1	194,292	194,292
	Savoonga-Hogarth Kingeekuk K-1 School	19	9	9	0	12	12	194,292	2,331,504
	Shishmaref K-12	17	9	5	4	12	8	194,292	1,554,336
	St. Michael- Anthony A. Andrews K-12	13	8	3	5	9	4	194,292	777,168
	Stebbins-Tukurngailnguq K-12	19	10	6	4	10	6	194,292	1,165,752
	Unalakleet K-12	47	35	1	34	35	1	194,292	194,292
Chatham	Angoon	11	10	10	0	7	7	194,292	1,360,044
	Tenekee Springs	1	1	1	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
	Klakwon	4	1	0	1	3	2	194,292	388,584
	Gustavus	4	1	0	1	1	0	194,292	0
Iditarod	Anvik	2	1	0	1	1	0	194,292	0
	Grayling	6	4	0	4	6	2	194,292	388,584
	Holy Cross	6	5	0	5	6	1	194,292	194,292
	Lime Village	2	1	0	1	2	1	194,292	194,292
	Nikolai	2	2	0	2	2	0	194,292	0
	Shageluk	3	2	0	2	3	1	194,292	194,292
Kuspuk Schools	Kalskag	12	3	0	3	6	3	194,292	582,876
	Aniak	9	1	0	1	10	9	194,292	1,748,628
	Stony River	2	1	1	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
	Sleetmute	1	0		0	2	2	194,292	388,584

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units- minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate- Minor Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate- Major Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)
	Crooked Creek	4	3	0	3	4	1	194,292	194,292
	Red Devil	2	1	0	1	2	1	194,292	194,292
	Chuathbaaluk	3	2	0	2	3	1	194,292	194,292
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Atmautluak	8	7	0	7	8	1	194,292	194,292
	Chefornak	12	7	0	7	12	5	194,292	971,460
	Eek	8	5	0	5	8	3	194,292	582,876
	Goodnews Bay	7	5	0	5	7	2	194,292	388,584
	Kasigluk-Akula	9	5	0	5	9	4	194,292	777,168
	Kasigluk-Akiuk	7	7	2	5	7	2	194,292	388,584
	Kipnuk	18	7	0	7	18	11	194,292	2,137,212
	Kongiganuk	10	8	1	7	10	3	194,292	582,876
	Kwethluk	17	11	3	8	17	9	194,292	1,748,628
	Kwigillingok	9	4	0	4	9	5	194,292	971,460
	Mekoryuk	6	4	0	4	6	2	194,292	388,584
	Napakiak	10	6	5	1	10	9	194,292	1,748,628
	Napaskiak	12	8	0	8	12	4	194,292	777,168
	Newtok	10	6	1	5	10	5	194,292	971,460
	Nightmute	7	5	1	4	7	3	194,292	582,876
	Nunapitchuk	13	10	1	9	13	4	194,292	777,168
	Oscarville	2	2	0	2	2	0	194,292	0
	Quinhagak	14	7	1	6	14	8	194,292	1,554,336
	Toksook Bay	16	11	0	11	16	5	194,292	971,460
	Tuntutuliak	11	6	3	3	11	8	194,292	1,554,336
	Tununak	10	8	0	8	10	2	194,292	388,584
Lower Yukon Schools	Marshall	10	7	1	6	10	4	194,292	777,168
	Russian Mission	10	9	0	9	10	1	194,292	194,292
	Mountain Village	34	30	9	21	34	13	194,292	2,525,796
	Scammon Bay	15	7	3	4	15	11	194,292	2,137,212
	Hooper Bay	28	18	10	8	28	20	194,292	3,885,840
	Alakunuk	18	14	8	6	14	8	194,292	1,554,336
	Nunam Iqua	6	6	6	0	6	6	194,292	1,165,752
	Emmonak	18	13	5	8	18	10	194,292	1,942,920

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units- minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate- Minor Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate- Major Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)
	Kotlik	15	10	1	9	15	6	194,292	1,165,752
	Pilot Station	15	10	2	8	15	7	194,292	1,360,044
	Pitka's Point	4	5	0	5	4	-1	194,292	-194,292
Northwest Arctic Borough Schools	Buckland	15	9	0	9	13	4	194,292	777,168
	Deering	6	4	0	4	6	2	194,292	388,584
	Kivalina	13	7	0	7	10	3	194,292	582,876
	Kobuk	6	5	0	5	6	1	194,292	194,292
	Kotzebue	76		0	0	76	76	194,292	14,766,192
	Selawik	24	14	0	14	22	8	194,292	1,554,336
	Ambler	13	3	0	3	6	3	194,292	582,876
	Kiana	13	6	0	6	8	2	194,292	388,584
	Noatak	14	12	0	12	10	-2	194,292	-388,584
	Noorvik	20	13	0	13	13	0	194,292	0
	Shungnak	10	6	0	6	6	0	194,292	0
Southeast Island Schools	Thorne Bay	7	7	4	3	10	7	194,292	1,360,044
	Hollis	2	2	0	2	2	0	194,292	0
	Kasand	1	1	1	0	1	1	194,292	194,292
	Nauketi	2	2	2	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
	Howard Valentine	2	3	2	1	2	1	194,292	194,292
	Whale Pass	1	2	2	0	1	1	194,292	194,292
	Hyder	1	0	0	0	1	1	194,292	194,292
	Port Alexander	1	0	0	0	1	1	194,292	194,292
	Port Protection	2	0	0	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
Southwest Region Schools	Aleknagik	4	4	2	2	4	2	194,292	388,584
	Manokotak	14	9	9	0	12	12	194,292	2,331,504
	Clarks Point	2	2	2	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
	New Stuyahok	15	11	3	8	15	7	194,292	1,360,044
	Ekwok	3	3	3	0	3	3	194,292	582,876
	Togiak	23	13	9	4	20	16	194,292	3,108,672
	Koliginek	7	7	2	5	6	1	194,292	194,292

Evaluate, Quantify, and Prioritize the Need for Teacher Housing in Rural Alaska

School District	School/Communities	# of Units- minor repair	Unit Cost Minor Repair	Cost Estimate- Minor Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (no foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (Low)	Cost Estimate- Major Repair	# of Units- Major Repair (Foundation work)	Unit Cost Major Repair (High)
	Twin Hills	1	1	0	1	1	0	194,292	
	Portage Creek	1	1	0	1	1	0	194,292	0
Saint Mary's Schools	St. Mary's	15	10	1	9	14	5	194,292	971,460
Tanana Schools	Tanana	6	5	5	0	5	5	194,292	971,460
Pribilof Schools	St Paul Island	10	8	8	0	10	10	194,292	1,942,920
	St George	2	4	2	2	2	0	194,292	
Yupit Schools	Akiak	9	11	5	6	12	6	194,292	1,165,752
	Akiachak	15	14	6	8	17	9	194,292	1,748,628
	Tuluksak	15	16	9	7	17	10	194,292	1,942,920
Yukon Flats Schools	Venetie	5	2	0	2	5	3	194,292	582,876
	Arctic Village	4	1	0	1	3	2	194,292	388,584
	Chalkytsik	2	4	0	4	2	-2	194,292	
	Beaver	2	0	0	0	0	0	194,292	
	Central	1	0	0	0	0	0	194,292	
	Fort Yukon	12	0	0	0	12	12	194,292	2,331,504
	Stevens Village	2	2	0	2	2	0	194,292	0
	Circle	3	0	0	0	3	3	194,292	582,876
Yukon/Koyuk Schools	Allakaket	5	4	0	4	5	1	194,292	194,292
	Hughes	2	2	2	0	2	2	194,292	388,584
	Huslia	9	3	0	3	8	5	194,292	971,460
	Kaltag	5	6	2	4	5	1	194,292	
	Koyukuk	2	1	0	1	2	1	194,292	194,292
	Manley	2	1	0	1	2	1	194,292	194,292
	Minto	8	4	2	2	8	6	194,292	1,165,752
	Nulato	10	1	0	1	10	9	194,292	1,748,628
	Ruby	5	3	0	3	5	2	194,292	388,584
	Total	1,044	635	185	450	948	498		\$96,951,708