MEMO TO: **BOARD MEMBERS;**
DR. JOHN SIMPSON

FROM: **BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)**

DATE: **DECEMBER 21, 2018**

RE: **BAC RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORT ON FACILITIES MATTERS**

Purpose of Report

During the past year, the Building Advisory Committee (BAC) has been actively engaged in the evaluation of facilities needs in the Webster Groves School District. This evaluation initially began with initiating a comprehensive Facilities Condition Assessment of existing district infrastructure (buildings and improvements). It subsequently evolved into a broader view of district-wide space, security, accessibility, health/safety and programmatic needs. This BAC report to the Board of Education and Webster Groves School District community is based on the information, observations and priorities established during the committee's work. It should not be viewed as a wish list of grand improvements to take the district to the next level but instead, as a roadmap to maintain safe, accessible and functional buildings to support quality instruction into the foreseeable future. As such, this report considers both existing/current district needs as well as anticipated future needs related to the continued aging of district infrastructure, projected enrollment growth and improvements/enhancements that are needed to provide a safe and educationally supportive physical environment for district staff and students in the coming years.

Purpose of the BAC

The BAC is one of Webster Groves School District's (District) standing Board committees. As such, its meetings are open to the public and are conducted with the same amount of formality (posting of meeting notices and minutes taken) as regular Board of Education meetings. It meets about 8 times yearly and its basic charge is to:

- Review/monitor district facility issues and needs;
- Advise the district on major facilities/building projects; and
- Make long-range facilities related recommendations to district and the Board.

BAC Membership

The BAC consists of 11 community members, a building administrator, the Director of Facilities, the Construction Manager, the COO/CFO and a Board liaison. Committee

members have a diverse background of education and experience in facilities construction/management and are asked to serve for at least a 3-year term.

Current members of the BAC are:

Bruce Wood	Chris Piazza	Chuck Mittler	Cyndi Demick
Jim Cibulka	Mark Arens	Monica Conners	Randy Curtis
Sean Eickoff	Darren Wilhite	Stephen Myers	John E. Thomas
Matt Palmer	Rob Steuber	Bruce Ellerman	Steve Loher
Arnold Stricker			

Background/Needs Assessment

Repairs and Maintenance of Existing Infrastructure

The BAC began work on the current report over a year ago with the issuance of an RFP for a comprehensive condition assessment of district buildings and improvements. This assessment was completed in April 2018 and included the identification and cataloguing of all major building systems/components and site improvements, the current condition and expected remaining useful life of each, an estimated cost of repair/replacement and a projected date such repairs/replacements would be needed on a year-by-year basis for the next 10 years. The district was advised to expect a total of about $51 million would be during this period just to keep existing infrastructure in good functional condition. Fortunately, district buildings are currently in good condition overall, so a large majority of projected need was back-loaded in years 5-10. In addition, a substantial portion of identified need was related to projects for which the timing and extent of repair/replacement was flexible such as sprinkler systems, parking lot resurfacing, window/door/flooring replacement and the like. At any rate, there were no significant immediate needs identified requiring attention in the next 3-4 years. Consequently, district resources can be available for other pressing district needs.

A copy of the 10 year Facilities Condition Assessment report is attached for reference as Addendum 1 Facilities Condition Assessment.

Improvements to Existing Infrastructure

The BAC considered needs for improvements to district facilities in a number of areas:

- Safety/Security
- Accessibility
- Abatement
- Programmatic

A number of the needs in these areas had previously been identified through the prior work of district staff. These needs were then supplemented by additional needs assessment work—particularly in the areas of safety/security and programmatic.

Safety/Security

The district developed a "Top Ten" list of potential physical improvements that would enhance safety/security in the school buildings (see Addendum 2 Safety and Security Top Ten). This list was developed using principal input, best practices and guidance from law enforcement. In fact, district administration met with local law enforcement representatives for input and a joint district/police safety walk-through of each school campus was conducted. This input also included suggestions from the community at open forum meetings held at each school and from community on-line surveys. The highest priority elements of this work was then incorporated into a comprehensive list of existing infrastructure needs in all areas for further consideration.

Accessibility

The district had previously contracted with a local architect, Jim Riddle, to identify what improvements were needed at each school building to make it fully accessible. The resulting report, as updated in November 2016 (see Addendum 3 Accessibility Report), compiled a list of about $6.4 million in recommended accessibility improvements. This list was then further revised by the district's Construction Manager to reflect completed work to date since the November 2016 update. This input also included suggestions from the community at open forum meetings held at each school and from community on-line surveys. The highest priority elements of this updated report was then incorporated into a comprehensive list of existing infrastructure needs in all areas for further consideration.

Abatement

The district is required by law to maintain a written Asbestos Management Plan identifying the location, type and condition of all asbestos-containing materials in the buildings. This Plan is maintained by and in the Facilities Department and is consulted whenever invasive work is being planned that might cause a disturbance. Most asbestos in the district is in floor tile, adhesives, insulation, mastic and other construction materials that are not easily accessible by students, staff or member of the general public. In addition, the district has been systematically removing asbestos-containing materials as regular construction, repair and renovation work is done in those areas. After reviewing the existing Plan, the Facilities Director reported the remaining highest priority abatement needs to the BAC. These priorities were then incorporated into a comprehensive list of existing infrastructure needs in all areas for further consideration.

Programmatic

Over the past summer, the district COO/CFO met with each building principal to review school space utilization and identify how the physical aspect of buildings/site improvements was or was not meeting student, staff and existing school program needs (see Addendum 4 Programmatic Needs). The important part of this evaluation was its focus on existing needs and not on potential new programs or "wants". The purpose was to address current students, current programs and current needs in order to be consistent with other district facility areas of need and in recognition of the district's limited resources. The elements of work identified through this process was then incorporated into a comprehensive list of existing infrastructure needs in all areas for further consideration.

Enrollment/Space

District enrollment, particularly at the elementary school level, has been gradually increasing for the past several years and is expected to continue this trend for at least the next five years. This growth has not occurred evenly throughout the district nor is it expected to be evenly distributed going forward. As a result, some schools have exceeded their desired enrollment capacity and are expected to approach or even exceed their maximum capacity by 2022-23. In contrast, other schools have remained at or below their desired enrollment capacity. In response to past enrollment growth, the district has added modular classrooms where needed—specifically at Edgar Road (4 classrooms), Clark (2 classrooms) and Avery (2 classrooms). An additional 2 modular classrooms may also be needed at Edgar Road next year (2019/20) based on projected enrollment. Enrollment growth has also required reconfigurations of limited space at some schools, resulting in smaller than ideal cafeterias, art rooms, music rooms, and other non-core classroom space. It has also detracted from office space and teacher workroom space in some instances.

In order to catch up with the space pressure created by the past years of elementary enrollment growth, as well as to get ahead of projected future growth, the district engaged the services of Collaborative Strategies to assist the district in developing enrollment space options. These options included a combination of new space and boundary adjustments to rebalance elementary enrollments. Based on a process including building capacities, current/future enrollment, socio-economic factors, community input and other data, several potential options were identified. These options were subsequently narrowed to two specific options:

- OPTION A – New additions at Edgar Road (8 classrooms), Clark (6 classrooms) and addressing space needs at Avery. Relatively minor elementary attendance boundary adjustments would be made to rebalance enrollments. The estimated cost of these additions is $8.5 million. Project completion could be accomplished by 2020/21.
- OPTION B – New building additions at Hixson to include classrooms (16), library expansion, multi-purpose room, cafeteria expansion, nurse's office expansion and other renovations in order to relocate sixth grade from Steger to Hixson. Steger would then be converted to a K-5 neighborhood elementary school. Significant elementary attendance boundary adjustments would be required to create a new

attendance area for Steger. The estimated cost of these additions/renovations is $16 million. Project completion could be accomplished by 2021/22.

After a phase-in period, both options would eliminate the existing modular classroom buildings at Edgar Road, Clark and Avery. However, Option A would eliminate the modular classrooms earlier while Option B would see them phased out over a longer period of transition due to the more extensive degree of phase-in that option would require. Furthermore, the addition of a third modular building at Edgar Road would not be needed under Option A because of the more immediate space relief that option provides to Edgar Road.

Costing

Estimated cost information for the various infrastructure projects and space options was derived from a variety of sources. For repairs and renovations to existing infrastructure, projected cost information was available from the facilities condition assessment document in Addendum 1 Facilities Condition Assessment. For improvements to existing infrastructure, projected cost information was developed by the Facilities Department for safety/security, abatement and programmatic needs and was available from the accessibility study in Addendum 3 Accessibility Study for accessibility needs. For new enrollment/space additions, projected costs were based on a standard gross new construction figure of $300 per square foot, which includes all design, architectural, construction, site improvements, utilities, furniture and other costs.

It is critical to remember that these cost estimates are for broad planning purposes only and are based on general assumptions and current standard/average market information. As such, these estimates can and will change (increase or decrease) as more detailed designs, site plans, bid specifications and other aspects of project construction are developed. These cost fluctuations may have a direct impact on the number and scale of projects that can be completed by the district within a set amount of funding available.

Prioritization/Scoring of Needs

Because of the variety of district needs from vastly different areas of operation (i.e. security, accessibility, abatement, programmatic and enrollment space), the BAC recognized the need for a standardized method of evaluating the priority of each project to be considered. In this way all projects/needs could be individually evaluated and compared to all other district projects/needs in a consistent, fair and meaningful way. To this end, the BAC developed a scoring rubric (see Addendum 5 Facilities Project Scoring Rubric) that incorporated several relevant aspects of each proposed project/need. Relevant aspects included:

- Safety/Health/Mandate—Scored primarily according to degree by which the project will affect the safety and health of students/staff. Additional consideration given to existing items which are not compliant with current codes/standards/requirements of governing or other recognized authorities.
- Potential Education Impact—Scored based on the expected impact of the project on the quality of education, enhancement of the educational experience and student achievement. Additional consideration given to school and district based education/program initiatives.
- Condition of Existing—Scored based on current condition of the facility/building/equipment/space involved. Factors include current serviceability, operational reliability, parts availability, age, remaining useful life, condition, maintenance history and related factors.
- Life Cycle Expectancy/Efficiency—Separate from existing condition. Scored relative to the expected useful life of the proposed project and its projected cost effectiveness (improved energy efficiency and repair/maintenance cost compared to existing)
- Aesthetics/Public Support—Scored based on degree that project would improve the appearance of the facility and/or the expected level of public support for the project.

Each aspect was scored on a scale of 0 -3 and was then multiplied by a differential "weighting" factor ranging from 1 – 5 based on its relative importance. This process resulted in a composite numerical score that could be used to determine the relative priority of each proposed project/need, resulting in a "scalable" list of projects/needs that could be adjusted based on the amount of funding available. These rubric scores for each project/need are included as a part of Addendum 6 Infrastructure Recommendations.

C**ommunity Input**

As part of the community engagement process employed by the district, the community was given the opportunity to provide feedback on proposed infrastructure projects/needs through an on-line survey and through community forums held at each school. (Staff input was similarly collected.) This feedback included an indication of the relative priority level of each project/need. The BAC used these community survey scores in conjunction with BAC rubric scores in determining its recommendations to the Board of Education. These community survey scores for each project/need are included as part of Addendum 6 Infrastructure Recommendations.

Infrastructure Recommendations

The primary district facilities needs are related to space for current and projected student enrollment growth. The number and extent of other district infrastructure needs that can be funded is therefore somewhat dependent on the enrollment space option chosen. Yet there are significantly different costs associated with the final two enrollment space options (Option A and Option B) being considered by the district. Furthermore, the related cost estimates for both enrollment space and other infrastructure projects are changeable

in scope and amount, making it difficult to determine their funding viability at this stage of the planning process with any degree of confidence. In view of these uncertainties, the BAC's objective was to create a list of other infrastructure projects/needs that could be adjusted (scaled up or down) based on the amount of "leftover" funding ultimately available. As a result, the BAC recommendations contained in Addendum 6A Option A Infrastructure Recommendations and Addendum 6B Option B Infrastructure Recommendations are both in priority order. They are therefore both flexible in the sense that the funding cut-off can "float" up or down to match the changing amount of funding available as more detailed design plans are made, bids are let, projects are actually completed and the amount of funding resources identified by the Finance Advisory Committee or district administration become available.

A complete listing of all identified and potential infrastructure projects is attached as Addendum 6C Infrastructure Projects and Needs Listing.

Attachments

Addendum 1 – Facilities Condition Assessment
Addendum 2 – Safety and Security Top Ten
Addendum 3 – Accessibility Report
Addendum 4 – Programmatic Needs
Addendum 5 – Facilities Project Scoring Rubric
Addendum 6A – Option A Recommended Infrastructure
Addendum 6B – Option B Recommended Infrastructure
Addendum 6C – Infrastructure Projects and Needs Listing