

McLean County Unit School District #5

LZT/Perkins+Will

January 31, 2007

PRE-REFERENDUM EXPENDITURES

Pros:

- Need: Unit 5 enrollment growth has been consistently growing at approximately 3% to 4% per year.
- Hedging Inflation: The projected savings range from \$5,000,000 - \$7,000,000+ if the bid March/August 2008
- Portable Classrooms: reduced dependence on portable classrooms. Savings approx. \$400,000+ if bid in 2008. (cost avoidance)
- Referendum Question: documents are complete enough to generate accurate estimates which will provide a more qualified cost for the referendum question.
- Architecture and Engineering: the documents can still be used even if the initial referendum does not pass.

Cons:

- Commitment of Funds: requires that approximately \$2.7M be expended prior to a potential referendum March 18, 2008.
- Referendum: passing the referendum is not guaranteed. An unsuccessful referendum will defer construction by at least a year negating any potential savings noted above. (however, the documents will still be used)
- Portable Classrooms: necessitates dependence on additional portable classrooms costing approx. \$400,000 in FY 2010.
- Public Perception: effective communication will be required in order to convey the need to begin expending funds prior to a potential referendum.

McLean County Unit School District #5

LZT/Perkins+Will

January 31, 2007

CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING SCHOOL DESIGNS?

Middle School

Not Applicable: a current middle school design does not exist in McLean County UD #5

Elementary Schools

The most recent elementary school design (Grove and Fox Creek) was originated in the late 80's and is 20+ years old. A number of changes have occurred in education design and repeating the design without review disallows the potential to providing learning environments arranged and flexible enough to allow for optimization of current & future teaching practices.

Codes: Illinois School Codes changed building codes in the summer of 2006 from BOCA to IBC (International Building Code) that requires a complete code review to adapt building to current codes.

Structural Engineering: New snow load requirements will require reevaluation of previous structural design minimizing potential savings in structural engineering fee.

Mechanical Engineering: new energy code requirements were adopted for Illinois in the spring of 2006 which requires energy modeling and a complete redesign of mechanical systems as well as a desire to design for geothermal systems not previously utilized. It is not realistic to expect any engineering fee savings. The energy modeling and review of materials will require a substantial use of the traditional design development phase fee.

Civil Engineering and Landscape Architecture: No savings would be realized since this effort would require a complete set of storm calculations be completed for each site and a unique design for each site.

Architecture:

- Project management and general interface and coordination with owner & consultants would be very similar to a standard effort. No savings would be realized.
- Schematic/Design Development (35-40% of fees) – A review and confirmation that all materials previously used are available and meet current expected standards for thermal integrity and performance. A complete review of previous change orders to ensure previous mistakes are not repeated. New requirement for architect to construct building model for engineers use for energy modeling requires hours that are in addition to design services that

McLean County Unit School District #5

LZT/Perkins+Will

January 31, 2007

were traditionally performed in and before spring of 2006. The effort invested to confirm the integrity of the design is current would not be significantly different than a new design.

- Contract Documents Drawings & Specifications (35% of fees)– The layout of documents and general quantity of work completed is significant though time will have to be spent adapting the plans, sections, details for those revisions for different mechanical systems, structure, and energy code requirements. A quality review of detailing will have to be completed to improve the integrity of detailing to eliminate the failure in detailing that has lead to the persistent leaks in the existing facilities. The specifications will require the same effort to edit for current standards as it would to adapt a previous specification from a previous school project. Though the effort with the drawings will be significant it will require approx. 35% less time on the architectural effort for the contract document phase. This reduced effort has a potential savings of 8% savings total fee for this school.
- Bidding and Construction Administration (25% of fees)- would provide no savings in effort.

Factoring code requirements, engineering services, project management, bidding and construction administration would net no reduction in effort for those specific services which in aggregate accounts for approximately 85%. The total net savings by using the existing design may be approximately 15% of the design fee. This translates to approximately \$130,000 of design fee savings from the expense of ES#1.

Note: if the results of the Workshop and Programming efforts indicate that the most recent ES school designs (Grove and Fox Creek) are in fact the desired design then closer consideration will be given to proceeding with that design.