Facility Assessment Report and Database July 12, 2010

I. Introduction

A. Facility Assessment Presentation

B. Erik Kass, Assistant Superintendent for Business Services

C. Background information – This project began when the Board of Education approved the contract with Durrant Engineering in April of 2009. Durrant was hired to provide a full condition assessment of all school district buildings to identify long and short-term repair needs. The vision of this project was to deliver to the school district a living database that would aid in the budgeting and planning process into the future.

The study focused primarily on all engineering systems and equipment, but also included an in-depth study of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) issues our school district faces. The study didn't include roofing projects, as that work has already been completed and is continually updated on an annual basis. For the assessment, trained professional engineers visited every site within the school district, evaluating systems and conditions, while also taking actual photographs to integrate into the report. This work transitioned into a grading system that has become part of the database delivered to the school district for future planning.

All of the information gathered and organized into the database format provides a lot of functionality for the school district moving forward. Each item has actual digital photos attached for reference, cost ranges are summarized for each item, and the ability to sort the information in various ways are examples of the functionality of the database.

Four individuals from Durrant Engineering will be present to provide a more in-depth review of the work that was completed. This presentation will also include a demonstration of the database that was created to show the functionality provided to the district with this tool.

D. Describe the action requested of the BOE - Administration is looking for the Board of Education to accept the maintenance project study with the database which is the planning tool to be used for future maintenance projects.

II. Implications

- A. **Budget** Once accepted by the Board of Education as a planning document, administration will begin to utilize this tool for prioritizing and identifying future maintenance projects.
- **B.** Strategic Plan The strongest connection to the strategic plan and this work is to maintain a safe and secure environment for all children to learn in. Projects prioritize and identified within the database directly reflect our district needs which are most critical to maintaining the buildings within our school district.
- C. Equity Plan Part of this project is aimed at ensuring equitable facilities in support of student learning across the district.
- **D. Implications for other aspects of the organization** This tool will impact many different pieces of our organization as we intend to utilize this tool to create proactive conversations about facility needs within our organization. Our hope is to utilize this to engage staff within our buildings to help further identify the needs of our facilities that don't solely encompass our systems and building envelope.
- E. Next Steps It is the intent of Administration to work toward creating a multi-year project plan, along with projected funds necessary to implement this plan each year. This work will begin upon approval by the Board of the information and data within the database, and will become important work of the new Director for the division of Building Services. Our goal is to return to the Board in May/June 2011 to present this multi-year plan with projected sources of funding.

.

(

(

·

.



| rspace | Access database created and used for facility management | Has seen continual improvement and refinement | Used to assess numerous hospitals, college campuses and school districts | Primary tool used during the State of lowa Vertical Infrastructure Assessment in 1998-99 encompassing over 20 million sf | Utilizes tablet PCs and integrates photos into the process and report |
|---------|--|---|--|--|---|
| DURBANT | | | | | |

| FACILITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS | Direction and Input from District Staff Condition assessment of all engineering systems and equipmer engineering systems and equipmer only identify ADA and building envelope deficiencies Provided a spreadsheet of recently completed envelope projects Provided input with regard to on- going maintenance issues such as entrance doors, hardware, etc. |
|--------------------------------|--|
| DURRANT | |

DURRANT

FACILITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS



Direction and Input from District Staff

- Directed not to include items such as roofs which had already been addressed
- Directed to not include ADA issues in database, nor their costs



| DORRANT | FACILITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS |
|---------|--|
| | Building Visits – System and Equipment Condition |
| | Evaluations Evaluate every engineering system |
| | and component Identify grade, priority and criticality of engineering systems/components |
| | and architectural deficiencies Determine code, ADA and safety violations |
| | |

Ć

| FACILITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS | Data Input and Documentation Each engineering system and components entered into database using Tablet PCs with the following. Grade Criticality Criticality Expected Remaining Life (ERL) Floor Level Local ID/Description |
|--------------------------------|--|
| DURRANT | |



FACILITY ASSESSMENT Exterior architectural components Data Input and Documentation entered into database with the Estimated Replacement Cost Unit of Measure following (cont): **CSI** Division PROCESS Memo m Ø DURRANT" $\widehat{\mathbb{M}}$

| FACILITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS | Data Input and Documentation Digital photos attached to each item Associated items that may affect costs identified Cost ranges summarized Components may be sorted by any one of the types of information entered Components may be sorted by any school or building | ADA spreadsheet for each building |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| DURBANT | | |
| | | |

ADA spreadsheet for each building



C10 Interior Construction

C1020 Interior Doors

The Metal Door/Metal Frame Systems are defined as follows: door type, design and size, frame type and depth. Included in the components for each system is painting the door and frame. No hardware has been included in the systems.

요즘 사람 승규는 물건을 즐

Steel Door, Half Glass Steel Frame

Steel Door, Flush Steel Frame

t

Wood Door, Flush Wood Frame

| | | | | COST FACH | |
|--|----------|------|--------|-----------|----------|
| System Components | QUANTITY | UNIT | MAT. | INST. | TOTAL |
| SYSTEM C1020 114 1200 | | | | 1 | |
| STEEL DOOR, HOLLOW, 20 GA., HALF GLASS, 3'-0"X7"-0", D.W.FRAME, 4-7/8" DP | | | | | |
| Steel door, flush, hollow core, 1-3/4" thk, half gla 20 ga., 3'-0" x 7'-0" | 1.000 | Ea. | 465 | 57 | 522 |
| Steel frame, 16 ga., up to 4-7/8" deep, 7'-0" H, 3'-0" W, single | 1.000 | Ea. | 170 | 64 | 234 |
| Hinges full mortise, avg. freq., steel base, USP, 4-1/2" x 4-1/2" | 1.500 | Pr. | 42 | ļ | 42 |
| Float glass, 3/16" thick, clear, tempered | 5,000 | S.F. | 34 | 37.25 | 71.25 |
| Paint door and frame each side, primer | 1,000 | Ea. | 6.38 | . 87 | 93.38 |
| Paint door and frame each side, 2 coats | 1.000 | Ea. | 11.30 | 144 | 155.30 |
| | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | 728.68 | 389.25 | 1,117.93 |

| C10 | 20 114 | ······································ | Meta | l Door/Met | al Frame | | | |
|------|--|--|----------------|--------------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| | TVDE | DECION | 6175 | EDANE | ΝΕΦΤΊ | | COST EACH | |
| | | DESIGN | JILE | FRANC | Verin | MAT. | INST. | TOTAL |
| 1000 | Flush-hollow | 20 ga. full panel | 3'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 660 | 355 | 1,015 |
| 1020 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 740 | 400 | 1,140 |
| 1160 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8″ | 1,125 | . 565 | 1,690 |
| 1180 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1,250 | 610 | 1,860 |
| 1200 | ************************************** | 20 ga. half glass | 3'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 730 | . 390 | 1,120 |
| 1220 | | | • | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 805 | 435 | 1,240 |
| 1360 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drywali K.D. | 4-7/8" | 1,250 | 630 | 1,880 |
| 1380 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1,375 | 675 | 2,050 |
| 1800 | | 18 ga. full panel | 3'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 720 | 355 | 1,075 |
| 1820 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 800 | 400 | 1,200 |
| 1960 | | | 6'-0" x 7.'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8″ | 1,250 | 565 | 1,815 |
| 1980 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1,350 | 610 | 1,960 |
| 2000 | | 18 ga. half glass | 3'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 775 | 395 | 1,170 |
| 2020 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 850 | 440 | 1,290 |
| 2160 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 1,350 | 640 | 1,990 |
| 2180 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1,450 | 685 | 2,135 |

C10 Interior Construction

C1020 Interior Doors

) 3)

3

| | | | hadeled m | | VICION FIONE | | | |
|------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|-----------|-------|
| | TYPE | DESIGN | SIZE | FRAME | DEPTH | MAT | COST EACH | TOTAL |
| 6000 | Hollow-1-1/2 hour | 20 ga, fuli panel | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | drvwall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 610 | 355 | 965 |
| 6020 | | an gar tan panta | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 785 | 405 | 1 190 |
| 6160 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drwail K.D. | 4-7/8" | 1,100 | 575 | 1,675 |
| 6180 | | | | buit welded | 8-3/4" | 1.250 | 620 | 1.870 |
| 6200 | | 20 ga, vision | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 760 | 365 | 1.125 |
| 6220 | | 0 | | butt welded | 8-3/4″ | 935 | 410 | 1.345 |
| 6360 | | | 6′-0″ x 7′-0″ | drvwall K.D. | 47/8" | 1,400 | 590 | 1.990 |
| 6380 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4″ | 1,550 | 635 | 2.185 |
| 6600 | | 18 ga. fuli panel | 2'-8" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4.7/8" | 685 | 360 | 1.045 |
| 6620 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4″ | 860 | 405 | 1,265 |
| 6760 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drvwall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 1.175 | 585 | 1.760 |
| 6780 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1.350 | 630 | 1.980 |
| 6800 | | 18 ga. vision | 2'-8" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 4-7/8" | 835 | 365 | 1.200 |
| 6820 | <i>'</i> | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1.000 | 415 | 1.415 |
| 6960 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drywall K.D. | 47/8" | 1.475 | 600 | 2.075 |
| 6980 | | | | buit welded | 8-3/4" | 1.625 | 645 | 2.270 |
| 7200 | Hollow-3 hour | 18 ga, full panel | 2'-8" x 7'-0" | butt K.D. | 5-3/4" | 685 | 360 | 1.045 |
| 7220 | | and Parison barrow | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 860 | 405 | 1.265 |
| 7360 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | butt K.D. | 5-3/4" | 1.175 | 585 | 1.760 |
| 7380 | | | ••• | but weided | 8-3/4" | 1,350 | 630 | 1,98(|
| 8000 | Composite 1-1/2 hour | 20 ga, full panel | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | drwall K.D. | 4-3/8" | 710 | 360 | 1,070 |
| 8020 | | and Bat the parton | 20,000 | butt weided | 8-3/4" | 885 | 405 | 1 290 |
| 8160 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drwall K D. | 4.7/8" | 1,300 | 585 | 1 88 |
| 8180 | | | | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 1,450 | 630 | 2 08 |
| 8200 | | 20 ga vision | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | dnavali K D | 4.7/8″ | 860 | 365 | 1 22 |
| 8220 | | 20 80. 4000 | | bitt welderi | 8.3/4" | 1 025- | 415 | 1 440 |
| 8360 | | | ና ረብ" y 7ኒብ" | driwal K D | 4.7/8" | 1 600 | 600 | 2 200 |
| 8400 | Composite-3 hour | 18 ga full nanel | 2'-R"x 7'-0" | drawali K D | 5.3/4" | 800 | 365 | 1 16 |
| 8420 | oompoone o nou | 10 64. 10. panoi | 20170 | butt welded | 8-3/4" | 975 | 410 | 1 385 |
| 8560 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | drywali K.D. | 5-3/4" | 1.425 | 590 | 2 015 |
| C10 | 20 120 | | Wood | Door/Woo | d Frame | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | | | | T | COST EACH | |
| | IYPE | FACE | SIZE | FRAME | DEPIH | MAT. | INST. | TOTAL |
| 1600 | Hollow core/flush | lauan | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | pine | 3-5/8" | 169 | 219 | 388 |
| 1620 | | | | | 5-3/16" | 153 | 232 | 38 |
| 1760 | | | 6'-0" x 6'-8" | pine | 3-5/8″ | 277 | 360 | 63 |
| 1780 | | | | | 5-3/16" | 257 | 375 | 63 |
| 1800 | | bìrch | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | pine | 3-5/8″ | 219 | 219 | 438 |
| 1820 | | | | | 5-3/16" | 203 | 232 | 43 |
| 1960 | | | 6'-0" x 6'-8" | pine | 3-5/8" | 370 | 360 | 73 |
| 1980 | | | | | 5-3/16" | 350 | 375 | 72 |
| 2000 | | oak | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | oak | 3-5/8" | 141 | · 180 | 32 |
| 2020 | | | | 1 | 5-3/16" | 220 | 235 | 45 |
| 2160 | | | 6'-0" x 6'-8" | oak | 3-5/8" | 360 | 365 | 72 |
| 2180 | | | | * | 5-3/16" | 370 | 380 | 75 |
| 3000 | Particle core/flush | lauan | 2'-8" x 6'-8" | pine | 3-5/8" | 218 | 227 | 44 |
| 3020 | | 1 | | | 5-3/16" | 202 | 240 | 44; |
| 0020 | | - | | | | | - | |
| 3160 | | | 6'-0" x 7'-0" | pine | 3-5/8" | 365 | 400 | 76 |

D20 Plumbing

10 10

D2010 Plumbing Fixtures



Systems are complete with trim seat and rough-in (supply, waste and vent) for connection to supply branches and waste mains.





One Piece Wall Hung

Supply

Waste/Vent

Λĺ.



Floor Mount

| System Components | | | | COST EACH | |
|--|----------|------|----------|-----------------|----------|
| system components | QUANTITY | UNIT | MAT. | INST. | TOTAL |
| SYSTEM D2010 110 1880 | | | | | |
| WATER CLOSET, VITREOUS CHINA, ELONGATED | | | 1 | | |
| TANK TYPE, WALL HUNG, TWO PIECE | | | | | |
| Water closet, tank type vit china wall hung 2 pc. w/seat supply & stop | _ 1.000 | Ea. | 655 | 212 | 867 |
| Pipe Steel galvanized, schedule 40, threaded, 2" diam. | 4.000 | L.F. | 76 | 70.20 | 146.20 |
| Pipe, CI soil, no hub, cp/g 10' OC, hanger 5' OC, 4" diam. | 2.000 | L.F. | 29.10 | 38.70 | 67.80 |
| Pipe, coupling, standard coupling, Cl soil, no hub, 4" diam. | 2.000 | Ea. | 45 | 68 | 113 |
| Copper tubing type L solder joint, hangar 10' O.C., 1/2" diam. | 6.000 | L.F. | 16.44 | 46.20 | 62.64 |
| Wrought copper 90° elbow for solder joints 1/2" diam. | 2.000 | Ea. | 3.20 | 62 | 65.20 |
| Wrought copper Tee for solder joints 1/2" diam. | 1.000 | Ea. | 2.74 | ⁻ 48 | 50.74 |
| Supports/carrier, water closet, siphon jet, horiz, single, 4" waste | 1.000 | Ea. | 830 | <u>117</u> | 947 |
| total. | | | 1,657.48 | 662.10 | 2,319.58 |

| 50 | 010 110 | Water Class | - Sychome | | | COST EACH | |
|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| P | | Wuler Gose | r systems | | MAT. | INST. | TOTAL |
| 1800 | Water closet, vitre | eous china, elongated | | | | | |
| 1840 | | Tank týpe, wall hung | _ | | | | • |
| -1880 | | Close coupled two piece | | - RD2010 | 1,650 | 660 | 2,310 |
| 1920 | | Floor mount, one piece | | _400 | 930 | 705 | 1,635 |
| -1960 | | One piece low profile | ÷ | | 970 | 705 | 1,675 |
| .2000 | | Two piece close coupled | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | •. | 625 | 705 | 1,330 |
| 2040 | | Bowl only with flush valve | | | | | |
| 2080 | | Wall hung | | | 1,425 | 750 | 2,175 |
| 2120 | | Floor mount | | | 750 | 715 | 1,465 |
| 2160 | | Floor mount, ADA compliant with 18" high bowl | | | 770 | 735 | 1,505 |
| | | | | * | | | |

Outside contractor for Individual items Contracted as part of a larger project **COSTING ASSIGNMENT** Work item may affect other spaces Limited to item only, minimal other Includes rough-in, finish and other Cost Range Philosophy District staff work order additional related work Procurement of Work Scope of Work work WORK DURRANT" (\bigcirc) 638

Patching or replacing adjacent floors elocation or replacement of another **COSTING ASSIGNMENT** Scope Definition and Potential Replace that next section of pipe Rework existing or provide new Upgrade component or replace Other components affected by Scope Considerations Related Work or walls system WORK j. DURRANT 6381 $\left[\bigcap\right]$

Identify Improvements with Greatest **COSTING ASSIGNMENT** Systems that use the most energy opportunities for outside funding Upgrades that have the greatest Buildings that are least efficient Return on Investment (ROI) Efficiency Upgrades **Outdated** systems WORK DURRANT" BF 63817714 $\widehat{\mathbb{M}}$



















DURRANT'

REVEW OF THE REPORT

210 Blackhawk Middle/ Gompers Elementary



DURRANT

 $\widehat{\mathbb{M}}$

INPLEMENTATION PROJECT



- Work Completed by District Staff
- Smaller summer projects
- Work Completed by Contractors
- Specific buildings
- Specific types of work
- Summer or year-round work

Sequencing

- Systems
- Buildings

Building zones

| PROJECT Implementation Implementation | Scope of Actual, Defined Projects | Condition assessment report is not a list of defined projects | Projects should be defined based on priorities and deficiencies | Building by building | - Systems | Work item types | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | |

S. O. . .

Ì

)

DURRANT

 $\widehat{\mathbb{M}}$

USE OF DATABASE AS A LIVING TOOL



- For Planning and Budgeting

 Must be edited and maintained to stay current
- As work is accomplished
- Overall update every 5-10 years
- Can be sorted for planning and budgeting
- By building
- By equipment type
 - By grade
- By criticality

DEMONSTRATION DATABASE

DURRANT

El Man Form



