

Comments on “Remediation Budget Outline and Recommendation”

The following comments are in response to the “Remediation Budget Outline and Recommendation” for Eugene Field School as provided by Mr. Gene Pfeifer, a Silverton citizen.

Mr. Andy Bellando requested that I review the above referenced document and offer my thoughts on the veracity of the scope as shown by the work activities and the budget dollars associated with these tasks.

To summarize my findings, I believe the “Remediation Budget Outline and Recommendation” to be incomplete and inaccurate in the following areas.

- 1) Seismic Upgrades – After reviewing the “Remediation Budget” I totaled the proposed combined work activity costs, for classrooms and gym Seismic code upgrades, as \$924,881.

I engaged in a conversation with James Schiess of Dalke Construction regarding questions concerning the “Remediation Budget”. Mr. Schiess assisted Mr. Pfeifer with construction costs. My understanding, from that conversation, was their assumption of placing steel portal frames on either side of the buildings front door in a longitudinal direction, and some similar design along gym walls would suffice in achieving building wall seismic stabilization. There are dollars budgeted for in the “Remediation Budget” that address’s the roof diaphragm as well.

The District hired ZCS Engineering to evaluate and provide a schematic plan and construction details for the Eugene Field facility. Their recommendation for seismic retrofitting of the building components were developed following American Society of Civil Engineer’s “Seismic Evaluation of Existing Buildings – ASCE 31-03”. This manual is accepted by the Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC) as an evaluation tool for existing buildings per section 3401.5 - Alternative Compliance and Statewide Alternate Method No. OSSC 08-05. The ZCS design calls for 41 separate and specifically located concrete block walls supported by concrete footings. Additionally, their recommendation is to raze the current gymnasium and construct a new one in its place. The combined budgeted construction costs, contingency and soft costs is approximately \$3,871,000.

That is a difference of \$2,946,119.

- 2) Assuming the anticipated large scale demolition and seismic upgrade work that would happen throughout the school, the “Remediation Budget” appears to lack sufficient dollars to address interior remodeling and modernization.
- 3) There are numerous entries in the “Remediation Budget” that assign the cost for specific work items to “by owner”. This effectively reduces the apparent construction costs but does not address the overall Project Costs. The District is required to consider all costs of the project.

Listed below are some key work items addressed in this fashion with no dollars allocated in the “Remediation Budget”. This is not an exhaustive list.

- Builders Risk Insurance
 - Site Lighting
 - Storm Sewer improvements on site and off site
 - Computer wiring, communication systems
 - Replace corridor door with 45 minute doors with no mention of installing rated door frames.
 - Fire rated walls in remodeled code compliant facility. The “Remediation Budget” has that work covered by Fire Sprinkler system.
 - Playground surfaces, covered play area seismic upgrades and roofing or complete replacement
- 4) There are two development “soft” costs that are quite low or missing in the “Remediation Budget”. The design fees as understood from the “Remediation Budget” allocate approximately 5.5%. The Industry standard for similar work is usually calculated at 9%. The “Remediation Budget” appears to have no budget for Owner’s Representation or Project Management oversight.
 - 5) There is work scope items that are budgeted too low compared to estimated costs provided by BLRB in the ZCS report and from other estimating sources. The largest discrepancies, other than the seismic work and the “by owner” entries mentioned above are: Cabinets, Roofing, Interior Doors, Interior Windows & Finishes, Carpet, Plumbing and HVAC.
 - 6) In Division 11- Equipment of the “Remediation Budget”, there is only \$10,000 allotted for upgrading appliances, counters and hoods. Through my conversation with James Schiess it is my understanding that the “by owner” entry for costs pointed to a possible new facility with a separate project budget, which would house kitchen and dining functions for the school. This additional project was mentioned to be a 5,000 square foot facility for \$1,500,000. This work, if undertaken, would reduce site availability for parking and require access from Front Street or N. First Street.
 - 7) The “Remediation Budget” assumes acquisition of a city street without consideration given to its feasibility.
 - 8) The “Remediation Budget” does not adequately reflect regulatory or compliance requirements by the City of Silverton, Marion County or ODOT.
 - 9) The “Remediation Budget” does not reflect the area limitations of the site, parking requirements, playground limitations and safety concerns related to its location adjacent to a state highway.
 - 10) The “Remediation Budget” does not adequately address current or future programming needs of the school such as Special Education, Full-Day Kindergarten and Enrollment changes over time.

It seems apparent that the scope of improvements that the District would consider acceptable for the current Eugene Field School facility to continue to function for at least another 50 years, and the assumed scope of improvements that appear to be identified by the Remediation Budget are not closely aligned.