

Summary Document  
Corvallis School District 509J  
2007 Facility Assessment  
Project No. 2007.0046

In June of 2007, the Corvallis School District contracted with Arbuckle Costic Architects to assist the District in their existing facilities assessment. Alan Costic of Arbuckle Costic started the process with the Long Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP) Committee to evaluate the existing facilities other than the Corvallis High School and Linus Pauling Middle School campuses. Clayton Vorse assumed responsibility for the project for Arbuckle Costic when the project turned from an advisory roll for Arbuckle Costic to facilitating and authoring the facility assessments for the buildings contained herein. Clayton met with the Committee on various times as well as meetings with project coordinators along with Kim Patten and Noel Mingo to produce the documents as well as site visits to several of the buildings.

The basis for the individual building reports contained herein was the Facility Assessments completed in the year 2000 by WBGs Architects of Eugene, Oregon, which were primarily responsible for the elementary school assessments within the district and LRS Architects of Portland, Oregon, which completed the assessment of Cheldelin Middle School and Crescent Valley High School in the year 2000. All of these assessments were updated; work that has been complete was stricken and any new facility needs were added. Work that was previously recommended that had not been done was moved up on the priority list and additional work required has been added at virtually every building.

The large portion of the work recommended in the 2000 assessment has been accomplished. Those projects were done as part of the 2002 Facility Improvement Bond, which was passed by the constituents of the School District in November of 2002. Projects recommended in the 2000 Facility Assessment have, for the most part, been accomplished except for the buildings listed in the report as "offline buildings". Roofing and seismic work at Adam's Elementary, which is the first listed in the probable cause spreadsheet is scheduled for construction in Summer of 2008. Several places in the assessments work is referred to as part of the 2002 Facility Improvement Bond, or the acronym "F.I.B.". This work has occurred over the 5 year period since the 2002 bond, much of the work was scheduled and accomplished starting in 2003. Some of the projects have concluded as late as the summer of 2007. Work is also scheduled for 2008 as mentioned earlier. Work below has been identified as critical and has been moved from the cost spreadsheet from the facility assessments to a capital improvement repairs spreadsheet authored by Noel Mingo of the facility department. This work is being scheduled through the facility department out of 2002 F.I.B. contingency funds and general fund maintenance budgets within the next 2 budget cycles. These work tasks are, in Arbuckle Costic's opinion, facility needs that need to be addressed within the next two budget cycles to prevent damage to the buildings that could accelerate these costs significantly.

- § On Adam's, Cheldelin and Crescent Valley High School, all of this work is roofing work that is in critical need. As mentioned earlier, Adam's roofing is scheduled for completion summer of 2008, before the start of the 2008/2009 school year.
- § At Cheldelin Middle School, a portion of the roofing and some seismic work was done as part of the FIB.
- § Roofing work was partially completed at Crescent Valley High School last summer and will be completed in the following summers.
- § Three of the buildings that are listed as "off-line" are as no longer used as District classrooms; the deferred maintenance of these buildings varies.
- § At Fairplay and Dixie Elementary, the deferred maintenance work is ADA improvements that need to be made before these buildings are brought online as district teaching facilities.

### Seismic/Life Safety

The work listed in the column noted as "Seismic/Life Safety" brings all of the buildings in the assessment up to a level of safety based on the FEMA requirements for collapse prevention. It needs to be understood by the district that these facilities, in a seismic event, would more than likely be inhabitable after the event for use, but the seismic measures that are delineated here would allow occupants to leave the structure and the structure would not fail. This is the path of seismic upgrade that most school districts elect to pursue because of the significant additional cost listed in the following column to reinforce the buildings in such a way that the buildings would be available for use directly after a seismic event with minor cleanup.

### HVAC

HVAC work is required at more than half of the facilities. A large portion of the cost for work at these facilities has to do with boiler replacement. Boiler replacement is eminent at four buildings within the district. The expected life on these boilers, when the 2000 assessment was done, was around 10 years and it appears that some of these boilers need to be scheduled for replacement within the next 3-5 budget cycles. The buildings that are offline have significant work required for their heating ventilating systems, and boiler replacement is eminent at two of these buildings as well.

### Plumbing

Plumbing work that is required in the six buildings listed on the cost sheet have a variety of issues, most that are exclusive to the particular building. The buildings with more significant cost have to do with the buildings currently using the existing boiler system to heat domestic water, and the cost involved is to provide a separate boiler or hot water heating system that would reduce the size of the boilers required in the replacement.

Several of the buildings require removal of existing galvanized pipe. Cost projections are for replacement of copper lines in some of these buildings may be applicable to go to a synthetic polymer "pex tubing" for domestic cold and hot water. Both of the offline facilities, Fairplay and Dixie Elementary, have significant plumbing cost involved for replacement of lines and hot water systems.

### Electrical Line Voltage

Many of the electrical issues were dealt with in the 2002 Facility Improvement Bond, however, significant issues remain at Garfield and Franklin Elementary. This has to do with lighting replacement and additional power service required, this is also the fact at Fairplay Elementary as well.

### Technology

The Districts general technology needs were dealt with across the district in the 2002 Facility Improvement Bond, the only building not brought up to that standard was Dixie Elementary.

### Fire Sprinklers

Four of the buildings listed in the Facility Assessment have cost involved for the installation of fire sprinklers. This is a condition similar to the difference between Life Safety and immediate occupancy concerns. Fire sprinklers generally are looked upon to save buildings rather than people. The District facilitated the Life Safety concerns for fire detection and annunciation in the

2002 Facility Improvement Bond. The cost for fire sprinklers at the four buildings listed are practical addition, especially if in the future of significant classroom additions to the building. The 2007 Oregon Structural Specialty Code recognizes fire sprinklers as a favorable alternative to fire rated walls for protection of the building. Cost and planning wise, this is an attractive alternative.

### Architectural Repairs

Significant cost in all of the buildings has to do with what is listed as Architectural Repairs. This would be repairs to walls, floors and ceilings primarily to bring those finishes up to their current level after seismic, HVAC, plumbing and electrical work were accomplished. The one school that is the exception to this rule is Hoover Elementary where the architectural repairs include the construction of a six classroom addition plus support space to replace the six modulars currently onsite.

The direct construction cost of these improvements can be significantly altered by the removal of specific areas in the Facility Assessments. This work can be phased over multiple budget cycles and it would be recommended that certain types of work be grouped with several schools, for example to do plumbing work at three to four elementary schools, will reduce the overall cost of material, labor and equipment just by the economy of scale. This was evident in the 2002 Facility Improvement Bonds when looking at technology and fire alarm work over several buildings. Indirect cost for each of these projects is a category that includes architectural and engineering design fees, testing and inspection services required by code, and geotechnical and surveying services that are purchased outside the A&E contracts that are required by the District on specific projects. This number also includes a modest cost per square foot for fixtures, furnishings and equipment (FFE) for these buildings.

Although, this probable cost sheet was put together, I think it is the committees assignment to provide information more on a school by school basis, and to establish priorities for items other than deferred maintenance based on the conditions of the existing buildings. Arbuckle Costic is happy to provide further analysis on any of these items or bring in another consultant to review the engineering aspects of many of these items as well. It is our pleasure to serve the District and eagerly await your comments and questions.