

2014-2015 Ad Hoc Committee – Facilities Subcommittee

ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Introduction

In 2008, Auburn School District completed a comprehensive evaluation of its existing schools to accomplish the following:

- Identify and document existing conditions.
- Identify the need for facility improvements.
- Identify the need for replacement of facilities.

Four methods of assessment were used. These are:

1. Determine economic life span of each school.
2. Measure compliance of each school with program area standards.
3. Measure compliance of each school with facility component standards.
4. Identify improvement costs as a percentage of replacement cost for each school.

The assessments were conducted by a team that included school district principals and building administrators, representatives of the school district's Maintenance and Capital Projects departments, engineers and facility consultants.

Economic Life Span

Economic life span was calculated for every school building. This determined the number of years after which it is no longer cost-effective to invest significant funds to modify or improve the building.

This measurement considered the building's roof material, exterior material, window type, structural frame, seismic design, and mechanical and electrical systems. Replacement of school buildings should be considered when the buildings have exceeded their economic life span.

Compliance with Program Area Standards

Each school facility was evaluated to determine its compliance with the minimum and recommended program area standards established for the school. Between 90 and 220 program areas were evaluated for each school.

Program areas are building and site design features that are included in the school. This includes features such as site access, building appearance, classrooms, support spaces and school size.

A score was assigned for each program area and a total score between 0 and 100 was computed for each school. A score of 100 reflects that every program area at the school met the school district's recommended standard. A score of 50 reflects that the average of all program areas meets but does not exceed minimum standards. A score below 50 reflects that, on average, the school does not meet minimum program area standards established for the school. Replacement or significant modernization of a school should be considered when the program area standard score is less than 50.

Compliance with Facility Component Standards

Each school was evaluated to determine its compliance with the minimum and recommended facility component standards. Between 202 and 228 facility component standards were evaluated for each school.

Facility components are the parts and pieces that are used to build the school site and building. The category of components are site areas, site improvements, landscaping, utilities, structure, building envelope, interiors, equipment, and mechanical and electrical systems.

A score was assigned for each facility component and a total score between 0 and 100 was computed for each school. Similar to the program areas, a score of 100 reflects that every facility component standard met the school district's recommended standard. A score of 50 reflects that the average of all facility component standards meets but does not exceed minimum standards. A score below 50 reflects that, on average, the school does not meet minimum facility component standards established for the facility. Replacement or significant modernization of a facility should be considered when the facility component standard score is less than 50.

Improvement Costs as a Percentage of Replacement Cost

Sometimes it is not cost-effective to modify or improve a building. This situation was recognized by the 2004-05 Citizens' Ad Hoc Committee, which recommended that the school district replace any facility or portion of a facility if the cost of modernizing it is greater than 70% of the estimated cost of a new building.

Consistent with this recommendation, the school district estimated the cost to improve existing buildings to meet the recommended program area and facility component standards established for the facility. This estimated cost of improvement or modernization was then compared with the cost to replace the building.

2008 School Assessment Summary

The following School Assessment Summary provides assessment information for each school. This assessment information is based upon data compiled as part of the 2008 Facilities Master Plan.

- Economic life span and year of replacement based upon economic life span.
- Program Area Standard assessment score.
- Facility Component Standard assessment score.
- Building improvement costs as a percentage of replacement cost.

2008 School Assessment Summary

Facility Name	Date of Original Construction	Economic Life Span (No. of Years)	Economic Life Span (Date)	Program Area Assessment Score	Facility Component Assessment Score	Building Improvement Cost Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS						
Alpac	1972	47	2019	50.94	49.90	56%
Arthur Jacobsen	2007	73	2080	87.14	93.80	2%
Chinook	1963	40	2003	31.79	43.00	81%
Dick Scobee	1954	45	1999	38.94	42.61	89%
Evergreen Heights	1970	45	2015	41.80	44.10	79%
Gildo Rey	1969	49	2018	54.82	44.50	52%
Hazelwood	1990	72	2062	74.03	57.20	39%
Ilalko	1992	72	2064	76.45	62.00	27%
Lakeland Hills	2006	73	2079	86.40	89.60	4%
Lake View	1980	61	2041	53.15	48.10	52%
Lea Hill	1965	40	2005	35.25	45.70	73%
Pioneer	1959	40	1999	34.82	44.10	78%
Terminal Park	1945	44	1985	34.19	42.00	102%
Washington	1972	65	2037	55.40	58.60	22%
MIDDLE SCHOOLS						
Cascade	1967	46	2013	55.06	47.69	56%
Mt. Baker	1994	70	2064	65.91	68.98	29%
Olympic	1957	45	2002	41.36	42.83	118%
Rainier	1991	70	2061	64.32	63.26	32%
HIGH SCHOOLS						
Auburn High	1950	58	2008	48.57	39.91	72%
Auburn Mountainview	2005	81	2086	85.45	89.65	5%
Auburn Riverside	1995	80	2075	69.65	61.90	19%
West Auburn	1990	73	2063	72.83	57.31	25%

Current Assessment Status

The assessment data identified above will be revised and updated where applicable to reflect current conditions. This revised data will be presented to the Ad Hoc Committee Facilities Subcommittee at a later date.

The following information summarizes the upcoming revisions:

1. Economic Life Span: Economic Life Span amounts calculated in 2008 remain valid and do not require revision.
2. Program Area Assessment: Program Area Assessment scores remain valid and do not require revision except for Auburn High School. The Auburn High School score will be revised to reflect the condition of the modernized and reconstructed school.
3. Facility Component Assessment: Facility Component Assessment scores will be revised to reflect improvements provided at schools as part of the Capital Levy Improvements program.
4. Building Improvement Cost Percentage: These percentages will be revised to reflect the current condition of schools and current replacement costs.