GENERAL UPDATE
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK
DESIGN OVERVIEW
WILSON SCHOOL SITE
The Wilson School site is located in Rosslyn, VA along Wilson Blvd, right at the edge of the Rosslyn Central Business District.
VERTICAL SCHOOL + COMMUNITY

Understanding that the Wilson School will be spread across multiple levels, the main goal was to provide a central space that connects the buildings’ levels and provide access to outdoor spaces adjacent to all levels.
UNDERSTANDING THAT THE WILSON SCHOOL WILL BE SPREAD ACROSS MULTIPLE LEVELS, THE MAIN GOAL WAS TO PROVIDE A CENTRAL SPACE THAT CONNECTS THE BUILDINGS LEVELS AND PROVIDE ACCESS TO OUTDOOR SPACES ADJACENT TO ALL LEVELS.
VERTICAL SCHOOL + COMMUNITY

Understanding that the Wilson School will be spread across multiple levels, the main goal was to provide a central space that connects the buildings levels and provide access to outdoor spaces adjacent to all levels.
VERTICAL SCHOOL + COMMUNITY

Understanding that the Wilson School will be spread across multiple levels, the main goal was to provide a central space that connects the building's levels and provide access to outdoor spaces adjacent to all levels.
OPEN SPACES & BUILDING LOCATION

As a starting point, a stacked bar of typical classrooms is located in the middle of the site. This allows for the open space behind the building to be connected to the adjacent park, and protected by the building. Towards Wilson Boulevard a portion of the site is reserved for civic uses.
TERRACES CONNECTING SCHOOL TO FIELD

To create green space adjacent to the instructional spaces the bars are rotated along a single hinge point. This creates sequential terraces leading from the instructional spaces of the school to the field.
LARGE, OPEN & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ALONG WILSON BLVD

Beneath the rotated classroom bars is a large open ground floor with varying ceiling heights. The large and public functions of the building are placed here. The result is also that all of the spaces shared with the community are located along the site's public edge at Wilson Blvd.
SITE MANIPULATIONS FOR ENTRIES AND DAYLIGHT

Manipulations to the landscape and ground surface create daylight to the lower level, access under the field to the Stratford Program, and access to 18th St. The remaining wedges facing Wilson Boulevard are programmed as small public parks, one near the entrance to the school and another facing the corner of Wilson & Quinn.
ACTIVATED TERRACES
Each of the terraces have their own themes relating to the use of the floor they are accessed by. These terraces give an opportunity for an urban school to have a 1-story feel, that otherwise would not be possible in a 5-Story school.
August 6, 2015

Dr. Patrick Murphy
Superintendent
Arlington Public Schools
1426 26th Street, North
Arlington, Virginia 22207

Dear Dr. Murphy,

I am pleased to report to you on behalf of the Building Level Planning Committee (BLPC) for the new school building on Wilson Boulevard. The committee selected “Fanning Fans” (Concept 3) to be further developed as the schematic design phase. This new facility, which will house 775 students enrolled in the H-B Woodlawn Program and the Stratford Program, as well as other smaller school initiatives currently housed on Vacation Lane, promises to be an important new educational asset for Arlington, as well as a vital community resource for those who live and work in Rosslyn.

As part of the work this spring, our BLPC reviewed a number of concepts for the building, as well as research findings and information provided by consultants and APS staff related to the geographic characteristics of the site, plus data on transportation and parking options for students, staff, and visitors. The architects presented three concept designs for the project and, by strong majority agreement the Committee selected “Fanning Fans” (Concept 3) as the best way forward for this project.

The concept design selected by the BLPC seemed the best choice in that it meets the building and site goals set out by APS and presents a creative, yet practical, building that will be an architectural centerpiece for the community.

The concept drawings place the building facing Wilson Boulevard to integrate the building into the existing urban environment, while the design of the building still allows for adequate solar exposure. The current plan calls for bus drop-off for both programs on North 18th Street, along the proposed athletic field, with a covered entrance for Stratford students adjacent to the parking structure. Parent drop-off is proposed along North Quinn Street. The building’s position on Wilson Boulevard also allows for the school’s athletic field and nearby park to maximize contiguous open space in the neighborhood.

The design provides both indoor and outdoor educational and recreational spaces for each program, as well as integrated spaces for all students to share. Additional recreational and other outdoor amenities will be available on the roof of the building for use by the school, and some of these facilities will likely be available to the community as well.

My fellow BLPC committee members and I look forward to continuing our work during the schematic design phase of this project this fall, as well as continuing our collaboration with others in our community to compare the new school in Rosslyn for a tax levy opening.

Sincerely,

Melissa McCracken
Chair, Building Level Planning Committee
Wilson Project

August 7, 2015

The Reasonable Frame Violations Section, Chief
The Arlington County School Board
1426-28 Quinn St.
Arlington, Virginia 22207

RE: Wilson School – Concept Design

The Public Facilities Review Committee (PFRC) has so far held three (3) meetings during 2015 to consider Arlington Public Schools (“APS”) concept design plans for a new Wilson Secondary School. The main issues discussed at the Wilson School meetings were related to building siting, maximizing the amount of open space on the site, ensuring public access to the recreational space, and parking. Some of the main issues discussed are summarized below.

Building Siting and Design

The PFRC reviewed five concept designs for the building design and massing of the proposed school building, including a consideration of which street, Wilson Boulevard or 18th Street North, should provide primary frontage. Members of the PFRC felt strongly that the school should be sited along Wilson Boulevard. Although APS’s design team presented options for placement along both 18th Street and Wilson during the process, final designs put the school facing Wilson Boulevard. The design team also presented several alternatives for the design and massing of the school. The PFRC generally endorsed the current modernist design, known as the “Fanning Fans” design. At its July 15, 2015, meeting, an informal straw poll of members showed that an overwhelming majority of the PFRC supported both the location of the school building along Wilson Boulevard and the “Fanning Fans” concept.

A design team recommendation was to be of interest in the placement of public amenities. Members continue to have a desire to have entrances, as much as practicable, be attractive, open, and accessible by the general public.

Ultimate Frisbee and Elevated Playing Fields

PFRC discussion initially dealt with the use of open space on the site. The PFRC dealt with a desire, expressed by some members of the community currently using the Stratford School site, of locating a regulation size Ultimate Frisbee field on the Wilson site. APS’s design team provided a number of options showing the configuration of a playing field on the site, with frontage on the Wilson Boulevard or 18th Street North. After evaluating existing site characteristics and Frisbee field requirements, it was clear that a regulation size Ultimate Frisbee field would not fit wholly within the boundaries of the school’s proposed property. However, a reason for PFRC members’ preferences for location of the school along Wilson Boulevard was to allow for creation of the largest contiguous open space on the 18th Street North side of the site.

My fellow PFRC committee members and I look forward to continuing our work during the schematic design phase of this project this fall, as well as continuing our collaboration with others in our community to compare the new school in Rosslyn for a tax levy opening.

Sincerely,

Melissa McCracken
Chair, Building Level Planning Committee
Wilson Project
BLPC PARKING SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATE
HALRB WORKSHOP
WILSON SCHOOL NAME

WILSON SCHOOL NAME IS VERY IMPORTANT TO SITE'S HISTORY
WILSON BOULEVARD ENTRANCE REMOVED DURING RENOVATIONS
We are interested in incorporating this pattern/material in some way in the new building.
We are interested in incorporating this pattern/material in some way in the new building.
H-B WOODLAWN HISTORIC ELEMENTS @ STRATFORD BUILDING

Yearbook walls

Gym Floor from H-B Woodlawn Program’s Original Site.

Fish Pond in Lobby
WRAPS
BIG will be working with the county parks & recreation department to study the public/open spaces in the WRAPS area. We are currently finalizing the terms of the contract and expect to start work by the end of next week.
SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Proposed Wilson School Project

- HB Woodlawn Program – 720 students
- Stratford Program – 55 students
- Total 775 students (10% enrollment increase)
- September 2019 completion date
- Funding approved in FY2015-24 CIP: $80,200,000
Total Project Cost Summary

- CIP estimate (Dec 2014): $80,200,000
- Current estimate: $100,153,000
- Difference: $19,953,000
## Description of Variances

### Floor Area Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Building</td>
<td>138,000 sf</td>
<td>150,000 sf</td>
<td>170,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>19,300 sf</td>
<td>21,000 sf</td>
<td>30,900 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Woodlawn</td>
<td>106,300 sf</td>
<td>115,500 sf</td>
<td>124,600 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Spaces</td>
<td>12,400 sf</td>
<td>13,500 sf</td>
<td>14,600 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,650,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 20,000 sf @ $344/sf hard cost.
Floor Area Increase

**Stratford Program:**
- Larger gymnasium to accommodate program and specialized equipment needs
- Larger support spaces to accommodate staff collaboration and storage

**H-B Woodlawn Program:**
- Larger classrooms to comply with Ed. Specs.
- More classrooms to accommodate expanded enrollment and comply with Ed. Specs.
- Appropriate support space for performing & fine arts program
# Description of Variances

## Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
<td>81 spaces</td>
<td>92 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimates*</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$5,731,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,521,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated each underground parking space range of costs per space $50,000 - $60,000, plus additional covered area for Stratford entrance.
# Description of Variances

## Community Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Use of 2\textsuperscript{nd} Level Terrace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,063,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf Field with Lights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,097,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced/Raised Height Parking for Community Use/Access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$401,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Utilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,914,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Description of Variances

### Escalation Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Factor</td>
<td>$3,590,000</td>
<td>$6,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Factor*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,231,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Industry construction cost increase factor from Fall 2014 to August 2015
# Description of Variances

## Soft Cost Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft Cost</td>
<td>$14,730,000</td>
<td>$17,677,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,947,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>$370.00/SF</td>
<td>$55,500,000</td>
<td>$344.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Improvements/demolition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,170,000</td>
<td>$1,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,731,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HARD COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,880,000</td>
<td>$65,741,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market factor (9.25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escalation (changes from 5.8% to 9.9%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,590,000</td>
<td>$6,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft costs (22.5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,730,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,677,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants, Project Management, etc</strong></td>
<td>$12,130,000</td>
<td>$14,553,293</td>
<td>$2,423,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furniture</strong></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,802,138</td>
<td>$302,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,321,568</td>
<td>$221,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community improvements with soft costs</strong></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,321,568</td>
<td>$221,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td>$100,153,000</td>
<td>$19,953,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Possible Cost Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Difference Between CIP and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost Baseline</td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td>$100,153,000</td>
<td>$100,153,000</td>
<td>$19,953,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Program of Building 2,000 sf</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$843,000</td>
<td>-$843,000</td>
<td>-$843,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Sustainability Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensors &amp; Dashboard</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal System</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,454,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Hot Water &amp; PV Panels</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,181,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Water Reclamation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C Staff</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL OF MODIFICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,297,000</td>
<td>-$293,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td>$108,450,000</td>
<td>$99,860,000</td>
<td>$19,660,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Funding Required
# Funding Available/Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available/Required Funding</th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate w/Recommendations</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond (FY2014-2019)</td>
<td>$ 80,200,000</td>
<td>$ 80,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvements (county/APS joint fund)</td>
<td>$ 3,914,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,914,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from annual operation’s budget *</td>
<td>$ 1,862,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,862,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding required **</td>
<td>$ 13,884,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,884,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 80,200,000</td>
<td>$ 99,860,000</td>
<td>$19,660,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 30% of furniture cost and all technology equipment.

** Potential Sources for additional funding required:
- Funding reserved for additional 300 MS seats in FY2015-24 CIP (16.6M)
- Capital Reserve.
## Funding Available/Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available/Required Funding</th>
<th>CIP Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate w/Recommendations</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond (FY2014-2019)</td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvements (county/APS joint fund)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,914,000</td>
<td>$3,914,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from annual operation's budget *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,862,000</td>
<td>$1,862,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding required **</td>
<td>$13,884,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTAL</td>
<td>$80,200,000</td>
<td>$99,860,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 30% of furniture cost and all technology equipment.

** Potential Sources for additional funding required:
- Funding reserved for additional 300 MS seats in FY2015-24 CIP (16.6M)
- Capital Reserve.

*These numbers are only estimates. Community improvements will be dependant on further discussions with county.
WHAT DOES A BASIC BOX BUILDING COST?
WHAT CAN WE GET FOR $80.2M?
WHERE CAN WE SAVE MONEY?
WHAT DOES A BASIC BOX BUILDING COST?
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WHERE CAN WE SAVE MONEY?
WHAT DOES A BASIC BOX BUILDING COST?
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WHERE CAN WE SAVE MONEY?
COST REDUCTION STUDIES
PREMIUMS IN EXISTING DESIGN

The Design Team compared the current design to a basic rectangular building containing the same program area in order to understand the cost premiums that are inherent in the current design.
BASIC BOX DESIGN

COST REDUCTION STUDIES
PREMIUMS IN EXISTING DESIGN

PROJECT COST: $97,603,000

7 stories tall

Occupiable roof terrace

Theater

Steel tonnage (16 lb/sf)

Gymnasium
PROGRAM

The Design Team and Principals from H-B Woodlawn and Stratford programs have investigated areas for possible reduction in program.
CONCEPT DESIGN PROPOSED SIZE

170,025 SF

Current capacity is 775 students

$100,435,000
Cost for the current building area.
REDUCTION TO PLANNED 150,000 GSF

$93,626,000

Reduce building area to 150,000 gsf, saves $6,809,000, using a unit cost of $340/sf.

*Student capacity may range from 704-730 students, depending on the specific program reductions.
REQUIRED REDUCTION TO GET TO $80.2M

$80,200,000
Required building area reduction to meet CIP budget.

*Student capacity may range from 340-370 students, depending on the specific program reductions.
# Existing vs. Proposed Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-B Woodlawn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>34,671 sf</td>
<td>34,309 sf</td>
<td>-362 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3,163 sf</td>
<td>5,789 sf</td>
<td>2,626 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>7,575 sf</td>
<td>15,427 sf</td>
<td>7,852 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5,229 sf</td>
<td>5,530 sf</td>
<td>1 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>3,352 sf</td>
<td>4,387 sf</td>
<td>1,035 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>9,513 sf</td>
<td>10,007 sf</td>
<td>494 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>53,230 sf</td>
<td>67,107 sf</td>
<td>13,877 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratford</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>5,904 sf</td>
<td>6,846 sf</td>
<td>1,052 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Instruction</td>
<td>2,160 sf</td>
<td>1,959 sf</td>
<td>-201 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,069 sf</td>
<td>2,120 sf</td>
<td>1,051 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Services</td>
<td>979 sf</td>
<td>2,209 sf</td>
<td>1,230 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1,304 sf</td>
<td>2,865 sf</td>
<td>1,561 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>119 sf</td>
<td>1,083 sf</td>
<td>964 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>11,046 sf</td>
<td>6,846 sf</td>
<td>1,051 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-B Clinic</td>
<td>699 sf</td>
<td>1,532 sf</td>
<td>465 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Clinic</td>
<td>368 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-B Library</td>
<td>3,033 sf</td>
<td>5,581 sf</td>
<td>1,548 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Library</td>
<td>962 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>8,378 sf</td>
<td>5,909 sf</td>
<td>-2,469 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12,470 sf</td>
<td>8,666 sf</td>
<td>3,804 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,763 sf</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,870 sf</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,107 sf</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Existing vs. Proposed Program

The Design Team will work with Stratford and H-B Woodlawn principals to look for inefficiencies in the program, targeting the delta between their existing and proposed programs, while still meeting the needs of both schools.
$80,200,000 BUILDING

The Design Team has investigated a series of changes and reductions to the project that would be required in order to meet the CIP budget.

These examples are drastic.
REMOVE OCCUPIED TERRACES
-$1,933,000

1. Proposed outdoor spaces (courtyards, terraces, and field) are **76,200 sf**, equal to 94% of existing H-B & Stratford facilities.
2. Removing terraces reduces student outdoor space by **50%**.
3. Increases stormwater basin below grade.
REMOVE ATHLETIC FIELD & PARKING GARAGE
-$7,944,000

1. Adds 25 parking spaces
2. Provides potential space for farmers market / community activity.
3. Eliminates play surface for school and community.
4. Eliminates covered entrance to Stratford program.
5. Eliminates covered bicycle parking / storage.
DELETE SUNKEN COURTYARDS
-$792,000

1. Eliminates controlled outdoor play area for Stratford program.
2. Decreases daylight into classrooms and auxiliary gym by 75%.
MINIMIZE FENESTRATION
-$2,212,000

1. Slight increase in building thermal performance.
2. Reduces daylight into classrooms by 92%.
3. No glass in building entries or gym, only one window in cafeteria.
4. Creates oppressive interior environment for students, staff, and visitors.
5. Not an inviting street front on Wilson Blvd.
REDUCE 21,629 SF OF PROGRAM
-$7,354,000

To meet the $80.2M target a significant amount of reduction in the size of the school is required.
$80.2M SCENARIO

-21,629 SF
-7,354,000

REDUCE FENESTRATION
-2,212,000

REMOVE COURTYARDS
-792,000

SURFACE PARKING LOT,
NO FIELD
-7,944,000

NO OCCUPIED TERRACES
-1,993,000

-$20,235,000

Total Project Cost = $80,200,000

The Design Team has looked at a series of drastic measures to demonstrate the reductions needed to meet the CIP budget. However, the Design Team does not support these measures, as they compromise the design goals established with the BLPC & PFRC Committees.
TARGETED MODIFICATIONS

The Design Team has begun a list of cost control measures that will continue to develop and evolve, which demonstrates items we know can be reduced and anticipate further reductions in the future.
OPTIMIZE STRUCTURE, REDUCE TONNAGE
-$365,000

Due to the apparent complexity of the structure in Concept Design, our structural engineers have taken a conservative approach to estimating the weight of required steel. As we move into Schematic Design, we will work together to design the structure to be as efficient as possible, reducing weight and cost.
OPTIMIZE ENCLOSURE, REDUCE COST
-$350,000

The Design Team is optimistic that we can provide a high-performance exterior enclosure at reduced cost.
REDUCE 6,500 SF OF EXTERIOR GLAZING
- $82,000

As we look in further detail at the classroom design, we will balance daylight considerations with thermal performance and practical use of wall perimeter at classroom interiors.
REDUCE 2,000 SF OF PROGRAM
-$534,000

As we look in further detail at the classroom design, we will balance daylight considerations with thermal performance and practical use of wall perimeter at classroom interiors.
REMOVE ONE PASSENGER ELEVATOR  
-$370,000

We currently have a bank of 3 elevators, in addition to a dedicated elevator for the Stratford Program. Removing one elevator allows for additional vertical shaft space. However, it has a few potential drawbacks:

1. Reduces quality of elevator service from "Good" to "Unacceptable."
2. Should one elevator go down, only one elevator will be in service for the interim.
3. Peak wait times are estimated to increase from 30 seconds to 49 seconds.
REDUCTION SCENARIOS

The Design Team has begun a list of cost control measures that will continue to develop and evolve, which demonstrates items we know can be reduced and anticipate further reductions in the future.
CONCEPT DESIGN PROPOSAL

Total Project Cost = $100,435,000
Community Improvements = $3,914,000
Transfer from Operations = $1,862,000

Bond Money Required = $94,659,000
OPTION 1

-2000 SF  
-534,000

+ OPTIMIZE ENCLOSURE  
-350,000

+ OPTIMIZE GLAZING  
-82,000

+ OPTIMIZE STRUCTURE  
-365,000

+ REMOVE 1 ELEVATOR  
-370,000

TARGETED MODIFICATIONS ONLY

-1,701,000

Total Project Cost = $98,734,000  
Community Improvements = $3,914,000  
Transfer from Operations = $1,862,000

Bond Money Required = $92,958,000
OPTION 2

-20.025sf  
-6,809,000

OPTIMIZE ENCLOSURE  
-350,000

OPTIMIZE GLAZING  
-82,000

OPTIMIZE STRUCTURE  
-365,000

REMOVE 1 ELEVATOR  
-370,000

TARGETED MODIFICATIONS & FURTHER REDUCTION IN PROGRAM  
-7,976,000

Total Project Cost = $92,449,000
Community Improvements = $3,914,000
Transfer from Operations = $1,862,000

Bond Money Required = $86,673,000
OPTION 3

SURFACE FIELD, NO GARAGE
- $7,368,000

OPTIMIZE ENCLOSURE
- $350,000

OPTIMIZE GLAZING
- $82,000

OPTIMIZE STRUCTURE
- $365,000

REMOVE 1 ELEVATOR
- $370,000

NO PARKING GARAGE
& TARGETED MODIFICATIONS
- $8,535,000

Total Project Cost = $91,900,000
Community Improvements = $3,914,000
Transfer from Operations = $1,862,000

Bond Money Required = $86,124,000
OPTION 4

SURFACE FIELD, NO GARAGE
- $7,368,000

OPTIMIZE ENCLOSURE
- $350,000

OPTIMIZE GLAZING
- $82,000

OPTIMIZE STRUCTURE
- $365,000

REMOVE 1 ELEVATOR
- $370,000

NO PARKING GARAGE & TARGETED MODIFICATIONS
- $15,344,000

Total Project Cost = $85,091,000
Community Improvements = $3,914,000
Transfer from Operations = $1,862,000

Bond Money Required = $79,315,000