

KELLEY CAREY PRESENTATION OF FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Beaufort County School District
July, 2007

This report section elaborates upon Section I “Recommendations.” The plan is based upon Alternative “G” in the series of alternatives analysis, meaning it supplies the evolved impacts as to facilities and student assignment requirements, since Alternative “G” itself shows only how it evolved, without repeating all the supporting materials developed in the prior alternatives.

This Section V is divided into several parts:

The first part, *Five year Plan Recommendations* cover the facilities and student assignment recommendations of this study. Then follows a list of suggested *District Administrative Recommendations* for policies and practices that are offered as a summary of how this five year planning process should connect to everyday operations of the school district and how such planning should be institutionalized. Next, specific *Facilities Administration* practices suggestions are made to help assure the value is received from funds spent on this schools planning, design, and construction program. Next, some brief comments are made as to furtherance of interface of schools and the community, *Public Outreach* to engender support for such large construction programs and for local public education. And, finally, the suggested adoption and *Implementation process* is outlined, aimed at a school bond referendum.

Our recommendations are as follows:

A. FIVE YEAR PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Acquire land as soon as practicable for the new elementary school in the southern cluster near Highway 170 and the new Bluffton Parkway.

This project was recommended in our June 2007 report. Action was taken on identifying the parcels for the next elementary and middle schools, but not for this school. It needs to be done right now, and with funds taken from whatever sources can be compiled. The site for the school should be in the vicinity of the Bluffton Parkway extension at Highway 170. That land is going to be expensive and will be even more expensive if acquisition is delayed. At some point ten or twelve acres for an elementary school in the area that it is needed will simply not be available at all, given the rapid and intense development occurring.

2. Prepare materials and documentation for a school construction bond referendum at an early time to be assigned by the School Board, with a suggestion being in Spring of 2008. This program should encompass all of the building and renovations projects outlined in this five year planning report and summarized in this recommendations set.

Time is of the essence for the School Board to examine this planning document, make comments and receive a final version covering all their concerns. Thereafter, the Board needs to coordinate with the new superintendent so that the new superintendent has ownership of the findings and recommendations of this process for moving ahead. Equally important to ownership is having an organization in place capable of implementing this plan from concepts to programming to sites selection to design and construction.

Then, the Board should adopt the projects and procedures recommended so that the second level of planning for a school bond referendum can begin. That planning includes putting the details into the projects, identifying the scopes of work and moving to a preliminary facilities planning stage so that costs for construction can better be estimated.

This report cannot set reliable cost figures for land or for new schools construction for simple reasons. Land is changing value every day in this market, and a particular site will have site location and land features that will go to its appraised value, including frontage, adjacent uses, soils types, presence of water features, etc.

As to the designs, the consultants note that the district has pursued a policy of developing original plans for each new school, even those of similar enrollment capacity. Some of the schools are straightforward in design and others offer challenges of complexity in configuration that usually lead to high construction prices, and appear to have done so in this case. We cannot envision what design will be chosen or what special features might be deemed good to insert into the new schools. So, there is no way at this stage to give more than a ball park figure for new construction, based solely upon recent bids for local schools with designs that are not likely to be repeated as any guidance. The bottom line is that no major business could afford this design from scratch approach to housing their Wal Marts or Best Buys with the accompanying gambles as to costs that this school board has usually lost badly. That is not to say that internal organization of buildings cannot progress with each new project, only that the general form could cost effectively be more consistent, so that the change orders are ironed out and local contractors have experience with the costs involved in the design from recent past work. *See "Building Within Budget," Kelley D Carey, School Spending 2000, special supplement to American School Board Journal*

With this uncertain approach to designs, we cannot comfortably set a construction cost estimate for the new construction, until a program and general schematic are decided upon (see "Program Implementation Process" section of this report). As an aside, consistent designs, prototypes, always offer economies of scale in purchasing and keeping inventory of items for scheduled maintenance and in maintenance time required due to familiarity with equipment and materials.

We have provided cost estimates for the list of renovations, modifications and additions to existing schools, based upon current construction costs in this region. These prices are based upon the current cost indexes and based on assumptions about the form and location of work items. At this stage, the estimates are for a preliminary concept of costs for each school and for an entire bond program. Those estimates must be updated based upon some preliminary planning before a bond issue, and regularly updated at strategic decision points. For example, a new computer lab can be made from two classrooms, but those rooms might be needed otherwise or the later designer might want a free standing module or another location that will be more expensive to construct than we estimate here. That is why architects should be selected and some preliminary design should ensue for better cost estimates based upon that stage of the program. Our experience is that architects will provide that early assistance if they are the designated designers for the project when it is approved and funded.

3. Construct three new elementary schools, two in the southern cluster and one in the northern cluster.

This report confirms the need for a new elementary school to be sited on the Jones Tract as set out in our study of the southern cluster last year, updated in this study with latest enrollment projections and growth trends. The Board already owns this property, as it was scheduled for the next school site before, but our advice was that this site was being prematurely developed, which led to the Red Cedar School construction instead.

The second elementary school is recommended for location in the vicinity of the Bluffton Parkway Extension and Highway 170. Both schools should commence planning and construction as soon as funding is available.

The third elementary school should be located north of the Coosa Elementary School in the northern cluster on Ladys Island. The density of residential development between Coosa and Ladys Island Elementary Schools does not allow for selection of a school site there and those areas are better served by some rezoning as between the two schools. Historical enrollments by neighborhood indicate the growth is mostly occurring in the area around the recommended new location. For the long range, there is a plan on the table to construct a new bridge through this area across the Beaufort River, which would add to the area appeal as well for the long term.

As to the Ladys Island elementary recommendation, there has been much expression about the presence of excess classrooms in the northern cluster. Please refer to our extensive analysis of how each school is used now, what efficient and equitable use would mean as to classrooms required and what the enrollment projections require as to capacity. It is self-evident that there are extra classrooms scattered about.

The practicality of planning, though, is that one cannot add up all the empty classrooms and convert those to equivalent excess schools. It would be much like taking all the extra bedrooms in the houses in one's neighborhood, adding them up and deciding ten houses are not needed, so newcomers need not build more.

We cannot reassign elementary students from growth areas on Ladys Island near Coosa Elementary to extra classrooms at Whale Branch Elementary, for example. In short, some impacts of past poor planning cannot convert into unequal treatment of students

now. We have to go forward with planning that does look to the long term and that does make best use of available classrooms to the extent practicable.

In the interest of time and economy, we recommend that the three schools be of identical designs. We recommend that the enrollment capacity for the new elementary schools be increased from 650 to 800 students. Due to the added expense of later adjustments and the need for a later funding source, we recommend that the full capacity be built initially for the two southern cluster schools. For the new school near Coosa Elementary, the opening enrollment capacity should be 600 minimum, with the core facilities should handle 800 enrollment capacity with expansion already designed in to add eight more classrooms, without core expense, as a simple extension of the design.

With the unknown level of future residential density (and very high densities emerging now) and very limited open space available, there is little chance of infilling elementary schools in the future in the areas of any of these three schools. Right size for any school is a function both of the programs and of the density of development. And, as a district grows and population density becomes an issue, we cannot afford the luxury and extreme cost of multiple schools a few blocks apart, especially as demographics age later and zones issues start to emerge with many smaller schools.

4. Acquire land as soon as practicable for the new elementary school in the northern cluster north of the Coosa Elementary School.

This comprehensive planning study, had it been done a couple of years ago, would have projected the need for these new schools. In all cases, the land should have been purchased in advance and at significant savings. But, that is history. It need not be repeated now, by delay in purchasing land for these schools. The Coosa Elementary area is also developing steadily with few remaining sites adequate for an elementary school. It is critical to identify parcels and take steps to evaluate them and to secure them without delay.

Funding may not be available for all three properties before a bond referendum is passed. Funding options may still exist, including sale of some very valuable excess properties or a short term borrowing to lock in good property. The escalating prices would probably more than pay back interest charges on a loan. If none of those suggestions will be possible, the district really needs to buy a new Coosa area site, as that will be likely the least cost property and there are not really very many alternatives available.

5. Undertake renovations, modifications, and additions to schools as outlined in this five year plan.

As part of this data driven process, we visited every school in the district, walked the halls with maintenance personnel, asked questions about the building components and applied standard architectural and engineering principals to the analysis based upon many years of experience of the team in planning, designing and renovating schools.

In some cases, principals requested major alterations or additions that did not comport with other schools facilities, based upon a special program held there. We have reported out these requests as line items in the “Do Nothing” Alternative plan. It will

be for the Board to decide whether, for example, art or music infused concepts should only be available at certain elementary schools. From equity, we suggest that such programs should be part of all children's experience not just those with parents who can provide transportation to another school or can deal with a different school calendar.

Other schools could be characterized as magnets with a defined attendance zone first preference, such as Beaufort Middle School. The benefits may be evident. But, the result is a considerable under enrollment at Ladys Island Middle School, while Beaufort Middle School requests additions for that program. Beaufort Middle School has had some sort of special program since it was built a few years ago, as there were insufficient students in a possible zone to use more than half the building. So, a balance has to be struck as to greatly under enrolling another school along with more transportation across the Ladys Island Bridge to special programs at Beaufort Middle School. Some other attractor programs could be offered at Ladys Island Middle School to use that building and not spend funds on adding on to Beaufort Middle School, given this context of attractor programs causing the apparent need. These kinds of shifts must be weighed by the board as a policy matter. We simply are documenting the impacts and resulting costs to weigh against the benefits perceived.

The resulting list of work items for each school is extensive in some cases. Prices have been estimated for the work based upon current construction costs. Again, all costs have to be updated to the time that construction will actually begin as part of the pre planning for a school bond issue that sets a timetable. We do not correct the data to a future time, as we cannot say with certainty what the Board might select that time to be. Some projects historically have lagged locally for several years after a referendum over various issues, mostly stemming from absence of planning.

6. Demolish a seven classroom wing at Shell Point Elementary.

In the Bond Referendum of 2000, a new seven classroom wing was added to the school, also containing rest rooms. The problem is that the wing was not really a new standard building. The program simply brick encapsulated prefabricated classrooms, that are elevated above wet soils (with a resulting higher floor elevation), requiring constant pumping to remove the water. Mold is present, along with dankness and peeling of paint along floor trim for example. The entire wing needs to be removed, as there is no reasonable way to cure the basic construction premise and continuing problem. Based upon the low site elevation and drainage issues, we do not recommend replacement of this wing or any further expansions of the school. Otherwise, it is in good condition, well-maintained, has other well designed additions built over the years, and can provide service for years to come, after this wing is removed.

Instead of replacing this lost enrollment capacity, this study recommends some rezoning to ripple through adjacent schools, both to address the reduced capacity at Shell Point and to make better use of good classrooms already existing elsewhere. As a result, the Beaufort Elementary resident enrollment after the rezoning will increase from 365 to 562, by adding some areas that are growing. That school's current actual roll, including transfers is 422. We project the five year resident enrollment to increase to 677.

In short, demolishing a substandard wing and some rezoning makes much better use of Beaufort Elementary School. The comprehensive recommendation also results in keeping Shell Point, Shanklin (which was at capacity) and Broad River Elementary zones enrollments within their five year projected need for capacity.

7. Build additional computer labs across the district as specified in this five year plan.

The administration directed application of a policy to add a computer lab to each existing elementary school to account both for intensity of usage and for mandated testing requiring use of existing computer labs. The addition was made in the plan where the result would be a standard of two computer labs at each middle school. Middle school requirement is for three computer labs. High schools requirement is a minimum of three computer labs, which criteria was applied in this study. Some of the newer middle schools already had three labs while others did not. In all cases we provided the standard by additions or modifications as indicated by the building.

8. Build addition to M. C. Riley to include classrooms not built in current program

The addition proposed in the last program was not built (Eight percent funding source), as the recent bids for the project were about twice the budgeted amount. This project entailed several additions to the main building, which often raises the expect price per foot due to complexity of scattering the small additions. We recommend a basic organization analysis of the building and the site and replanning of the expansion. The added capacity is certainly recommended as the areas to the east of the school, toward Hilton Head, will continue to grow, but not so as to require another elementary school.

Additionally, we are budgeting an early learning center at the school, which should be a free standing module, so that the core building can be reorganized for expansion. The result will not be as cost effective as a good initial design, but this building has had additions and deletions over the years that make reorganization necessary. The bus loading and parking are disorganized and should be entirely replanned.

Because of the extent of work indicated to make a better organized building with expansions, we suggest the latest bid be factored forward to actual construction with the addition of our recommendation for an early learning center for 200 students. It appears that the food service capacity of the existing building should accommodate these additions. But, detailed study is indicated for that decision. The site should be master planned so that these additions are not random and allow for future changes and uses on the large property of the school.

9. Build early learning centers at Bluffton and M. C. Riley Elementary Schools.

See above discussion for M. C. Riley Elementary. Bluffton Elementary is at the hundred percent location as to residential development being all around it. Our zones plan relieves it via expansions at Riley and the two early learning centers. We do not recommend any more classrooms at this site in this five year plan. The major relief will come via shrinking its attendance zone to account for Red Cedar and Jones Tract elementary schools which in turn will be complemented by another elementary near Bluffton Parkway and Highway 170. Also, with a middle school and elementary

school on the same site traffic circle, congestion is a problem that will not be completely remedied. The Bluffton Early Learning Center should also have a 200 student capacity and should be located between the school and the Boys and Girls Club, on property owned by the district, and with its own separate access to the public street. Due to congestion and distance to travel to the main building, this should be a free standing operation with all services in house.

A programmatic study is recommended before the grade structures are set for these two early learning centers due to the developing pressure on buildings capacity. For example both centers could contain Pre K and K or Pre K-1 or Pre K-2. More grades might mean a little more space and cost. But, that is to be compared to no likely options for future new elementary schools in the densely developing area around the two schools.

Also, the program study must answer detail questions, such as self-contained food preparation and service, or supply of food from the core cafeteria (least cost). See the Implementation section of this report.

10. Rezone elementary schools in northern cluster, before demolishing a substandard classroom wing at Shell Point Elementary.

This recommendation is an administrative sequencing issue. Enrollment trends require that the recommended rezonings for Shell Point, Shanklin, Broad River, and Beaufort Elementary Schools be in place so that students are reassigned and in their new schools before the demolition of the wing is begun at Shell Point Elementary.

11. Rezone elementary schools on Ladys Island, after construction of a new elementary school north of Coosa Elementary.

This recommendation is obviously the reverse of the process involving Shell Point. The new school near Coosa Elementary must be opened at the same time as rezoning of students to it and between Coosa Elementary and Ladys Island Elementary Schools. Every effort should be made in all these rezonings to have them effected at the start of school years instead of mid term due to planning and construction delays that should be anticipated in the scheduling.

12. Rezone elementary schools in southern cluster, after construction of new elementary schools at Jones Tract and near Highway 170.

Both of these schools must be in the next building program. Using the same design for all three schools will ease the process and probably result in better bid prices. In any event the two in the southern cluster must open at the same time, so that rezoning across the whole cluster west of Hilton Head Island can be done at the same opening of a school year. There is a domino effect from all these reassigments that absolutely requires all projects to be completed and opened by the same opening date for school.

13. Conform middle school zones to certain new elementary zone lines in north and south clusters.

Part of our planning is to overlay the secondary school zones to permit zone lines at the different levels to be concurrent to the extent practicable. Since there will be a new

middle school in the southern cluster, this zone will be a completely new one as related to McCracken Middle School. There is only one high school zone for all these schools. In the northern cluster, our recommended rezoning between Broad River and Beaufort Elementary Schools requires an adjustment at the middle school and high school levels so that small fragments of a zone are not assigned to a different secondary school.

14. Land banking for future high school and middle school campus in the Bluffton area, beyond this five year plan.

Our enrollment projections show no need for a new high school in the southern cluster within the next five years. However, we recommend elsewhere in this report a rolling five year planning program to anticipate and plan for emerging trends at least five years in advance. In the case of the southern cluster, this creates a small dilemma, as there is no five year need, but a glance at all the planned elementary schools makes it obvious that another high school is in the future in a ten year view. Ordinarily, our recommendation would be to buy land when the five year plan told us the school was an emerging need. Not so in this case though due to the extreme density of land developments underway, the environmental and county line limitations, and the disappearing availability of, say, fifty acres minimum for a high school complex.

Therefore, we recommend budgeting for land banking a new high school site in the southern cluster that would be west to south west of the existing high school along Highway 170 perhaps. There has been some discussion about a technical high school in the northern cluster being complemented by one in the south. It may well be that the purchase of land could include accounting for some extra room for this option to exist in the future. Probably incorporating such a program would not be a land intensive addition to the next high school, if its emphasis is on being a technical-academic facility, not a traditional vo-tech school.

The second use for the site could be for a future middle school, since the ripple through of growing enrollments at the elementary level will have the same impact on need for another middle school in the within a ten year horizon. And, the same land scarcity issue will apply as for the high school for the twenty or so acres required.

In sum, not setting aside land for future middle and future high schools would be poor planning in the face of the particular local circumstances discussed here, taken with the astronomical growth in land costs in the Bluffton area that will likely continue.

Note: These recommendations do not include reference to the new northern high school that is being planned and funded pursuant to the Year 2000 School Bond Issue, nor to the Academy for Career Excellence that is administered as a separate legal entity by its own governing board and jointly funded by the Beaufort County and Jasper County Boards of Education. See Alternatives Section, Alternative F discussion relative to the ACE program.

B. DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS.

Planning should be a cross disciplinary as well as a specialized process within a school district. There must be team work and sharing of data, priorities, and solutions, along with individual responsibility for specific activities actually getting done. Some of these suggestion are at the policy level, suggesting that they should be brought as

recommendations to the board and adopted as policies so they survive after individual capabilities to complete missions well. Other suggestions may already be initiated or thought about in part, but not formalized as to how the objectives will be achieved, regardless of who has an assignment in the future. Absent a formal planning structure, how things get done can be a moving target from one situation to another. All of the suggestions flow from our reviews of data, visits to schools, and appraisal of where the district is today as to comprehensive planning. Certainly, the suggestions are offered in the constructive context of experience with many school districts facing similar challenges and trying various solutions and are directed at organizational planning, not assessment of any person, and are for discussion as an avenue to planned change.

15. Develop a process for generating a rolling five year programs, demographics and facilities plan with annual updates of programs, student demographics and facilities utilization, conditions and projected needs.

Long range comprehensive planning has to be integral to an organization's thinking all the time, not just when needs have produced a panic mode for getting solutions in a hurry. The district history is not one of documented planning processes and public trust is bound up with rational expectation that the needs expressed for schools are indeed justified by reasonable effort at planning. In short, a quick plan for a bond issue will fall short here and over do there. Every year the district needs to update computer maps showing where kids live versus where they attend, to show current attendance zones, and new five year enrollment projections by grade at each school should be prepared. The needs surveys from maintenance should be gathered as to emerging capital replacement requirements. The programmatic changes should be factored into space needs. Building utilization should be checked for conformance with adopted policies. Changes in enrollment and demographics should be factored into a new five year update of facilities and student assignment adjustments and capital outlay requirements. Those are among the planning updates that should be done each year. Waiting years to do a study and then retaining a consultant to build a base of data where little exists is a very expensive and time consuming approach that has backfired in the local experience of capital outlay planning. (*See also "Why School Building Programs Go Bust," Kelley D. Carey, School Business Affairs, July 2007, Journal of Assoc. of School Business Officials*).

16. Establish a joint in-house planning group consisting of the assistant superintendents overseeing curriculum, facilities, transportation, and finance to review materials for a rolling five year plan, to approve projects proposals before they are developed for formal presentation, to monitor progress and content of construction planning, and to be a cross disciplinary clearing house for use and alterations of school facilities. This team shall meet at least once each calendar quarter and shall be chaired by the assistant superintendent for curriculum, who shall request reports from time to time from team members to make the meetings productive.

17. Place governance in any planning for building modifications, alternations or adaptations at the central office level. Especially is this true with reference to adapting classrooms to pull out programs, work room, lounges, or other non-traditional applications.

- 18. Require multi-disciplinary planning in building additions and new buildings to cross instruction expertise with maintenance, security, transportation, and long range planning.**
- 19. Move to a single calendar for all district schools to enable reliable planning for continued need for new facilities to respond to growth, and equitable and stable student assignment planning.**

This recommendation was similarly offered in our June report of last year to the school district as to the southern cluster. It still remains a “seats available” opportunity that takes a seat needed for future kids living within the school zones and gives it to a transfer student, who becomes entitled to that seat all the way through elementary school. When the seats are all filled with transfers, the district will have to buy portables for the zone kids who come, as the projections clearly show. That is not a workable plan, nor is it equitable. Whatever calendar seems the best to the Board, it must adopt a single one for all schools, despite likely furor from some who feel they have vested rights to go where they please. Were the policy adopted now, the current transfers could be grandfathered in to some extent, depending upon the planned new construction schedule. The district simply cannot plan for the long term and waste limited funds on portables with calendar and program transfers rife in the district.

- 20. Engage a planning consultant each year to review computer maps of students, to review demographic trends and changes made to facilities as an independent report of emerging needs for the five year plan as to zones realignments and new construction. This need not be an exhaustive service and should be based on data regularly maintained rather than need to acquire original information. The work requires an expertise that cannot be justified all year in house, except in the largest districts, and may include computer mapping updates, absent in-house resource, as a cost benefits measure. See “Best-Laid Plans,” Kelley D. Carey, *American School Board Journal*, Oct. 1999).**
- 21. Require a written report to the Superintendent and Board prior to adoption of any program for addition, modification or new construction, containing at a minimum: justification, alternatives considered, explanation of why this alternative was selected, basis in student demographics or building condition or program offering, estimated costs for construction (citing source), utilities, furnishing, fixtures and equipment, land, access, environmental regulations compliance, and implementation (with the source of the cost estimate cited), resources required, possible disruptions to educational programs, and schedule of necessary events up till opening. (See “Renovate or Replace,” Kelley D. Carey, *American School Board Journal*, October 2000).**
- 22. Install a school finder on the district web site to help control schools assignments, including zone maps and an address entry for finding one’s assigned school. There are many examples on the web that are easy to set up and to use.**

This type of simple web screen would help to get new students into the right school ahead of enrollment time. It is good public relations. The program could easily be extended later to a pre enrollment form that would speed up admissions process and cut the amount of work required to correct student address data, as every school has

specific streets and address limits that can register there, absent a transfer authorization code, for example.

23. Maintain a simple computer student demographics mapping program in house that uses street files from the transportation routing program for common data usage and that is used to compare where students attend school with where they are zoned to attend and to project student resident zone enrollment trends. Provide a report by the third enrollment month listing all out of zone students by category of reason to be sent to all principals for verification or records update for correct home addresses.

The consultants can assist in this regard with recommended software and training. In the interim, the consultants can annually update maps as part of support for annual facilities needs update. If the maps in this report, along with the needs surveys are not updated each year, the costs for redo of materials will be quite high.

24. Adopt a clear and concise list of reasons for allowing students to transfer to other than their zoned school.

Assigned responsibility and active enforcement of this policy makes or breaks it. The current data base shows a wide range of transfers. Some simply say “program” which could mean an “infused” program or a special education program, or anything else. Do not grant permission for transfers until an authorization is entered onto the compiled computer student data base from the assistant superintendent in charge of all transfers. Prohibit the use of paper records keeping for student transfers.

25. Where excess classrooms exist to any extent, provide guidance to principals to organize programs so that entire halls or zones may be closed to reduce cleaning and maintenance costs and utilities costs, and to improve public appearance impact from scattered rooms used for storage.

26. Conduct an appraisal of all land and property owned by the Beaufort County Board of Education. Sell surplus property to use the proceeds now.

The public records show scores of land parcels owned by the school district. But, the accounting is uncertain and the values are unknown, it seems. Many parcels are only a few acres in size, and some, but only some, may actually be combined together on the ground as existing school sites. That is simply a guess. There is a six inch binder of this property listing data, and we could find no one who knew what it was all about. The parcels that are attendant to actual school sites should be consolidated on record for clarity. Then the other real estate should be appraised for a study of ultimate disposition. An outstanding example is the old Battery Creek High School property that some have said is worth perhaps \$12 million. The building probably needs some abatement before demolition, which probably could better be handled by a purchaser than by a public school board.

Some may believe that such assets are investments for the future. But, in this case with all the building and renovation needs requiring huge expenditures across the district, the future is now, and school districts are not ordinarily in the investment business, especially in this context. Any activities now held in that facility could easily find a home in another building in the district. In sum, the board should hire an appraiser to

report on this property and its value and current use, and divest itself of surplus property holding no promise of having a future educational need. The income could help meet current facilities needs and reduce the amount of borrowing required for this five year program of construction. Selling just one small parcel could pay for this step.

27. Plan for future consolidation of all district-wide operations into a central facility.

This recommendation, of course, would not cover building maintenance and vehicle related activities. Our survey of facilities included visits to all buildings, including closed schools that hold central office type personnel. While central office planning was not within our scope, our experience elsewhere is that scattered school district operations always involve redundancy of personnel and equipment, keeping old schools open when they were closed as schools before, so that the same building operating costs continue, though the space is usually not effectively converted. Dispersal of central office personal can create its own form of site based management and splintered decision making, along with uneven supervision of personal and activities, and unnecessary use of surplus facilities.

The current central office is too small, cramped and poorly arranged as to the design fitting the activities, as to small public areas, inadequate offices, rest rooms, and meeting rooms (the public should not pass executive offices to get to a meeting room in back), and other considerations. It cannot be expanded at the site, and enlargement by use of the parking across the street would leave too little parking at the present building site were it cleared. In short, we have seen significant income from selling properties scattered about districts that are used for administration, along with improved governance and efficiency in other consolidations of school district administration. Obviously, the southern cluster administration offices should continue to operate due to travel distances involved. Again, developing this consideration into a specific solution is not within the scope of this planning process. It is offered for future planning, because we suggest that dispersal of central operations is both demonstrably costly and can impede the planning recommended in this report.

28. After development of program for technical-academic high school in northern cluster, evaluate alternative futures of Academy for Career Excellence.

As discussed in Alternative “F” for Reorganization, the current setup of managing a technical school split between two school districts as to finance and with its own board is not a good long range situation. The facility requires many millions of dollars for renovation, modification and expansion. But, both individual districts have huge needs for other construction that will make it difficult to come together on this separately managed priority as a practical matter. Also, we recommend that this program be coherent with the program to be developed for the new northern academic-technical high school. Ultimately, the southern cluster should offer closer access to the same program. As part of a rolling five-year plan, the district should place a hold on further facilities investments at ACE, until it can specifically relate such needs to its overall fabric of education, which might mean upgrading the program at its present site, relocating it to a new high school site, reorganization of ownership, and, certainly, programmatic evaluation in the context of the new northern high school program.

29. Eliminate program transfers among schools, except for designated magnet type programs such as I. B. and special education and other normally adopted transfer reasons.

By far the majority of school districts that we deal with nationally have a short set of reasons to allow students to attend school out of zone. They go to hardship, special education, special needs, and sometimes magnet programs, but not to a wholesale migration of kids out of one school and into another. The same analysis obtains for this policy as it does for a unified calendar. It amounts to an objective of reasonably equal access to a similar level of education at all schools.

Certainly, many larger school districts have one or two magnet schools or an International Baccalaureate Program at central locations. Some of these programs typically have either a district wide access or first enrollment preference to a certain zone or to students living within a certain distance of the school. What they do not have are randomly “infused” programs scattered around the district without consistency or access to all kids within their zoned schools. The concept evolved here from site based management and use of space that was empty at the time without a long range plan. It has resulted in disparities in programs among schools and some schools in growth areas becoming very overcrowded with out of zone transfers for “program.” We recommend that this whole program be revisited at the central administration level to assure equity in education at all elementary schools, as it clearly drives the huge number of transfers occurring, and contributes to schools being over enrolled and under enrolled. That outcome will not work in a growing school district.

30. Place designated magnet type programs at schools with excess enrollment capacity and little prospects of zone growth, within the context of travel distance to other schools, instead of at schools that are crowded from zoned students.

Typically, magnet type programs are located to attract students to particular school facilities, often to make better use of a school building, to enliven downtown schools, or to encourage desegregation. The problem comes in when the attractor program is offered at a school with a zone that is growing to need all of the capacity. Study should be given to the projected enrollments at the schools to ascertain where magnet programs (or infused programs or some other options) might be less apt to create unnecessary construction. For example, Beaufort Middle School is attracting kids from Ladys Island Middle School, so that Ladys Island Middle School is notably under enrolled while being a large school set up in pods that might adapt to such special programs. Perhaps the program at Ladys Island could be enhanced to reduce travel burden and make use of that school.

31. Provide guidance to schools as to uniform curriculum and space requirements for special programs. Prohibit site based design and institution of any special programs, apart from coordination with the Schools Planning Team recommended in this section.

This concern comes as an outgrowth of the district history of site based management. Our survey showed disparity among schools as to programs offered, some quite large, along with different concepts that were difficult to compare between schools. As a result some of the different thinking has been resolved and program titles have been

better aligned. But, the situation that developed spoke to need for clear central authority in programs and student assignment; else the issues will evolve again. Effort should continue to achieve measurable uniformity in program offerings or the currently proposed plan that efficiently uses classrooms will gradually become irrelevant to how schools are being used, and seeming new needs for classrooms will again emerge. If the programs offered are not monitored yearly as part of a five year plan update, new situations are likely to develop of site based programs.

32. Annually monitor the organization of classrooms uses in each school to assure that assigned classroom programs and age and grade groupings or any site based concepts of organization conform to school district policies for programs delivery and recognized best practices.

In our surveys we found various theories of education being explored at the elementary schools. One school had been modified at high cost just to meet a past site based idea of lower grades having same room space as kindergarten. In past visits we saw such things as grouping first graders with fifth graders on the same hall on a buddy system theory, among other unusual site based initiatives. Building organizations, like curriculum should be consistent with the building plan organization and Board policy, such as having safe locations with adequate space for kindergarten classrooms, and not devolve into site based theories of program delivery that cannot be assessed as to comparative need for space (not to mention use of resources). Particularly is this important to track each year, before programs lapse back into different titles, unusual offerings, and non classroom uses of classrooms.

33. Guide the planning for staff needs for each coming year at the central office to assure the same formula intent is realized for teacher and staff hiring and classroom utilization at all schools at the same levels.

Some practices in place for budget allocations have indirect impacts upon one school appearing overcrowded, while another with the same grades and similar enrollment does not need portable classrooms. One possibility is the site based use of the budget for a different mix of certified teachers versus assistants. Each teacher needs a classroom in the basic program. But some mix of personnel hired could result in lower student to teacher ratios in a given school that use up the classrooms that would otherwise be available for programs, just because they are there. A reasonable expectation is to start with similar student to teacher ratios everywhere and adjust them for special conditions that are approved by the central office, under policies adopted by the School Board and State. Require consistent titles for programs among schools, with a sub title for special funding if required, so that equity in offerings is clear and needs for classrooms can be understood at all planning levels.

Allied to this note, class scheduling expertise, in our experience, can mean that one principal can hold all classes and activities and pull out programs within the school facility, while another principal would require several portable classrooms with the same situation. In sum, scheduling and site staff budget allocations both can have serious impacts upon the classrooms required in a school district.

C. FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the following recommendations should be formally adopted by the school district to assure continuity in support of good planning by ongoing activities. Other items are suggested practices that are conducive to a coordinated effort at maintaining and planning for quality school facilities.

34. Establish a facilities planning, construction, operations, and maintenance department.

This department should be under the administration of an assistant superintendent for facilities qualified by degree(s) and substantial experience in improving and maintaining facilities in a public school district. Some school districts have a practice of hiring personnel with advanced education degrees for all assistant superintendent jobs, except for comptroller. Our experience is that a manager needs to be trained in the work they direct and should not have to learn it by asking their employees or consultants who do not have an overview. Certainly, strong experience in a successful public school district facilities management environment is helpful experience for this leadership, along with organizational and communications skills.

These roles are currently divided in the district, so that leadership in practice has to be directly from the superintendent. One qualified assistant superintendent should be assigned to direct all of these activities, to make certain they coordinate with one another, and that data, analysis, needs, projections, and recommendations are all folded into a single process stream. That unity cannot exist under the current personnel organization.

35. Include within the scope of work for the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities to maintain ongoing official liaison with all local and regional planning agencies.

The district must plan in part by staying in coordination with shifts in land uses, prospects of significant impacts from new thoroughfares and large developments that might result in increased enrollments. This liaison should specifically extend to sharing demographics and planning data from the district and from the local planning agencies by formal agreement. A report from this manager to the Superintendent and Board should be made early each Spring on emerging issues of growth and facilities needs that will be informational in team planning for student demographics and use of facilities in the coming year, prepared pursuant to the report from the independent planning consultant on the rolling five year plan update. See required planning update and team coordination under "District Administration."

36. Require a structured preliminary planning process for new schools and major school modifications prior to seeking Board approval and funds through annual budget or bond referenda.

A formal process for planning and presenting needs is recommended so that building and student assignment plans and costs estimates are realistic and corrected to the future construction dates. See “*Before You Dig*,” Kelley D. Carey, *American School Board Journal*, Oct. 2001).

37. Adopt a building utilization standard requiring that first preference be given to use of classrooms for core instruction and special education.

Core programs should take precedence in the main school building, which is not always the case in school districts, before uses such as for pull out programs, lounges or workrooms or other non core activities. Core educational classes are not relegated to portable classrooms, unless as a last resort.

38. Update cost estimates for a long range construction program each year to reflect local conditions corrected to the expected time of construction being underway.

Cost estimates get stale anywhere, but markedly so in area having high demand for construction skills. It simply is poor business to estimate a building construction cost, then go to the public for a referendum, or skip a funding cycle for budgeting the work, then hire a designer, and learn far too late that the project is now going to cost much more than estimated two years before.

39. Issue a yearly report to the Board and to the public after adoption on the web site.

Public presentation and access to information is a fine communication tool, summarizing the facilities work done in the prior year and the expected renovations, modifications, expansions and student reassignments projected for the coming years, along with attendant costs and areas affected.

The Board and the public need to know what has been done with school facilities in the past year and what is projected to be done. If planning is done as it should be in scheduling, an annual report is a simple item to provide. It engenders public and board confidence in the integrity of the process and provides opportunity for open discussion.

40. Consider a policy of using prototype designs for elementary schools, in particular, along with a scoring process for architect selection involving the Board.

Too many schools are designed from scratch with resulting cost overruns due to no track record for the construction, design and construction errors, scheduling issues affecting opening, and local subcontractor unfamiliarity with the design. Also, project costs run up with intricate designs that are hard to build with unique floor plans that might bring awards. Consider school designs that have worked well locally and designs used successfully in other districts.

Selection of architects is a key part of cost control. This board has had uneven experience with architects in costs, delays, and design. We suggest that an ordered method begins with notice placed in The State newspaper and a state trade journal, reciting specific selection criteria, including prior experience in designing this specific type of school, track record of meeting budget in projects, qualifications of the project manager assigned, not of the firm partners, references from prior clients (including calls to principals of schools designed before final selection of an architect), understanding of process for incorporating the staff instead of selling expensive ideas, distance from the district, willingness to hold all meetings locally, and other practical line items.

The school board itself should conduct this selection interview, perhaps from the top five short listed from scoring responses to requests for statements of qualifications, as these are lay questions that can be scored one to four. A line item scoring is necessary to avoid being swayed by a glitzy presenter who will not do the actual work. Leaving selection to staff can result in uneven results, when the board can do a good job with good information and a scoring guide, instead of just passing on a recommendation for a huge funding process commitment. For more discussion see "*Selecting an Architect*," Kelley D. Carey, *American School Board Journal*, August 2000.

41. Compile written standards for design components of new construction, classrooms, ancillary facilities, and furnishings, fixtures and equipment.

The recommendation becomes simpler than it sounds, using reference to the wide base of such data available, including for prototype construction to reduce costs and cost overruns. The State of South Carolina is producing a manual of guidance that would be the core of this specification guidance. Many districts maintain such a resource, and they should be consulted to avoid undue expense in development of a local guidance.

42. Engage an independent cost consultant to estimate construction costs for final designs of new schools and major additions, and require, by contract, written estimates from the architect at the programming stage, at the building schematic stage, and at the final design development. Huge cost overruns are likely in the absence of this estimating along the way.

Architects are not always good cost estimators, but should be held accountable early on in what their candidate design is going to cost, at every stage right up to the completed drawings. It costs relatively little to engage a professional cost consulting for a reliable independent estimate to compare to the bids that will come in and to see if there are problems before the program goes to bids. At least until the district has a proven process of planning and price estimating and architect selection in place, this second opinion is recommended.

43. Encourage all senior personnel associated with facilities to be active members in the Council of Educational Facilities Planners and to seek appropriate certifications from CEFPI and state licensing, as appropriate, in their areas of concern.

44. Prepare a computer digitized set of architectural building floor plans (not entire construction documents) drawn to scale or digitized from original documents or site measurements where plans do not exist.

This effort need not be overblown with costly software and machines to serve most of the practical uses of recordation. Simple commercial scanning of drawings to computer file will be better than roles of drawing that get lost or damaged. Overlays of other data are still easily done, and the cost does not make something worthwhile not happen.

All architects and engineers should be required to furnish final plans and specifications in CAD form on media storage for this archiving and maintenance use.

Drawings should ultimately include property lines and acreage, roads access, parking and driveways, site improvements and utilities access, space layouts, areas, a space numbering system, and current space utilizations table for use in planning and administration. This plans resource on computer should be updated each year for multiple purposes, with a copy of their school floor plan furnished to each principal.

45. Emphasize building security in planning new facilities and modifications.

In our survey, we noted that exterior doors had been added to classrooms to meet code requirement for two exits. But, the Life Safety Code only requires two exits, one of which is usually a window. Exterior doors for classrooms can be a dangerous idea, especially opening onto driveways or hidden areas. Modules have been added without closed connectors to the main building, inviting unchecked entry. Require a design review for security for any new school and site or modification plan. Assure that additions to buildings are designed to avoid blind halls and isolated access without clearance by the front desk (see *“Designing for Student Needs,” Kelley D. Carey, Special 2003 Supplement, American School Board Journal*).

46. Give close attention to professional site planning at existing schools as to movement and parking of private vehicles versus queuing for student pickup and bus loading.

A number of schools were poorly located on property with poor site circulation and mix of cars and buses, for example. Transportation, the principal, and planning should be consulted in arranging the site access. Review of plans should include careful examination of the proposed site plan, not just concern about local driveway permits.

47. Consider automatically routing stored furnishings and equipment excess to current year needs to a central depot.

Keeping such expensive items at a central depot helps to assure minimal costs for additional needs elsewhere in the district and helps eliminate use of classrooms and portables for such storage. In building surveys at school districts, we often see spare desks and other furnishings hoarded in empty classrooms or portables, when they should be used to replace worn units or to handle growth at other schools.

48. Assure that portable classrooms, not justified for housing students, are removed from school sites.

Dispose of substandard portable classrooms, rather than create a declining site appearance. Do not use portable classrooms for storage units, as that creates an eyesore and a false impression of over enrollment to the public.

D. PUBLIC OUT REACH

49. Prohibit non-school sponsored programs from using core facilities or classrooms during school hours.

Short term activities may, with central office review of a written request, use classrooms excess to any school needs in an organized and distinct building area, and not requiring mix of children and outside people during school hours.

As a matter of policy, we cannot recommend mixing adult activities or adult use of media centers or classrooms or PE facilities within a school during school hours. There are too many opportunities of serious concern as to who is there and why. Any uses of excess classrooms should be gated off from the school operations for security of children and protection of property. None of this public use of buildings should occur without prior Board approval.

50. Look for opportunities for joint use of open spaces for after school sports programs, public parks, and local community activities to engender public support for schools.

Sometimes, the reaction to this suggestion is that liability is involved. That answer applies to anything a district does and does not foreclose joint agreements with towns and the County to make use of the huge investment in school sites after hours. Some districts couple land purchases with other local government so that the open space is developed as a recreation park by the local government who shares the capital and operating costs. We note that the Bluffton High School tennis courts have been available for adult tennis programs, for example, and certainly other examples exist or ought to be encouraged. Such public engagement does much to bridge the communications gaps and engender public support for education.

51. Develop an outreach program, centrally monitored, to use excess classrooms for other public and community programs, with careful regard to security, liability assignment, and costs recovery.

Some schools are obviously far under enrolled with little promise of the extra space ever needing to be used for the school. Some schools are in rather remote communities where the excess space might be used for other public activities compatible with a school, such as a library.

In such cases, with minor modifications such as hall gates, sections could be shared by other public activities such as Boys and Girls Club, after school care, community

center, etc. Of course the implementation costs should not be borne by the district and the opportunity of reversion in use should be held, and no such function should interfere with or be mingled with the daily instructional programs.

Note: All resource articles cited above for in depth discussion of key issues are posted on the Web by publishers and easily accessed from web site www.kelleycarey.com.

E. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

52. Option “T”

This option is based upon optimal performance, that the qualified and experienced personnel/consultants are in place and ready to proceed at the times listed, and that the project coordination leadership fully understands next steps and all of the attendant details not listed here that should be foreseen from similar experience in other bond building programs.

With those assumptions, this schedule is feasible for about \$100 million in new construction and additions (exclusive of land), together with about \$70 million in renovations and modifications (not including land cost).

Proven experience and expertise is required to get these projects off the ground and to complete them on time and within budget as a single building program process lasting from now until school opening of 2010. Sequencing of events and decisions such as timely land purchases, land being ready for construction when designs are complete, scheduling of projects to fit the local market conditions, etc. must be done competently, or this schedule cannot work.

a. Schedule a meeting of the Board to present this planning document for Information. (July 16)

No extensive program like this one should simply be presented to a school superintendent and board for approval. It requires serious study and hard questioning so that the plan belongs to the school district not to a consultant. There is always the possibility that findings are not clear and that recommendations are incomplete or not clearly tied to the base data that should drive them.

So, this report should be styled a “Draft” for further review and discussion over a suggested time of thirty days, due to the urgency of all the planning and other work that will follow. If the document should be edited for reasons cited, then the final document will be presented for approval—after the questions have been addressed. Not everyone, on a board and in the public, is likely to agree with any comprehensive plan. Compromises, in understanding that overall benefits outweigh costs, attend any garnering of support for a complex program.

b. The superintendent should direct a property search to commence without delay for the proposed school sites.

- c. After review of the plan, and consideration of any board and staff comments, the Board should call a meeting to adopt the five year plan and supporting recommendations, subject to the final budget being accepted. (Sept. 1)**

The Superintendent may wish to separate the core five year plan in the first section from the supporting recommendations. However, many of the recommendations are critical to a successful planning and building program. So, it may be that certain recommendations are separated out individually for formal acceptance by the Board to assure future continuity, while others are accepted as advisory for continued reference. The intent is to institutionalize a sense of direction with attendant responsibilities.

- d. Superintendent should immediately form a multi-disciplinary team tasked with reviewing the five year plan components for level two planning of programs.**

Level two planning includes devising the actual programs for each school so that space needs can be estimated and preliminary cost estimates can be developed. It also includes detailed scheduling and sequencing of events, including but not limited to, design period, awards dates for construction, tentative opening dates, projected need for portable classrooms, and decisions on use of any special programs.

- e. The implementation team should return with a curriculum driven amplification of the five year plan so that true costs can be estimated for a school bond referendum. (Oct. 1)**

While funds might not be on hand, some funding can be supplied for search and preliminary examination of land options as discussed above.

- f. Architects should be tentatively selected for the building projects, so that planning is realistically based on expected project costs. (Oct. 1)**

Historically, the district has taken certain steps just in time for need, such as selecting architects after the bond referendum has passed, which means a huge delay in the actual opening date for new schools and additions. The sooner that architects can be on board for the process, even at an advisory level, the quicker that realistic construction prices can emerge, as much of the cost variance rides upon the actual design selected. Also, it seldom works for one party (the administration or consultant) to forecast a cost and much later for a second party, the architect, to design and estimate the cost, absent a target price in their contract. Two unrelated parties are being relied upon for the same critical information, but only one has actual control of the outcome and can really say that they had nothing to do with the prior estimate used in the bond issue. In short, architects should be selected early on within sixty days so they can help in cost estimating for the final program documentation and budget. Funding will not be available for design, but some funding should be supplied for some preliminary cost estimating.

- g. Prepare a final summary document of line item projects for the bond referendum along with expected schedules and costs for the program. (Nov. 1, 07)**

- h. The Board should adopt the final program not later than in early November 2007 and authorize work to proceed to promote and hold a bond referendum in Spring of 2008. (Mid Nov. 07)
- i. After the referendum is successful, the board should direct the design stage of projects to commence without delay, based upon prior building planning. (May 08)
- j. After the referendum is successful, the board should acquire property that has been identified for the new school sites without delay.
- k. Advertise for construction bids on additions and expansions. Oct. 08
- l. Advertise for new schools construction. Nov. – Dec. 08.
- m. Award projects and begin new construction. Jan. 09.
- n. Complete additions and renovations. Summer 09
- o. Complete new schools and ready for opening. Summer 10

53. Option “II”

This option recognizes the difficulty of mounting a new schools and new additions program at the same time as a complex renovations program, and completing all of the work within the time required by the new construction (which takes the longest time in any event). The work would require considerable professional coordination and scheduling of events. As Option II, only the new work would be done within the same time schedule as in Option 1, being all complete for school opening in the Fall of 2010. Those are the most critical projects.

The work would be phased so that renovations would commence upon closing of schools in the Summer of 2010 and would be completed by school opening in the fall of 2011. There are perhaps four benefits to this lengthened schedule: a) The work on the new buildings would have tapered down to finishes, perhaps opening up more subcontractors to bid on the renovations. b) Bidding for renovation projects could be staggered so that those doable over the first summer would commence first. Then those requiring longer times would be let in a phased sequence designed for all of the work to be done by Fall of 2011 school opening. c) The more complex projects could include a summer at the end for a period of least site disruption. d) The bids may be lower, by being spread over several months, than might occur when many projects are let in a short period of time. e) The local architecture market, most likely to design renovations, would be more able to absorb the design work, if it is spread out over several months of deadlines.

Given the factors known at this time, we would favor recommending Option II to optimize budgets and to work within the likely ability of the district to marshal the complex process.

54. We do not believe that the district can undertake a bond program of this size without a construction program management consultant, well experienced in schools construction, cost estimating and scheduling, retained at the earliest time to facilitate detailed planning, sites acquisition, reviews of plans, design awards, construction inspection, and budget control.

55. Optionally, the Board could choose to divide the program into two school bond issues, as the total value of the bond issue will be about \$200 million, including land purchases. Due to the brief time interval likely between the issues, we believe it better for program supporters to mount one campaign, rather than two, due to all of the work involved, and fund the program appropriately in stages from the approved bonding capacity. Details for making a decision will be provided by the comptroller and bond counsel.

Note: The above schedule is offered for discussion. Meeting this schedule requires experienced leadership in formulating, commencing, and carrying out a large and complex schools construction process. It will require early selection of design firms, careful review of designs at all stages, sound cost estimating, and construction management. Staff concerned with the construction planning and implementation process must be actively involved in the process with specific delegations of duties, rather than simply depending upon outside consultants. Internal coordination within the school district organization for budgeting, administration, and coordination of consultants and regular program progress and budget reports to the Board are critical to program success.

The Board is encouraged to have the program materials for the bond referendum itself published preferably about 90 days ahead of a referendum to allow full airing of discussions. It should be noted that the tentative costs and the program scope would already be public knowledge the first of November 2007, allowing plenty of time for review and publicity. The probable content of the program would be known in early September 2007.

V1. RECOMMENDED PLAN—DETAILS OF STUDENT ASSIGNMENT

The recommended plan is based upon Alternative “G” in the series of alternatives analysis. This report section supplies the supporting details as to student assignment requirements, since Alternative “G” itself shows only how it evolved, without replicating all the supporting materials developed in the prior alternatives.

It depict when all of the recommended new construction and additions are completed and ready for occupancy. Recall, that the construction program sequence calls for new construction to be undertaken first. When the new projects are ready, obviously those students involved should be reassigned per the maps for all schools involved.

Clearly, most renovations and modifications do not affect the timing of student reassignments shown on the maps, because they are not facilities capacity dependent. And, their construction should be planned to cause minimal interaction with ongoing programs during the school year.

The reassignments for the northern cluster area commencing with Shell Point Elementary and circling around to end as Beaufort Elementary are not dependent upon removal of the seven classroom wing at Shell Point or improvements planned for Broad River

Elementary. Instead, the removal of the wing does require the rezoning be done first instead of afterward.

Conversely, the new school near Coosa Elementary, obviously must be completed before rezoning of students in that area is undertaken. And, in the southern cluster, all of the new schools must be in place for the suggested zones to be implemented. Please note the discussions in Section V as to those facilities and the interim zoning recommendations that we recommended in 2006 for the current construction projects transition into this five year building plan for two more elementary schools.

VII. RECOMMENDED PLAN—DETAILS OF FACILITIES RENOVATION, MODIFICATION AND EXPANSION

This report section presents a detailed summary of renovations, modifications, and additions for schools across the district. It is based upon our on site surveys of the buildings and compilation of building systems data from the district maintenance contractor who supplied costs estimates for their inputs (that are separately identified). We supplied cost estimates for architectural work based upon recent cost data in the area.

See the discussion of the overall program implementation in Section V as to updating our preliminary cost estimates after the actual programs are adopted and design firms are selected to assist in the program.