

## CAPITAL PLAN - Overview

Oak Park District 97 has engaged STR Partners to compile a 10-Year Capital Plan document describing currently known scope of work required to meet code requirements, maintain facilities, meet D97 educational goals, and provide for accessible environments at each of the 10 D97 facilities.

The document has been organized in the following categories:

- A. **Life Safety Violation Corrections (Mandated)**
  - Borne from the 10-Year Life Safety Survey conducted by STR Partners for each Elementary School.
  - Remaining 10-Year Life Safety Survey items from the 2012 Survey conducted by DLA.
  - These items are observed code violations ranked per ISBE requirements
    - "a" priority must be completed in one year.
    - "b" priority must be completed within 5 years.
- B. **Facility Assessment Improvements/Maintenance Items (Non-Mandated Life-Safety Items and Other)**
  - Includes "c" priority items from the Life Safety Surveys – recommended items without requirement mandate to complete.
  - Includes facility improvements identified by D97 Administration, Buildings and Grounds, and Principals.
- C. **Capacity Improvements**
  - Identified renovations or additions resulting from STR's and D97's analysis of the updated demographic report prepared by Ehlers (2016)
- D. **Previous 10-Year Capital Plan (carry-over)**
  - Work items that had not yet been completed from the previous 2012 Capital Plan
    - These items have now been captured in Categories A and B above.
- E. **Educational Enhancement Improvements**
  - Borne from Dr. Kelley's vision – still being defined.
- F. **Accessibility Improvements**
  - Includes items not yet complete from the 2013 FAC Accessibility Committee Report.
  - Also includes items identified during STR Life Safety Survey
- G. **Temperature Controls**
  - Addresses HVAC control issues at the Middle Schools

## PRIORITIZATION

D97 created a sub-committee from the Facilities Advisory Committee to assist STR and Therese O'Neill as well as Buildings and Grounds in providing logic to prioritizing scope of work across the 10 years at the 10 buildings.

As a group, we identified the major categories requiring attention at each of the facilities. They are as follows ranked in the order of importance:

1. Capacity
2. Building Systems
3. Accessibility
4. Miscellaneous (masonry, hardscape, finishes, lockers)

Each school was given a rank from 1 to 3, 1 being having the greatest need for improvement in a category or scope of work. These scores were weighted according to the above priority order. The outcome was then over-ridden only to address immediate capacity issues at Holmes, Longfellow, and Lincoln.

Please refer to the attached Priority Framework Scoring sheet and the resulting Priority Framework schedule.

This framework was then used to inform the Capital Plan in the assignment of work across the next ten years.

## **ESTIMATES**

The FAC Sub-Committee has recommended we include on the Capital Plan Summary a line for Soft Costs. For the purpose of this Plan we are including Professional Fees (A/E fees and CM Fees) as well as a contingency.

STR has provided estimates to each scope item to the best of our ability to intuit the full scope around a life safety or facility improvement item. It is possible that at the time of further developing the design or investigating in the field unknown conditions or new scope items may affect the accuracy of our current estimates.

The provided estimates are in today's dollars. Our estimator has recommended a 5% escalation increase per year. We have confirmed this amount with other consultants of ours such as Construction Managers. Therefore, the Capital Plan Summary assumes a 5% escalation for every year a scope item is pushed out.

## **END OF SUMMARY**