

Intermediate District 287

RESPONSIVE. INNOVATIVE. SOLUTIONS

FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

8:30 AM @ District Service Center Board Room

AGENDA

	<u>Page #</u>
1. North Education Center (NEC) Facilities Committee Agenda for October 18, 2011	2
* Facilities Committee Meeting Agenda for October 18, 2011	
* Weekly Risk Detail	
* Weekly Risk Summary	
* Change Order Memo	
* NEC Monthly Finance Report	
* October 2011 Fact Sheet #5	
* Long Term Facility Space Needs	

Intermediate District 287

RESPONSIVE. INNOVATIVE. SOLUTIONS.

GROUP: Facilities Committee

DATE: October 18, 2011

TIME: 8:30 – 10:30 AM

LOCATION: DSC Board Room

PROTOCOLS:

Decisions will be made via consensus on the agenda items.

CONVENER: Tom Shultz

FACILITATOR: Peyton Robb

ATTENDING:

LONG TERM PURPOSE

The Facilities Committee for the North Education Center project will provide oversight and direction to administration and bring recommendations to the full Board for approval as needed.

AGENDA ITEMS	OUTCOMES	TIME BUDGETED	ACTION
1. J.E. Dunn Construction Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee members will receive construction update 	20 minutes Jeff Walker	
2. Weekly Risk Report, WRR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee members will understand the most recent Weekly Risk Report (WRR) 	15 minutes Jeff Walker Site Supt. Jeff Callinan Project Manager	
3. Change Orders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee will be informed of 3 change orders within approval range of Facilities Director 	30 Minutes Tom Shultz Mark Thiede Jeff Callinan	
4. NEC Finance Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group will discuss the monthly NEC Finance Report and approve of its use each month. 	30 minutes Janet Johnson	
5. Long Term Facility Space Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand changes to the Long Term Facility Space Needs due to increased enrollment. 	15 minutes Laura Keller-Gautsch	
6. October Fact Sheet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee members will review the latest NEC Fact Sheet and either recommend it go to full Board as a final document or suggest revisions 	15 minutes Tom Shultz Colleen Baumtrog	

<p>7. Facilities Committee Schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee members will decide possibility of changing November meeting date from 11/15 to 11/8 to accommodate full Board scheduled for 11/10 	<p>5 minutes Colleen Baumtrog</p>	
-----------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

HANDOUTS:

1. Weekly Risk Detail
2. Weekly Risk Summary
3. Change Order Memo
4. NEC Monthly Finance Report
5. Long Term Facilities Space Needs
6. October 2011 Fact Sheet #5

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
1	3/25/11	1) NO RISKS							
2	3/31/11	2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	1. Doboszinski may not complete Phase I to allow us to start on time (not our contract). 2. We have some limited flexibility if they can complete Area A by 4/15/11 3. Doboszinski and Intermediate District #287 4. Estimated time schedule delay of TBD days. 5.	4/15/11	4/15/11	0	\$0	0	10
3	3/31/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	1. TSP to provide a coordinated 'construction set' of drawings prior to 4-15-11 2. Keep open dialogue with the design team to help resolve any potential issues. 3. TSP 4. Estimated time schedule delay of TBD days. 5. Plans Received. Are being reviewed and will follow up with appropriate pricing. 5/20/11 - Pricing is being reviewed. Please see item 11 below. This item closed and will be tracked below.	6/15/11	6/10/11	0	\$0		10
4	4/8/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
5	4/15/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
6	4/22/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
7	4/29/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
8	5/6/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
9	5/13/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
10	5/20/11	1) NO RISKS	This risk was moved to the RMP list per the direction of ASU						
11	5/27/11	2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Pricing based on design details has come in higher than the Allowance used at time of contract. 2. JED is reviewing pricing supplied and details behind differences to ascertain correctness of price. Upon completion, pricing will be reviewed with design team. 3. The project team. 4. Unknown at this time. 5. The allowances came in over budget due to various items (material cost increases, changes in the scope of the item, errors in drawings, etc.). The issues and pricing are currently being worked through by the architect and JED to reduce cost overrun. Since the amount has not been determined, it does not meet criteria of risk set by program, so JED has removed it from the risk tab and added it to the RMP tab. They are being added (see below) as individual risks by Allowance number as they are complete in lieu of being lumped together here. This item will be closed.	7/15/11	7/8/11 - moved to RMP tab as noted in risk details Closed 9/2/11	0	See individual items		1
12	6/10/11	1) NO RISKS	This risk was moved to the RMP list per the direction of ASU						
13	6/10/11	1) NO RISKS	This risk was moved to the RMP list per the direction of ASU						
14	6/17/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
15	6/24/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
16	7/1/11	5) UNFORESEEN IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. During drilling of the geothermal wells, the driller has encountered a void in the field in the SE corner. To date, they have lost a drill bit in one of the holes and drilling mud in two others in the field. We are working to identify the extent of the field. It was unexpected due to being an Unforeseen condition. 2. As noted, we are working to identify the extent of the field and will then request guidance from the engineer with regards to relocation of the holes that are affected. To minimize risk, we have held off drilling in the supposed area as part of trying to locate the extent of the void. 3. Currently, the ball is in the contractor's court until such time as the field is identified. 4. See the column to the right. 5. 7/22/11 Update. There are 4 holes to date with issues. One has been corrected. One is lost and we need the State back to move forward. The third one has been successfully grouted and redrilling will happen next week. The last hole will be grouted early next week. 7/29/11 Update: We are still waiting to here form the state on hole 204. Hole 194 is complete. Hole 200 is grouted - drilling to follow. 8/5/11 Update - Holes 200 and 194 are complete. Waiting to hear from MDH on hole 204. 8/12/11 Update. All work is complete and pricing is in for review. In addition to the issues with the three holes noted above, fluid loss due to voids was encountered during drilling of 15 additional holes. 9/16/11 Update. All holes are complete. Job was impacted by rework at three holes and added cost due to loss of fluid on 12 holes. A change order has been issued for the costs, see amount to the right.	8/1/11	9/14/11	0	\$63,789	17	
17	7/8/11	5) UNFORESEEN IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. The Minnesota State Government shut down over a budget impasse. The electrical inspection is being done by an independent contractor for the State of MN. He can not work until the State budget is settled an the Government opens for business. 2. We can proceed with the rough in for the SOG and SOD in area A. We can also continue with the block rough in areas B1 and B2. We can continue with all work up to the point where we begin to cover electrical. I would assume we can do roofing as long as there is no conduit running between the membrane and deck. Immediate impacts would be no underground (duct banks, direct bury, etc), no SOG or SOD work in any other areas. No drywall or ceilings can be done (which hopefully we have a budget before then). We have already talked to the inspectors and the City of New Hope. We do not have the choice to use an independent contractor - the current inspector is an independent contractor. The state has told the City that short of a referendum by the council (which we figure would take more time than the budget should), we cannot cover up electrical work until it is inspected by the state. Nothing more we can do to control or minimize the risk. 3. The Governor of Minnesota and State of Minnesota House and Senate 4. No way to estimate at this time. 5. 7.22 11 Update. Special session is ongoing with a deadline of 7/21/11 to get everything passed. Hopefully State will be open for business next week. 7/29/11 Update - The state is back in business and inspectors are back working without impact.	7/25/11	7/25/11	0	0		

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
18	7/15/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
19	7/22/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance Item 1 and 2 were for changes to doors and hardware per Code official reviews. Costs were over the allowance due to differences in changes from allowance review and final code requirements 2. It will be built per code. / Plan to minimize risk was inclusion of alternate at time of contract.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	\$7,788	3	10
20	7/22/11	2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance Item 4 was for the addition of a trustwater system in the kitchen, which was a change in the scope. Final costs came in under the allowance. 2. The pricing for the system was accepted by the owner and included in the contract.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	-\$2,405	4	10
21	7/22/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance Item 8 was for the addition of non-rated access panels in the kitchen exhaust system. The subcontractor was able to minimize the cost by including the doors as a no cost change in the contract.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	-\$2,300	5	10
22	7/22/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance Item 9 was for changes to the size and make up of ERU No. 3. During the allowance setting meeting, the pricing was provided to enlarge ERU No. 2. When the drawings were issued, ERU No. 3 was the one enlarged. This unit is an exterior unit and thus more expensive. 2. The owner accepted the pricing and a change order was issued.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	\$38,189	7	10
23	7/22/11	2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance items 12, 13 and 14 were combined into one issue. Items 12 and 13 involved revisions to the ductwork of the air supply and exhaust and toilet exhaust systems due to code review comments. Allowance 14 was for the addition of a ionization system - a change in scope. The pricing for the three items came in under the budget set in the allowance. 2. The owner is proceeding with all of the changes.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	-\$1,437	6	10
24	7/22/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. ASI 2 was issued to change some storm water piping sizes due to code review comments. 2. Piping size was changed.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	\$2,886	1	10
25	7/22/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. ASI 8 was issue dot add door B212 to the door schedule. It was deleted sometime during the design process. 2. Door was added to the schedule.	7/18/11	7/18/11	0	\$2,145	2	10
26	7/29/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
27	8/5/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
28	8/12/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Proposal request 7 was issued to provide piping chases in the data/server rooms in lieu of letting pipe be exposed in the space. The pipes would have been exposed due to the room needed to move around a beam under the floor. 2. The pricing was accepted and the chases will be built.	8/9/11	8/9/11	0	\$1,621	8	10

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
29	8/12/11	2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. PR 6 was issued to revise the door schedule and make owner requested changes. Unexpected due to change in scope. 2. Door types are changed. Costs minimized by close review of original door/hardware revisions	8/9/11	8/9/11	0	\$1,551	9	10
30	8/12/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Door sizes into the gym were incorporated in to the contract drawings at the wrong size. ASI 11 changed the door sizes. 2. Door frames were reordered the correct size. Original frames were already on site.	8/9/11	8/9/11	0	\$10,417	10	10
31	8/19/11	5) UNFORESEEN IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Contaminated soil was found in the area north of Area A where the geothermal well trenching is ongoing. 2. Braun was called in to test the material. The material was found to have some oil based contaminant, but not enough to be removed. It will be used under the paving. 3. The project team 4. At this time, for the JED contract, \$0. Braun's contract is with the owner. I am sure there will be a bill for the testing, but I won't see it. 5. Closed as a no cost issue for JED. Material will be used under parking to contain on site. I do not know if there are any costs for the owner from Braun for testing.	8/19/11	8/23/11	0	\$0	N/A	10
32	8/26/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
33	9/2/11	5) UNFORESEEN IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Due to the way above average rainfall this year on the site, we are having issues with the on site material being used for pipe bedding and backfill. This was unforeseen because the rain quantities are way above normal. There is also the inconsistency when dealing with soil (some have areas have had issues, others have not been a problem). 2. With regard to pipe bedding, we are bringing in offsite material. We have asked for direction from the civil engineer on (1) what do to with left over material (from use of offsite sand), (2) direction on how to address high moisture content on the back fill we need to reach to 100% density on in final 3' lift under paving and (3) direction on how to address high moisture content on the lower levels of back fill (up to final 3') we need to reach 95% density. 3. It will require a team review and decision. 4. To be determined after review with the engineer. 5. 9/9/11 - Over the past week, we have completed multiple areas without compaction issues. Sand is still required at the bottom of the trenching.	9/9/11		0	\$15,000		
34	9/9/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. The terrazzo for the project is thin set directly on the concrete. In some of the terrazzo areas, there is underslab heating. The concrete subcontractor noted in the coordination meeting a concern with the concrete cracking in the future above the heating tubes. If the slab under the terrazzo cracks, the crack will be transmitted through the terrazzo. 2. Wire mesh will be added over the tubes under the terrazzo to help control cracking. 3. The project team reviewed it the coordination meeting. The designers reviewed the concern and added the mesh. 4. (A) Cost of the mesh (TBD) and (B) future cracking 5. New risk	9/19/11		0	\$1,500		

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
35	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	This change order was an adjustment to Owner Change Order No. 7 to correct for some work that was in the base contract.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	-\$6,923.00	11	10
36	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. ASI No. 9 was issued. It added some VAV's, revised some HVAC ducting and revised the control sequencing. 2. The changes have been implemented as directed by ASI 9. 3. The project team 4. See amount to right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$24,795.00	12	10
37	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance items 5, 6 and 7 were combined into one issue. All three items involved code revisions - to the storm and sanitary sewer systems. 2. The revisions required by the code review were made to the project plans. 3. The project team 4. See amount to right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$14,738.00	13	10
38	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. Allowance items 15. This allowance was to cover changes to the project that were incorporated into the Technology Package and not originally in our scope of work. 2. Rough in requirements in our scope of work have been revised per the Technology package with respects to added fire alarm requirements 3. The project team 4. See amount to right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$11,058.00	14	10
39	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. The risk was added ductwork above ceiling in Room B117. It was identified as part of the MEP coordination meetings. It was unexpected due to the amount of added ductwork required to reroute in the room. 2. The duct was rerouted in as efficient a manner as possible. 3. The project team as part of the MEP coordination meetings. 4. See amount to the right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$5,476.00	15	10
40	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. The risk was a fire sprinkler revision and added lights as part of the MN Health Department review. 2. The changes noted (added check valve and light fixtures) will be added as required. 3. The project team. 4. See the amount to the right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$3,258.00	16	10
42	9/16/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	Please describe the details of the risk: 1. The wiring for the transformer was sized too small in the original design. 2. The wiring has been upsized. The design was reviewed to minimize the change and the wire changed to copper to allow use of the existing conduit. 3. The project team 4. See the amount to the right.	9/14/11	9/14/11	0	\$32,241.00	18	10
43	9/23/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						
44	9/30/11	1) NO RISKS	No risks identified this week.						

NO	DATE ENTERED	RISK CATEGORY	RISK DETAILS 1. What is the risk / why was it unexpected? 2. What will be done / what is plan to minimize this risk? 3. Who is responsible for resolving the issue? 4. What is an estimated impact of the risk? 5. Any updates to this risk (if applicable)	PLANNED RESOLUTION DATE	ACTUAL DATE RESOLVED	OVERALL DURATION IMPACT	OVERALL COST IMPACT	CHANGE ORDER NUMBER	PM SATISFACTION RATING
45	10/7/11	4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	RISK DETAILS 1. The storm drain on the south side as shown is located between a fiber optic truck line and a high pressure main. The fiber optic line was not accounted for in the design and conflicts with the piping run location. 2. We are currently working on identify options for the design team to consider in rerouting the line. This would include running it in the street, relocating the line north and moving the pond or getting as easement from the property owner to the east. 3. The project team 4. The impact is still being researched. 5.	9/11/11		0			

Intermediate District 287

Weekly Risk Report

October 7, 2011

Project Name: North Education Center	Risk Rating: <u>1.4</u>
Project ID: 12/1/2010	Percent Complete: <u>59%</u>
Contractor: JE Dunn	Overall PM Risk Satisfaction: <u>9.6</u>
Project Type: General Construction	Risks: <u>26</u>
Award Method: RFP - PIPS Best Value	Risks Unresolved: <u>4</u>
	Risks resolved but no Change Order: <u>3</u>

Cost Analysis

Allocated Funds: \$27,100,000
 Awarded Cost: \$25,987,230

Potential Cost Increases: \$223,387
 Potential Final Cost: \$26,417,504

Actual Cost Increases: \$206,887
Actual Final Cost: \$26,194,117

Percent Increase in Cost: 0.8%

Contractor Change Order Rate: 0.0%

Non-Contractor Change Order Rate: 0.8%

Schedule Analysis

Notice to Proceed Date: 3/24/2011
 Original Completion Date: 8/24/2012

Potential Project Delays: 0
 Potential Completion Date: 8/24/2012

Actual Project Delays: 0
Actual Completion Date: 08/24/12

Percent Delayed: 0.0%

Contractor Delay Rate: 0.0%

Non Contractor Delay Rate: 0.0%

Project Schedule Analysis	Total Number of Risks	Potential Schedule Impacts	Potential Cost Impacts	Actual Schedule Impacts	Actual Cost Impacts
1) NO RISKS	17	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
2) CLIENT ISSUE / IMPACT	5	0	\$ -	0	\$ (2,291)
3) CONTRACTOR ISSUE / IMPACT	0	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
4) DESIGN ISSUE / IMPACT	17	0	\$ 1,500	0	\$ 145,389
5) UNFORESEEN IMPACT	4	0	\$ 15,000	0	\$ 63,789
	26	0	\$16,500	0	\$206,887

Intermediate District 287

RESPONSIVE. INNOVATIVE. SOLUTIONS.

M E M O R A N D U M

Date: October 18, 2011
To: Board Facilities Committee
From: Thomas Shultz, Director of Facilities
RE: NEC Change Orders

The following is a list of Change Orders (COs) for the North Education Center construction project. All of these change orders are less than \$10,000 and fall under Facilities Director approval. These are being presented as information only.

The total cost is \$17,680.

Administration Decision

	Description	Cost
Change Order #N/A	Increase contract from Braun Intertec Test to include floor level and flatness testing for demountable wall installation.	\$3,283
Change Order #19	Add conduit and wire for four handicap bollard locations	\$6,678
Change Order #20	Add aluminum flashing at brick to metal panel transition per ASI 27	\$7,719



Background

North Education Center (NEC) will be built to replace the Hosterman Education Center after a 15-month comprehensive facilities study showed it to be the most cost-effective solution to replace the aging facility. See the November, 2010 Q & A document for more background information.

NEC will be a flexible educational site that offers multiple programs for students. Wherever possible, NEC will replicate staffing and operational efficiencies seen at South Education Center in Richfield and easily adapt as programs grow and change to meet student needs.

Size: 157,521 sq. ft. – 3 floors

Land: 10 acres

Architect/Engineer: TSP, Inc.

General Contractor: J.E. Dunn Construction

Timeline and Progress

October 2011 Construction is approximately 35% complete. The geo-thermal well field is complete with piping connected into the large junction box under the parking lot. All floors are poured and 99% of steel is in place. Section A has most of the exterior brick installed and Section C has about 25% of the exterior brick installed. Sections A and C roofs are installed with section B1 to be installed by Oct 15th. Approximately 80 workers are on site which includes brick layers, roofers, electricians, plumbers, pipefitters, sheetmetal workers, iron workers and many others. The project is on schedule and on track to be within budget.

Costs/Financing

NEC will provide long-term stability to District 287's lease expenses and keep costs to member districts in line with current lease levy amounts, while taking full advantage of current economic conditions for construction, low interest rates and federal stimulus funding.

Project Cost \$35.1 million (includes \$1.175M land purchase)

Financing \$29.8 million federal Qualified School Construction Bonds awarded – largest QSCB award in MN

(only need \$24.9 million to pay off due to interest earned on sinking fund)

\$ 4.1 million additional long term financing

\$ 1.1 million from District 287 operating budget

Programs/Enrollment

NEC will include classrooms for area learning center, ALC, high school students, onsite daycare for infants and toddlers, and structured settings for students with autism, emotional/behavioral disorders and/or fetal alcohol syndrome. NEC will serve approximately 350 students who currently attend Sandburg, North Vista and Invest/Venture High School, and approximately 50 infants and toddlers of enrolled students. We expect NEC to be at capacity when it opens in 2012.

OPTIONS High School and STRIVE Secondary will move from Bren Road to NEC. Some of the SAFE students currently at Bren Road will also move to NEC. ALC programs City West Academy, and PCA currently residing at Shady Oak Crossing will move to Bren Road, saving \$336,149 annually in lease costs. (Shady Oak lease will expire in 2013.)

Mission

District 287's mission is to be the premier provider of innovative specialized services to ensure that each member district can meet the unique learning needs of its students.

Long Term Facility Space Needs

North Education Center Option 1 approx 122,000 sq. ft.	North Education Center Option 2 approx. 132,000 sq. ft	North Education Center Option 3 approx. 157,000 sq. ft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hosterman Elementary •CIP & SUN - full •STRIVE/OPTIONS/INVEST MS •INVEST / Venture •North Vista and Daycare - full •Limited options for student support space •Career-Tech integrated into program space to extent possible •Reading lab activities integrated into program space to extent possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hosterman Elementary •CIP & SUN - full •STRIVE/OPTIONS/INVEST MS •INVEST/Venture •North Vista and Daycare •Increased options for student support space •Career-Tech dedicated space equitable with SEC •Reading lab dedicated space equitable with SEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hosterman Elementary •CIP & SUN - full •STRIVE/OPTIONS/INVEST MS •INVEST/Venture •North Vista and Daycare •Maximum options for support space •Career-Tech dedicated space equitable with SEC •Reading lab dedicated space equitable with SEC •Bren Road OPTIONS High School and Strive Programs (Keep Options program at Bren) •SAFE, most students will attend NEC •Potential on-site day treatment •Potential co-located County services
<p>Shady Oak Crossing (21,400 sq. ft.) or Northwest Tech (24,000 sq. ft.) avg. 22,700 sq. ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Continue to lease Shady Oak and Northwest Tech Center 	<p>Shady Oak Crossing (21,400 sq. ft.) or Northwest Tech (24,000 sq. ft.) avg. 22,700 sq. ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Continue to lease Shady Oak and Norwest Tech Center 	<p>Shady Oak Crossing (21,400 sq. ft.) or Northwest Tech (24,000 sq. ft.) avg. 22,700 sq. ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •One leased site vacated and moved to NEC •One site remains leased •Both sites remain leased for the foreseeable future
<p>167,400 Total Sq. Ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •122,000 owned (NEC) • 45,400 leased (Shady Oak & NWTC) 	<p>174,400 Total Sq. Ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •129,000 owned (NEC) • 45,400 leased (Shady Oak & NWTC) 	<p>174,700 Total Sq. Ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •157,000 owned (NEC) • 45,400 leased (Shady Oak & NWTC)

Background for Discussion

Special Education

- Special Education enrollment continues to grow.
- Surveyed member district special education directors attributed program growth beyond their predictions to:
 - High mobility of students, with families moving into their communities,
 - Increase in homeless and group home students
 - Increase in open enrollment students
- The impact of Hennepin County cuts, for example, shortened stays in residential facilities, impacts special education enrollment growth.
- Many special education programs have been closed to non-members since January.
- Additionally some late year member district referrals were not able to be accommodated.

Care and Treatment

- The addition of 4 new Care and Treatment programs has increased our enrollment by 130 students. One program, West Academy is located in the vacated county space at Bren Road, other programs are located in space owned or leased by the providing agency.

Area Learning Center

- An anticipated partnership for truancy programming between Hennepin County and our ALC programs will increase ALC enrollment.
- The Edina Sober School will be closing, causing anticipated enrollment growth in the City West Alternative Program.

Overall Costs

- Leased space contributes to the overall lease levy in a less predictable way than owned space.
- Additional space to accommodate program growth either by retaining the Shady Oak Crossings lease beyond 2012-2013, identifying new lease space or major additions or modifications to currently owned or leased spaces, will increase our total lease costs and the related levy.

Summary

- Because of the additional Care & Treatment Programs; and, because of increased enrollment at NEC, SEC and Edgewood, additional space will be needed for the 2013-2014 school year.

Reviewed by School Board 8/26/10

Revised 9/28/10

Revised 2/2/11

Revised 10/17/11 (Revisions are in green)

1. NEC still remains at capacity when it opens
2. SEC is at capacity
3. Edgewood is nearing capacity