



**WORKSHOP AGENDA FOR THE
BURGESS & COMMISSIONERS AND
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**February 6, 2023
6:30 p.m.**

1. Planning issues update
 - a. Memorial Hall redevelopment
 - b. Hollow Creek Professional Center
 - c. 406 West Green property
 - d. Middletown Library
 - e. Caroline's View Apartments
2. Foxfield Section 6 – on-street parking
3. Middletown School Complex proposals
4. Ordinance updates
5. Comp Plan Update



Option 2A Alternate Sequence

1. Build new ES & MS buildings (blue) concurrently w/ road around old HS
2. Demo old MS and build connecting road to FC Park.
3. Build new HS (green) with intersection upgrades at main campus entrance
4. Demo old HS and complete campus roads/parking throughout
5. Replace all recreational and athletic fields in kind (yellow).
6. Demo or re-purpose old ES and complete all site work

Total Duration 9.5 years - New ES/MS w/in 5.5 years; New HS w/in 8 years

Benefits

1. Fastest construction sequence of learning environments.
2. Eliminates need to relocated current HS Football Stadium.
3. Old ES building could remain for other uses (i.e Community Center).
4. Creates campus loop while separating buses away from traffic.
5. Generally capable of using most existing civil site features.
6. Maintains current separation and uses around residential areas.
7. Building in the rear of campus first creates the most separation of construction activities from younger students and campus operations.
8. Site SWM areas and drainage patterns remain the same.

Drawbacks

1. Campus athletic field use would be impacted the most by construction operations and need to depend on FC Park use.
2. County park road intersection would likely experience the most congestion in high volume times (in lieu of Green Street).
3. During High School construction, a high volume of traffic control will be necessary due to limited setback from roads.
4. The back of campus has not been previously developed and will need to have utilities extended to the area.

APPENDICES:

Appendix F: Building Concept Options

Section F4: Evaluation of Options

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS

	Option 1 Renovation/Addition – 3 Schools			Option 2A Replacement – Loop/ 3 Schools			Option 2B Replacement – Loop/ HS, colocated ES-MS		
	GSF	\$/SF or %	TOTAL	GSF	\$/SF or %	TOTAL	GSF	\$/SF or %	TOTAL
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION COSTS									
Total Proposed Building	448,377			416,064			396,332		
Selective Building Demolition	*			0	-	-	0	-	-
Whole Building Demolition	87,960	\$2.51	\$1,123,918	359,773	\$9.65	\$3,870,506	359,773	\$10.08	\$3,864,914
Renovation	274,117	\$163.35	\$73,241,713	0	-	-	0	-	-
New Construction	174,260	\$138.71	\$62,194,143	416,064	\$360.82	\$150,124,828	396,332	\$369.44	\$146,421,088
Hazardous Materials Abatement		\$3.52	\$1,576,898		\$4.33	\$1,801,112		\$4.56	\$1,805,880
SUBTOTAL BUILDING COSTS		\$308.08	\$138,136,671		\$374.45	\$155,796,446		\$383.75	\$152,091,882
Site Construction		\$26.16	\$11,728,296		\$75.01	\$31,209,568		\$77.67	\$30,782,260
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS		\$334.24	\$149,864,967		\$449.46	\$187,006,014		\$461.42	\$182,874,142
ADDITIONAL COSTS									
Design Contingency		10.00%	\$14,986,497		10.00%	\$18,700,601		10.00%	\$18,287,414
Phasing		5.00%	\$8,242,573		2.00%	\$4,114,132		2.00%	\$4,023,231
CM Contingency		5.00%	\$8,654,702		3.00%	\$6,294,622		3.00%	\$6,155,544
Bonds and Insurance		2.50%	\$4,543,718		2.50%	\$5,402,884		2.50%	\$5,283,508
General Conditions		5.00%	\$9,314,623		5.00%	\$11,075,913		5.00%	\$10,831,192
CM Fee		3.00%	\$5,868,212		3.00%	\$6,977,825		3.00%	\$6,823,651
SUBTOTAL ADDITIONAL COSTS			\$51,610,326			\$52,565,978			\$51,404,540
ESCALATION (1)		?	\$83,633,573		?	\$113,962,655		?	\$86,030,747
ESCALATION (2)		?	\$74,562,461		?	\$89,610,700		?	\$75,376,805
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS (1)		\$635.87	\$285,108,866		\$849.71	\$353,534,647		\$808.18	\$320,309,429
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS (2)		\$615.64	\$276,037,754		\$791.18	\$329,182,691		\$781.30	\$309,655,487

= \$4,131,872.00 (delta) ~2.2%

\$27M (delta)
\$14M (delta)

When determining Escalation, what percentage was used and why isn't the Option 2A rate consistent with Option 1 and 2B? With construction value only \$4M difference (~2%) it seems escalation should generally be consistent. If the third building causes the increase, should it be reflected in 'Phasing and CM Contingency' percentages like in the Option 1 calculation, or is that cost already included in the construction value?

(1) Sequential Timeline
(2) Concurrent Timeline