



SCHOOL BOARD ACTION REPORT

DATE: August 9, 2018
FROM: Denise Juneau, Superintendent
LEAD STAFF: Dr. Lester Herndon, Associate Superintendent, Facilities and Operations, (206) 252-0644, ltherndon@seattleschools.org

For Intro: August 29, 2018
For Action: September 5, 2018

1. TITLE

BEX IV: Wing Luke Elementary School Replacement Project Phase II: Constructability Review Report and Implementation

2. PURPOSE

This Board Action Report approves the Constructability Review Report for the Wing Luke Phase II Elementary School project. This review process provides quality assurance and is a requirement for state funding.

School Board approval of the Constructability Review Report is required by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) D-9 Form approval process to receive state funding assistance for the Wing Luke Elementary School Project.

3. RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move that the School Board accept and approve the Constructability Review Report, dated August 8, 2018, by LRC Consultants, Inc., for the Wing Luke Elementary School Phase II Project.

4. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

a. Background:

The constructability review process is part of the systematic approach for design quality assurance. Even if this process was not a requirement for State Funding Assistance purposes, this review would be undertaken as a standard practice to minimize changes during construction and to support the quality assurance of the facility design. The professional service fee for this Constructability Review Report is \$32,098.

b. Alternatives:

Do not approve the Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School Constructability Review Report as complete. This is not recommended. If the Board does not accept the report, it would delay the issuance of the form D-10, which allows the District to enter into a Construction Contract and could impact the District receiving State Funding Assistance. Not having the ability to open bids in a timely manner would have a negative impact on the project schedule. If the State assistance funding requirements are not met, the District

will not receive approximately \$2,000,000 in state assistance funding for this project. Additional capital funds would need to be obtained to complete the project.

c. **Research:**

- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Form D-9
- Washington Administration Code 392-343-080

5. FISCAL IMPACT/REVENUE SOURCE

Action helps to secure approximately \$2,000,000 in state funding assistance for Wing Luke Elementary School Project. The professional service fee for this Constructability Review Report is \$32,098.

The revenue source for this motion is \$2,000,000 of state funding assistance.

Expenditure: One-time Annual Multi-Year N/A

Revenue: One-time Annual Multi-Year N/A

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

With guidance from the District's Community Engagement tool, this action was determined to merit the following tier of community engagement:

Not applicable

Tier 1: Inform

Tier 2: Consult/Involve

Tier 3: Collaborate

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction application for state assistance is a multi-form process requiring School Board approval on particular requirements of the design and construction process to acquire state assistance funding which does not specifically require community review.

7. EQUITY ANALYSIS

This motion was not put through the process of a full racial equity analysis. The selection of projects in the BEX IV program was designed to provide equitable access to schools across the district.

8. STUDENT BENEFIT

This action will benefit students by providing the necessary funding to design and construct a school facility which meets current educational specifications and operational goals.

9. WHY BOARD ACTION IS NECESSARY

- Amount of contract initial value or contract amendment exceeds \$250,000 (Policy No. 6220)
- Amount of grant exceeds \$250,000 in a single fiscal year (Policy No. 6114)
- Adopting, amending, or repealing a Board policy
- Formally accepting the completion of a public works project and closing out the contract
- Legal requirement for the School Board to take action on this matter
- Board Policy No. _____, [TITLE], provides the Board shall approve this item
- Other: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction application process for state assistance funding.

10. POLICY IMPLICATION

Performing a constructability review report is a requirement of the Office of Superintendent and Public Instruction State Funding Assistance Form D-9. This action is consistent with Board Policy No. 6100, Revenues from Local, State, and Federal Sources, which states, “It is the policy of the Seattle School Board to pursue systematically those funding opportunities that are consistent with district priorities from federal, state, and other governmental units, as well as from private and foundation sources,” and “the Board agrees to comply with all federal and state requirements that may be a condition for the receipt of federal or state funds....”

11. BOARD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

This motion was discussed at the Operations Committee meeting on August 22, 2018. The Committee reviewed the motion and moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

12. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the accepted recommendations is immediate.

13. ATTACHMENTS

- Executive Summary Attached (for full report please contact the Board office)



Constructability Review Report

Seattle Public Schools is committed to making its online information accessible and usable to all people, regardless of ability or technology. Meeting web accessibility guidelines and standards is an ongoing process that we are consistently working to improve.

While Seattle Public Schools endeavors to only post documents optimized for accessibility, due to the nature and complexity of some documents, an accessible version of the document may not be available. In these limited circumstances, the District will provide equally effective alternate access.

For questions and more information about this document, please contact the following:

Ziyao Yang
Project Assistant Capital Projects
ziyang@seattleschools.org

Constructability review and comments for the Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School.

LRC CONSULTANTS, INC.

CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW COMMENTS

**SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
WING LUKE PHASE 2 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

August 8, 2018

CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW DOCUMENTS



August 8, 2018

Seattle School District #1
Project Manager: Scott Lund
CBRE/HEERY
500 Union, Suite 1000
Seattle, WA 98101

RE: Constructability Review of Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School

Dear Mr. Lund,

This document contains the comments from LRC Consultants, Inc. for the Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School project. Our comments are categorized by the major design disciplines. The comment section labeled "Coordination" represents comments involving multiple disciplines. This section should be reviewed by all disciplines.

We have tried to present our comments in a clear matter of fact approach. We hope our findings help to provide a more complete set of documents to benefit your project. Should any questions arise regarding the enclosed review, please feel free to contact Larry or Ron at 509-466-0419.

Thank you for having LRC Consultants, Inc. be a part of your building project.

Sincerely,



Ron Hadwiger
VP, LRC Consultants, Inc.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Listing of Owner/ Design Team and Constructability Review Team
Summary of review
Constructability Review construction document comment summary

SPECIFICATION/PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

CIVIL, LANDSCAPE

Civil, Landscape, Architectural site drawing and specification comments (designated with C/L). Additional comments concerning site are in the Coordination section.

ARCHITECTURAL

Architectural drawing and specification comments on building (designated with A). Additional comments concerning Architectural are in the coordination section.

STRUCTURAL

Structural drawing and specification comments on building (designated with S). Additional comments concerning Structural are in the coordination section.

MECHANICAL HVAC

Mechanical HVAC drawing and specification comments on building (designated with MH). Additional comments concerning Mechanical are in the coordination section.

MECHANICAL PIPING

Mechanical Piping drawing and specification comments on building (designated with MP). Additional comments concerning Mechanical are in the coordination section

ELECTRICAL

Electrical, Low Voltage and Fire Alarm drawing and specification comments on building (designated with E). Additional comments concerning Electrical are in the coordination section.

COORDINATION

Coordination comments of building involving multiple disciplines (designated with C). This section should be reviewed by all disciplines as resolutions may affect all disciplines.

WING LUKE PHASE 2 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DESIGN TEAM

<u>OWNER:</u>		SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
<u>PROJECT MANAGER:</u>	Contact: Scott Lund Tel: (206) 678-3154	CBRE/HEERY
<u>ARCHITECT:</u>	Contact: Brian Love, AIA Tel: (206) 441-5422	NAC ARCHITECTURE
<u>CIVIL ENGINEERS:</u>	Contact: Sascha Eastman Tel: (206) 343-0460	COUGHLIN PORTER LUNDEEN
<u>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS:</u>	Contact: Daniel Robben Tel: (206) 628-9133	CASCADE DESIGN COLLABORATIVE
<u>STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS:</u>	Contact: Chris Duvall Tel: (206) 343-0460	COUGHLIN PORTER LUNDEEN
<u>MECHANICAL ENGINEERS:</u>	Contact: Brian Cannon Tel: (206) 448-3376	HARGIS ENGINEERS
<u>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS:</u>	Contact: Kevin Wartelle Tel: (206) 285-7228	TRAVIS FITZMAURICE & ASSOCIATES

CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW TEAM LRC CONSULTANTS, INC.

<u>CIVIL/LANDSCAPE:</u>	LRC Consultants, Inc.	Larry Cargile
<u>ARCHITECTURAL:</u>	LRC Consultants, Inc.	Ron Hadwiger
<u>STRUCTURAL:</u>	LRC Consultants, Inc.	Larry Cargile/ Ron Hadwiger
<u>MECHANICAL HVAC:</u>	LRC Consultants, Inc.	Terry Nemitz
<u>MECHANICAL PIPING:</u>	DMS Consulting, LLC	Doug Schindler
<u>ELECTRICAL:</u>	RWS Consulting	Wayne Stevers

Constructability Review –Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School

BACKGROUND:

LRC Consultants was retained to perform a Constructability Review of the Wing Luke Phase 2 Elementary School constructability review set of 70% construction documents dated June 15, 2018. Our review occurred from June 19th, 2018 to July 10th, 2018. We utilized a (5) person review team consisting of construction professionals with specific trade experience for the major design disciplines. Our main review comments were sent out on July 9th and July 10th via email.

CONTENTS OF DOCUMENT:

This document contains the original comments organized by the major design disciplines. The section labeled Coordination contains comments that involve multiple disciplines regarding single issues.

The following is a list of review comments we believe are of higher importance:

- Identification of Phase 1 overexcavation/fill work on Civil drawings. Comment C/L1.
- Provide guardrail support design at Allen block retaining wall. Comment C/L 2.
- Complete irrigation design. Listed items not provided. Comments C/L15 and 16.
- Complete play surfaces drainage design. Comments C/L 21A and B.
- Clarify integrated door systems locations and details. Comments A 18 and 19A, B.
- Clarify information around storefront S-31 and details. Comment A 27A-E.
- Clarify MWB sizes and locations at areas noted. Comments A33A-C.
- Identify locations of abuse resistant GWB. Comment A50.
- Update exterior canopy details. Comment A64.
- Complete design of all WD2.5 features throughout. Comment A 74.
- Complete design of reception and library reception desks. Comments A76A-D.
- Identify where 9 different types of FRL material is used throughout. Comment A80.
- Update design for enlarged Mechanical rooms. Comments MH 22, a, b, 39a-d, and MH50a-f.
- Update one-line feeders, panel, and equipment schedules. Comment E64.
- Provide details and coordinate materials around Allen block wall. Comments C1A-H.
- Coordinate materials around vertical 14x7 ductwork in classrooms. Comments C7A-D.
- Provide details around stair S01 platform and benches. Comments C9A-B.
- Coordinate concrete wall faces with wall framing around stage area. Comments C12A-E.
- Update thick set tile specification and coordinate locations for slab recesses. Comment C13A-C.
- Provide details at stage floor if wood floor is installed. Comment C23.

- Provide details and specification for column and RL piping covers. Comments C28A-B.
- Update reflected ceiling plans to include Mechanical GRD locations. Comment C43.
- Verify one louver size will work for all locations. Comment C76.
- Review library exterior soffit framing and coordinate materials. Comment C84A-B.
- Clarify mock up information, location and requirements. Comments C91A-C.

SUMMARY:

LRC Consultants, Inc. through the Constructability Review process identifies discrepancies within the Contract Documents. Careful attention is taken with all major disciplines in addition to the coordination of those disciplines integrated together to create your building. When the comments contained herein are integrated into the Contract Documents, all parties should expect tighter bids, achievable schedules, and reduced change orders. We firmly believe this process helps prevent change orders above acceptable levels and helps maintain overall project schedules.

DISCLAIMER:

Our review process doesn't guarantee that all issues will have been identified and corrected. These comments are to assist the Design Team with their own quality control of the Contract Documents. These comments are not intended to direct or imply design direction.

DISCIPLINES REVIEWED:

Civil/Landscape
Structural
Electrical

Architectural
Mechanical
All Related Specifications