FACILITY ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Gilbert Architects Inc. was hired as a part of our open end agreement with Howard County Public School System to provide facilities assessments on all twelve of their existing high schools. This assessment was divided into two components: a program assessment to identify how well each building is supporting the delivery of the educational program to the students; and a facilities condition assessment to identify the condition of the physical plant and systems in the buildings and an estimate of the deferred maintenance costs for each building. Gilbert Architects Inc. (GAI) provided the programmatic assessments of the high schools and Facilities Engineering Associates (FEA) provided the condition assessments as a sub-consultant to GAI.

PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT

The following approach was utilized to identify the program requirements for the high school facilities and to establish a measurable methodology for analyzing potential deficiencies.

Establish Baseline - GAI reviewed the General Educational Specifications for High Schools developed by Howard County Public School System in 1999. A space summary of required program areas was created and amended to include modifications to these Educational Specifications developed for the Board of Education on March 21, 2002.

Document Review – Copies of existing floor plans and site plans were secured from the School System. These were reviewed and analyzed to identify any space deficiencies or excesses compared to the baseline Ed. Specs. A High School Educational Specification Comparison Chart that summarizes these results is included at the end of the Executive Summary (Page 1.5-1 and 1.5-2).

Meetings/Interviews – A series of interviews with the principals and some of the assistant principals for each high school was conducted between March and September, 2007. These interviews helped clarify and identify some of the major problems or deficiencies at each school. A set of meeting minutes for each interview is included at the end of each high school section.

Surveys – Utilizing the Council of Educational Facilities Planners International (CEFPI) Appraisal Guide for High School Facilities, surveys of each facility were conducted between April and September, 2007. This guide is a tool to assess 6 major categories of a school and rate how well those elements of the building are meeting established standards for high school facilities. A CEFPI score is established for the general overall educational programmatic assessment of the facilities and is included with this Executive Summary. A detailed CEFPI report of each school assessment is included within each high school sub-section of this report.

Deficiency Reports – The High School Educational Specification Comparison Chart is included at the end of the Executive Summary (Pages 1.5-1 and 1.5-2) and identifies both space deficiencies and excesses compared to the baseline Ed. Specs. This data has been summarized with comments for each of the individual high schools. Those reports are within each high school section.

CONDITION ASSESSMENT

FEA compiled a team to conduct assessments that were structured to review the following major components: structural, exteriors, roofs, mechanical, electrical and plumbing (MEP), conveying systems (elevators), fire and life safety, interiors, and ADA issues. Prior to accomplishing field assessments, several meetings were held during March 2007 between HCPSS facilities and maintenance personnel, Gilbert Architects and FEA to discuss known school issues and to obtain inputs from the lead tradesmen, operators and maintainers. HCPSS personnel were knowledgeable and very helpful. HCPSS provided interior access and escorts for roof access, MEP, fire and life safety, and elevators.

Team personnel used checklists for reference and professional experience to observe and assess conditions. Digital photographs of noted deficiencies were also taken and representative samples are included for each school.

Portable classroom assessments and a detailed review of ADA issues were not part of this project. Issues identified in these areas were noted during observations that were made in the course of other system assessments.

In addition to the assessment of individual buildings, the team also recorded relative comparisons of the system conditions they reviewed between the high schools to allow HCPSS to compare results between facilities.

Recommended work items are identified as "Identified Repair Needs" or "Repairs over Term". "Identified Repair Needs" includes items considered building or fire code violations, items considered life safety concerns, and deferred maintenance items that, in our opinion, are causing deterioration to the building systems by being delayed. All other items are considered "Repairs over Term" items.

Condition Assessment Elements

The condition assessment evaluation of each of the high schools included site visits to observe the buildings and site systems, interviews with building management and maintenance personnel, and a review of available maintenance plans, design and construction documents and plans. Repair estimates are predicated on replacing equipment-in-kind and do not include upgrades. The assessment did not include any invasive procedures, or any assessments of temporary classroom structures or their systems. The team performed a visual assessment of the interior, exterior and limited site components of each building, including the following elements:

Document Review – The Team reviewed provided and/or available building and engineering files, previously prepared reports and studies, building plans and specifications, and testing reports, as they pertain to the schools. We also reviewed current management/facility operating procedures and maintenance contracts to determine if, in our opinion, the ongoing maintenance meets current industry standards. There is evidence of a strong ongoing maintenance program throughout all of the schools assessed. Mechanical spaces and equipment showed signs of proper maintenance and attention. The HCPSS Comprehensive Maintenance Plan is well organized and current.

Site Systems – The team observed the condition of existing pavement access roads and parking areas, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and adjacent landscaping elements, as they pertain to the schools.

Structural (Superstructure) System - Structures were visually observed for signs of distress. This proposal does not include a review of original design assumptions or calculations or a completion of structural analyses or Probable Maximum Loss (PML) Studies.

Exterior Elements – We visually observed the exterior wall, window and door systems for visible evidence of deficiencies, continuity of seals, and other types of distress and report an overall condition of the systems. We reviewed available architectural flashing and connection details for drainage design and observed the condition and placement of expansion joints. These observations were based on those conditions that could be observed from the ground, from accessible roof/plaza levels, and from operable windows.

Roof System – We accessed the roof and visually observed the condition of the roof system, and installed accessories and details. We reviewed construction documents and flashing and penetration details for conformance with accepted practice. The evaluation included discussion of warranties, replacement costs and useful life.

Mechanical/HVAC, Electrical, Plumbing – We reviewed the various MEP systems that make-up the infrastructure of the building. Our review results define, in general terms, the character of the systems and our assessment of their functionality, condition, expected life and obvious code violations. The review included discussions of utilities presently serving the building.

Conveying Systems – A certified elevator inspector assessed the elevators.

Interior Finishes – Interiors were given a cursory review of sample ceiling tiles, walls and flooring to determine overall conditions. Allowances have been included for cyclical painting and partial flooring and ceiling tile replacements as future requirements develop and dictate specific locations for these projects.

Fire and Life Safety Issues – We observed the age and condition of the fire and life safety elements and noted their condition and visible deficiencies. The elements observed were: structural fire protection, means of egress, fire suppression systems, and fire detection and alarm systems.

Accessibility Issues - We conducted a cursory level site reconnaissance to observe major systems that may not comply with the applicable accessibility requirements. We also reviewed accessibility from parking areas to school entrances.

The condition assessment was visual in nature and was not destructive to the property in order to gain access to hidden conditions. FEA did not propose to perform any destructive testing or uncover or expose any system members. We documented the type and extent of visually apparent defects.

As this scope of services is limited to visual observations, this assessment will not identify all potential deficiencies. FEA will not access all areas of the property, but will endeavor to access a sample of the areas. As such, our report will not warrant or guarantee that the conditions noted in the areas observed will not vary from other areas not observed. In addition, our findings and recommendations will not be based on a comprehensive engineering study. Our report is not intended to be a complete review of all systems or a check of design professional's computations. Our observations and resulting report will not warrant or guarantee the performance of any building system or site improvement.

Property Information

The properties assessed were the following high schools with these original construction dates, dates of renovations or expansions and current square footage:

- Atholton HS - 1966, 1972, 1977, 1978, 1987, 1988, 2003 203,074 sf
- Centennial HS - 1977, 2002 201,600 sf
- Glenelg HS - 1957, 1963, 1969, 1971, 1987, 2006-7 212,436 sf
- Hammond HS - 1978, 1996 194,260 sf
- Howard HS - 1952, 1960, 1964, 1971, 1975, 1977, 2006 245,465 sf
- Long Reach HS - 1996 236,599 sf
- Marriotts Ridge HS - 2005 251,645 sf
- Mount Hebron HS - 1965, 1968, 1972, 1977, 1978, 1983, 1999 193,996 sf
- Oakland Mills HS - 1973, 1991, 1992, 2005 204,578 sf
- Reservoir HS - 2002 241,321 sf
- River Hill HS - 1994 236,181 sf
- Wilde Lake HS - 1996 247,875 sf