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The Facilities Assessed

- Crichfield Elementary School
- Hailmann Elementary School
- Handley Elementary School
- Indian Trail Elementary School
- Kingsbury Elementary School
- Kingsford Heights Elementary School
- Lincoln Elementary School
- Riley Elementary School
- Kesling Intermediate School
- LaPorte Middle School
- LaPorte High School
- Educational Services Center (ESC)
- Former Education Services Center
- Support Services Center
- Transportation Garage
- Kesling Athletic Fields
- Kiwanis Field
The Facility Assessment Project Schedule

- **5/11/2020** - Leadership Group (LG) kick-off meeting
- **5/11/2020** – Schmidt begins collecting drawings for all facilities
- **5/18/2020** – Staff Input Forms sent to Staff for feedback
- **6/1/2020** – Staff input forms returned to Schmidt
- **6/8/2020** - Schmidt compiles/presents Staff feedback
- **6/15/2020** - Schmidt team on site for week assessing facilities
- **6/29/2020** – Schmidt populates the Facility Assessment document
- **7/13/2020** – Schmidt presents summaries and initial priorities to LG
- **7/20/2020** – Schmidt begins preparing estimates for priority items
- **7/27/2020** – Schmidt presents priorities and estimates to LG
- **8/3/2020** – Schmidt updates priorities for Board presentation
- **8/10/2020** – Schmidt organizes all photos into “Open Asset”
- **8/24/2020** – Schmidt prepares for School Board presentation
- **9/14/2020** – School Board presentation
Staff Input Summaries

**Kingsford Heights Elementary School**
- **Site**
  - Need secure/fenced playground, add walking trails around playground, complete the walking trails and outdoor labs on the adjacent property for better classroom and community use, better landscaping and curb appeal, add parking lot lighting, need a place for lawn maintenance/mower storage, larger lawn mower needed.
- **Building Shell**
  - Improve to flood
- **Interior Finish**
  - Add low kindergarten
- **Building Climate**
  - HVAC
- **Technology**
  - Card reader

**Crichfield Elementary School**
- **Site**
  - More parking (in front specifically ADA or running track is unequipped)
- **Building Shell**
  - Better ADA access
- **Interior Finishes**
  - More classroom ceiling, more open space, more open for children, more open for teachers in building, create a more open environment
- **Building Climate & Environment**
  - HVAC too warm or too cold
- **Technology**
  - Poor sound system, ability to page from room to room

**Support Services Center**
- **Site**
  - Larger parking lot (more parking)
- **Building Shell**
  - Roof leaks, exterior brick is deteriorating
- **Interior Finishes**
  - Not enough storage on campus for usability of small custodial closets in the kitchen.
- **Building Climate & Environment**
  - HVAC upgrades, electrical upgrades, hot water or heat/AC in Men’s Room
- **Technology**
  - No security cameras, no card reader

**LaPorte High School**
- **Site**
  - More parking, traffic flow improvements, outdoor learning space, parking lot resurfacing, consider moving sports fields to Keele for expansion at LPHS site, improved landscaping.
- **Building Shell**
  - More windows, roof leaks, New Field House/Fitness Center are needed.
- **Interior Finishes**
  - Overall updates needed, ADA accessibility issues throughout, new flexible classroom furniture needed, more restrooms and improve existing, more classroom storage, more classrooms, additional whiteboards, more office space for all departments, create a fun common area with comfortable seating - “coffee shop feel”, painting throughout, carpet replacement in many areas, elevator unreliable/need additional elevators, more labs, tables for outside café use, ED rooms need calm space/kitchen/laundry facilities, replace damaged ceiling tiles, directional signage in hallways, staff restrooms are small, exterior door numbering is confusing, open group space needed (not hallways), more conference rooms, improved band room, orchestra pit for the PAC, Shultz Hall needs new seats, need a Teacher’s Lounge, interior windows for classrooms are security issue, add trash/recycling at kitchen dock, PAC stage floor issues.
- **Building Climate & Environment**
  - HVAC improvements/humidity/air quality issues, leaking faucets, some electrical outlets do not work.
- **Technology**
  - Need to update computers/projectors/technology throughout, better WiFi connectivity/cell service, card reader access in lieu of keys.
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

The purpose of this study is to develop a tool to analyze the LaPorte Community School Corporation educational facilities. The results, divided into four categories, provide both an overall functional assessment of the existing conditions, as well as a set of ranked priorities of critical needs.

The following categories were assessed, and each represent a percent of the total facility value:

- **A - Building Exterior** (30% overall total facility value)
  - Building foundation conditions, structure, exteriors walls, windows, doors, roof

- **B - Building Interior** (30% overall total facility value)
  - Interior construction and materials in classrooms, common areas, athletic and fine arts related spaces, code and ADA compliance

- **C - Building Climate and Environmental Conditions** (30% overall total facility value)
  - Mechanical, controls, plumbing, electrical, fire alarm systems

- **D – Technology** (5% overall total facility value)
  - Communications, LAN/WIFI, intercom, classroom AV systems, access control/video surveillance, phones

- **E - Site** (5% overall total facility value)
  - Site access, circulation, pavement, parking, utilities, signage, playfields, fencing
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

The assessment breaks each category down to several individual components that “make up” a building or site. Each component is scored on a scale of 0 (poor), 1, 2, 3, 4 (good). Often, a .5 is assigned to better define the condition.

In the assessment, we have color coded each score as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Space/ System</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>0 - poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 - good</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Building Interior</td>
<td>Common Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceilings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors and Frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA &amp; Code Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

These scores are then weighted in the assessment document to provide an overall suitability of that category, such as “Building Interior” in this case.
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

The scores of the five categories are then weighted in the document to an overall suitability score for the building. A perfect score of all 4s would result in an overall suitability of 100. A score of 67.6% gives a “general” indication that 67.6% of the building is good and 32.4 is poor. The table to the right indicates a letter grade for each suitability range:
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

On the Facility Assessment Summary Sheet, the Suitability Score for all buildings is indicated, giving a quick comparison of each building’s condition to all others in the district. This gives a general indication of the buildings with the most need and those with the least need. Below is a summary of the building suitability scores in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Kesling Athletic Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Handley Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>LaPorte Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>(Old) Ed Services Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Hailmann Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>(New) Ed Services Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Riley Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Kingsbury Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>LaPorte High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Kesling Intermediate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Lincoln Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Kingsford Heights Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Crichfield Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Transportation Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Support Services Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Kiwanis Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Indian Trail Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Condition Score

- **A** (Good): 76-100%
- **B**: 51-75%
- **C**: 26-50%
- **D**: 1-25%
- **F** (Poor): 0
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

Along with establishing the 0 through 4 scores for many individual items and an overall “percent suitable” for each building, the following general information is provided on the Summary sheet of the Facility Assessment:

- Gross area (square footage) of the building along with site acreage.
- Year constructed and the years of renovations.
- Aerial photograph of each building.

### Compiled Building Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Gross Area</th>
<th>Suitability %</th>
<th>Year Constructed &amp; Renovated</th>
<th>Student Capacity</th>
<th>Site (Acres)</th>
<th>Annual Utility Cost ($/SF)</th>
<th>Aerial View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Educational Services Center (ESC) (previously: Boston Middle School)</td>
<td>Administration, Preschool, Special Ed - (was originally Boston Middle School)</td>
<td>137,000 sf</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1924, 1931, 1956, 1957, 1979, 20__, 2020</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Aerial View 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Crichfield Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary K-4</td>
<td>54,298 sf</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1929, 1951, 1956, 1970, 1972, 1979</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Aerial View 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Facility Assessment Process

In addition, two additional important items metrics were studied:

- Square foot per student for school buildings; this gives an indication if the building is “right-sized for the population.
- Annual energy cost per square foot; this gives an indication of the energy efficiency of the building.
  - Generally, $1 per square foot per year would be considered an average cost for an energy efficient building. For instance, an “efficient” building that is 150,000 square foot will have $1 per square foot or $150,000 per year in energy costs.
  - A building that uses more than $1 per square foot is an indication that it is not functioning “optimally” and some adjustments may be needed.
  - A building that is under $1 per square foot could indicate a building is more than efficient, but in most cases, it also indicates something needs investigation. One example would be the lack of adequate ventilation.
# Summary of Needs and Findings – Indian Trail Elementary School

## Priority Items (0s and 1s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Building Exterior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Building Interior</td>
<td>$312,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bldg. Climate &amp; Environ</td>
<td>$3,201,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Technology</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Site</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost** $3,670,700  
**Contingency (8%)** $293,656  
**Inflation until 2021 (5%)** $183,535  
**Sub-Total** $4,147,891  
**Sot Cost (20%)** $829,578  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST** $4,977,469

## Building Metrics:

- **Site Size:** 20.0 acres
- **Building Size:** 63,895 sf
- **Student Capacity:** 456
- **140 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)**
- **Annual Utility Cost:** $1.68 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – (Old) Educational Services Center

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0
B. Building Interior $87,500
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $578,600
D. Technology $45,000
E. Site $12,500

Total Construction Cost $723,600
Contingency (8%) $57,888
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $36,180

Sub-Total $817,668
Sot Cost (20%) $163,534

TOTAL PROJECT COST $981,202

Building Metrics:

- Building Size: 11,800 sf
- Annual Utility Cost: $0.74 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Hailmann Elementary School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior  $0
B. Building Interior  $242,000
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ  $3,128,500
D. Technology  $85,000
E. Site  $263,500

Total Construction Cost  $3,719,400
Contingency (8%)  $297,552
Inflation until 2021 (5%)  $185,970

Sub-Total  $4,202,922
Sot Cost (20%)  $840,584

TOTAL PROJECT COST  $5,043,506

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 18.0 acres
- Building Size: 63,601 sf
- Student Capacity: 492
- 129 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.20 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – (New) Educational Services Center

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.  Building Exterior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.  Building Interior</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.  Bldg. Climate &amp; Environ</td>
<td>$2,055,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.  Technology</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.  Site</td>
<td>$194,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Construction Cost: $2,264,500

Contingency (8%): $181,160

Inflation until 2021 (5%): $113,225

Sub-Total: $2,558,885

Sot Cost (20%): $511,777

TOTAL PROJECT COST: $3,070,662

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 5.23 acres
- Building Size: 137,000 sf
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.20 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Riley Elementary School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $110,000
B. Building Interior $100,000
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $3,397,250
D. Technology $100,000
E. Site $316,000

Total Construction Cost $4,023,250
Contingency (8%) $321,860
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $201,163

Sub-Total $4,546,273
Sot Cost (20%) $909,255

TOTAL PROJECT COST $5,455,527

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 4.3 acres
- Building Size: 63,846 sf
- Student Capacity: 289
- 221 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.43 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Kingsbury Elementary School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $620,000  
B. Building Interior $250,000  
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $3,132,080  
D. Technology $92,500  
E. Site $268,000

Total Construction Cost $4,362,580  
Contingency (8%) $349,006  
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $218,129

Sub-Total $4,929,715  
Sot Cost (20%) $985,943

TOTAL PROJECT COST $5,915,658

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 15.0 acres
- Building Size: 62,884 sf
- Student Capacity: 334
- 188 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.41 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – LaPorte High School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0
B. Building Interior $2,775,000
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $4,734,750
D. Technology $12,000
E. Site $141,500

Total Construction Cost $7,663,250
Contingency (8%) $613,060
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $383,163

Sub-Total $8,659,473
Sot Cost (20%) $1,731,895

TOTAL PROJECT COST $10,391,367

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 31.3 acres
- Building Size: 444,408 sf
- Student Capacity: 2,200
- 202 sf/student (250 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.48 per SF
## Summary of Needs and Findings – Kesling Intermediate School

### Priority Items (0s and 1s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Building Exterior</td>
<td>$91,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Building Interior</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bldg. Climate &amp; Environ</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Technology</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Site</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost** $656,200

**Contingency (8%)** $52,496

**Inflation until 2021 (5%)** $32,810

**Sub-Total** $741,506

**Sot Cost (20%)** $148,301

**TOTAL PROJECT COST** $889,807

### Building Metrics:

- **Site Size**: 25.0 acres
- **Building Size**: 102,208 sf
- **Student Capacity**: 1,000
- **102 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)**
- **Annual Utility Cost**: $1.35 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Lincoln Elementary School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0
B. Building Interior $202,000
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $392,000
D. Technology $92,500
E. Site $0

Total Construction Cost $686,500
Contingency (8%) $54,920
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $34,325

Sub-Total $775,745
Sot Cost (20%) $155,149

TOTAL PROJECT COST $930,894

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 3.13 acres
- Building Size: 48,075 sf
- Student Capacity: 345
- 139 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.55 per SF
## Summary of Needs and Findings – Kingsford Heights Elementary School

### Priority Items (0s and 1s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Building Exterior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Building Interior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bldg. Climate &amp; Environ</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Technology</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Site</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Construction Cost  $1,434,000  
Contingency (8%) $114,720  
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $71,700  
Sub-Total $1,620,420  
Sot Cost (20%) $324,084  
TOTAL PROJECT COST $1,944,504

### Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 11.3 acres
- Building Size: 47,099 sf
- Student Capacity: 318
- 148 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.79 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Crichfield Elementary School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0  
B. Building Interior $0  
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $1,140,000  
D. Technology $85,000  
E. Site $148,000  

Total Construction Cost $1,373,000  
Contingency (8%) $109,840  
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $68,650  

Sub-Total $1,551,490  
Sot Cost (20%) $310,298  

TOTAL PROJECT COST $1,861,788

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 15.85 acres
- Building Size: 54,298 sf
- Student Capacity: 498
- 109 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $2.17 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – Kesling Athletic Fields

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0
B. Building Interior $0
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $0
D. Technology $0
E. Site $12,000

Total Construction Cost $12,000
Contingency (8%) $960
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $600

Sub-Total $13,560
Sot Cost (20%) $2,712

TOTAL PROJECT COST $16,272

Building Metrics:

• NA
# Summary of Needs and Findings – Handley Elementary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Items (0s and 1s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Building Exterior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Building Interior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bldg. Climate &amp; Environ</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Technology</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Site</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Construction Cost $5,000
Contingency (8%) $400
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $250

Sub-Total $5,650
Sot Cost (20%) $1,130

TOTAL PROJECT COST $6,780

## Building Metrics:
- Site Size: 7.44 acres
- Building Size: 83,500 sf
- Student Capacity: 409
- 204 sf/student (170 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.69 per SF
Summary of Needs and Findings – LaPorte Middle School

Priority Items (0s and 1s):

A. Building Exterior $0
B. Building Interior $0
C. Bldg. Climate & Environ $0
D. Technology $0
E. Site $0

Total Construction Cost $0
Contingency (8%) $0
Inflation until 2021 (5%) $0
Sub-Total $0
Sot Cost (20%) $0

TOTAL PROJECT COST $0

Building Metrics:

- Site Size: 25.0 acres
- Building Size: 156,996 sf
- Student Capacity: 1,000
- 157 sf/student (180 sf/student typical average)
- Annual Utility Cost: $1.35 per SF
**Summary of Needs and Findings – Transportation Garage**

**NOTE:** This building scored extremely low in many categories. LPCSC need to consider the future of this building (i.e.: renovation/addition options) vs. the potential of a new facility or relocating to a different building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Exterior</th>
<th>Walls, windows, doors, roof (subgroup suitability = 22.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Interior</strong></td>
<td>No secure vestibule, doors/frames/hardware throughout, ADA &amp; Code compliance throughout, walls/floors/ceilings throughout, vanities/sinks/toilet partitions, signage, equipment. (subgroup suitability = 25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Climate &amp; Environmental Conditions:</strong></td>
<td>HVAC, controls, plumbing systems and fixtures, electrical devices and distribution, fire alarm (subgroup suitability = 22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology:</strong></td>
<td>Intercom, video surveillance, access control, AV systems/infrastructure/equipment (subgroup suitability = 12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td>Size of site, vehicular access, traffic flow, overall drainage, lawn/landscape, main and wayfinding signage, outdoor storage, dumpster/service area, site benches/furnishings, perimeter fence, concrete aprons, parking lot asphalt/curbs, spill containment at fueling area. (subgroup suitability = 18.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is estimated that hard construction costs to upgrade this building could be in the range of $1.6 to $2.0 million which translates to a project cost range of to $2.0 to $2.5 million. These estimated costs do not improve the size of the site, the layout of the building, or many other challenges at this location.
- This building does not meet the needs of LPCSC for bus maintenance. If rebuilt the facility would need to be significantly larger which is not possible on the current site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Metrics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 3.38 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Size:</strong> 9,025 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Utility Cost:</strong> $2.84 per SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Needs and Findings – Support Services Center

NOTE: This building scored extremely low in many categories. LPCSC need to consider the future of this building (i.e.: renovation/addition options) vs. the potential of a new facility or relocating to a different building.

Building Exterior – Walls, windows, doors, roof (subgroup suitability = 15.6%)
Building Interior – ADA & Code compliance throughout, signage throughout, FFE, ceilings throughout, vanities/sinks/toilet partitions, signage, equipment. (subgroup suitability = 52.0%)
Building Climate & Environmental Conditions: HVAC, controls, plumbing systems and fixtures, lighting, electrical devices and distribution, fire alarm (subgroup suitability = 25.0%)
Technology: Intercom, video surveillance, access control (subgroup suitability = 40.6%)
Site: Size of site, vehicular access, traffic flow, overall drainage, flagpole, wayfinding signage, mechanical courtyard, dumpster/service area, sidewalks, parking lot curbs, ADA accessibility, lack of large outdoor storage space (subgroup suitability = 30.0%)

31% Support Services Center

Building Metrics:
• Site Size: 1.3 acres
• Building Size: 29,350 sf
• Annual Utility Cost: $1.40 per SF

• It is estimated that hard construction costs to upgrade this building could be in the range of $2.9 to $3.5 million which translates to a project cost range $3.6 to $4.4 million. These estimated costs do not improve the size of the site, the layout of the building, or many other challenges at this location.
• The location of the SSC building is distant from the High School, Kesling Campus, and the (old) ESC. The Maintenance, Food Service, and Technology staff, and associated equipment are thus separated from the largest group of users of their services.
• This building offers a lot of space but there are several high cost improvements needed as outlined above. In addition, the use and programming of this building should be studied in more detail to help determine the required interior space and site modifications beyond the maintenance items listed above. This will help determine total costs for keeping this building vs. building new.
Summary of Needs and Findings – Kiwanis Field

NOTE: This building scored extremely low in many categories. LPCSC need to consider the future of this building (i.e.: renovation/addition options) vs. the potential of a new facility or relocating to a different building.

Building Exterior – No major items identified as 0 or 1; primarily 2 (subgroup suitability = 60.9%)
Building Interior – Ceilings/Walls/Floors throughout, doors/frames/hardware throughout, signage, FFE, ADA & code compliance throughout, concessions casework/shelving, toilet partitions, lockers (subgroup suitability = 31.7%)
Building Climate & Environmental Conditions: HVAC, controls, plumbing systems, electrical devices and distribution, fire alarm (subgroup suitability = 22.7%)
Technology: Lighting and cooling in Telecom Room, intercom, video surveillance, access control, A/V Weight Room (subgroup suitability = 34.4%)
Site: Main building sign, mechanical courtyard, dumpster/service area, site benches/furnishings, parking lot curbs, sidewalks, Main Field running track and field events, Practice Field irrigation/goal posts/ ADA accessibility (subgroup suitability = 44.9%)

- It is estimated that hard construction costs to upgrade this building could be in the range of $2.3 to $2.7 million which translates to a project cost range $2.9 to $3.4 million. The estimated costs only improve the existing conditions and do not offer additional space.
- There are several items that scored 2 that will also need attention soon.
- Many high school stadiums were built in the past in a similar way by placing occupied spaces such as Concessions/Lockers/Restrooms under the bleachers. However, this type of design has led to many maintenance issues over the years and many of these facilities are commonly being demolished and rebuilt with the grandstands/press box being built separate from the Concession/Restroom/Locker buildings.
- One option would be to consider salvaging some of the historically unique portions of the building to incorporate into the new facility.
Summary of Energy Costs
Summary of Energy Costs

![Chart showing energy costs for various Laporte Schools. The chart indicates the total utility cost for the average of 2018 and 2019 for each school. The costs range from the highest at LaPorte High School to the lowest at ESC.]
Summary of Energy Costs
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