



“Community” = Faculty, staff, administration, parents, taxpayers, city officials, school board members, city council members, any and all stakeholders.

**Likely questions from the community regarding the state of design and budget & possible responses:**

**Q: “How did this (cost / budget gap) happen?”**

A: There are a lot of factors that have contributed to this large gap between the pre-bond budget estimate and the preliminary Schematic Design Budget. First, there were always concerns, from before the bond vote, that \$70 million was not going to be an adequate budget to address the many needs of this facility and the community. The \$70 million budget was driven more by the bonding/debt capacity of the City and less by the actual costs of what the community was saying they wanted. Early in the process one of the design team members said, “With \$70m, the Owner has enough money to do ANYTHING they want, but they don’t have enough money to do EVERYTHING they want.” Meanwhile, through the “wish list” approach of soliciting input via public meetings, staff meetings, design charrettes, surveys, etc., the community essentially asked the architectural team to design a \$90+ million facility.

This is a necessary process and a very common outcome. 1) Tell the project team what you want and need; 2) The project team then figures out how to meet all or most of those wants and needs, and; 3) Produces a detailed estimate of costs to meet those wants and needs. The next step is to refine the list of wants and needs and refine the design to match the budget.

**Q: “What is driving this cost increase over the pre-bond budget?”**

A: The first driver is that, true to the concerns of many community members, \$70m was never going to be enough to meet ALL of the wants and needs of the community given the condition of the existing facility and site constraints. But it should be more than adequate to meet most, if not all, of the needs. Other cost drivers include:

- Problematic soil conditions that have increased design costs and will increase construction costs with the current design.
- More extensive soil contamination that could have been anticipated.

- More extensive findings of asbestos and PCBs in the building than anticipated meaning that testing and abatement costs will be significantly higher than originally budgeted.
- Storm water treatment more extensive than anticipated.

**Q. “Will we have to go back out to the voters for more money?”**

A: NO. This is not an option. We simply must work to delivery as much as possible for the \$70m cap. There may be opportunities in the future for grants or donations to provide funding for items that we can’t currently afford. But addition debt or bonding is off the table.

**Q. “What are we going to have to give up in order to keep this on budget?”**

A: We will have to scale back on some of the wants and needs in order to make this budget work. This is letting go of wishes for some things that we don’t currently have so the reality is that we are not giving up anything. In the end this project will provide a facility that is VASTLY improved over the current facility.

**Q. “Will all that community input into design go to waste?”**

A: No! On the contrary! That input, from all community members was, and remains essential to the design process and final outcome. In fact the project team will continue to solicit input from the community as we refine the design to meet the budget.