

Impacts of School Design to Ongoing Maintenance/Operations



Tuesday, October 31, 10:10 am – 11:00am Room Africa 50

Agenda

Introductions Why are We Here Selecting A Design Standard What is Value Engineering

Value Saving Considerations

- > Building Reclassification
- > Building Benchmarking

System Considerations

- Mechanical Systems
- > Acoustics
- > Lighting

Funding Options

Questions and Answers



We Don't Know What We Don't Know Donald Rumsfeld February 12, 2002



Why Improve Our Buildings?

Reduce Building Maintenance Costs Reduce Operating Costs/Energy Efficiencies Modernize/Replace Obsolete Systems Remove Hazardous Conditions/Materials Address Complaints (Staff and Visitors) Opportunities Provided by Added Funding IMPROVE/EXPAND WORKING ENVIROMENTS

So related to any of these projects, What does VALUE ENGINEERING mean to you?





ARE YOU STARTING WITH PROJECT GOALS ARE THEY PART OF YOUR CONTRACTS/AGREEMENTS



Opportunities for Growth and Understand

- Keep the focus on students and their daily activities rather than "a Program/Room"
- Be aware of the challenges of our diverse society and the impacts on a school
- Visit other buildings which reflect your vision and goals
- Be open to new ideas and opportunities to evolve what is teaching and learning
- Use association groups, peers, and researchers as opportunities to grow your understanding of the opportunities





Your Tools to Guide Decision Making

NOURISHMENT

- Selection/Availability
- Serving Size
- Information

AIR

- Quality
- PurificationHumidity

FITNESS

- Fitness Centers
- Stairs
- Bike Room
- Incentives Programs

WATER

- Quality
- Treatment
- Drinking Promotion

COMFORT

- Ergonomics
- Sound Reduction
- Olfactory Comfort

LIGHT

- Natural Access
- Color
- Dimming/Circadian Rhythms

MIND

- Collaboration
- Quiet Rooms
- On-site Child Care
- Health & Wellness Library

OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS | PAGE 19

THERE ARE MANY TOOLS AND OPTIONS FIND ONE WHICH REFLECTS YOUR PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

Changes to Building Codes

Which code you apply will allow for different design strategies and project processes. There is no longer a one size fits all application for the buildings.

Building and Energy Code Changes (ASHRAE 90.1 VS IECC 2012)

- Renovations/Additions to Existing Buildings
- Exemptions to Historic Structures
- Insulation Requirements
- > Air Barrier, Water Barrier and Vapor Barrier
- Lighting and Plug Load Controls
- Building and Systems Commissioning
- R-Values, u-Values, Reflectivity, Shading Co-Efficient
- > NRFC Ratings for Windows and Doors
- Limits to the Window Wall Ratios
- Mandates for Energy Recovery
- Re-Roofing Projects
- Vestibules Locations
- > Lighting Control and Lighting Reduction

AND THE SOCIAL CHALLENGES AND IMPACTS GENDER EQUITY | ADA | SAFE SECURE | STORMWATER | ROOF LOADS

What is Value Management

Seemed Like a Good Idea

- Mechanical Retrofit and Reroofing Project
- Increases in wind and snow loading
- > Point loads from the roof top units
- > Roof draining off the north and east sides of building
- > Walls are deteriorating due to water freezing and thawing
- Added railings puncture membranes

Implementation of the International Building Code

- > Redesigning of the roof structure
- > Wall repairs and flooring repairs
- > Repair the tunnels and grade around the building
- Replace the mechanical system
- Operations and maintenance impacts (comfort/utilities)

Opportunity Costs Lost Due to Replacement Values

- Loss of quality interior and exterior finishes
- > Environmental considerations: windows, lighting, IDAQ
- Repair of the existing structures and site

CHANGING CODES AND REGULATIONS IMPACTS COSTS OFTEN ARE NOT FULLY ADDRESSED PROJECT BY PROJECT

How Many Decision Are Made Every Day with a Small Bit of Information?

And How Many Decisions are Made Because That Is What We Always Do?

If I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horse Henry Ford

Building and System Assessments

Building Reclassification

- > May be able to eliminate rated walls
- > Identifies future design strategies
- Impacts to ventilation rates

Retro-Commissioning

- Functional testing and verification
- > Depreciation and system age
- > Controls and monitoring

Construction Types

- Heat Sink Structures: 1990 and Older
- Insulated Structures: 1990 and Newer
- System Impacts and Design Strategies

NOT UNDERSTANDING THE ENTIRE "BUILDING" CAN DRAMATICALLY IMPACT ALL COSTS OF OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Building Reclassification Benefits/Savings

Doors and Hardware Modifications

- Fewer Doors with Fire/Smoke Gasketing
- > Fewer Rated Doors, Frames and Hardware

Mechanical and Life Safety Systems Modifications

- > Elimination of Fire/Smoke Dampers
 - Improved IDAQ, Efficiency, Maintenance, Operations
- Simplified Building Automation Systems
- Reduced Scope for Detection Systems

Other Operational and Maintenance Savings

- > Reduced Rated Penetrations Due to Fewer Rated Walls
- Fewer Inspections and Service Calls

NOT UNDERSTANDING THE ENTIRE "BUILDING" WILL DRAMATICALLY IMPACT ALL COSTS

ISD 622 Savings Due to Building Reclassification

Across the district the number of fire walls dropped from 23 to 7

Cost to the District

- > Based on Building Size, Age and Complexity: \$8,500 average
- > 5 Buildings x \$8,500 = \$42,500 total costs

Construction Savings

> Currently over \$75,000 on just Five Buildings and Growing

Other Operational and Maintenance Savings

- > Three Elementary Schools: \$5,000 per year savings
- > One Middle School: \$8,250 per year savings
- > One High School: \$22,500 per year savings

Total One Year Savings (construction and operations): \$120,750

CONSTRUCTION COSTS ARE COMPONENT REPLACEMENT OPERATIONS COSTS INCLUDE MAINTENANCE AND EFFICIENCIES

Clients Use Multiple Strategies to Achieve Energy Reductions But Is There More?

- Requirements to include strategies to reduce consumption in a COMPREHENSIVE FACILITIES PLAN(S).
- Complete RETROCOMMISSIONING or RECOMMISSIONING to help with staff training and identifying potential building and system improvements/replacement.
- Make energy savings potential a factor in considering CAPITAL PROJECTS or changes in space function.
- Building project REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT is prioritized based on guaranteed energy savings and funds available, thereby freeing up money for other potential projects.
- Energy consumption was made a factor in more aggressively pursuing building/system RIGHTSIZING.
- Compile USER GROUP DATA. Use their comments to guide your goals and let them know how they impacted the process

CONDUCT ENERGY AUDITS AND MEASURE BUILDING PERFORMANCE THE TOOL FOR SYSTEM/BUILDING PERFORMANCE

Three Areas of Energy Management

Energy-efficient operations

Savings Potential: 7% to 17%

Building and systems improvements

Savings Potential: 5% to 20%

Beyond the meter: understanding the rate structure

Savings Potential: 1% to 3%

B3 Benchmarking: Consumption vs Dollars

EUI: kBTU/sf/yr

		EUI	Completed	Total
#	Name	(kBTU/SF/yr)	Sq Ft	Sq Ft 📥
136	Mankato	76.63	1,538,416	1,538,416
86	Wayzata Public Schools	63.80	992,240	1,613,919
-	Hopkins	0.00	81,526	1,621,933
132	Edina Public Schools	75.97	1,666,994	1,666,994
129	Minnetonka	75.26	1,689,112	1,689,112
107	North St. Paul, Maplewood, Oakdale	68.96	1,743,485	1,743,485
87	White Bear Lake	63.84	1,775,767	1,775,767
189	Mounds View	135.72	1,833,999	1,833,999
68	Eden Prairie	60.53	1,883,279	1,883,279
75	Burnsville-Eagan-Savage	61.84	1,900,504	1,900,504
109	Eastern Carver County Schools	69.69	1,912,060	1,912,060
77	Lakeville	62.23	1,918,474	1,918,474
122	St. Cloud	74.35	1,947,142	1,947,142

Ranking Among Districts of similar size (1.5 - 1.9 million sf)

- 1. Eden Prairie 60.53 (68 /197)
- 2. Burnsville-Eagan-Savage 61.84 (75/197)
- 3. Lakeville 62.23 (77/197)
- 4. Wayzata Public Schools 63.80 (86/197)
- 5. White Bear Lake 63.84 (87 /197)
- 6. North St. Paul, Maplewood, Oakdale 68.96 (107/197)
- 7. Easter Carver County Schools 69.69 (109 /197)
- 8. St. Cloud 74.33 (122 /197)
- 9. Minnetonka 75.26 (130 /197)
- 10. Edina Public Schools 75.97 (132 /197)
- 11. Mankato 76.63 (174 /197)
- 12. Mounds View 135.72 (189/197)

Target: 62.25 Data From 04/26/16

- St. Cloud \$1.02
- 10. North St. Paul, Maplewood, Oakdale \$1.08
- 11. Easter Carver County Schools \$1.28
- 12. Mounds View \$1.76

Target: \$0.78 Data From 04/26/16

Dollars: \$/sf/yr

#	Name	Dollars (\$/SF/yr)	Completed Sq Ft	Total Sq Ft 🔺
81	Mankato	\$0.90	1,538,416	1,538,416
130	Wayzata Public Schools	\$1.02	992,240	1,613,919
-	Hopkins		81,526	1,621,933
125	Edina Public Schools	\$0.99	1,666,994	1,666,994
98	Minnetonka	\$0.94	1,689,112	1,689,112
143	North St. Paul, Maplewood, Oakdale	\$1.08	1,743,485	1,743,485
64	White Bear Lake	\$0.85	1,775,767	1,775,767
190	Mounds View	\$1.76	1,833,999	1,833,999
69	Eden Prairie	\$0.86	1,883,279	1,883,279
59	Burnsville-Eagan-Savage	\$0.83	1,900,504	1,900,504
174	Eastern Carver County Schools	\$1.28	1,912,060	1,912,060
87	Lakeville	\$0.91	1,918,474	1,918,474
132	St. Cloud	\$1.02	1,947,142	1,947,142

Ranking Among Districts of similar size (1.5 – 1.9 million sf)

- 1. Burnsville-Eagan-Savage \$0.83
- 2. White Bear Lake \$0.85
- 3. Eden Prairie \$0.86
- 4. Mankato \$0.90
- 5. Lakeville \$0.91
- 6. Minnetonka \$0.94
- 7. Edina Public Schools \$0.99

- 9. Wayzata Public Schools \$1.02

ISD 622 District Wide Energy Performance

The average annual energy costs per square foot for IDS 622: Note: costs for the last 12 month period.	\$1.08
The average annual energy costs per square foot for 15 districts:	\$0.96
The average annual EUI per square foot for NSP-M-O: Note: costs for the last 12 month period.	68.96 kBTU
The average annual EUI per square foot for 15 districts:	68.41 kBTU

The difference between the energy costs average and ISD NSP-M-O: \$0.12

There are 1,743,485 square feet in the district so the potential operational savings to "average" **\$0.12 x 1,743,485 sf = \$209,218 dollars annually.**

Some of the best performers include across the state: Albert Lea (\$0.67), Duluth (\$0.75), Burnsville (\$0.79), Bloomington (\$0.84), Eden Prairie (\$0.82), Minnetonka (\$0.87)

Note: Building age has very little to do with the potential performance. Data From 04/26/16 One Third of the utilities are provided by a small cooperative which charges more per kW Due to the Extensive number of projects undertaken over the last 18 months, number have not been updated

Managing the Costs and Consumption

	MAILING ADDRESS	ACCOUNT N	UMBER
2 Xcel Energy	ISD 277 SCHOOL DISTRICT	51-6795	. 8-600
Chickensy	5901 SUNNYFIELD RD E	STATEMENT NUMBER	STATEMENT DATE
	MOUND MN 55364-8250	530672653	01/10/2017

METER 17956112 - Multiplier x 3	00	R	ead Dates: 11/22/16 - 12/2	27/16 (35 Days)
DESCRIPTION	CURRENT READING	PREVIOUS READING	MEASURED USAGE	BILLED USAGE
Firm Demand	Actual			250 kW
Internet Demand	Actual			157 kW
Demand	Actual			407 kW
Billable Demand				407 kW
Power Factor Demand	91.66%			

ELECTRICITY CHARGES		RATE: P	eak Controlled Servi	ce
DESCRIPTION	USAGE	UNITS	RATE	CHARGE
Basic Service Chg				\$55.00
Energy Charge	160617	kWh	\$0.032010	\$5,141.35
Fuel Cost Charge	160617	kWh	\$0.024360	\$3,912.59
Firm Demand Winter	250	kW	\$9.960000	\$2,490.00
Controllable Demnd	157	kW	\$8.210000	\$1,288.97
Affordability Chro				\$2.79
Resource Adjustment				\$861.20
Interim Rate Adj				\$695.59
Total				\$14,447.49

Predetermined Demand Level 250

Premises Total

\$5,007.10

DAILY AVERAGES	Last Year	This Year
Temperature	32° F	24° F
Electricity kWh	4321.0	13492.6
Electricity Cost	\$1,589.53	\$1,327.52

Xcel Energy Invoice

Strategic Goal Review

Page Building Program Demand Level Daily Average Sav 3 Hilltop Elementary Peak Controlled 50 228.29 129.45 96 4 Mound Westonka HS* Peak Controlled 250 1,589.53 1,327.52 266.11 11 Grandview MS Peak Controlled 50 316.61 149.42 167	Highlig	nts of January 2017 Involc	.е.		Last Year	This Year	
19 Shirley Hill Elementary Peak Controlled 50 188.89 94.06 94	Page 3 4 11 19	Building Hilltop Elementary Mound Westonka HS* Grandview MS Shirley Hill Elementary	Program Peak Controlled Peak Controlled Peak Controlled Peak Controlled	Demand Level 50 250 50 50	Daily Average 228.29 1,589.53 316.61 188.89	Daily Average 129.45 1,327.52 149.42 94.08	98.84 262.01 167.19 94.81

*Credit applied to MWHS invoice in the amount of \$9,440.39.

			AM				Time	2		P	M				
1	2	2	4	6	8	10	12	2	4	6	8	10	12	Hr	s/Day
Monday				ÌÌ	12				{3 {4} ↑	X 5 \r				17.5	hours
Tuesdav											1			11.5	hours
Wednesdav				1							i			11.5	hours
Thursday										i				17.5	hours
Friday										i.				17.0	hours
Saturday			·							i	1			13.0	hours
Sunday					-<u>4</u>≻					4	<mark>6</mark>			0.0	hours
														88.0	hrs/w
D															
Proposed AH	J2 Of	berati	AM	neo	lule		Time	2		P	M				
1	2	2	4	6	8	10	12	2	4	6	8	10	12	Hr	s/Day
Monday					1 2				{3 {4}	×5> (6		15.5	hours
Tuesday										1				13.5	hours
Wednesday										1				10.5	hours
Thursday										i i				13.5	hours
Friday										1	1			10.5	hours
Saturday			1	1'						i				13.0	hours
Sunday				4							6'			0.0	hours
														76.5	hrs/w
Symbol Key		Pe	eak Der	mano	d Charo	ies			AHU	J Opera	ting				
	1	Staff	and St	uden	ts Arri	ve		<mark>4</mark> } /	Activiti	es Begir	n				
	2	Classe	es Begi	n				5}	Classro	om Staf	f Depar	t			
	3	Classe	es End				{	<mark>6</mark> } /	Activiti	es End					
Considerations															
A. How long can v	ve susp	pend sy	/stem (opera	ation a	nd ma	intain c	occup	ant cor	nfort du	ring oc	cupied l	nours		
B. Can schedules I	be adju	usted to	o avoid	l peal	k dema	and ch	arges (l	PDC)							
C. Can avoiding P	DC als	o reduc	ce the l	hours	s of op	eratio		-	11						
I i an tomporatu	rés be	reduce	ad duri	ng Ao	tivitie	s (athl	etics) a	na st	ii main	tain occ	upant c	omfort			
E le it cost offerti	VA *A -	A REAL PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPER	0.0.00		A DECK OF THE REAL PROPERTY OF	and the second sec									
E. Is it cost effecti E. Are the AHUS	ve to c oned +	o refle	e nign	t set-	hal nee	ds and	sched	ules							

Daylighting Analysis and Design Options

Level 1 – Current Design

Basement – Current Design

Level 1 – Design Alternative

Basement – Design Alternative

May 15, 2018

Meets targeted daylight levels

Does not meet targeted daylight levels

Lighting Systems

LED Lighting (Light Emitting Diode)

The technology first because utilized in 1968 and the first large scale lighting application in 2003.

Advantages

- Operations: Installation, Pay-Back, Warranty, Security
- Efficiency: Size, Dimming, Focus, Maintenance
- 3.5 times Bulb/System Life: 42,500 hours vs 12,500 hours
 - LED vs Incandescent: 85% Reduction in Carbon
 - LED vs Fluorescent: 34% Reduction in Energy
- Occupant Comfort: Color of Light, Flicker, Ballast Buzz
 - Occupant Headaches and Impacts to Special Needs Students
- Daylight Harvesting: Every Fixture can be Addressable
 - Teaching Tools and Community Communication Tool

Disadvantages

• Operations: Heat

Getting The Full Benefit Of A System

An LED Lighting Replacement Project Project Budget

- Construction
- Operations and Maintenance
- Benefit of Use

Control Light Intensity (Dimming)

- The Biggest Cause of Headaches
- Challenge for Students with Disabilities
 We don't know what we don't know
 Color and Tuneability
 Day Light Harvesting

Mechanical Systems Performance

Mechanical Systems are the most critical component regarding occupant comfort. Systems should consider:

- System Types
 - Unit Ventilators
 - Central VAV/Constant Volume
 - Displacement and Radiant
- Consistent and Constant Temperature
 - Space Heights and Floor Area
 - Heating vs Cooling
- Limited Drafts and Uncomfortably Cold Surfaces
 - Radiant Heat vs Forced Air
 - Heat Sinks vs Insulated Structures
- Reduce Air and System Noises
 - Background Noises Impact Learning (33db background)
- Indoor Air Quality
 - Stale Air vs Sick Air (human illnesses)
 - Molds and Other Unwanted Growths
 - Cleaning Practices are a Big Challenge

Figure 1 - Mixing Ventilation

Figure 2 - Displacement Ventilation

http://www.iklimnet.com

Mechanical System: Traditional Mixed Air System

Background Noise Levels and Mixing of Air:

The typical VAV system generates an average of 40 dB of background noise due primarily from fans pushing air from the ceiling to the floor. The Displacement and Conditioned Air Systems are generating and average of 30db (less than half) the background noise levels.

Mixed Air Systems will mix 30% to 55% of the return room air (recycled existing room air). Other systems can incorporate 100% outside air without mixing airborne germs/particulates.

Mechanical System: Total Displacement Ventilation

Total Displacement Benefits:

A hybrid displacement system is part of our healthy buildings research efforts. The system incorporates 100% outside air. This system has proven to reduce the number of sick days, improved learning/test scores, and improve overall occupant comfort.

Background Noise Levels

With the rise in studies regarding teaching and learning, one of the greatest challenges is the level in Background NOISE. Areas of greatest impact include:

- Student Challenges
 - Special Needs Students
 - English as Second Language
- Hearing Development
- Teacher Variables
 - Soft Spoken Individuals
 - Suffering from Illness
- We Combat Noise with.....

MORE NOISE!!

For these reasons and others, many states (including Minnesota) are requiring background noise levels in learning spaces to be 35 dB or less.

DECIBEL LEVELS

http://tamco.com

Safe and Secure Strategies

Safe and Secure Front Entry Design Discussions

Carver Elementary School: Building Design

Safe and Secure: Restroom Design

Impacts of School Design to Ongoing Maintenance/Operations

