

- DRAFT -**Table 1: Cost Normalization, As of January 1999**

	Findley¹¹	Scholls¹²	Difference
Total Construction Cost	\$7,680,779	\$6,157,023	\$1,523,756
Normalization			
Dewatering Expenses ¹	<\$126,823>		<\$126,823>
Phone/Data Wiring ²	<\$49,640>		<\$49,640>
Design Change - Size Reduction ³	<\$300,000>		<\$300,000>
Design Change - Upper Level Flooring System ⁴	<\$92,000>		<\$92,000>
2 nd Floor Access Bridge and Related Retaining Wall ⁵	<\$15,500>		<\$15,500>
Offsite Sidewalks ⁶	<\$15,000>		<\$15,000>
Fire Doors ⁷	<\$12,000>		<\$12,000>
Water Treatment Swale and Landscaping/Soil Removal ⁸	<\$115,000>		<\$115,000>
Forced Main Sewage System ⁹	<\$67,605>		<\$67,605>
Change Orders ¹⁰	<\$32,457>		<\$32,457>
Subtotal	<\$826,025>		<\$826,025>
CM/GC Fee Associated with Cost Adjustments(3.77%)	<\$31,141>		<\$31,141>
Total Normalization Factors	<\$857,166>		<\$857,166>
Normalized Cost	<u>\$6,823,613</u>	<u>\$6,157,023</u>	<u>\$666,590</u>
Percent Difference			<u>11%</u>

Note: The actual cost differences between the schools cannot be finally determined until Scholls is completed, at which time this analysis may need to be updated.

1. There were groundwater issues at Findley requiring dewatering services not required at Scholls.
2. The cost of phone/data wiring was accounted for separately on the Scholls contract.
3. A design change at Scholls reduced the size of the school by approximately 30,000 ft³.
4. A design change at Scholls simplified the flooring system for the single story upper level. The single story upper level at Findley uses a slab on grade design requiring a heavy retaining wall for structural support. At Scholls a framed floor system was used eliminating the need for an 8000 ft² slab, a retaining wall, damp proofing for the slab and wall, and metal decking.
5. The topography at Findley required a 2nd floor access bridge and related retaining wall be built. This was not required at Scholls.
6. The cost of offsite sidewalks is included as part of the Findley scope of work. This scope of work was the responsibility of the general contractor developing the surrounding community at Scholls. Therefore, no offsite sidewalk work was included in the Scholls project cost.
7. The Findley location made use of fire doors that were not required at Scholls due to a jurisdictional code interpretation.
8. The Findley location required substantially more site preparation than Scholls. The dredging of a water treatment swale and its associated soil removal and landscaping added work not required at Scholls.