Staff responses to November 13, 2025, School Board motions regarding the Cub Run Elementary School Project

School Board Motion

(i) Provide the School Board with a thorough analysis of (and rationale for) the estimated cost for the Cub Run ES project in the CIP

The FY2026-30 CIP estimate for the Cub Run ES Renovation project varies from recently awarded renovations in three significant areas: (1) the incorporation of Net Zero sustainability cost assumptions into the estimating methodology, (2) the estimation of the project as a new construction project with an on-site swing space, and (3) the inflation of the project estimate to its anticipated midpoint of construction.

(1) Net Zero sustainability adds a cost premium to the baseline construction estimate. During the presentation to the Board and ultimate approval of the FY2025-29 CIP, it was determined that this sustainability framework would begin to be reflected "in Future projects starting in FY26 and beyond." As such, the Cub Run ES renovation project reflects the impacts of NZE-related costs. The proposed FY 2027-31 CIP estimate for Cub Run ES (without Net Zero) is $88.5M. The Net Zero alternative estimate is $95.8M, a delta of approximately $7.3M. The base assumption of $/SF premium for Net Zero utilized in FY 2026-30 CIP development was slightly higher, and with that the delta in the estimates was $9.5M.

(2) Cost estimates for multiple construction and sustainability alternatives were considered for this project, and ultimately presented a cost estimate for new construction with on-site "swing space" in the FY2026-30 CIP. Unit pricing (per SF) for new construction exceeds that of renovation, and the "swing space" estimate also reflects separate demolition costs that were not required in a phase-occupied renovation. This option was the costliest of those priced, but was also viewed as representative of the anticipated project approach.

(3) Project estimates are prepared based on current market assumptions, while funding levels dictate a need to plan projects with life cycles that start in the future. To present accurate portfolio costs for these future projects, estimates are escalated to a respective project's midpoint of construction to mitigate against potential risks relative to the construction market and/or greater economic climate, as well as to most accurately account for the time value of funding.

It is worth noting that costs posted in the CIP reflect a comprehensive project estimate inclusive of all direct and indirect costs; examples include, but are not limited to,

estimated construction costs, design fees, permitting fees, utility fees, temporary classroom costs, asbestos abatement, furniture and equipment budgets, technology upgrades, and project contingency budgets.

(ii) Determine whether the use of Design-Build or Construction Management at Risk methodologies could reduce the cost and timeframe of the Cub Run ES project without causing any significant delay in the renovation /construction process

The Request for Proposal (RFP) for this project was prepared and conducted prior to the approval of the most recent revisions to School Board Policy 8240, authorizing the school division to utilize design-build and construction manager at risk project delivery methods. In anticipation of the authorization of these alternative project delivery methods, the RFP for Cub Run ES was crafted, with legal counsel, with the intentional flexibility for FCPS to elect either a Design-Bid-Build or Construction Manager at Risk delivery method during the design phases at a no-cost change to the A/E design fee. This inherent ability to write an RFP with such duality is made possible by the fact that in both Design-Bid Build and Construction Management delivery methods, a separate contract with each is held by FCPS. Under the current RFP, FCPS can solicit a separate contract for Construction Management services, during the project's earlier design phases to provide pre-construction services.

It is worth noting that because the Design-Build delivery concept is based on a designer/builder team operating under a single contract with FCPS, there was no ability to pursue such a solicitation as P8240 had not yet been approved.

(iii) Determine whether the modular (or off-site) construction of a new school building adjacent to the existing building could reduce the cost and timeframe of the Cub Run ES project (wherein the existing building could be demolished or re-purposed).

A vetted determination of potential cost and/or schedule savings is not available absent an analysis of the Cub Run ES site and infrastructure suitability for permanent modular construction, conducted in parallel with a comprehensive feasibility study of the applicability of this project type in Fairfax County as well as in relation to FCPS operations. This would be an involved exercise. Proceeding in this direction would be best suited by a cease in pursuit of the subject contract award, with eventual preparation of a new solicitation(s) as available pending results.