

District: City of New Bedford  
 School Name: John B. DeValles Elementary School  
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic  
 Date: June 14, 2023

**Recommendation**

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the City of New Bedford (the “District”), as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design for a project that proposes to consolidate the student population of the existing John B. DeValles Elementary School and the James B. Congdon Elementary School and construct a new facility serving grades K-5 on an alternative site referred to as the Goodyear site. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s Preferred Schematic.

If the District is approved by the Board to proceed into Schematic Design for this proposed project, and then is later considered by the Board for approval of a Project Scope and Budget Agreement and a Project Funding Agreement, the vote to approve a Project Scope and Budget Agreement and a Project Funding Agreement, would be contingent upon the District gaining sufficient ownership or a lease consistent with 963 CMR 2.05(1) for the useful life of the proposed project. The District would be required to have legal authority, control, and use of the proposed project and associated site to the extent required for construction, repairs, and continued operations for the useful life of the proposed project , unless this condition is met prior to such vote. The District’s Preferred Schematic requires land acquisition.

<b>District Information</b>	
District Name	City of New Bedford
Elementary School(s)	Abraham Lincoln ES (K-5) Alfred J Gomes ES (K-5) Betsey B Winslow ES (K-5) Carlos Pacheco ES (PK-5) Casmir Pulaski ES (PK-5) Charles S Ashley ES (K-5) Elizabeth Carter Brooks ES (K-5) Ellen R Hathaway ES (PK-5) Elwyn G Campbell ES (PK-5) Hayden/McFadden ES (PK-5) James B Congdon ES (K-5) Jireh Swift ES (PK-5) John Avery Parker ES (PK-5) John B. DeValles ES (K-5) John Hannigan ES (PK-5) Renaissance Community school for the Arts ES (PK-5) Sgt H Carney Academy ES (PK-5) Thomas R Rodman ES (K-5) William H Taylor ES (PK-5)
Middle School(s)	Keith Middle School (6-8) Normandin Middle School (6-8) Roosevelt Middle School (6-8)

<b>District Information</b>	
High School(s)	Trinity Day Academy MS/HS (4-12) Whaling City JR/SR HS (6-12) New Bedford High (9-12)
Priority School Name	John B. DeValles Elementary School
Type of School	Elementary School
Grades Served	K-5
Year Opened	1912
Existing Square Footage	57,030
Additions	N/A
Acreage of Site	2.5 acres
Building Issues	<p>The District identified deficiencies in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Structural integrity</li> <li>– Mechanical systems</li> <li>– Electrical systems</li> <li>– Plumbing systems</li> <li>– Envelope</li> <li>– Windows</li> <li>– Roof</li> <li>– Accessibility</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the physical plant issues, the District reported that the existing facility does not support the delivery of its educational program as well as existing and projected overcrowding.</p>
Original Design Capacity	Unknown
2022-2023 Enrollment	304 Students
Agreed Upon Enrollment	<p>Study Enrollment includes the following configurations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Enrollment 400 (grade configuration K-5)</li> <li>– Enrollment 760 (grade configuration K-5) (Preferred Schematic)</li> </ul>
Enrollment Specifics	Contingent upon the Board’s approval of the Preferred Schematic, the District will sign a Design Enrollment Certification for 760 students in grades K-5.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	No

<b>MSBA Board Votes</b>	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	April 14, 2021
Invitation to Feasibility Study	December 15, 2021
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On June 21, 2023 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on December 13, 2023
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	80.00%

<b>Consultants</b>
--------------------

Owner's Project Manager (the "OPM")	P-Three Inc. in collaboration with Atlantic Construction & Management, Inc
Designer	Turowski2 Architecture, Inc.

## Discussion

The existing John B. DeValles Elementary School is a 57,030 square foot facility located on a 2.5-acre site that currently serves 304 students in grades K-5. The original school building was constructed in 1912.

The District's Statement of Interest ("SOI") identified numerous deficiencies in the existing facility associated with outdated mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; building envelope; accessibility issues; and deficiencies in existing spaces deemed incapable for appropriately delivering the District's educational program.

As part of the Feasibility Study, the MSBA considered and accepted the District's request to explore options that include a consolidation of the students from the John B. DeValles Elementary School and the James B. Congdon Elementary School resulting in the following study design enrollments: 400 students in grades K-5; and 760 students in grades K-5.

The existing James B. Congdon Elementary School is a 47,000 square-foot facility located on a 1.3-acre site. The facility currently serves students in grades K-5. The original school building was constructed in 1907.

In conjunction with its consultants, the District performed a comprehensive assessment of the existing conditions and the educational program and received input from educators, administrators, and facilities personnel. Based on the findings of this effort, the District and its consultants initially studied (16) preliminary options that include: (1) code upgrade option, (1) renovation only option, (5) addition/renovation options, and (9) new construction options, as presented below.

Option	Description of Preliminary Options
Option 1A	Code Upgrade/Base Repair for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at the existing John B. DeValles Elementary School; with an estimated project cost of \$36.9 million.
Option 2A	Renovation only for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at the existing John B. DeValles Elementary School; with an estimated project cost of \$44.9 million.
Option 3A	Addition/Renovation for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at the existing John B. DeValles Elementary School; with an estimated project cost of \$70.4 million.
Option 3B	Addition/Renovation for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option A (An expansion of the existing school site, as a result of closing Katherine Street to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$102.8 million.

Option 4A	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at Site Option A (An expansion of the existing school site, as a result of closing Katherine Street to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$70.6 million.
Option 4B	New Construction for grades 5-8 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option A (An expansion of the existing school site, as a result of closing Katherine Street to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$104.8 million.
Option 5A	Addition/Renovation for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$72.2 million.
Option 5B	Addition/Renovation for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$105.8 million.
Option 6A.1	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$73.2 million.
Option 6B.1	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$107.5 million.
Option 6A.2	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$74.4 million.
Option 6B.2	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option B (An expansion of the existing school site and Strip Mall Site (486 Orchard Street) to the north of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$110.4 million.
Option 7B	Addition/Renovation for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option C (An expansion of the existing school site and the Former Auto Body & Camara Field to the south of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$104.4 million.
Option 8A	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 400 students at Site Option C (An expansion of the existing school site and the Former Auto Body & Camara Field to the south of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$71 million.
Option 8B	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option C (An expansion of the existing school site and the Former Auto Body & Camara Field to the south of the site); with an estimated project cost of \$105.7 million.
Option 9B	New Construction for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at Site Option D (A parcel south of Ashley Park (Goodyear Site)); with an estimated project cost of \$100.3 million.

As a result of this analysis, the District determined that “Option 1A” is not considered a viable option because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program, the existing building will not accommodate an enrollment of 400-students, and this option would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District. However, this option was included as part of the final evaluation of options for cost comparison purposes only.

The District determined that “Option 2A” would not be considered for further evaluation because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program, does not provide properly sized Kindergarten classrooms, does not support the District’s desired Kindergarten and Grade 1 looping, and does not provide a separate media space.

The District determined that “Option 5A” would not be considered for further evaluation because would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District, does not address the issues at the existing James. B Congdon Elementary School, and this option would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 486 Orchard Street site.

The District determined “Options 6A.1 and 6A.2” would not be considered for further evaluation because these options do not address the issues at the existing James. B Congdon Elementary School and would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 486 Orchard Street site.

The District determined that “Option 6B.1” would not be considered for further evaluation because this option would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District and would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 486 Orchard Street site.

The District determined that “Options 7B, 8A, and 8B” would not be considered for further evaluation because both options would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 500 Orchard Street site and approval to reconfigure and exclude community use of the adjacent Camara Field during school hours. Additionally, “Option 8A” does not address the issues at the existing James B. Congdon Elementary School.

Subsequent to the evaluation of preliminary options, the District further developed “Option 5B”, which resulted in a new iteration, referred to as “Option 5B.2”; and further developed “Option 9B” which resulted in a new iteration, “Option 9B.3”. Additionally, the District developed the following (2) options for cost comparison purposes:

- “Option 10A”: A Code Upgrade/Base Repair option at the existing James B. Congdon Elementary School site; and,
- “Option 11B”: An Addition/Renovation option for grades K-5 with an enrollment of 760 students at the James B. Congdon Elementary School site.

MSBA staff and the District agreed to explore the following (10) options for further development and consideration in the final evaluation and development of preliminary design pricing as presented below, including: (2) code upgrade options, (4) addition/renovation options, and (4) new construction options.

### **Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing for Final Evaluation of Options**

<b>Option (Description)</b>	<b>Total Gross Square Feet</b>	<b>Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost*</b>	<b>Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Estimated Total Project Costs</b>
Option 1A Base Repair at the John B. DeValles ES (400 students)	57,109	57,109 \$515/sq. ft.	N/A	\$1,461,476	\$30,901,878 \$541/sq. ft.	\$37,332,254
Option 3A Addition/Renovation at the James B. DeValles ES (400 students)	83,052	52,227 \$592/sq. ft.	30,825 \$768/sq. ft.	\$4,447,647	\$59,075,533 \$711/sq. ft.	\$71,140,640
Option 3B Addition/Renovation at the James B. DeValles ES (760 students)	123,553	58,445 \$561/sq. ft.	65,108 \$681/sq.ft.	\$4,437,738	\$81,592,421 \$660/sq. ft.	\$98,285,905
Option 4A New Construction (400 students)	77,495	N/A	77,495 \$702/sq. ft.	\$4,989,429	\$59,405,868 \$766/sq. ft.	\$71,662,042
Option 4B New Construction (760 students)	125,159	N/A	125,159 \$653/ sq. ft.	\$5,268,723	\$86,947,078 \$695/sq. ft.	\$104,711,494
Option 5B.2 Addition/Renovation (760 students)	126,353	36,465 \$595/ sq. ft.	89,888 \$705/ sq. ft.	\$5,963,750	\$91,047,332 \$721/sq. ft.	\$110,765,423
Option 6B.2 New Construction (760 students)	127,836	N/A	127,836 \$680/ sq. ft.	\$6,362,715	\$93,350,846 \$730/sq. ft.	\$113,529,640
<b>***Option 9B.3 New Construction (760 students)</b>	<b>124,668</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>124,668 \$686/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$6,759,153</b>	<b>\$92,279,710 \$740/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$113,969,902</b>
Option 10A Base Repair at the James B. Congdon ES (400 students)	47,000	47,000 \$509/ sq. ft.	N/A	\$1,432,384	\$25,360,480 \$540/sq. ft.	\$30,682,576
Option 11B Addition/Renovation at the James B. Congdon ES (760 students)	126,327	47,000 \$530/ sq. ft.	79,327 \$713/ sq. ft.	\$3,083,169	\$84,556,259 \$669/sq. ft.	\$101,842,511

\* *Marked up construction costs*

\*\* *Does not include construction contingency*

\*\*\**District's Preferred Schematic*

The District has selected “Option 9B.3”, as the Preferred Schematic to proceed into Schematic Design because this option best supports the District’s educational program for an enrollment of 760-students, and provides optimal building orientation for daylight control in the classrooms. Although there will be costs associated with purchasing the Goodyear site, this option will have no impact to students and staff during construction.

As noted above, “Option 1A” was not considered a viable option because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program, the existing building will not accommodate an enrollment of 400-students, and this option would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District. However, this option was included as part of the final evaluation of options for cost comparison purposes only.

“Option 3A” was not selected by the District because it does not provide the minimum number of parking spaces required, would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District, and this option does not address the issues at the existing James. B Congdon Elementary School.

“Option 3B” was not selected by the District because it does not provide optimal building orientation for daylight control, the large building footprint limits outdoor learning and play areas, does not provide the minimum number of parking spaces required, and would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District.

Although “Option 4A” meets the needs of the District’s educational program for a 400-student enrollment it was not selected by the District because it does not address the issues at the existing James. B. Congdon Elementary School.

“Option 4B” was not selected by the District because it does not provide optimal building orientation for daylight control in the classrooms, would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District, and does not provide the minimum number of parking spaces required.

“Option 5B.2” was not selected by the District because it does not provide optimal building orientation for daylight control in the classrooms, would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District and would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 486 Orchard Street site.

“Option 6B.2” was not selected by the District because parking and outdoor play areas would be unavailable to students and staff during construction and this option would result in additional costs associated with purchasing the 486 Orchard Street site.

“Option 10A” was not selected by the District because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program, the existing building will not accommodate an enrollment of 760-students, and this option would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District.

“Option 11B” was not selected by the District because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program for an enrollment of 760-students, the large building footprint limits outdoor learning and play areas, and would result in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction due to temporarily relocating students and staff to other locations within the District.

The District presented its proposed Preferred Schematic to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on May 24, 2023. At that meeting, members of the FAS discussed the following items: appreciation for the site plan, building layout and adjacent outdoor learning and play spaces, location of the proposed parking and vehicle circulation in relation to the building, character and scale of the building in relation to the surrounding neighborhood, appreciation of playfulness in the building design and separation of public spaces from classroom wing, opportunities to simplify the building envelope as the design progresses, site constraints, the proposed building massing and canting of the roof, efficiency of the floor plan and wayfinding within the building, appreciation of the Educational Program and Kindergarten/Grade 1 looping, distribution of Special Education spaces, sheltered access to the building for individuals with limited mobility, school department leadership transition and continuity of educational vision, considerations associated with acute angles within the classrooms, including supervision, storage and furniture, and circulation on the first floor as it relates to connections between the classroom wing and access to the Media Center.

MSBA staff reviewed the conclusions of the Feasibility Study and all other subsequent submittals with the District and found:

- 1) The options investigated were sufficiently comprehensive in scope, the approach undertaken in this study was appropriate, and the District’s Preferred Schematic is reasonable and cost-effective and meets the needs identified by the District. However, based on the current restrictions associated with accessing the proposed Goodyear site, the MSBA will require the District and design team to confirm that an appropriate level of site investigation and testing will be performed to inform a sufficiently detailed scope of work and proposed budget as part of the schematic design submittal.
- 2) The District has submitted an operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget statement for MSBA review.
- 3) The District’s Special Education submission will be subject to final review and approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as part of the Schematic Design submittal, which is prior to executing a Project Scope and Budget Agreement.
- 4) Subject to Board approval, the MSBA will participate in a project that includes spaces that meet MSBA guidelines, except for variations previously agreed to by the MSBA. All proposed spaces will be reviewed during the Schematic Design phase.
- 5) As part of the Schematic Design phase, the District will work with the MSBA to determine a mutually agreeable methodology to differentiate eligible costs from ineligible costs, including costs associated with acquiring the proposed Goodyear site.

Based on the review outlined above, staff recommends that the City of New Bedford be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to consolidate the student population of the existing John B. DeValles Elementary School and the James B. Congdon Elementary School and construct a new facility serving grades K-5 on an alternative site referred to as the Goodyear site.

If the District is approved by the Board to proceed into Schematic Design for this proposed project, and then is later considered by the Board for approval of a Project Scope and Budget Agreement and a Project Funding Agreement, the vote to approve a Project Scope and Budget



Agreement and a Project Funding Agreement, would be contingent upon the District gaining sufficient ownership or a lease consistent with 963 CMR 2.05(1) for the useful life of the proposed project. The District would be required to have legal authority, control, and use of the proposed project and associated site to the extent required for construction, repairs, and continued operations for the useful life of the proposed project, unless this condition is met prior to such vote. The District's Preferred Schematic requires land acquisition.