

District: Town of Brookline
 School Name: Edward Devotion School
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic
 Date: November 12, 2014

Recommendation

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the Town of Brookline, as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the majority of the existing Edward Devotion School with a large addition that will be attached to the visible portion of the original 1913 building, which portion will be renovated. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s preferred solution.

| District Information | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| District Name | Town of Brookline |
| Elementary-Middle School(s) | Brookline Early Education Program at Beacon (PK) Brookline Early Education Program at Putnam (PK) Edith C. Baker School (K-8) Edward Devotion School (K-8) Heath School (PK-8) John D. Runkle School (PK-8) Lawrence School (K-8) Lynch Center (PK) Michael Driscoll School (PK-8) Pierce School (K-8) William H. Lincoln School (K-8) |
| High School(s) | Brookline High School (PK; 9-12) |
| Priority School Name | Edward Devotion School |
| Type of School | Elementary-Middle School |
| Grades Served | K-8 |
| Year Opened | 1913 |
| Existing Square Footage | 162,051 |
| Additions | 1954: Addition 1977: Addition |
| Acreage of Site | 7.5 acres |
| Building Issues | The District identified deficiencies in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanical systems - Windows - Roof 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. |
| Original Design Capacity | Unknown |
| 2013-2014 Enrollment | 840 Students |
| Agreed Upon Enrollment | 1,010 Students |
| Enrollment Specifics | The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 1,010 students serving grades K-8. |

| MSBA Board Votes | |
|---|---|
| Invitation to Eligibility Period | March 28, 2012 |
| Invitation to Feasibility Study | January 30, 2013 and November 20, 2013 |
| Preferred Schematic Authorization | On November 19, 2014 Board agenda |
| Project Scope & Budget Authorization | District is targeting Board authorization on March 25, 2015 |
| Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentives points are not applicable) | 35.84% |

| Consultants | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Owner's Project Manager | Anthony Guigli, Brookline Town Employee |
| Designer | HMFH Architects, Inc. |

Discussion

The existing Edward Devotion School is a 162,051 square foot facility located on a 7.5 acre site serving the Coolidge Corner neighborhood of Brookline. The existing facility currently houses grades K-8.

The original school building was constructed in 1913 with upgrades and additions completed in 1954 and 1977. The District's Statement of Interest ("SOI") identified deficiencies in the following areas: mechanical, windows, and roofing. 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.

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 considered five preliminary options that included one base repair option, three addition/renovation options and one new construction option. The following is a detailed list of the preliminary alternatives considered.

| Option | Description of Preliminary Options |
|---------------|---|
| 0 | Base Repair |
| 1.1 | Addition/Renovation: Renovation of the 1913 building and an addition on the adjacent ball field site |
| 1.4 | Addition/Renovation: Renovation of the 1913 building and an addition to the east and southeast elevations |
| 2 | Addition/Renovation: Renovation of the 1913 building and an addition to the east elevation |
| 3.2 | New Construction on the adjacent ball field site |

After additional analysis, and given the similar aspects of the preliminary options shown above, the District and design team worked to combine appropriate elements of the preliminary options and subsequently established a revised list of options, shown below, to be further evaluated that better address the District's stated needs.

| Option | Description |
|--------|--|
| 1 | Addition/Renovation (proposes combination of preliminary options 1.1 and 1.4) |
| 2 | Addition/Renovation (proposes reduced square footage of new construction) |
| 3 | New Construction (proposes to retain the 1913 portion of existing facility for non-school use) |
| 3A | New Construction (proposes to demolish the existing facility in its entirety) |

Upon further discussion and review, MSBA staff and the District agreed to four (4) final options for further development and consideration in the final evaluation and development of preliminary design pricing as presented below. Please note that the “Base Repair” option is not considered a viable solution by the District as it does not address significant issues identified in the District’s SOI and Feasibility Study, and it is included for comparative purposes only.

Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing for Final Evaluation of Options

| Option Description | Total Gross Square Feet | Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sf) | Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sf) | Square Feet of Ineligible Structured Parking (cost*/sf) | Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost* | Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sf) | Estimated Total Project Costs |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Option 0: Base Repair | 162,051 | 162,051 \$263/sf | N/A | N/A | \$5,179,601 | \$47,842,028 \$295.23/sf | \$68,302,274 |
| Option 1: Add/Reno** * | 196,582 | 17,965 \$465/sf | 154,527 \$405/sf | 24,089 \$150/sf | \$10,472,963 | \$84,964,582 \$432/sf | \$118,397,806 |
| Option 2: Add/Reno | 191,463 | 17,965 \$595/sf | 147,080 \$375/sf | 26,418 \$180/sf | \$11,567,241 | \$82,183,252 \$429/sf | \$114,178,504 |
| Option 3: New Const. (Retain 1913 Bldg) | 193,039 | N/A | 166,095 \$371/sf | 26,944 \$193/sf | \$9,269,322 | \$76,147,472 \$394/sf | \$105,898,980 |
| Option 3A: New Const. (Demo 1913 Bldg) | 193,039 | N/A | 166,095 \$366/sf | 26,944 \$193/sf | \$10,158,745 | \$76,061,929 \$394/sf | \$104,936,957 |

* Marked up construction costs

** Does not include construction contingency

*****District’s preferred option**

The District has selected “Option 1,” which proposes a large addition to replace the majority of the existing facility and renovates the visible portions of the existing 1913 Edward Devotion School, as the preferred option to proceed into Schematic Design. The District states that “Option 1” represents its preferred solution to deliver its desired educational program which organizes the proposed school into three, grade-level cohorts: Pre-Kindergarten (2 classrooms), Kindergarten through Grade 2; Grades 3 through 5; and, Grades 6 through 8. The District states that the proposed solution will enable the District to create desired smaller learning communities within the 1,010 student school and allow teachers to work with students in a clustered approach.

Further, the District has expressed interest in retaining and renovating visible portions of the existing 1913 facility and feels this option provides for the most appropriate outdoor space for younger students and better suits the context of the local neighborhood. Although “Option 2” is similar in concept, this option does not retain the desired portions of the 1913 building, resulting in a lack of the same ‘urban feel’ that “Option 1” proposes to retain along Harvard Street. “Options 3 and 3A” both propose new construction at a lower estimated construction cost, when compared to “Option 1,” and would allow the District to organize and deliver its desired educational program. However, these options were considered less-likely to gain local support because of the scale of the building, and its location along a residential street.

The District presented its preferred solution to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on October 29, 2014. At that meeting, staff and members of the FAS discussed: the ineligible multipurpose room and parking garage, 880 nsf academic classrooms and associated project areas, MSBA cost funding limitations regarding site and building costs, ineligible costs that arise out of the relocation of students, adjacencies of programmed spaces relative to the grouping of grade cohorts, spaces for Pre-K students, internal circulation and the number of elevators in the building, history of the site and sub-surface conditions, the community’s interest in retaining the 1913 building, planned use of the proposed media center, and the wireless capabilities of the proposed building. Staff and members of the FAS raised concerns regarding: the increase in the size of the large gymnasium from 6,000 to 7,000 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines, location of art classrooms relative to the quality of available natural light, location of music classrooms relative to the proposed multipurpose space, student relocations to accommodate construction, and ineligible costs that will increase the District’s share of the total project costs. The District noted potential areas of future design development and staff emphasized the importance of notifying the MSBA of planned revisions to the proposed conceptual layout in our collaboration in establishing a mutually agreeable project.

Staff and FAS members requested additional information regarding: the District’s selection of “Option 1” as its preferred solution over “Options 2, 3, and 3A” and the additional benefits that the District believes will be realized by their choice of “Option 1,” discrepancies between some of the adjacencies in the educational program versus the conceptual layout of the proposed solution, and an estimate of the total projected cost for completing “Option 1” and the District’s estimate of its share of that cost. Staff also requested updated conceptual layouts that address adjacency issues discussed regarding the performance space, music, art, science, locations for book storage, small group rooms (coaching), and spaces available for use by the school’s after-school program. Staff has received the requested the information and finds the material to be responsive.

MSBA staff reviewed the conclusions of the Feasibility Study, all subsequent submittals, and the enrollment data 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 solution is reasonable and best meets the needs identified by the District.
- 2) The District has submitted an operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget statement for MSBA review.

- 3) The District's schematic design submittal will be subject to final review and approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as part of the schematic design submittal prior to 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, with the exception of variations previously agreed to by the MSBA. All proposed spaces will be reviewed during the Schematic Design phase.
- 5) Throughout the course of the Schematic Design phase, the MSBA will continue to work with the District to understand and identify defined areas of improvement and/or development of the overall layout as it compares to the conceptual layout established at Preferred Schematic.
- 6) 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.

Based on the review outlined above, staff recommends that the Town of Brookline be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the majority of the existing Edward Devotion School with a large addition that will be attached to the visible portion of the original 1913 building, which portion will be renovated.