

District: City of Framingham  
 School Name: Fuller Middle School  
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic  
 Date: June 20, 2018

**Recommendation**

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the City of Framingham, as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Fuller Middle School with a new facility serving grades 6-8 on the existing site. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s preferred solution.

<b>District Information</b>	
District Name	City of Framingham
Elementary School(s)	Juniper Hill School (PK) King Elementary School (K-2) Barbieri Elementary School (K-5) Brophy Elementary School (K-5) Charlotte A. Dunning Elementary School (K-5) Hemenway Elementary School (K-5) Mary E. Stapleton Elementary School (K-5) Miriam F. McCarthy Elementary School (K-5) Potter Road Elementary School (K-5) Woodrow Wilson Elementary School (K-5)
Middle School(s)	Cameron Middle School (6-8) Fuller Middle School (6-8) Walsh Middle School (6-8)
High School(s)	Framingham High School (9-12)
Priority School Name	Fuller Middle School
Type of School	Middle School
Grades Served	6-8
Year Opened	1958
Existing Square Footage	196,000
Additions	N/A
Acreage of Site	30 acres
Building Issues	The District identified deficiencies in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Structural integrity</li> <li>– Mechanical systems</li> <li>– Electrical systems</li> <li>– Plumbing systems</li> <li>– Windows</li> <li>– Roof</li> <li>– Accessibility</li> </ul> In addition to the physical plant issues, the District reported that the existing facility does not support the delivery of its educational program.
Original Design Capacity	Unknown

<b>District Information</b>	
2017-2018 Enrollment	501
Agreed Upon Enrollment	630
Enrollment Specifics	The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 630 students serving grades 6-8.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	Yes

<b>MSBA Board Votes</b>	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	January 27, 2016
Invitation to Feasibility Study	February 15, 2017
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On June 27, 2018 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on October 31, 2018
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	57.05%

<b>Consultants</b>	
Owner’s Project Manager (the “OPM”)	Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc.
Designer	Jonathan Levi Architects LLC

## Discussion

The existing Fuller Middle School is a 196,000 square foot single story building located on 42-acres of campus-style combined property, along with the Farley Middle School, which is currently occupied by Massachusetts Bay Community College. The original school building was constructed in 1958 as the Framingham South High School and became the Fuller Middle School in 1995 and currently serves grades 6-8.

The District identified numerous deficiencies in the Statement of Interest that are associated with: structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; building envelope including roof and windows; and accessibility constraints. The District has also expressed concern regarding the ability to deliver its educational program due to lack of programmatic space.

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 eight preliminary options on the existing site. These options include one base repair option, three addition/renovation options, and four new construction options as listed below. All of the options are based on serving 630 students in grades 6-8 at the existing site.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description of Preliminary Options</b>
0	Base Repair/Full renovation to the existing building
0.1	Demolition/Addition – Improved cafeteria
A	Addition/Renovation – New two-story classroom/administration wing
B.1	Addition/Renovation – “Tree Branches” New two-story construction and renovating existing auditorium and gymnasium

B.2	New Construction – “Tree Branches” New two-story construction and new auditorium
C.1	New Construction – “Folded Hands” New three-story construction and renovating existing gymnasium
C.2	New Construction – “Folded Hands” New three-story construction and new gymnasium
D	New Construction – “Butterfly” New two-story construction

Upon further review, MSBA staff and the District agreed to five final options for further development and consideration in the final evaluation and development of preliminary design pricing as presented below.

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

Option (Description)	Total Gross Square Feet	Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sq. ft.)	Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sq. ft.)	Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost*	Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sq. ft.)	Estimated Total Project Costs
Option 0: (Base repair/ Code upgrade)	195,400	195,400 \$492/sq. ft.	N/A	\$4,663,750	\$100,810,223 \$516/sq. ft.	\$130,856,319
Option A: (Addition/ Renovation)	166,789	69,461 \$423/sq. ft.	97,328 \$489/sq. ft.	\$15,318,356	\$92,379,651 \$554/sq. ft.	\$117,065,481
Option B.1: (New Construction)	153,905	N/A	153,905 \$462/sq. ft.	\$15,869,878	\$87,052,451 \$566/sq. ft.	\$110,646,204
<b>Option C.2: (New Construction)***</b>	<b>153,905</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>153,905</b> <b>\$456/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$16,711,164</b>	<b>\$86,977,969</b> <b>\$565/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$110,556,454</b>
Option D: (New Construction)	153,905	N/A	153,905 \$465/sq. ft.	\$16,099,116	\$87,681,064 \$570/sq. ft.	\$111,403,682

\* Marked up construction costs

\*\* Does not include construction contingency

\*\*\*District’s preferred solution

The District has selected “Option C.2” as the preferred solution to proceed into schematic design because it builds on the District’s educational program and supports the goals identified by the District in the visioning sessions and detailed in the educational program. Key features include: the creation of student-driven, problem-based, “hands-on project space” at three different scales within the floor plan; classroom clusters that can be flexibly arranged within the floors of cohort clustered classrooms; medium-size collaboration spaces and smaller-size breakout spaces that are highly visible from the learning commons. Additionally, “Option C.2” provides a single open space that will serve as the food court but also as a flexible use space, a whole community collaboration space, and a potential assembly space.

Although base repair “Option 0” was evaluated by the project team, the facility was originally designed as a high school, contains oversized common spaces and many undersized classrooms when compared to MSBA guidelines. The District eliminated this option from further consideration because of inadequately sized classroom spaces and because the layout does not

support the District's desired educational program. This option would also require complex phasing, considerable swing space, and extended project duration.

Although the addition/renovation "Option A" maintained the auditorium space and an over-sized gymnasium, the District eliminated it from future consideration because it did not support the District's desired educational program. The District determined that future cohort grouping flexibility would be compromised and poor campus relationships would continue due to the remote parking and lack of shared open space. Disruption during occupied construction was also considered a disadvantage of "Option A" by the District. Additionally, the estimated costs associated with restructuring, code upgrades, and systems replacement contributed to the factors that lead the District to eliminate this option from future consideration.

Options B.1 and D support the delivery of the District's educational program; however neither were selected by the District because of isolated classroom wings that limited cohort grouping flexibility, separation of the S.T.E.A.M. areas, and limited visual learning opportunities. The District also determined that "Option B.1" has a larger footprint than the other options evaluated and does not allow for an ideal solar orientation, while Option D includes a centrally located auditorium, which could limit flexibility in the future.

The District presented its proposed project to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee ("FAS") on May 23, 2018. At that meeting, members of the FAS raised a number of concerns regarding recognition of the District's educational program and building design, safety and security of both the main entrance and community entrance, efficiency and compactness of the floor plan, location of the break-out spaces and how the visual and collaboration work described in the educational program is delivered, project-based work and physical space requirements for 'Maker Spaces', introducing 'Maker Spaces' into the science classrooms and reducing project areas in the common areas by providing larger science classrooms, S.T.E.A.M. classrooms and their adjacency to the performance spaces, the adjacency of the Band, Music and Art rooms to the auditorium, the District's documented high number of students with special needs, transitional bi-lingual program and learning acquisition, continued inclusion of City officials in the planning process, clarification regarding the MSBA's potential participation in a base repair option, and the anticipated changes that may occur in the Schematic Design phase based on further project development.

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 the study was appropriate, and the District's preferred solution is reasonable and meets the needs identified by the District.
- 2) The MSBA requests that the District be available to present the updated preferred solution to the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee should the MSBA determine that an updated presentation is required. This update would ensure a mutual understanding and agreement of the proposed project scope and ensure that this scope will be reflected in the District's Schematic Design submittal.
- 3) The District has submitted an operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget statement for MSBA review.

- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.
- 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 City of Framingham be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Fuller Middle School with a new facility serving grades 6-8 on the existing site.