

District: Town of Maynard
 School Name: Green Meadow Elementary School
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic
 Date: August 24, 2022

Recommendation

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the Town of Maynard (the “District”), as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Green Meadow Elementary School with a new facility serving pre-kindergarten through grade 3 on the existing school site. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s Preferred Schematic.

District Information	
District Name	Town of Maynard
Elementary School(s)	Green Meadow Elementary School (PK-3)
Middle School(s)	Fowler Middle School (4-8)
High School(s)	Maynard High School (9-12)
Priority School Name	Green Meadow Elementary School
Type of School	Elementary School
Grades Served	PK-3
Year Opened	1955
Existing Square Footage	76,378
Additions	1974 and 1988
Acreage of Site	18.775 acres
Building Issues	<p>The District identified deficiencies in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanical systems - Electrical systems - Plumbing systems - Envelope - Windows - Roof - Accessibility <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 overcrowding.</p>
Original Design Capacity	Unknown
2021-2022 Enrollment	357
Agreed Upon Enrollment	395
Enrollment Specifics	The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 395 students for grades K-3, for a project that will serve grades PK-3.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	Yes

MSBA Board Votes	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	December 11, 2019
Invitation to Feasibility Study	February 11, 2021
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On August 31, 2022 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization in March 2023.
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	55.63%

Consultants	
Owner's Project Manager (the "OPM")	Colliers Project Leaders USA NE, LLC
Designer	Mount Vernon Group Architects, Inc.

Discussion

The existing Green Meadow Elementary School is a 76,378 square foot facility located on an 18.775-acre site. The original building was constructed in 1955, with additions built in 1974 and 1988.

The District's Statement of Interest ("SOI") identifies numerous deficiencies in the existing facility associated with outdated mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; building envelope; accessibility issues; overcrowding; and existing spaces not conducive for delivering the District's educational program.

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 (3) preliminary options that include: (1) code upgrade option, (1) addition/renovation option, and (1) new construction option, as presented below.

Option	Description of Preliminary Options
Option 1	Code upgrade at the existing Green Meadow Elementary School; with an estimated total construction cost of \$21.6 million.
Option 2	Addition / renovation at the existing Green Meadow Elementary School; with an estimated total construction cost of \$52 million.
Option 3	New construction on the south-west side of the existing Green Meadow Elementary School site; with an estimated total construction cost of \$62.4 million.

As a result of this analysis, the District determined that all three options would be considered for further evaluation.

Subsequent to the evaluation of preliminary options, the District renamed its options as follows:

- "Option 2" was further developed into two addition/renovation design alternatives now referred to as "Option 2" and "Option 3"; and,
- "Option 3" was further developed into four new construction design alternatives now referred to as "Option 4", "Option 5", "Option 6", and "Option 7". Please note the District

removed “Option 5” from further consideration prior to the final evaluation of alternatives because of the spread-out design, a larger building footprint resulting in extensive travel for students from common spaces to core spaces, and single loaded corridors.

MSBA staff and the District agreed to explore the following (6) options for further development and consideration in the final evaluation and development of preliminary design pricing as presented below, including: (1) code upgrade option, (2) addition/renovation options, and (3) new construction options.

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 1 (Code Upgrade)	76,378	76,378 \$236/sq. ft.	N/A	\$4,442,975	\$22,457,490 \$294/sq. ft.	\$28,071,863
Option 2 (Large Addition / Full Renovation)	91,585	20,025 \$236/sq. ft.	71,560 \$386/sq. ft.	\$15,764,031	\$48,123,600 \$525/sq. ft.	\$60,154,499
Option 3 (Small Addition / Full Renovation)	89,880	39,960 \$236/sq. ft.	49,920 \$386/sq.ft.	\$13,208,773	\$41,912,843 \$466/sq. ft.	\$52,391,053
Option 4 (New Construction)	94,000	N/A	94,000 \$549/sq.ft.	\$9,658,363	\$61,270,943 \$652/sq. ft.	\$76,588,679
Option 6 (New Construction)	91,000	N/A	91,000 \$549/sq.ft.	\$9,658,363	\$59,623,733 \$655/sq. ft.	\$74,529,666
Option 7*** (New Construction)	87,980	N/A	87,980 \$541/sq.ft.	\$9,658,363	\$57,237,067 \$651/sq. ft.	\$71,546,334

* Marked up construction costs

** Does not include construction contingency. The costs estimates presented in the table above are based on the Design-Bid-Build project delivery methodology. However, should the District choose the Construction Manager-at-Risk project delivery methodology, a cost increase of approximately \$4M will be applied to the cost estimate. Selection of the project delivery methodology will be made during the schematic design phase.

*****District’s Preferred Schematic**

The District has selected “Option 7”, as the Preferred Schematic to proceed into Schematic Design. The District selected “Option 7” because it best meets the needs of the District’s educational program, while minimizing the direct disturbances to ongoing education during construction, its 2-story compact design was viewed as advantageous by the District, and provides opportunities for future expansion.

“Option 1” was not selected by the District because the District determined that this option does not meet the requirements described in the educational program, it does not alleviate overcrowding issues, and the existing building has an inefficient building layout.

“Option 2” and “Option 3” were not selected by the District because the District determined that these options would require multi-phased construction, resulting in significant disruption to ongoing education, and would require temporary classrooms for swing space during the construction phases.

“Option 4” was not selected by the District because the District determined that this option resulted in a larger building footprint, the court-yard design does not provide centralized common core/community spaces accessible from the main entrance, and this option has limited opportunities for future expansion.

Although the building design for “Option 6” is similar to “Option 7” it was not selected by the District because the District determined that the classroom wing provided in this design was not oriented in the most optimal north-south orientation.

The District presented its proposed Preferred Schematic to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on August 3, 2022. At that meeting, members of the FAS discussed the following items: District’s Educational Program and proposed scheduling; the importance of plans for professional development and teacher collaboration; the District’s use and operation of the STEAM classroom and Innovation Hub; consideration to expand on the push-in model for multi-lingual students; acoustics of the building and vertical connections between floors; clarity of architectural plans to support concepts; site circulation and secure student entrances; further development of the proposed site plan; and, community use of the building afterhours.

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.
- 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.
- 6) The MSBA has requested that the District provide an updated version of the proposed educational program that addresses certain components discussed at the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on August 3, 2022.

Based on the review outlined above, staff recommends that the Town of Maynard be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Green Meadow Elementary School with a new facility serving pre-kindergarten through grade 3 on the existing school site.