

District: Town of East Longmeadow  
 School Name: East Longmeadow High School  
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic  
 Date: April 19, 2023

**Recommendation**

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the Town of East Longmeadow (the “District”), as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing East Longmeadow High School with a new facility serving grades 9-12 on the site of the existing school. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s Preferred Schematic.

<b>District Information</b>	
District Name	Town of East Longmeadow
Elementary School(s)	Mapleshade Elementary School (3-5) Meadow Brook Elementary School (PK-2) Mountain View Elementary School (3-5)
Middle School(s)	Birchland Park Middle School (6-8)
High School(s)	East Longmeadow High School (9-12)
Priority School Name	East Longmeadow High School
Type of School	High School
Grades Served	9-12
Year Opened	1959
Existing Square Footage	186,890
Additions	1964 (addition)– Added classrooms and labs to the south, a four-lane pool, additional locker room space, and other small miscellaneous additions. 1974 (addition)– Provided more classroom space to the west, a large maintenance building to the south, and an auxiliary gym.
Acreage of Site	61-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>– Envelope</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
2021-2022 Enrollment	812 students
Agreed Upon Enrollment	800 students

<b>District Information</b>	
Enrollment Specifics	The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 800 students serving grades 9-12.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	Yes

<b>MSBA Board Votes</b>	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	December 11, 2019
Invitation to Feasibility Study	June 23, 2021
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On April 26, 2023 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on October 25, 2023
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	56.48%

<b>Consultants</b>	
Owner’s Project Manager (the “OPM”)	Skanska USA Building, Inc
Designer	Jones Whitsett Architects, Inc. (in association with SMMA)

**Discussion**

The existing East Longmeadow High School is a 186,890 square-foot three-story facility located on a 61-acre site that currently serves students in grades 9-12. The original facility was constructed in 1959. It was expanded with an addition in 1964 which added classrooms and labs to the south, a four-lane pool, and additional locker room space. Then there was an addition in 1974 which provided more classroom space to the west, a large maintenance building to the south, and an auxiliary gym.

The District’s Statement of Interest (“SOI”) identified numerous deficiencies in the existing facility associated with the age of the building and its systems, along with programmatic deficiencies; inefficient and noisy unit ventilators and plumbing fixtures and equipment; oversized and underperforming electrical systems; the declining PE annex areas. The poor condition of exterior windows and doors, and deteriorating finishes and built-in casework also warrant attention. Accessibility, both within the building, and on site requires improvement in ways that are typical of a school of this age.

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 (8) preliminary options that included: (1) code upgrade option, (2) addition/renovation options, and (5) new construction options, as presented below.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description of Preliminary Options</b>
1	Code Upgrade/Base Repair for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$110 million.
2A	Addition/Renovation (with a new pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$167 million.

2B	Addition/Renovation (with existing pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$164 million.
3A	New Construction (central location with a pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$178 million.
3B	New Construction (central location without a pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$167 million.
4A	New Construction (south location with a pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$180 million.
4B	New Construction (south location without a pool) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$169 million.
5	New Construction (split building) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 800 students with an estimated project cost of \$181 million.

As a result of this analysis, the District determined that “Option 2A” would not be considered for further development because it would result in higher operating costs and requires the use of modular classrooms, resulting in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction. Additionally, this option was eliminated from further development after the MSBA communicated its policies regarding the inclusion of Natatoriums (pools) as a component of the proposed project. For reference, below is the guidance provided to the District by the MSBA:

- **New construction options:** Natatoriums (pools) cannot be included or incorporated in the scope of work and/or associated budget for projects seeking MSBA grants. If a District chooses to include a Natatorium (pool) as a component of their school buildings in a new construction scenario: Procurement, design, and construction associated with this work must be separate from the MSBA project (scope and budget). Further, this work cannot be combined or 'bundled' in any contracts or bidding documents associated with the MSBA project, either as base scope or as a construction alternate.
- **Renovation options:** For Natatoriums (pools) that exist in facilities where the preferred option includes renovation of these existing spaces, the MSBA may consider it acceptable to incorporate scope associated with renovating this component as part of the MSBA project. However, all costs associated with design, construction or fit-out for this work will be considered ineligible for reimbursement and will be 100% borne by the District.

The District determined that “Options 3A and 4A” would not be considered for further development because the construction of the new school while school is in session will be more challenging because of the proximity of the new school to the existing school, and the parking layout and traffic circulation would assume some use of the Norden Street connection for faculty driven vehicles. Additionally, these options were eliminated from further development after the MSBA reiterated to the Project Team and the District current policies regarding Natatoriums (pools) as a component of the proposed project:

The District determined that “Option 4B” would not be considered for further development because the proposed building layout does not allow for a future development for a pool and the District would have to build a pool as a separate project on an alternate site.

Subsequent to the evaluation of preliminary options, the District determined “Option 5” would not be considered for further development because the proposed layout resulted in a higher cost of construction.

Additionally, the District further developed “Option 2B” which is now referred to as “Option 2C”, and further developed “Option 3B” which is now referred to as “Option 3C”.

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

### 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/ Base Repair	186,890	186,890 \$477/sq. ft.	N/A	\$6,718,361	\$95,901,747 \$513/sq. ft.	\$114,800,000
Option 2C Addition/Renovation	199,720	113,282 \$574/sq. ft.	86,438 \$673/sq. ft.	\$20,990,884	\$144,167,334 \$722/sq. ft.	\$173,030,000
<b>Option 3C New Construction***</b>	<b>191,780</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>191,780 \$660/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$21,025,446</b>	<b>\$147,519,519 \$769/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$176,559,772</b>

\* Marked up construction costs

\*\* Does not include construction contingency

\*\*\***District’s Preferred Schematic**

The District has selected “Option 3C” as its Preferred Schematic to proceed into Schematic Design. The District selected “Option 3C” because this option best meets the needs of the District’s educational program and provides the most flexibility, while minimizing the direct disturbances to ongoing education during construction. Additionally, this option has the shortest construction duration and allows for the continued use of East Longmeadow’s athletic facilities and fields while taking advantage of their recently completed track and field.

“Option 1” was not selected by the District because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program, does not provide the District’s preferred adjacencies, and requires use of modular classrooms resulting in significant disruption to ongoing education during construction.

“Option 2C” was not selected by the District because it would require a new penthouse to be constructed on the roof of the existing structure – containing the majority of the new ductwork which would result in very low ceilings. The District determined that this option also requires use of modular classrooms through construction.

The District presented its proposed Preferred Schematic to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on March 15, 2023. At that meeting, members of the FAS discussed the following items: appreciation of the Educational Program; distribution of Special Education program spaces and the DESE submittal process; indoor/outdoor connections and intended use of proposed outdoor learning and dining areas; site circulation, parking and sheltered walkway from bus drop-off; entry into the site and visual connection to the main entrance of the building upon

approach; opportunities to simplify massing as design progresses; considerations associated with assignment methodology for guidance counselors to students; incorporation of State Seal of Biliteracy and opportunity to include ASL; schedule of health and physical education classes to encourage physical activity year round; location of the proposed dark room and graphics programs and distance from the art rooms; potential challenges associated with transporting set materials from art classrooms to stage; location of the proposed loading dock in relation to cafeteria, auditorium, and art programs; location of the proposed cafeteria and associated design considerations to reduce sound from interfering with adjacent spaces; and, opportunities for students to engage in projects in adjacent wetlands.

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 MSBA will continue to work with the District to better understand the total area associated with health and physical education and how the space serves the student population and the renovation of the existing facility.
- 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 East Longmeadow be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing East Longmeadow High School with a new facility serving grades 9-12 on the site of the existing school.