District: Town of Greenfield
School Name: Greenfield High School
Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic
Date: November 9, 2011

Recommendation

That the Executive Director be authorized to conditionally approve the Town of Greenfield, as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into schematic design to renovate the existing facility, subject to the conditions set forth below. MSBA staff reviewed the Feasibility Study and conditionally accepts the District's preferred solution to renovate the existing Greenfield High School.

District Information	
District Name	Town of Greenfield
Elementary School(s)	The Academy of Early Learning at North Parish (PK) Federal Street Elementary School (K-4) Discovery School at Four Corners (K-4) Massachusetts Virtual Academy at Greenfield (K-8) Newton Elementary School (K-3)
Middle School	Greenfield Middle School (5-7)
High School	Greenfield High School (8-12)
Priority School Name	Greenfield High School
Type of School	High School
Grades Served	8-12
Year Opened	1957
Total Square Footage	166,740
Additions	1975 math classroom addition; 1978 auxiliary gym, band/choral, library expansion and single-story science addition
Acreage of Site	22 acres
Building Issues	The District noted deficiencies in the following areas: - Lighting - Windows - Heating System - Ceilings - Electrical - Accessibility In addition to the physical plant issues, the District reported that the lack of modernization and inadequate classroom sizes inhibit delivery of its educational program.
Original Design Capacity	Approximately 1,000
2010-2011 Enrollment	483
Agreed Upon Enrollment	585 (includes the District's "Poet Seat" program)
Enrollment Specifics	The District and the MSBA mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 555 grade 8-12 students with an additional "Poet Seat" enrollment of 30 students for a total design enrollment of 585 students.

MSBA Board Votes	
Invitation to Feasibility Study for a Potential Repair	September 30, 2009
Re-categorization to Feasibility Study	July 27, 2011
Preferred Schematic Authorization	November 16, 2011
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on March 28, 2012
Reimbursement Rate Before Incentives	78.95%

Consultants	
Owner's Project Manager	Construction Monitoring Services, Inc.
Designer	Dore & Whittier Architects, Inc.

Discussion

The existing Greenfield High School was constructed in 1957, with minor additions in 1975 and major additions and renovations in 1978. It was designed for an enrollment of approximately 1,000 students. The total enrollment in grades 8-12 during the 2009-2010 school year was 490 students, including those participating in the District's Special Education "Poet Seat" program.

In its Statement of Interest ("SOI"), the District identified concerns with the Greenfield High School that included issues with several building systems and a general lack of modernization. On September 30, 2009, the MSBA Board of Directors voted to invite the Greenfield High School into the Feasibility Study for a potential repair.

In conjunction with the design team, the District performed a comprehensive assessment of the existing conditions and the existing educational program of Greenfield High School, receiving input from educators, administrators, community members, and facilities personnel. Based on the findings of this effort, the District and its design team submitted a Preliminary Design Program, including a "code-upgrade only" option and an extensive interior renovation option. Although MSBA staff found that the District's Preliminary Design Program, dated June 17, 2011, was insufficient in its examination of potential options, it did identify a number of educational deficiencies that could not be mitigated through a repair project. In order to allow the District to address these issues within the proposed project, the MSBA Board of Directors authorized an expansion of the proposed project to include a Feasibility Study to examine renovation options at the Greenfield High School.

To ensure that the Feasibility Study was sufficiently comprehensive in its scope and that the evaluation of renovation options focused on reasonable and cost-effective solutions, MSBA staff required the District to investigate and consider other less extensive renovation options.

The District's Preferred Schematic Report, dated August 19, 2011, proposed a preferred solution (Option 4, see below) that was essentially the same extensive option included in the Preliminary Design Program submission but with expanded scope that included the addition of exterior modifications to the building. The proposed solution exceeded the renovation-only scope of work that was authorized by the MSBA Board on July 27, 2011, and it was the most expensive option. Additionally, it significantly exceeded the square footage that is included in the MSBA guidelines for this design enrollment and indicated an estimated project cost that could exceed the cost of replacing the existing facility with a school more properly sized for a student enrollment of 555. MSBA staff met with the District and its team at the high school to discuss concerns regarding the proposed scope of work and explore the possibility of developing options that would better utilize the existing spaces to reach agreement on a project scope that could be forwarded to the MSBA Board of Directors for its consideration. After this on-site meeting and a number of further discussions, the Design team submitted three additional options (5, 5A and 5B) that investigated ways to deliver the educational program more efficiently, resulting in less required square footage.

Ultimately the District investigated seven options, all based on a square footage that is equal to the existing building, but with varying levels of renovation. Options 1 through 4, the District's original options, all considered that the entire facility would be renovated and updated into new educational spaces. Options 5 and 5A investigated more efficient use of space, resulting in a reduction in the amount of space that is needed to deliver the District's educational program. Based on the results of these investigations, the District concluded that at least some space in the existing vocational technical wing is required and that it would not be possible to meet the District's educational objectives within the remaining portion of the existing building. Options 5 and 5A also included required code and system upgrade work within the proposed unutilized space in the vocational technical wing, even though it would not be used for education; therefore the reported total gross areas reported in the table below are presented as equal to the size of the existing facility. Option 5B, built on the work of Options 5 and 5A, incorporates the District's "Poet Seat" special education program into the remaining space, thus eliminating the continued need for separate modular units to house the "Poet Seat" program. With the inclusion of the "Poet Seat" program, Option 5B proposes to utilize the entire existing facility for educational purposes.

Based upon the estimated costs and evaluation summarized in Table 1, the District and its Designer determined that the most cost-effective solution that best meets the District's educational needs and priorities is Option 5B, which is more cost-effective than the previous preferred solution, Option 4, and unlike the previous options, is based on an increased design enrollment of 585 students that includes the additional 30 "Poet Seat" students.

Table 1 – Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing

Option (Description)	Total Gross Square Feet	Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sf)	Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sf)	Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost*	Estimated Total Construction (cost*/sf)	Estimated Total Project Costs
Option 1 Code Upgrades + Deferred Maintenance Only	166,740	166,740 $365/sf	**N/A**	$3,788,634	$31,350,005 $188/sf	$38,620,006
Option 2 "Light" Renovations	166,740	166,740 $189/sf	**N/A**	$4,031,225	$35,508,754 $213/sf	$43,490,505

Table 1 – Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing						
Option 3 "Medium" Renovations	166,740	166,740 $209/sf	**N/A**	$4,229,393	$39,125,743 $235/sf	$47,950,892
Option 4 "Heavy" Renovations	166,740	166,740 $222/sf	**N/A**	$4,229,393	$41,284,410 $248/sf	$50,541,292
Option 5 Renovations/ Reduced Area	166,740	166,740 $209/sf	**N/A**	$3,846,292	$38,614,482 $232/sf	$47,337,378
Option 5A Renovations/ Reduced Area	166,740	166,740 $213/sf	**N/A**	$3,788,364	$39,275,445 $236/sf	$48,130,534
Option 5B Renovations includes Poet Seat**	**166,740**	**166,740 $217/sf**	**N/A**	**$3,888,948**	**$40,127,148 $241/sf**	**$49,152,578**

** Marked up construction costs*
***** District's preferred option***

The District has selected Option 5B, as the preferred solution to proceed into schematic design. The District believes that Option 5B best meets the needs of the District's educational program, addresses the needs of their "Poet Seat" students and proposes to produce an energy-efficient facility that addresses the deficiencies identified in the Statement of Interest.

On November 2, 2011, the District presented these seven options to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee ("FAS") with an emphasis on Option 5B. At that meeting, MSBA FAS members raised a number of concerns regarding the size of the building, the cost associated with the renovation, and the long-term operational costs that will be with the District for decades to come. In general, the MSBA is concerned with proposed renovation projects on buildings that are larger than needed, that the estimated construction cost may increase through schematic design such that it could closely approximate the cost of constructing a smaller and more efficient facility that is more cost effective to build and operate.

MSBA staff reviewed and discussed the options and corresponding space summaries with the District and the Designer to better understand which educational program is most reasonable and beneficial for the Town of Greenfield, given that many of the existing core spaces exceed what is included in the MSBA guidelines. After review, MSBA staff conditionally accepts, as outlined in Item 5 below, the Designer's Feasibility Study submission that identifies the options that have been explored on behalf of the District and the preferred solution selected by the District.

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

1) All initial paperwork required has been processed, including an executed Initial Compliance Certification, the composition of the School Building Committee, and the enrollment information.

2) MSBA has completed an enrollment projection and has reached a mutual agreement with the District for a design enrollment of 585 students for the Greenfield High School.

3) An operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget have been submitted to the MSBA for review.

4) The District's schematic design submittal will be subject to final review and approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education prior to a Project Scope and Budget Agreement.

5) MSBA reviewed the Feasibility Study and subsequent material and finds that, although the District and its team investigated a variety of options, MSBA staff continue to be concerned regarding the scope of renovations in the existing building, most notably in areas that are not being re-purposed and where extensive renovations may not be cost effective or necessary for delivery of the educational curriculum. MSBA staff recommend allowing the District to proceed into schematic design contingent upon the following:

    a. The District agrees to continue to work with the MSBA to further reduce the scope of renovations, most notably in the Administrative area, Music area, and Media Center.
    b. The District agrees to provide a letter to the MSBA documenting its attempts to repurpose the vocational portion of the existing facility to an alternate municipal or private use, functionally separate from the Greenfield High School, thereby reducing the overall size and construction cost of the proposed project and long-term operational costs.
    c. In addition to development of a robust schematic design for the District's preferred solution (Option 5B – Renovations inclusive of the "Poet Seat" program), the District and its team will work with the MSBA to clearly establish a minimal scope of work that is limited to envelope and system upgrades and code conformance for all areas of the building outside of the existing vocational technical wing. This will be used to establish a benchmark against which to compare Option 5B and to inform the extent of scope reduction that could be achieved should the project's cost increase as the project progresses. This effort shall include a detailed cost estimate that is of sufficient detail and in a format that could support scope modification and value engineering should the need arise. The scope of this task must be completed by December 21, 2011.
    d. In addition to the development of a robust schematic design for the District's preferred solution, the District and its team will work with the MSBA to reach an agreement on a space summary associated with new construction, a conceptual layout, and preliminary design cost estimate to establish a benchmark against which to compare Option 5B. The scope of this task must be completed by December 21, 2011.

6) Should the MSBA and the District be unable to reach an agreement on the scope of the proposed renovation at the Greenfield High School, or clearly establish that renovating the existing high school is more cost effective than constructing a new, smaller and more efficient high school that better complies with MSBA guidelines, the MSBA reserves its right to rescind its approval for the Town to proceed into schematic design to renovate the existing Greenfield High School.

Based on the review outlined above, staff recommends that the Town of Greenfield be conditionally approved to proceed into schematic design to renovate the existing Greenfield High School.