

Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chairman, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

John K. McCarthy
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

May 22, 2018

Mr. Adam Chapdelaine, Town Manager
Town of Arlington
730 Massachusetts Avenue Annex
Arlington, MA 02476

Re: Town of Arlington, Arlington High School

Dear Mr. Chapdelaine:

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") is forwarding review comments for the Module 3 Feasibility Study Preliminary Design Program submission for the Arlington High School project in the Town of Arlington, received by the MSBA on April 25, 2018.

Responses to the attached comments shall be forwarded to the assigned Project Coordinator, Brian Lynch (Brian.Lynch@MassSchoolBuildings.org), through the Owner's Project Manager. Please review and return responses within 14 days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Karl Brown (Karl.Brown@MassSchoolBuildings.org).

Sincerely,



Mary Fichetti
Director of Capital Planning

Cc: Legislative Delegation
Joseph A. Curro, Jr., Chair, Arlington Board of Selectmen
Steve Nesterak, Facilities Director, Town of Arlington
Dr. Krisi C. Allison, Chair, Arlington School Committee
Dr. Kathleen Bodie, Superintendent, Arlington Public Schools
Chuck Adam, Owner's Project Manager, Skanska USA Building, Inc.
Jim Burrows, Owner's Project Manager, Skanska USA Building, Inc.
Lori Cowles, Designer, HMFH Architects, Inc.
File: Letters 10.2 (Region 4)

ATTACHMENT A
MODULE 3 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM REVIEW COMMENTS

District: Town of Arlington
School: Arlington High School
Owner’s Project Manager: Skanska USA Building, Inc.
Designer Firm: HMFH Architects, Inc.
Submittal Due Date: April 25, 2018
Submittal Received Date: April 25, 2018
Review Date: April 25 – May 10, 2018
Reviewed by: K.Brown, J.Jumpe

MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments¹ on the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) submittal are issued pursuant to a review of the project submittal document for the proposed project presented as a part of the Feasibility Study submission in accordance with the MSBA Module 3 Guidelines.

ITEMS REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ACTION

- *As noted in the April 25, 2018 Cursory Review email from MSBA, provide the following items:*
 - *Local Actions and Approvals: provide a certified copy (raised seal and/or stamp and/or original signature) of the April 24, 2018 meeting minutes, and a certified copy of the Local Actions and Approvals Certification with original signatures.*
 - *Cover Letter: send an original copy of the OPM Cover letter with an original “wet” signature.*

3.1 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM

Overview of the Preliminary Design Program Submittal	Complete	Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Not Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Receipt of District’s Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
OPM Certification of Completeness and Conformity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table of Contents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.1 Introduction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.2 Educational Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.3 Initial Space Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ The written comments provided by the MSBA are solely for purposes of determining whether the submittal documents, analysis process, proposed planning concept and any other design documents submitted for MSBA review appear consistent with the MSBA’s guidelines and requirements, and are not for the purpose of determining whether the proposed design and its process may meet any legal requirements imposed by federal, state or local law, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances and by-laws, environmental regulations, building codes, sanitary codes, safety codes and public procurement laws or for the purpose of determining whether the proposed design and process meet any applicable professional standard of care or any other standard of care. Project designers are obligated to implement detailed planning and technical review procedures to effect coordination of design criteria, buildability, and technical adequacy of project concepts. Each city, town and regional school district shall be solely responsible for ensuring that its project development concepts comply with all applicable provisions of federal, state, and local law. The MSBA recommends that each city, town and regional school district have its legal counsel review its development process and subsequent bid documents to ensure that it is in compliance with all provisions of federal, state and local law, prior to bidding. The MSBA shall not be responsible for any legal fees or costs of any kind that may be incurred by a city, town or regional school district in relation to MSBA requirements or the preparation and review of the project’s planning process or plans and specifications.

Overview of the Preliminary Design Program Submittal	Complete	Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Not Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
3.1.4 Evaluation of Existing Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.5 Site Development Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.6 Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.7 Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.8 Appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

General note: The submittal makes multiple references to anticipated student population growth beyond the 1,755 students that was agreed upon in the executed design enrollment certification. MSBA notes that the design enrollment calculation includes projected future growth in Arlington that increases enrollment beyond the current (approximately) 1,330 students in the high school. The District and design team should consider accommodating any potential growth beyond that number by providing future areas of expansion on the building site, not new construction as a part of this project. Confirm that the District still concurs with the agreed upon design enrollment.

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Summary of the Facility Deficiencies and Current S.O.I.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Date of invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study and MSBA Board Action Letter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Executed Design Enrollment Certification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Narrative of the Capital Budget Statement and Target Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Project Directory with contact information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Updated Project Schedule	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

3) The Executed Design Enrollment Certification included in the submittal notes an agreed upon design enrollment of 1,755 students in grades 9-12 (no response required).

4) The Town's targeted total project budget for this project is described as ranging from \$287m to \$293m (no response required).

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.2 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Provide a summary and description of the existing educational program, and the new or expanded educational vision, specifications, process, teaching philosophy statement, as well as the District's curriculum goals and objectives of the program. Include description of the following items:

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Grade and School Configuration Policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Class Size Policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	School Scheduling Method	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Teaching Methodology and Structure				
	a) Administrative and Academic Organization/Structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Curriculum Delivery Methods and Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) English Language Arts/Literacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Mathematics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Social Studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) World Languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Academic Support Programming Spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Student Guidance and Support Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Teacher Planning and Professional Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Pre-kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Lunch Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Technology Instruction Policies and Program Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Media Center/Library	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Visual Arts Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Performing Arts Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Physical Education Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Special Education Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Vocation and Technology Programs				
	a) Non-Chapter 74 Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Chapter 74 Programming – <i>Not Applicable</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Transportation Policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Functional and Spatial Relationships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Security and Visual Access Requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

(Provide the following information in an updated educational program provided in the Preferred Schematic Report):

1) Page 5 references Arlington High School as a “comprehensive regional high school”. Arlington High School is not a comprehensive regional school using the strict definition of the terms. Clarify and/or edit for the final updated educational program.

2) Class size policy is noted as 18-25 students per general classroom, but going as high as 30 when necessary. MSBA science lab guidelines are written to accommodate no more than 24 students per lab. Verify that class size policy for science labs will not exceed that number.

3) Regarding the cafeteria scheduling, note that the MSBA guidelines provide for a cafeteria sized for three seating periods, not two as indicated in the educational program. The initial space summary appears to indicate a cafeteria based on the correct three seating standard (no response required).

4a) The educational program notes that the existing facility is organized by academic departments, and the proposed school will also include departmental areas and supporting offices, as well as shared spaces for interdisciplinary collaboration. The current three “houses” will be increased to four given increasing enrollment and a desire to have roughly 500 students in each house. Describe the type of departments within each house, whether each house includes all nine departments, or if the houses are specialized.

The educational program suggests that, at least, the science labs will be grouped. Describe how this proposed grouped science labs arrangement may accommodate a potential organizational change in the future toward a more integrated, inter-disciplinary approach with specialized classrooms such as science labs available to each house.

4b) Describe any intent to support inter-disciplinary and inter-departmental programs, courses and projects. Describe potential scheduling, adjacencies and common planning time relating to these programs, if they are intended.

4e) Consider having exploratory “science” multi-disciplinary courses that run only for one semester, especially in the second half of the senior year where students can explore non-MCAS, non-standard topics of high interest, as an option to Advanced Placement (applicable for other departments as well).

The educational program notes adjacency between the Science lab and a Maker space. It also describes multiple maker spaces throughout the building, a library maker space, and other similar spaces in the library learning commons. Describe how the District will manage these spaces; whether the equipment is going to be redundant in each maker space, etc. Provide some indication in the educational program how the District will efficiently operate these multiple maker spaces. For each Maker space, provide a detailed safety plan and describe the assigned faculty member or technician responsible for managing the space full time.

4f) The educational program notes adding a Civic Engagement Certificate to the history and social studies program. Does the District have any plans to conduct these courses outside of the school facility?

4g) The educational program suggests that, with the use of technology, world language teachers are currently able to use other lab spaces rather than the language lab. Provide additional information to clarify the District’s intent to build dedicated language labs and/or to use a lab space for multiple purposes. Refer to the MSBA science guidelines For examples of spaces with easily convertible amenities with utilities around the periphery, refer to the MSBA science guidelines.

4h) Page 3 “Furthermore, AHS ranked higher than would be predicted given our percentage of low income students...” Suggest a revision to say how well low income students performed, rather than saying they performed better than what would be predicted.

“Houses and Advisory” section states that the advisory groups are organized alphabetically. Are there any checks in place to verify that the students are not inadvertently segregated by national origin or ethnicity?

6&7) Menotomy Preschool is described as integrated early childhood program for three to five year old students, operated by the Department of Special Education of the Arlington Public Schools. The program is reported to be currently located in the existing high school facility. Please confirm, and describe any functions in this proposed program that are not currently located in the high school facility (if any), how many students are to be moved to the proposed high school, and where they are currently located.

8) The educational program describes two lunch periods. See the comment above regarding MSBA guidelines for cafeteria seating periods. Please acknowledge.

9) Describe any consideration to provide Hearing Assistive Technologies (i.e. FM/digital wireless and audio distribution systems) in the classrooms.

The educational program describes a “bring your own device” policy for Chromebooks and laptops. Explain how all students are accommodated with this policy, especially those without access to their own devices.

12) The submittal includes a proposed theater that seats 900 students. In lieu of providing such a large auditorium, has the District considered a design that allows for a more intimate setting for 300-600 students for performances and productions that would not play well in such a large space? If keeping a 900 seat theater with an expanded stage is necessary for the District’s program, clarify its intended use and utilization. Given the expanded stage, has the District considered using the stage as the instrumental space for certain instrumental and choral programs rather than the expanded band and choral rooms in addition to the larger auditorium. Please clarify.

14) The Special Education program includes the LABBB (“Lexington, Arlington, Burlington, Bedford and Belmont”) Collaborative. Describe the extent that the LABBB Collaborative staff travels between these school districts, the need for LABBB administrative/non-student spaces in each of these Districts, and the potential to share space with other administrative offices for the times LABBB staff are at the Arlington High School.

Page 28; The phrase “cognitive rigidi.” appears to be a typographical error (cognitive rigidity)? Clarify and/or edit for the final updated educational program.

15a) The educational program describes vocational programs in the existing and proposed school that are not intended to be approved as MA Chapter 74 programs, such as Family and Consumer Sciences (“FACS”), Early Childhood Education (“ECE”), Culinary Labs, and Interior Fashion Design. Please confirm, and describe the extent that these spaces in the proposed school are or are not intended to conform to MA Chapter 74 requirements for area per pupil, minimum shop sizes, ceiling clearance and safety/equipment standards. The educational program notes that the ECE program requires “35 feet of open space per child (420 sf)” although the source of this standard is not indicated. Describe which standards are used to determine the space standards for these spaces (e.g. MSBA, DESE CH74, MA DOE Early Childhood Program Standards for Three and Four Year Olds, or MA Department of Early Education and Care 606 CMR 7.07).

Page 44 “...and other digital tools where we can.” appears to be an incomplete sentence. Clarify and/or edit for the final updated educational program.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.3 INITIAL SPACE SUMMARY

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Space summary; one per approved design enrollment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Floor plans of the existing facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Narrative description of reasons for all variances (if any) between proposed net and gross areas as compared to MSBA guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

- 1) The MSBA has performed an initial review of the space summary and offers the following:

General notes regarding the submitted space summary:

- *The following review is based on the submitted preliminary space summary for new construction. The final MSBA determination of compliance with MSBA space guidelines in subsequent submittals will vary (in part) depending on the District's preferred option and the extent that the proposed spaces are located either in existing construction, substantially renovated existing construction, or new construction. MSBA will expect spaces located in new or substantially renovated areas to be compliant with MSBA space standards.*
- *In future submittals carry spaces typically defined as gross area (including unoccupied rooms, toilet rooms, unoccupied closets, supply rooms and storage rooms) within the grossing factor, not as net area, unless the MSBA space summary template specifically includes that space in the net area category. MSBA notes that the proposed total gross area cannot exceed the maximum allowable factor of 1.5 of net area.*
- **Core Academic** – Per the information provided, the following spaces will be proposed in order for the District to deliver its educational program:

Anticipated Core Academic Spaces	MSBA Comments
(54) General Classrooms @ 850 nsf	Total proposed classrooms meet guidelines
(6) General Classrooms @ 950 nsf	Total proposed classrooms meet guidelines
(17) Science Classrooms/ Labs*	Proposes (2) labs above guidelines
(17) Science Prep Space	Proposes (2) spaces above guidelines
(4) Small Group Seminar Spaces	Meets guidelines; no preliminary comments
(10) Teacher Planning spaces	Meets guidelines; no preliminary comments

*Provide proposed scheduling information specific to these spaces.

Proposed programmatic spaces are 3,880 nsf over MSBA guidelines. This overage is due to two additional science labs and associated prep rooms. The educational program states that this additional need is due to participation in the science labs at 110% of the MSBA space summary calculated lab usage. Note that the MSBA does not object to this variation of the guidelines.

- **Special Education** – *The proposed net area for the Special Education category is 48,170 nsf or 2.8 times the MSBA guidelines, and 1.7 times the area of the current programs. Respond to each of the following comments:*
 - *The space summary includes multiple specialized SPED programs including the following:*
 - *Reach – 4,000 nsf*
 - *Compass – 3,300 nsf*
 - *Summit – 2,200 nsf*
 - *Millbrook – 2,700 nsf*
 - *Workplace – 2,250 nsf*
 - *Harbor/Shortstop – 1,700 nsf*
 - *Menotomy Preschool – 16,610 nsf*
 - *LABBB Collaborative – 6,810 nsf*

These specialized programs total 39,570 nsf of space. Presumably the remaining 8,600 nsf of proposed area within the SPED category is the area required for the non-specialized SPED programs.

- *Provide information regarding the number of students participating in each of these programs, and scheduling/utilization information that shows the extent that these students are located in the special program spaces as opposed to being integrated into the non-specialized SPED spaces, or within the general student population.*
- *Elaborate on the need for the substantial increase over the existing SPED programs to the proposed programs in terms of space requirements and staffing.*
- *In future submittals carry the entire 16,610 nsf Menotomy Preschool component of the program in the “Other” category.*
- *The space summary notes that the 3,300 nsf Compass program and 2,700 nsf Millbrook program are consolidations of spaces not currently located at the existing high school. Describe where these programs are currently located, and why these programs are better served by being relocated as a part of the proposed high school project. Confirm that, of the programs listed above, these are the only programs proposed to be relocated to this school. Provide the same information for any other proposed program that is also not currently located at the existing high school.*
- *Each of these programs includes various administrative offices (totaling approximately 16 staff offices, eight 250 nsf quiet rooms, and multiple conference rooms) and other support spaces. Given the potential scheduling/utilization information requested above, describe any potential to share administrative spaces and support spaces with other SPED programs.*

- *The “LABBB” Collaborative is noted in the educational program as serving 21 students, while the proposed area is 6,810 nsf / 10,200 gross square feet (or 486 gsf per student). Five classroom-like spaces are proposed for these 21 students including the 1,000 nsf Common space and the 1,500 nsf OT/PT space, although the educational program notes a goal of eight to ten students per classroom. Explain this discrepancy, and why three classrooms for this program would not provide adequate classroom space for that goal. In addition, describe how many (if any) of the 21 LABBB students are from outside of the Arlington District.*
- *Refer to item #14 above regarding the potential for the LABBB Collaborative staff to share office space with other administrative offices proposed for the Arlington High School.*
- *Confirm that, outside of the Menotomy Pre-School spaces, the proposed program spaces included in the Special Education space summary category are dedicated exclusively for students receiving special education services with an IEP.*
- *The SPED category includes a 3,000 nsf Alternate PE/PT space that serves as a gym station for students within the Special Education program. Verify that this SPED gym station is dedicated exclusively for students receiving special education services with an IEP.*

Note that the Special Education program is subject to approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (“DESE”). Formal approval of the District’s proposed Special Education program by the DESE is a prerequisite for executing a Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA. The MSBA will continue to review the proposed project with DESE, and for conformance with the MSBA guidelines and programmatic needs that may vary from the guidelines in the subsequent Preferred Schematic phase of the study. MSBA may consider some of the area referenced above as ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

No further preliminary comments.

- **Art & Music** – *Proposed programmatic spaces exceed the MSBA guidelines by 6,850 nsf. This is due to an additional 1,200 nsf art classroom and associated 150 nsf workroom, larger band and chorus spaces (1,000 nsf extra each), a 3,000 nsf performing arts space, and a 500 nsf Music Uniform/ Costume storage room. Storage spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines are typically considered as gross area included in the grossing factor, not net area, as noted above. Note that the MSBA does not object to the District including these additional Art and Music spaces in the project; however, all space in this category in excess of MSBA guidelines will be deemed ineligible for reimbursement. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Vocations & Technology** – *The overall proposed square footage aligns with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Health & Physical Education** – *Proposed programmatic spaces in this category exceed the MSBA guidelines by 11,000 nsf, due to an additional 11,000 nsf of gymnasium area (the space summary includes a 12,000 nsf Gymnasium, a 4,000 nsf Larger Gymnasium, and an additional 7,000 nsf Gymnasium, totaling 23,000 nsf of gym area, although the submitted floor plan diagrams show this gym area as one large space rather than multiple separate gyms). Prior to the MSBA accepting any variation to the guidelines, the District must provide scheduling and utilization calculations that demonstrate the need for additional teaching stations to deliver the*

District's health and physical education curriculum. As noted in the (attached) MSBA policy memo dated November 2, 2016 Staff Recommendation for policy revisions to allow for auditorium and gymnasium spaces in excess of the MSBA Space Summary Guidelines at the district's sole expense "areas in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be at the sole expense of the district"; and, "the district may choose to build a gymnasium and related spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines, but in no event shall the gymnasium exceed 18,000 nsf." Provide the scheduling and utilization calculations noted above, and reduce the gymnasium area to no more than the maximum allowable 18,000 nsf. Refer to the memo referenced above for further information regarding MSBA policies regarding auditorium and gymnasium spaces in excess of guidelines.

The educational program references a proposed indoor jogging track, although a track is not included in the space summary. Please clarify, and if there is a proposed track, note its location (e.g. within the floor area of the gymnasium, elevated above the gym floor, etc.), and include it in the space summary.

500 nsf of area is deducted from the Locker rooms in order to provide a 500 nsf Trainer's room/Laundry/Ice space. Verify that this reallocation does not unnecessarily reduce student use of the locker rooms in order to provide space for school staff and support functions. See the note above about the potential to allocate non-programmed spaces and/or unoccupied spaces in the grossing factor as a way to avoid reducing required net areas.

No further preliminary comments.

- **Media Center** – *Proposed programmatic spaces exceed the MSBA guidelines by 1,681 nsf. This overage is due to the inclusion of a workroom, conference room, office, tech storage, and learning center, and is partially offset by a media center that is 369 nsf smaller than guideline. Note that the MSBA does not object to the District including these additional spaces in the project; however, all space in this category in excess of MSBA guidelines will be deemed ineligible for reimbursement. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Auditorium/Drama** – *Proposed programmatic spaces exceed the MSBA guidelines by 2,040 nsf. This overage is due to a proposed 9,000 nsf auditorium that exceeds guidelines by 1,500 nsf, and a stage that exceeds guidelines by 540 nsf. Note that the MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all area in this category in excess of MSBA guidelines will be deemed ineligible for reimbursement. Refer to the memo referenced above for further information regarding MSBA policies regarding auditorium and gymnasium spaces in excess of guidelines, and see additional comments and questions noted in Section 3.1.2.*
- **Dining & Food Service** – *Proposed programmatic spaces appear to align with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Medical** – *Proposed programmatic spaces appear to align with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Administration & Guidance** – *Proposed programmatic spaces appear to align with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Custodial & Maintenance** – *Proposed programmatic spaces appear to align with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*

- **Other** – Proposed programmatic spaces in this category total 20,275 nsf including the following spaces that are not directly related to the Arlington High School project:

- District Administration Offices (9,225 nsf)
- Community Education (1,800 nsf)

As the school related spaces listed above are located in the existing facility the MSBA does not object to these spaces being included in the proposed project however, they will be deemed ineligible for reimbursement.

- Town IT (3,150 nsf)
- Town Facilities (3,650 nsf)
- Town Comptroller (900 nsf)
- Town Payroll (1,550 nsf)

In order for the MSBA to consider supporting a project that includes the town spaces listed above, provide the following information as an appendix to the Preferred Schematic Report for the District, community, and the MSBA Board of Directors to understand the benefits and impacts to the project, and to demonstrate that this represents the most appropriate solution: 1) describe the current locations of these spaces, and, if they are not in the current high school building, why they are being relocated, 2) the estimated added construction costs for these spaces (including parking), 3) estimated cost of added fixtures / furniture / equipment, 4) an outline of the alternatives that were considered in addition to locating these town spaces in the proposed project, 5) a summary of the discussions and cost-benefits analysis performed to establish the need to include the town spaces within the proposed project.

Note that upon selection of a preferred solution, the District may be required to adjust spaces/square footage that exceeds the MSBA guidelines and is not supported by the educational program provided.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.4 EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Provide the following Items		Complete; No response required	Provided; District's response required	Not Provided; District's response required	Receipt of District's Response; To be filled out by MSBA Staff
1	Confirmation of legal title to the property.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Determination that the property is available for development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Existing historically significant features and any related effect on the project design and/or schedule.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Determination of any development restrictions that may apply.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Initial Evaluation of building code compliance for the existing facility.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Initial Evaluation of Architectural Access Board rules and regulations and their application to a potential project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
7	Preliminary evaluation of significant structural, environmental, geotechnical, or other physical conditions that may impact the cost and evaluations of alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Determination for need and schedule for soils exploration and geotechnical evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Environmental site assessments minimally consisting of a Phase I: Initial Site Investigation performed by a licensed site professional.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Assessment of the school for the presence of hazardous materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Previous existing building and/or site reports, studies, drawings, etc. provided by the district, if any.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

1&2) The civil / landscaping existing site conditions report (volume 3) notes that the 10 acre school site does not include the adjacent Pierce Field sports field complex. This play field area is owned & operated by the Town, and is not part of the high school project scope. The Existing Site Plan and Site Use Diagram (volume 4) shows a school property line that includes both the school site and the Pierce Field sports field complex, and is described as being a 23 acre site. The Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives section of the submittal (volume 4) shows a proposed new toilet facility adjacent to the existing stadium seating, and a proposed access path on the Pierce Field to the Minuteman bike path, both located on the Pierce Field. Clarify the extent of the property line and scope of work for this project, and, if the project includes construction on the Pierce Field sports field complex, any considerations regarding ownership, control, and exclusive use of all school and Town land associated with the proposed project. Review the MSBA Project Advisory #45 MSBA Requirements for Land Use regarding identification of considerations and restrictions to development the site and how this might affect project approvals.

3) The submittal includes a notification letter from the Massachusetts Historical Commission (“MHC”) dated April 19, 2018 in response to a Project Notification Form submitted by the designer that described the project as potentially demolishing some or all of the existing building. The MHC letter states that the existing Arlington High School is not included on any state or federal historic inventories or registers, and that “no further review by the MHC is required....” The District’s submittal describes the 1914 Fusco building, and most notably, the 1938 Collomb building, as having a significant presence in Arlington and are worth consideration for renovation or repurposing for new programmed space (the submittal notes that the central wooden portico and steeple/clock tower of the Collomb building currently serves no programmatic function). No response required.

4) The existing site report notes that the Pierce Field sports complex adjacent to the school site originally included Cutter’s Pond that was filled and contains contaminated soil that was capped in 2004. The Mill Brook passes under the Pierce Field and school sites in a 4’ concrete box

culvert. Describe any preliminary information regarding building limitations related to the easements that are associated with the Mill Brook culvert, the extent that the Mill Brook requires compliance with the Wetlands Protection Act and local Wetlands By-Laws, and how this may affect the buildable areas of the site. Note that several building design options in the submittal appear to be located over these easements and the culvert. Describe how this may affect building design and approvals.

The site report also notes that the western corner of the Pierce Field site appears to be located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain. Describe any preliminary information regarding how this may affect the buildable areas of the school site (if any), any associated mitigation regarding proposed site and building floor elevations, and design resiliency considerations.

7) The Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives section of the submittal describes options that include renovation of the 1938 Collomb House building. The civil existing conditions report notes that this building experiences periodic flooding in the basement to a depth of 3’-4’, and significant foundation damage in 2017 due to hydrostatic pressure in a sealed drain manhole under the building. In the subsequent Preferred Schematic Report, describe how these conditions may inform the evaluation, selection and cost of any options that include renovation of this building.

8) Not provided. Note that all of the proposed options are in the same general location on the existing site, so some preliminary soil boring locations could be identified (the submittal notes that preliminary borings results will be provided in the following Preferred Schematic Report). Comment in the response to this review, and provide any updates regarding the soils exploration and geotechnical evaluation.

9) The April 20, 2018 McPhail Associates Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report indicates multiple various recognized environmental conditions in the groundwater, soils and indoor air at this property. As a result, a Phase 2 Site Investigation was recommended and later performed by McPhail dated March 23, 2018. The Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports detail numerous recommendations regarding further site development for this project. Describe any updates or further investigations based on these reports and comment on each of these recommendations in the response to this review. Describe how these investigations and resulting recommendations will be coordinated within the proposed Feasibility Study / Schematic Design project schedule. MSBA notes that all costs associated with abatement of contaminated soil from any source, including treatment of pumped groundwater, and abatement of underground storage tanks, vaults and transformers must be itemized in the cost estimates for the following Schematic Design submittal as ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

10) The Hazardous Materials Identification Study provided a preliminary abatement cost estimate for this project totaling \$4.4m, including \$780,000 for abatement of flooring and flooring mastic. MSBA notes that all costs associated with the removal of asbestos containing flooring and ceiling tiles must be itemized in the cost estimates in the following Schematic Design submittal as ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.5 SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Provide the following Items	Complete; No response required	Provided; District's response required	Not Provided; District's response required	Receipt of District's Response; To be filled out by MSBA Staff
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--	---

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	A narrative describing project requirements related to site development to be considered during the preliminary and final evaluation of alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Existing site plan(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

1) *The submittal notes that the District does not provide bus transportation for the students, and that the proposed site development will not include bus stacking and bus drop-off lanes. Describe how the proposed site could function without bus lanes if that policy was modified in the future.*

Submittal section 3.1.5 states that no student parking is allowed on the current high school property, and that current school and Town staff (numbering roughly 200), have limited onsite parking. The submittal notes a goal of providing 250 parking spaces for the proposed project. In the response to this review, describe how these parking spaces will be allocated among the building occupants (high school staff, Arlington District staff, and other Town staff). Describe any policy limitations regarding who will be permitted to use these parking spaces, and any new policy for the proposed project regarding onsite student parking.

MSBA notes potentially ineligible site scope proposed for this project (refer to the MSBA website “Policies Forms & Guidelines / Site Cost Allowance Guidelines” for additional information). Categorically ineligible site costs include all costs associated with athletic stadiums, spectator amenities such as concession stands, press boxes, and/or toilet facilities for outdoor athletic facilities. Please acknowledge.

2) *Refer to the existing site conditions above for additional site development comments (no response required).*

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.6 PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Analysis of school district student school assignment practices and available space in other schools in the district	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Tuition agreement with adjacent school districts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Rental or acquisition of existing buildings that could be made available for school use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Code Upgrade option that includes repair of systems and/or scope required for purposes of code compliance; with no modification of existing spaces or their function	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5	Renovation(s) and/or addition(s) of varying degrees to the existing building(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Construction of new building and the evaluation of potential locations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	List of 3 distinct alternatives (including at least 1 renovation and/or addition option) are recommended for further development and evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

3) Provide any updates regarding the potential use of the existing Minuteman Career and Technical High School in Lexington as swing space for the Arlington High School project as presented in the submittal. If this opportunity is considered further in the following Preferred Schematic Report, the design team should provide scheduling information for both projects that show that the Minutemen building is available for use during the appropriate phases of the Arlington High School project.

4&5) The Evaluation of Existing Conditions (volume 3) includes narratives from the Designer and various sub consultants describing the scope of work required for a “code upgrade” option, and the submittal includes floor plans for a “renovation only” option (volume 4). A comparative cost table indicates the code upgrade / base repair option with a construction cost of \$91m and a project cost of \$118m, the renovation option is shown with a construction cost of \$157m and a project cost of \$204m. The submittal includes a description of how these options do not fulfill the District’s stated educational program, and notes that the District will not investigate these options further as a part of the feasibility study. Please confirm.

5) Preliminary options include a variety of addition/renovation options on the existing site based on keeping both the 1914 Fusco building and 1938 Collomb building (options 1, 1A, 2 and 3), keeping the 1938 Collomb building only (options 4 and 5), and the 1914 Fusco building only (option 5A). Option 3 leaves the 1914 Fusco building for Town use only.

6) Preliminary new construction options on the existing site include options 6, 6A and 7. Four alternate sites for new construction are provided and shown with block, scaled building mass diagrams and an evaluation matrix. The alternate site options were eliminated for further consideration due to land ownership concerns and remote site locations.

7) General comments regarding the four options recommended for further development and evaluation (four options were selected by the Town for further development and evaluation including addition/renovation options 2 and 5B, and new construction options 6A and 7):

- MSBA Module 3, Section 3.1.6 states that “Alternatives shall retain the same title and designation between PDP, PSR, and SD submittal, therefore maintaining clarity in the documentation.” In future submittals, continue to use consistent option designations. The four Options selected for further development in the PSR submittal should therefore maintain their original designations of Options 2, 5B, 6A and 7 (Option 5B is a later variation of addition/renovation Option 5A, but keeps both the 1914 Fusco building and 1938 Collomb building).
- Regarding the proposed parking structure under the building shown in Option 5B, in order for the MSBA to consider supporting a project that includes a parking structure, provide the following information as an appendix to the Preferred Schematic Report for the District, community, and the MSBA Board of Directors

to understand the benefits and impacts to the project, and to demonstrate that this represents the most appropriate solution: 1) the estimated added construction costs for this parking structure, 2) an outline of the alternatives that were considered in addition to locating a parking structure in the proposed project, 4) a summary of the discussions and cost-benefits analysis performed to establish the need to include a parking structure within the proposed project. All construction costs and soft costs associated with this parking structure must be itemized separately and will be considered ineligible for reimbursement in the following phases of the Feasibility Study.

- The MSBA notes that significant portions of the existing Arlington High School are being considered for demolition that were constructed as recently as 1980. Summarize local discussions and analysis regarding the liabilities and benefits associated with replacing versus preserving these portions of the existing building.
- Provide a brief description and details of any District or community interest to incorporate iconic or locally significant elements of the existing buildings into the new construction options 6A and 7.
- As noted above, the Town’s stated total project budget for this project ranges from \$287m to \$293m. Comparative cost analyses for the four options recommended for further development do not exceed that budget (no response required).

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.7 LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVAL

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District’s response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District’s response required</i>	Receipt of District’s Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Certified copies of the School Building Committee meeting notes showing specific submittal approval vote language and voting results, and a list of associated School Building Committee meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s):				
	a) Submittal approval certificate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting approval certificate. <i>Not applicable</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	[Applicable for Districts proposing grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting /consolidation] Provide the following items to document approval and public notification of school configuration changes associated with the proposed project				
	a) A description of the local process required to authorize a change to the existing grade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	configuration or redistricting in the district				
b)	A list of associated public meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Certified copies of the governing body (e.g. School Building Committee) meeting notes showing specific grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting, vote language, and voting results if required locally	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	A certification from the Superintendent stating the District's intent to implement a grade configuration or consolidate schools, as applicable. The certification must be signed by the Chief Executive Officer, Superintendent of Schools, and Chair of the School Committee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

1) *The meeting notes include multiple references to providing a swimming pool in the proposed project although a pool is not included in the initial space summary or educational program and the existing Arlington High School does not have a swimming pool. Based on current practice the MSBA would not support a project that includes a newly constructed swimming pool. Please acknowledge.*

1&2a) *As noted in the April 25, 2018 Cursory Review email from MSBA, provide the following items:*

- *Local Actions and Approvals: provide a certified copy (raised seal and/or stamp and/or original signature) of the April 24, 2018 meeting minutes, and a certified copy of the Local Actions and Approvals Certification with original signatures.*
- *Cover Letter: send an original copy of the OPM Cover letter with an original "wet" signature.*

2b&3) *Not applicable (no response required).*

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.8 APPENDICES

	Provide the following Items	Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Current Statement of Interest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	MSBA Board Action Letter including the invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Design Enrollment Certification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

No review comments for this section.

End

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors, Massachusetts School Building Authority
FROM: Maureen G. Valente, Chief Executive Officer
John K. McCarthy, Executive Director, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Staff Recommendation for policy revisions to allow for auditorium and gymnasium spaces in excess of the MSBA Space Summary Guidelines at the district's sole expense
DATE: November 2, 2016

Based upon review of project data and discussions with the Board of Directors, staff is recommending a policy revision to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") space guidelines specifically for Auditorium and Gymnasium related spaces that are in excess of those included in the MSBA space summary guidelines.

Background

Based on project reviews in late fall 2015, the Board of Directors requested that staff provide information regarding the potential to revise the policies for space guidelines to allow for requests by districts for spaces in excess of the MSBA's guidelines at the district's sole expense. Staff presented an overview of current policies and practices at the March 16, 2016 Board of Directors meeting and followed with additional information regarding potential revisions at the March 30, 2016 Board of Directors meeting.

Based on the discussions and input received from the Board members, staff has prepared a Potential Revised Policy, included as Attachment A, which will allow districts to include spaces in excess of the MSBA's space summary guidelines at the district's sole expense for two program areas: auditorium and gymnasium. Staff has received favorable feedback regarding this proposed revision to the MSBA's policies, and as noted at the September 29, 2016 Board of Directors meeting and further reviewed at the October 19, 2016 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee meeting, staff have prepared this recommendation to revise the MSBA's policy for the Board of Directors approval.

Recommendation

Specific details are set forth in Attachment A: Potential Revised Policy – Auditorium and Gymnasium spaces above guidelines requested to support community use at district's sole expense.

Key features of the policy revision include:

- Areas in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be at the sole expense of the district;
- Community support must be demonstrated prior to MSBA approval of a district’s proposed project scope and budget;
- The MSBA will exclude from its grant the cost of the total gross square foot (“gsf”) above guidelines for these areas as shown below in the sample calculation. This amount will not change over the term of the grant even if the bids come in at a lower amount.

- High Schools:
 - Upper limits on allowable nsf in excess of guidelines include:
 - The district may choose to build an auditorium in excess of MSBA guidelines, but no more than 13,300 net square foot (“nsf”) (based upon an upper limit of 1,000 seats). The MSBA funding limit will vary depending on the agreed-upon design enrollment but will not exceed 10,400 nsf; and
 - The district may choose to build a gymnasium and related spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines, but in no event shall the gymnasium exceed 18,000 nsf. The MSBA will participate in a gymnasium of up to 12,000 nsf unless adjusted by the MSBA to increase teaching stations for enrollment and/or the educational plan.

- Middle Schools/Elementary Schools:
 - Upper limits on allowable nsf in excess of guidelines include:
 - The district may choose to build an auditorium even though the MSBA space guidelines do not include an auditorium and no portion of the design and construction of an auditorium will be reimbursed, including the stage, regardless of whether the district chooses not to include a stage in its cafeteria or gymnasium. If the district chooses to build an auditorium, the auditorium cannot be larger than 13,300 nsf; and
 - The district may choose to build a gymnasium and related spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines, but in no event shall the gymnasium itself exceed 12,000 nsf. The MSBA will participate in a gymnasium up to no more than 6,000 nsf, unless adjusted by the MSBA to increase teaching stations for enrollment and/or the education plan.

 - Sample Calculation for Auditorium space in a high school in excess of guidelines at the district’s sole expense:

Total net square footage (nsf) requested by the District	13,300 nsf
Total nsf for Auditorium Category allowed as eligible by MSBA space guidelines	10,400 nsf
Excess net square footage equals District request minus net	2,900 nsf

square footage allowable by MSBA space guidelines	
Gross square foot (gsf) exclusion = Excess net square feet times the project's grossing factor. For illustration purposes, project's sample grossing factor is 1.5	2,900 nsf x 1.5 = 4,350 gsf
Total cost of exclusion = Gross square foot times the project's total construction cost/square foot. For illustration purposes, project's total construction cost/square foot is \$375 per square foot.	4,350 gsf x \$375/gsf = \$1,631,250
Total cost of exclusion	\$1,631,250

Recommendation

MSBA staff is recommending a policy revision to the MSBA space guidelines specifically for Auditorium and Gymnasium related spaces that are in excess of those included in the MSBA space summary guidelines. This recommendation would be effective for districts that are approved to proceed into schematic design on or after January 1, 2017.

