

District: Town of Stoughton  
 School Name: Stoughton High School  
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic  
 Date: January 20, 2016

**Recommendation**

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the Town of Stoughton, as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Stoughton High School on the existing site with a new facility to serve students in grades 9-12. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s preferred solution.

<b>District Information</b>	
District Name	Town of Stoughton
Elementary School(s)	Edwin A. Jones Early Childhood Center (PK) Helen Hansen Elementary School (K-5) Joseph H. Gibbons Elementary School (K-5) Joseph R. Dawe, Jr. Elementary School (K-5) South Elementary School (K-5) West Elementary School (PK-5)
Middle School(s)	O’Donnell Middle School (6-8)
High School(s)	Stoughton High School (9-12)
Priority School Name	Stoughton High School
Type of School	High School
Grades Served	9-12
Year Opened	1923
Existing Square Footage	216,000
Additions	1952: Addition 1955: Addition 1965: Addition
Acreage of Site	40 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
2014-2015 Enrollment	1,013 students
Agreed Upon Enrollment	1,065 students
Enrollment Specifics	The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 1,065 students serving grades 9-12.

<b>MSBA Board Votes</b>	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	January 29, 2014
Invitation to Feasibility Study	July 30, 2014
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On January 27, 2016 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on May 25, 2016
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentives points are not applicable)	54.16%

<b>Consultants</b>	
Owner's Project Manager ("OPM")	Compass Project Management, Inc.
Designer	Drummey Rosane Anderson, Inc.

## Discussion

The existing Stoughton High School is a 216,000 square foot facility located on a 40 acre site that currently serves students in grades 9-12. The original school building was constructed in 1923, with additions constructed in 1952, 1955 and 1965.

The District identified numerous deficiencies in its Statement of Interest associated with space constraints inhibiting the District's ability to deliver its educational program, as well as current building envelope conditions contributing to poor energy efficiency performance. In addition, the District noted the following: outdated mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; non-compliance with current seismic, accessibility, and building codes; the presence of hazardous materials; moisture infiltration; and air quality issues.

In conjunction with its consultants, the District performed a comprehensive assessment of the existing conditions and the educational program, receiving input from educators, administrators, and facilities personnel. Based on the findings of this effort, the District and its consultants initially studied nine preliminary options that include one base repair option, four addition/renovation configurations, and four new construction options. The following is a detailed list of the preliminary alternatives considered.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description of Preliminary Options</b>
1	Base repairs of the existing facility
B.1	Addition/renovation of the existing facility (73,000 sq. ft. addition)
B.2	Addition/renovation of the existing facility (91,000 sq. ft. addition)
B.3	Addition/renovation of the existing facility (137,000 sq. ft. addition)
B.4	Addition/renovation of the existing facility (190,000 sq. ft. addition)
C.1	New construction on the existing site (on southern site, linear layout)
C.2	New construction on the existing site (on southern site, courtyard layout)
C.3	New construction on the existing site (on existing track/field location)
C.4	New construction on the existing site (on existing football/baseball fields)

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

pricing as presented below. (Please note that the “Base Repair” option does not address the educational program needs, was not developed further, and has been included for comparative purposes only).

### 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: (Base Repair)	216,000	216,000 \$115/sq. ft.	N/A	\$5,055,890	\$29,726,716 \$138/sq. ft.	\$41,625,196
Option B.2: (Addition/ Renovation)	224,000	146,000 \$335/sq. ft.	78,000 \$379/sq. ft.	\$15,718,133	\$94,124,075 \$420/sq. ft.	\$123,228,972
Option B.3: (Addition/ Renovation)	224,000	100,000 \$347/sq. ft.	124,400 \$383/sq. ft.	\$16,331,460	\$98,882,669 \$440/sq. ft.	\$127,170,131
Option C.1: (New Construction - linear)	214,860	N/A	214,860 \$372/sq. ft.	\$16,566,786	\$96,434,023 \$449/sq. ft.	\$120,927,065
<b>Option C.2: (New Construction - courtyard)***</b>	<b>214,860</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>214,860 \$372/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$16,566,786</b>	<b>\$96,545,336 \$449/sq. ft.</b>	<b>\$121,045,054</b>

\* Marked up construction costs

\*\* Does not include construction contingency

\*\*\*District’s preferred option

The District has selected “Option C.2” as the preferred solution to proceed into Schematic Design because this option addresses all of the deficiencies associated with the existing conditions of the current facility at a slightly lower estimated project cost when compared to the addition/renovation options explored. In addition, “Option C.2” will allow the District to deliver its desired educational program and is anticipated to result in the least disruption to students during construction. Although “Option C.1” would produce similar advantageous results, the proposed courtyard configuration associated with “Option C.2” proved to be a more flexible design and was determined by the District to be the most advantageous solution when compared to the other new construction options considered. Although the “Option B” solution proved to be similar in cost, and could meet the programmatic expectations desired by the District, the extended construction duration associated with complex phasing, as well as disruption to students associated with an occupied facility, proved to be a less advantageous solution. Therefore, addition/renovation options were not selected.

The District presented its proposed project to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on December 16, 2015. At that meeting, members of the FAS raised a number of concerns including: the proposed size of the auditorium; the proposed building organization and opportunities to provide programmatic flexibility; location and delivery of Special Education programs compared to current conditions; class size policies included in the Educational Program;

organization of science lab preparation rooms and chemical storage; teacher assignments as it relates to polygon-shaped classrooms; interior courtyard design and maintenance; and consideration of covered entrances for handicap accessibility.

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

- 1) MSBA reviewed the Feasibility Study and subsequent material and finds that the options investigated were sufficiently comprehensive in scope, the approach undertaken in this study was appropriate, and the District's preferred solution is reasonable and cost-effective and meets the needs identified by the District. However, per MSBA review of the schematic design submittal, the District has acknowledged that the total square footage of the proposed Auditorium/Drama category of spaces must be reduced to meet MSBA guidelines. MSBA staff will continue to work with the District and design team to explore design opportunities early in the Schematic Design phase in order to reach a mutually acceptable solution for the proposed project.
- 2) The District has submitted an operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget statement for MSBA review.
- 3) The District's schematic design submittal will be subject to final review and approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as part of the schematic design submittal prior to a Project Scope and Budget Agreement.
- 4) Subject to Board approval, the MSBA will participate in a project that includes spaces that meet MSBA guidelines, with the exception of variations previously agreed to by the MSBA. All proposed spaces will be reviewed during the Schematic Design phase.
- 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 and, more specifically, how ineligible costs associated with the proposed detached Central Administration structure will be identified.

Based on the review outlined above, MSBA staff recommends that the Town of Stoughton be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing Stoughton High School on the existing site.