

District: Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District  
 School Name: George H. Mitchell Elementary School  
 Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic  
 Date: April 3, 2019

**Recommendation**

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District (the “District”), as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing George H. Mitchell Elementary School with a new facility on the existing site. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accepts the District’s Preferred Schematic.

<b>District Information</b>	
District Name	Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District
Elementary School(s)	George H. Mitchell Elementary School (PK-3) L.B. Merrill Elementary School (K-1) LaLiberte Elementary School (2-4) Williams Intermediate School (4-6)
Middle School(s)	Bridgewater Middle School (7-8) Raynham Middle School (5-8)
High School(s)	Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High School (9-12)
Priority School Name	George H. Mitchell Elementary School
Type of School	Elementary School
Grades Served	PK-3
Year Opened	1997
Existing Square Footage	127,804
Additions	N/A
Acreage of Site	22 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>– Building envelope</li> </ul>
Original Design Capacity	Unknown
2018-2019 Enrollment	1,095
Agreed Upon Enrollment	Study Enrollment includes the following configurations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 995 students in grades K-3</li> <li>– 740 students in grades K-2 (Preferred Solution)</li> </ul>
Enrollment Specifics	Contingent upon the Board’s approval of the Preferred Schematic, the District will sign a Design Enrollment Certification for 740 students in grades K-2.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	Yes

<b>MSBA Board Votes</b>	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	February 15, 2017
Invitation to Feasibility Study	October 25, 2017
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On April 10, 2019 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on August 28, 2019.
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	55.63%

<b>Consultants</b>	
Owner’s Project Manager (the “OPM”)	Daedalus Projects, Inc.
Designer	Raymond Design Associates, Inc.

## Discussion

The existing Mitchell Elementary School is a 127,804 square foot facility located on a 22-acre site and was originally constructed in 1997 to serve students in grades K-3. During a winter of record snowfall in February 2015, the facility was closed following a partial roof collapse caused by ice damming and excessive snow loading. As a result of the roof collapse, a pipe froze and burst, flooding the central wing and causing widespread water damage. Additionally, there was ice damming along the perimeter of the entire roof at all three academic wings, which resulted in extensive water damage to the exterior walls and ceilings. Subsequent to closing the facility, the Mitchell Elementary School student population was relocated to the other schools within the District.

The District’s Statement of Interest (“SOI”) identified numerous deficiencies in the existing facility associated with the structural integrity, outdated mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, and the building envelope.

As part of the Feasibility Study, the MSBA mutually agreed with the District’s intent to explore options associated with Bridgewater’s grade K-3 student population, resulting in the following two student enrollment options: 995 students in grades K-3; and 740 students in grades K-2.

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 (11) preliminary options that included: one base repair option; four addition/renovation options; and six new construction options as listed below.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description of Preliminary Options</b>
PK2/PK3.A.1	Code Upgrade – Grades K-2 with an enrollment of 740 students or Grades K-3 with an enrollment of 995 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School.
PK2.B.1	Addition/Renovation (“Comprehensive”) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School.
PK2.B.2	Addition/Renovation (“Hybrid”)– Grades K-2 with an enrollment of 740 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School.
PK2.C.1	New Construction – Grades K-2 with an enrollment of 740 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School site.

PK2.D.1	New Construction – Grades K-2 with an enrollment of 740 students at the Mitchell playfield site.
PK2.E.1	New Construction – Grades K-2 with an enrollment of 740 students at the existing Senior Center site.
PK3.B.1	Addition/Renovation (“Comprehensive”) – Grades K-3 with an enrollment of 995 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School site.
PK3.C.1	New Construction – Grades K-3 with an enrollment of 995 students at the existing Mitchell Elementary School site.
PK3.D.1	New Construction – Grades K-3 with an enrollment of 995 students at the Mitchell playfield site.
PK3.E.1	New Construction – Grades K-3 with an enrollment of 995 students at the existing Senior Center site.
PK3.F.1	Addition/Renovation (“Comprehensive”) – Grades K-3 for 995 students at the Mitchell playfield site.

As a result of this analysis, the District determined that “Option PK2/PK3.A.1” was not considered a viable option for further development because it does not meet the needs of the District’s educational program and it does not address the safety and security concerns associated with the existing building.

The District did not consider “Option PK2.D.1” and “Option PK3.D.1” for further evaluation because of higher estimated construction costs associated with the existing playfield site. “Option PK2.E.1” and “Option PK3.E.1” were not considered for further evaluation because the District determined that the proposed site would require the replacement of the existing senior center simultaneously with the construction of a new school. “Option PK3.F.1” was not considered for further evaluation because of District concerns associated with the proposed building layout, potential higher operational costs, and higher estimated costs when compared to other options being considered.

Additionally, based on the District’s desire to restructure the grade configuration among Bridgewater students in grades K-8, the District voted to further evaluate options limited to the grades K-2 study enrollment only. Therefore, “Option PK3.B.1” and “Option PK3.C.1” were not considered for further evaluation because they do not support the District’s desired grade configuration.

Based on the District’s desire for a K-2 grade configuration, MSBA staff and the District agreed to four final options for further development and consideration. However, as part of the District’s development of its “Final Evaluation of Options” an additional seven K-2 options were included and further evaluated. Therefore, the District evaluated the following eleven options: one base repair option; two renovation options; two addition/renovation options; and six new construction options, as listed below.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description of Final Evaluation of Options</b>
PK2.A.1	Code Upgrade – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School. (Est. project cost \$26.0-\$29.8 million)
PK2.A.2	Renovation (Minor program reconfigurations) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School. (Est. project cost \$43.4-\$47.1 million)

PK2.A.3	Renovation (Major program reconfigurations) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School. (Estimated total project cost \$48.4-\$52.0 million)
PK2.B.1	Addition/Renovation (“Comprehensive”) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.B.2	Addition/Renovation (“Hybrid”) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School. (Est. project cost \$80.6-\$84.3 million)
PK2.C.1	New Construction (‘T’-Shape School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.C.2	New Construction (‘L’-Shape School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.C.3	New Construction (‘L’-Shape School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.C.4	New Construction (‘U’-Shape School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.C.5	New Construction (‘Straight Bar’ School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)
PK2.C.6	New Construction (‘L’-Shape School) – Grades K-2 for 740 students at the existing Mitchell School site. (Est. project cost \$86.8-\$90.5 million)

As a result of this analysis, the District narrowed their list of options from eleven to five where “Option PK2.A.2” was not considered for further evaluation because the District determined that this option does not address the safety and security concerns of the existing building and it does not support the District’s grade-level professional learning communities. Although “Options PK2.C.2, PK2.C.3, PK2.C.4 and PK2.C.5” could meet the District’s educational program, these options were not considered for further evaluation because the District determined that locating pre-kindergarten spaces on the ground floor would require a separate entrance. Additionally, the District determined that “Options PK2.C.2, PK2.C.3, and PK2.C.5” do not provide optimal solar orientation, and “Option PK2.C.4” does not provide preferred flexibility for future enrollment growth.

Therefore, the District established cost estimates for the following five options: one renovation option; two addition/renovation options; and two new construction options as listed below. Please note the District does not consider “Option PK2.A.1” a viable option, however, it has been included for cost comparison 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 PK2.A.1: Code Upgrade ( <i>Cost Comparison Only</i> )	124,704	124,704 \$153/sq. ft.	N/A	\$3,176,780	\$22,204,780 \$178/sf. Ft.	\$27,533,927
Option PK2.A.3: Renovation	124,704	124,704 \$349/sq. ft.	N/A	\$9,679,766	\$53,138,638 \$426/sq. ft.	\$67,418,638
Option PK2.B.1: Addition/Renovation	140,446	92,408 \$401/sq. ft.	48,038 \$405/sq. ft.	\$10,251,796	\$66,806,514 \$476/sq. ft.	\$83,571,514

<b>Option (Description)</b>	<b>Total Gross Square Feet</b>	<b>Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost*</b>	<b>Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Estimated Total Project Costs</b>
Option PK2.B.2: Addition/Renovation	140,446	92,408 \$386/sq. ft.	48,038 \$405/sq. ft.	\$10,251,796	\$65,351,385 \$465/sq. ft.	\$81,876,385
Option PK2.C.1.2: New Construction	132,213	N/A	132,213 \$415/sq. ft.	\$11,239,711	\$66,094,151 \$500/sq. ft.	\$82,284,151
<b><i>Option PK2.C.6.1: New Construction***</i></b>	<b><i>132,213</i></b>	<b><i>N/A</i></b>	<b><i>132,213 \$412/sq. ft.</i></b>	<b><i>\$11,520,168</i></b>	<b><i>\$65,962,536 \$499/sq. ft.</i></b>	<b><i>\$82,152,536</i></b>

\* *Marked up construction costs*

\*\* *Does not include construction contingency*

\*\*\****District's Preferred Schematic***

The District has selected “Option PK2.C.6.1”, new construction as the Preferred Schematic to proceed into Schematic Design because it meets the needs of the District’s educational program, more closely aligns the grade configurations at the elementary and middle school level in Bridgewater and Raynham, alleviates the current overcrowding associated with temporary placement of the Mitchell School students at other schools, and will not disrupt ongoing education during construction.

“Option PK2.A.3” was not selected because it does not address the safety and security concerns of the existing building and does not support the District’s preferred grade-level professional learning communities.

Although “Option PK2.B.1” and “Option PK2.B.2” support the District’s educational program, the proposed layouts result in undesirable splitting of grade-one pods and creates pre-kindergarten spaces on the ground floor which requires a separate entrance, and therefore were not selected.

Although “Option PK2.C.1.2” meets the needs of the District’s educational program, the District did not select this option because the proposed layout was considered less-desirable than the layout associated with the Preferred Schematic, “Option PK2.C.6.1”.

The District presented its proposed Preferred Schematic to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (“FAS”) on March 13, 2019. At that meeting, members of the FAS discussed a number of topics including: the educational program and its relation to the proposed building layout; grade reconfiguration and opportunity for increased alignment throughout the District; importance of input from teachers and early education specialists in educational planning; importance of professional/staff development; clarification of interdisciplinary and project-based learning models; proposed location of the stage in relation to the gym and cafeteria; the MSBA’s “Review and Recommendations of Best Practices for K-12 STEM Learning Spaces” report and Staff Recommendation for 2018 Science/Technology/Engineering Area Guidelines as it relates to including more than one sink in general classrooms; utilization of the proposed maker space; distribution of special education spaces; appreciation for the integration of pre-kindergarten classrooms; appreciation for the location of breakout spaces; proposed location of adaptive physical education and operational and physical therapy rooms and opportunities for improved adjacencies; outdoor play spaces, the rationale for the number of parking spaces, the impact to the project, and opportunity to further develop landscape plan as design progresses; clarification of

estimated site, demolition and hazardous materials costs for the two 'new' options; project schedule; and community outreach.

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 MSBA will work with the District and project team during schematic design to further understand the District's vehicular parking requirements associated with the proposed site access, circulation, and development and further explore the number of spaces required and additional configurations for the parking.
- 4) 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, which is prior to executing a Project Scope and Budget Agreement.
- 5) 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.
- 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 Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District be approved to proceed into Schematic Design to replace the existing George H. Mitchell Elementary School with a new facility on the existing site.