

INTRODUCTION

SECTION 3.3.1

(PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

- 3.3.1.1 Process Overview
- 3.3.1.2 Project Schedule Update
- 3.3.1.3 Final Evaluation of Existing Conditions Summary
- 3.3.1.4 Final Evaluation of Alternatives Summary
- 3.3.1.5 District's Preferred Solution Summary
- 3.3.1.6 Copy of MSBA PDP Review/District Response

(PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) is to define the programmatic, functional, spatial and environmental requirements of the educational facility necessary to meet the Tyngsborough Public School's (District) educational program and perform the review and investigation required to clearly define the existing building deficiencies.

Based on the District's educational program we have identified the programmatic space needs for the Tyngsborough Middle School project. The space needs, along with an evaluation of existing conditions and site development requirements, have formed the evaluation of alternatives upon which the most educationally appropriate and cost-effective solution will be recommended. With that information in-hand, the Preferred Solution has been approved by the Tyngsborough Middle School Building Committee and is being submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) for review and comment prior to going to the MSBA Board of Directors approval to proceed with the Schematic Design.

The Tyngsborough Public Schools submitted their Statement of Interest (SOI) for the Tyngsborough Middle School in April of 2018. The project was accepted into the MSBA's Eligibility Phase in December of 2018 and into the Feasibility Phase in February 2020. The SOI identifies and details the building's deficiencies. A copy of the SOI is provided in the Appendix of the previously submitted Preliminary Design Program (PDP).

3.3.1.1 PROCESS OVERVIEW

The Preliminary Design Program (PDP) was submitted to MSBA on March 31, 2021. MSBA PDP Review comments issued to the Town of Tyngsborough on May 3, 2021. The Town responded to the MSBA PDP review comments on May 13, 2021. A copy of the MSBA PDP Review Comments Response Letter is in Section 3.3.1.6 of this report.

Beginning in April 2021, the Design Team met twice a month with the Tyngsborough Middle School Building Committee (Committee) over the duration of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) phase. During Committee meetings, the design parameters, site configurations, building layouts, building systems and sustainability goals were presented and discussed. Copies of the meeting minutes are provided in Appendix 3.3.6.1 of this report.

Working with the project team, the Committee worked diligently to further develop the three (3) options advanced from the PDP for evaluation in the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR). The options were:

- Option A Code Upgrade – 50 Norris Road
- Option B.1 Renovation and Addition – 50 Norris Road (Gymnasium Building)
- Option D.2 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field)

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

The further conceptual design development resulted in the generation of the following six (6) options that were considered for the preferred solution:

- Option A.1.1 Code Upgrade – 50 Norris Road
- Option B.1.1.1 Renovation and Addition – 50 Norris Road (Gymnasium Building)
- Option D.2.1.1 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field)
- Option D.2.1.2 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field)
- Option D.2.1.3 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field)
- Option D.2.1.4 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field)

The Committee evaluated each option based on an agreed upon set of criteria organized in the following categories: Educational, Cost & Schedule, Community, Building and Site. Estimates of probable construction costs were prepared for each option. On June 16, 2021, the Committee voted to approve Option D.2.1.3 as the preferred solution for the PSR and authorized the PSR submission to MSBA.

The Committee and project team have implemented an extremely open, transparent and comprehensive design review process. In addition to the open, public meetings detailed below the project public outreach includes a web-site hosted by Leftfield (<https://www.tyngsboroughmiddleschoolproject.com>) that provides public access to project documents, meeting agendas, meeting minutes, meeting presentations and MSBA submissions. In addition, the Committee obtained public comment during their regular meetings as well as the May 12, 2021 Community Forum #2. The Community Forum provided an update on the educational program and design options allowing appropriate time to address public questions.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY

At the April 5, 2021, & April 19, 2021, Building Committee Meeting, LF (Leftfield) presented at length the pros and cons of CM-R and D-B-B methodologies/utilization in the public construction market sector. CM-R vs. At the conclusion of the April 19, 2021, presentation the Committee voted to proceed utilizing the CM-R methodology for the project. This presentation, given on the two aforementioned dates, explained and provided data on the following topics:

- History of M.G.L. Ch. 149 (Design-Bid-Build) and Ch. 149A (CM-R)
- Design-Bid-Build Explained
- CM-R Explained
- The role of the OPM on a Ch. 149A project
- Design-Bid-Build vs. CM-R – Advantages and projects best suited for Ch. 149 or Ch. 149A
- Design-Bid-Build vs. CM-R – Disadvantages and projects best suited for Ch. 149 or Ch. 149A
- Filed Trade Contractor and Subcontractor selection process, similarities and differences based on the construction methodology utilized
- Filed Sub-Bid categories explained
- Key Differences Between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- General Project Risks regardless of delivery used
- How CM-R Can Help Mitigate Project Risk
- Higher Risk Projects Appropriate for CM-R

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

- Other considerations and views
- Contractor pool/selection differences between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- Pre-construction differences between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- Schedule / early release – fast track differences between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- Cost and Accounting differences between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- Change Orders and RFI's differences between Design-Bid-Build and CM-R
- Additional Factors
- Snapshot of Similar Projects in the MSBA pipeline that choose CM-R
- IG CM-R approval timeline

Key factors and differentiators that lead the Committee to overwhelmingly approve proceeding forward with utilizing Ch. 149A (CM-R) [in no particular hierarchy]

- Team-oriented process with the CM involved in design and planning of the project,
- Utilizing CM means and methods knowledge during the design and planning process,
- Ability to vet the design and budgeting of the project before subcontractor/filed trade bidding,
- Ability to hold the CM in an accountable manner based on early involvement,
- Ability to interview and select a specific CM team to work with,
- Consideration of early bid packages to secure scope as early as possible to hedge against continued construction inflation,
- OPM and Designer having vast experience in CM-R processes and protocols on public projects,
- Benefit of involving the CM in the process as early as possible and releasing early scopes of work,
- Ability to work with higher caliber contractors, (we understand this is a subjective comment)
- Ability to have more control of the selection of non-filed trade contractors
- Comfort level from a committee member that is in the construction industry moving forward with the CM-R delivery option as well as comfort level from the OPM and Designer.
- Prior experience with past Ch. 149 projects,

Other points made during the CM-R vs. D-B-B discussion:

- CM-R projects typically costs more; based on a correlation of fees and additional staffing,
- There are risks on ALL projects regardless of the use of CM-R or D-B-B.
- Explanation of CM-R holds, allowances and contingency use,
- Explanation that there are still 18-filed bid scopes of work regardless of use of CM-R or D-B-B,
- Both models (CM-R and Design-Bid-Build) work in the industry.

INSPECTOR GENERAL APPLICATION TIME-LINE

Leftfield will submit, on behalf of the project and project team, the Inspector General (IG) CM-R application before Town Meeting and the Town Meeting/Debt override in May/June 2022. This timeline is depicted in the project schedule attached to this submittal.

Please note that the cost estimates, proposed project schedule, and total project estimates reflect a CM-R construction methodology.

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

3.3.1.2 PROJECT SCHEDULE UPDATE

An updated project schedule is included in the Appendix 3.3.6.2. In summary, the critical milestone dates currently proposed are as follows:

- Massachusetts Historical Commission Project Notification Form: March 16, 2021
- MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Presentation: July 21, 2021 or August 4, 2021
- MSBA Board meeting to authorize Schematic Design: August 25, 2021
- TMSBC vote to submit to the DESE submittal to the MSBA: February 9, 2022
- Project Team submits the DESE submittal to the MSBA: February 23, 2022
- TMSBC vote to submit to the Schematic Design submittal to the MSBA: February 9, 2022
- Project Team submits the Schematic Design submittal to the MSBA: February 23, 2022
- MSBA Project Scope and Budget Agreement meeting: March 23, 2022
- MSBA Board meeting to approve Project Scope and Budget Agreement: April 13, 2022
- Projected Town vote for PS&BA and full funding of the project: May 17, 2022
- Projected Town vote for Debt Exclusion: June 21, 2022
- Project Team submits the Design Development submittal to the MSBA: December 15, 2022
- MSBA Design Development Submittal Review Completed on or about: January 12, 2023
- Project Team submits 60% Construction Documents submittal to the MSBA: May 12, 2023
- MSBA 60% Construction Documents Submittal Review on or about: June 12, 2023
- Project Team submits 90% Construction Documents submittal to the MSBA: August 11, 2023
- MSBA 90% Construction Documents Submittal Review on or about: September 11, 2023
- Anticipated Bid Date/GMP Execution Date on or about: December 12, 2023
- Construction Start on or about: March 6, 2023
- Substantial Completion on or about: February 18, 2025
- Move-in Date on or about: April 28, 2025

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

3.3.1.3 FINAL EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS SUMMARY

The existing Tyngsborough Middle School was built in 1967. The two story, 80,667 gross square foot (gsf) building remains as originally constructed without any additions to create new educational space. As such, the core academic spaces, vocations and technology, media center, dining and food service, medical, administration and guidance, and custodial program areas are below current MSBA guidelines. While accommodations were made over the years, many aspects of the existing building are not accessible or code compliant. While in fair condition, the existing building envelope exhibits signs of distress with compromise water tightness and energy performance that does not meet the requirements of today's energy code. Existing interior finishes are original to the building. Asbestos containing materials and lead base paint have been identified within the building complex. Despite being well maintained, the building systems have notably exceeded their useful lives.

Due to space limitations, equipment, finishes and systems that have exceeded their useful lives, the existing building cannot support today's instructional models including flexible, project-based learning and co-teaching methodologies.

3.3.1.4 FINAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

As previously noted in Section 3.3.1.1, the three (3) options advanced from the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) led to the development of six (6) options for consideration for the preferred solution. In summary, the options include:

- Option A.1.1 Code Upgrade – 50 Norris Road. This option was limited to addressing accessibility and code issues, removal of asbestos containing materials, replacement of major building systems that are beyond their useful life and providing an automatic sprinkler system.
- Option B.1.1.1 Renovation and Addition – 50 Norris Road (Gymnasium Building). This option explored renovating the existing Gymnasium Building and building a new two story addition to support the spaces identified in the Educational Program with a new Central Office.
- Option D.2.1.1 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field). This option proposed new construction of a three-story classroom wing with a two-story administration/common space wing with a new Central Office.
- Option D.2.1.2 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field). This option proposed new construction of two-story classroom wings pinwheeled around a two-story administration/common space wing with a new Central Office.
- Option D.2.1.3 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field). This option proposed new construction of two-story classrooms wings that create an outdoor learning area between the wings north of a two story administration/common space wing with a new Central Office.

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT, JUNE 2021

- Option D.2.1.4 New Construction – 50 Norris Road (Softball Field). This option proposes new construction of an L-shape two story classroom wings adjacent to a two-story administration /common space wing with a new Central Office.

Section 3.3.3 Final Evaluation of Alternatives of this report provides a detailed description of each option.

Subsequent to the issuance of the PDP Initial Space Summary in March 2021, the Space Summary continued to evolve based on discussions with the District regarding updates in the Educational Program to support two (2) teams of four (4) classrooms each per grade while adjusting the Special Education spaces to align with the District’s proposed program that influenced the development of the various design options.

Section 3.3.4 Preferred Solution of this report provides a detailed description of variations between the PDP Initial Space Summary and the PSR Preferred Solution Space Summary.

3.3.1.5 DISTRICT’S PREFERRED SOLUTION SUMMARY

After a careful consideration of the six (6) options for the support of the Educational Program, probable total project and construction cost, construction phasing, construction schedule and need for swing space, the Committee selected Option D.2.1.3 as the Preferred Solution.

Option D.2.1.3 is proposed to occupy the existing softball site on the 50 Norris Road Middle School / High School campus. The proposed building will be approximately 112,400 gross square feet over two stories to serve 480 students in Grades 6 through 8.

Section 3.3.4 Preferred Solution of this report provides a detailed description of this option.

3.3.1.6 COPY OF MSBA PDP REVIEW/DISTRICT RESPONSE

A copy of the MSBA PDP Review Comments annotated with the District’s response is provided on the following pages of this report.

May 13, 2021

Ms. Sarah Przybylowicz
Project Coordinator
Massachusetts School Building Authority
40 Broad Street, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02109

Re: Town of Tyngsborough
Tyngsborough Middle School
Tyngsborough, Massachusetts
Module 3 Feasibility Study Preliminary Design Program Submission Review
Comments
MSBA Project No. 201803010305
JCJ Project No. H20039.00

Dear Ms. Przybylowicz:

In collaboration with Town of Tyngsborough (Town), Tyngsborough Public Schools (TPS) and Leftfield, LLC (OPM), JCJ Architecture (JCJ) offers the following written response to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) review comments of the Module 3 Feasibility Study Preliminary Design Program (PDP) submission for the above referenced project in the letter authored by Mary Pichetti dated May 3, 2021.

ATTACHMENT A MODULE 3 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM REVIEW COMMENTS

District: Town of Tyngsborough
School: Tyngsborough Middle School
Owner's Project Manager: Leftfield, LLC
Designer Firm: JCJ Architecture
Submittal Due Date: May 12, 2021
Submittal Received Date: March 31, 2021
Review Date: March 31, 2021 – April 30, 2021
Reviewed by: S. Fallon, M. Esdale, C. Forde, C. Alles, J. Jumpe

¹The 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.

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.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

4) *The information provided in this submittal indicates that the estimated total project cost for this project could range from \$75-\$88 million, which exceeds the low and high range initially indicated by the District in the OPM and Designer Request for Services (“RFS”). For reference the OPM RFS indicated an estimated total project cost range of \$40-\$60 million, and the Designer RFS indicated an estimated construction cost range of \$55-\$65 million. In response to these review comments, describe this variation and provide information that indicates that the District has discussed and acknowledged the increase in estimated costs. Also, please indicate how the District and design team intend to maintain the District’s project budget through schematic design.*

Response: The OPM RFS indicated an estimated total project cost range of \$40-60 million. This estimate range was developed based on limited client marketplace knowledge known at the time in establishing this range for the purpose of the OPM RFS. In the MSBA marketplace, we typically see many total project values listed in OPM RFS documents that are lower than what the estimated total project value materializes once the OPM and Designer are engaged and work with the client to develop a more accurate estimate based on an educational vision, education plan, space summary and possible solutions. Regarding disclosure of what the anticipated total project value may be to the District, Leftfield, during our interview on June 3, 2020, slide 20, showed an estimated total project range of \$77-\$81 million to the District. This value was based on historical data, assumed square footage and other professional assumptions. Once Leftfield was officially engaged by the District, we assisted and developed the estimated range of construction costs to be listed in the Designer RFS. [please note that the OPM RFS states a range of total project cost, while the Designer RFS states an estimated range of construction cost] The Designer RFS listed a construction cost range of \$55-\$65 million. Appendix 3.1.8.12 of the PDP, Comparable Cost Analysis – Detail [page 475 of the PDF file] shows a construction cost range of \$46.7-\$64.8 million, which is fairly close to what was listed in the Designer RFS. This same chart shows total project costs ranging from \$66-\$84 million. However, the options designated to be further studied have a range of total project costs of \$76-\$72 million, which is under our estimated total project range Leftfield showed in our June 3, 2020, interview for the project. The District has been fully informed of the estimated construction and total project costs from early on and “costs” are a routine discussion with the project team and the committee. The target budget listed in the PDP is \$75-\$88 million. Conceptual construction [hard costs] estimates were developed and a robust conceptual estimate of all soft costs were developed for each option studied. While the estimated square footage may change from PDP to PSR, as a result of the continued development of the space summary, the project team is confident that we can manage the project to maintain the District’s target project budget range through schematic design.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Class Size Policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Curriculum Delivery Methods and Practices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Student Guidance and Support Services	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Kindergarten	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Lunch Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	b) Chapter 74 Programming	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Security and Visual Access Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

In response to these review comments address the comments below. As part of the District’s Preferred Schematic Report (“PSR”) include two copies of the updated Educational Program, one (1) redlined copy and one (1) clean copy. The updated Educational Program must address the comments below, include District updates, provide a Designer response for each component of the educational program, and align with the District’s Preferred Schematic.

Response: As requested, the District’s Preferred Schematic Report will include the two copies of the updated Educational Program as delineated above as well as addressing the comments contained herein along with a Designer response for each component of the educational program aligned with the District’s Preferred Schematic.

4d) In response to these review comments, please clarify whether students are permitted to take a higher tier mathematics program than the District’s criteria indicates. If so, describe how a student may opt into the higher-level program. If not, please describe.

Response: In the event that a student or their parent/guardian disagrees with the mathematics placement for the upcoming year (7th or 8th grade), They may meet with the principal to review the criteria and student data that led to the decision. If the parent/guardian still believes that the student was not placed in the correct level, they can complete a placement waiver form to have the child placed in the requested level. Additionally, in the event that a student demonstrates advanced knowledge and skills beyond the highest level offered at their grade, the student may be permitted to (1) take a higher level math class in the grade level above (in the MS or at the HS), or (2) take an accelerated class through one of our virtual partners such as Virtual High School or Edgenuity.

4e) *The information provided indicates that, science is scheduled for 50-minute periods, except for every other day in 6th and 7th grade. If students are fully engaged in investigative laboratory work, including obtaining supplies and equipment, and stowing gear and cleaning up, please confirm this is adequate in a robust investigative program. Additionally, chemical supplies should be separate and inaccessible to students. Only chemicals needed for the specific activity should be out in the regular classroom area. Please acknowledge.*

Response: To clarify, science is offered every day for 50-minutes in all three grades. Due to our teaming model, each grade level has large blocks of core academic time that are made up of the individual 50-minute blocks. As a result, grade level teams may use this time flexibly for a variety of purposes. For example, if the science teacher needs an extended block to provide students with a robust lab/investigative assignment/project, the team may flex their time to accommodate the science need.

As noted in the Initial Space Summary, one (1) 150 nsf Central Chemical Storage Room is proposed to keep chemical supplies separate and inaccessible to students.

4g) *In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that clarifies whether the Spanish program is on a rotating schedule within the 65-minute science program.*

Response: At this time, all class periods at TMS are between 50-55 minutes in length. The Spanish program is scheduled for all three grades during the Unified Arts block. In recognition of the importance of providing our students with a strong foundation in Spanish, students have this class every other day for the entire year as opposed to a one or two trimester offering.

9) *In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:*

- *Consider smart projectors that can be focused on multiple surfaces around various locations within rooms, rather than interactive white boards that are fixed in place and permanently occupy a large single wall space.*

Response: The District will consider the inclusion of smart projectors that can be focused on multiple surfaces in the Preferred Schematic Report.

- *Consider providing blackout shades in some educational spaces for activities that may require a fully-darkened area.*

Response: The District will consider the inclusion of blackout shades in the Preferred Schematic Report.

- *The MSBA suggests the District consider providing assisted listening technology in each classroom, as well as general use throughout educational spaces within the proposed project for hearing impaired accessibility. Please acknowledge.*

Response: The District will consider the inclusion of assisted listening technology in each classroom in the Preferred Schematic Report.

- *Please describe whether or not there is a policy in place that insures that every student has access to web/internet services at home.*

Response: The District does not have a formal policy regarding internet access for students at home. The District recognizes the importance of students having internet access beyond the school day. The District is also aware that not all families have equal access to technology or the internet. As such, a variety of strategies are implemented to support our students beyond the school day such as:

- *The technology team works with individual families to help them understand their options in regard to obtaining internet access through various vendors or plans that they may not be aware of.*
- *Students are permitted to come to school early or stay late after school to use District tools or access in order to complete school assignments that are technology based.*
- *The District has shifted to a 1:1 Chromebook program which allows each student K-8 to have their own District assigned & owned device. The District plans to expand this program to include grades 9-12 over the next 1-2 school years.*
- *All outside of school learning activities are designed with a non-tech option in the event that there are unsolvable access issues for families.*

11) Please ensure that all toxic/hazardous chemicals (e.g., glazes, epoxies, acids) are safely secured (including appropriate ventilation) in spaces accessible only to appropriately-trained instructors and that all appropriate SDS (safety data sheets) are appropriately available. (This also includes provisions for science-chemicals). Please acknowledge.

Response: As noted in the Initial Space Summary, one (1) 150 nsf Central Chemical Storage Room is proposed to keep chemical supplies separate and inaccessible to students. The District acknowledges this space will be accessible only to appropriately trained instructors and that all appropriate SDS will be available.

12) For programming and planning purposes, further describe how provisions for performing arts spaces, such as sufficient square footage, room configuration, and utilities will be incorporated into the proposed design. For example, a dance program might require a spring floor, a piano or composition course may require space and utilities to support electronic keyboards for each student. Some instrument programs may require a lot of secure storage with controlled heat and humidity.

Response: As stated in the Educational Program, TMS would like to expand its performing arts programs to include vocal music as well as electives such as guitar/piano, music appreciation, and digital music classes that are relevant and engaging in an effort to provide students with diverse offerings that could provide choice and potentially, multiple areas of study. The project design should provide appropriate instructional and performance space that meets the specific needs of this type of programming while also being adaptable within the framework

of performing arts. For example, the proposed Flexible Performance Space may be designed as a double height space with a level floor to accommodate a variety of stage and seating configurations with the appropriate amount of storage required to support this space. In addition, the space may be equipped with a suspended, overhead pipe grid system to support flexible theatrical lighting and sound equipment as well as a designated teaching wall equipped with overhead projection with an appropriate level of acoustic treatment. The actual interior finishes for all of the performing art spaces will be determined during the Schematic Design phase.

13) In response to these review comments, please verify whether the proposed 50-minute periods for Wellness is adequate. Additionally, please provide a rationale for providing, or not providing, provisions for student showers for hygiene purposes resulting for physical education activities.

Response: At this time, all class periods at TMS are between 50-55 minutes in length. The Wellness program (Health & PE) is scheduled for all three grades during the Unified Arts block. In recognition of the importance of providing our students with a strong foundation in Wellness, students have this class every other day for the entire year as opposed to a one or two trimester offering. This scheduling model provides students with a yearlong model that promotes the importance of a year-round, lifelong focus on physical and mental health and fitness. Additionally, an important component of this program is focused on hygiene and taking care of one's body. As such, the inclusion of locker rooms with student showers is important. Students are encouraged or required (depending on individualized needs) to change for PE and may or may not want or need to wash up after physical activity. Additionally, TMS students participate in a robust MIAA middle school athletic program and will benefit from having appropriately designed locker room space that includes full functioning bathroom facilities that include showers.

14) In response to these review comments, provide the following information regarding the District's Special Education Programs:

- Describe the types of substantially separate programs the District offers. Also, describe if those programs vary by grade and how many students receive services in those settings.*

Response: Currently, the District offers substantially separate programming (BRIDGES program) for students with intellectual disabilities. Students within this program receive functional academics and life skills services. Students within this program often participate in Unified Arts classes and some academic programs (i.e. science/social studies) with their typical peers. Students within this program range from grade 6 through grade 8 and there are currently 5 students within the program. In the past, this program has served upwards of 8 students. Often, related services providers (SP, OT, PT, BCBA) will provide individual and small group services within the BRIDGES program as well as in their specific workspaces.

- *Provide additional information that further describes the District's inclusion model and indicate how many students are served, how often are the students going to small-group spaces and related services, etc.*

Response: The middle school utilizes a full inclusion/co-taught learning model that supports approximately 75 students in grades 6 through 8 who receive the majority of their services within the general classroom setting as well as in a variety of small group and individual settings. Small group spaces will be utilized with high frequency as students are transitioning between settings to receive supports and services during all periods of the school day. Small group spaces should be able to accommodate upwards of 10 students. In regard to small group spaces, related services providers all run small groups (upwards of 5 students) and should be able to have space to facilitate these sessions. Related service space (specifically OT/PT) should be able to accommodate large equipment that may be required as our student population and needs evolve.

- *Describe the District's current and proposed adaptive P/E spaces for students with disabilities.*

Response: Currently, there are no students requiring adaptive P/E services through their IEP. However, in the past and potentially in the future students have or will receive specialized physical education that utilizes a motor group model in collaboration with related services providers and physical education teachers. Current space utilized for P/E is within the gym or PT spaces. We are anticipating a student transitioning to TPS who will require adaptive P/E in the near future and will continue to plan accordingly to meet the needs of students who require these specialized types of programs.

17) *The information provided on page 21 of the educational program provides neighborhood diagrams. Please note it is also important to consider proximity, adjacency, and accessibility of these academic and unified arts neighborhoods to large spaces such as the cafeteria, gymnasium, and media center. Consideration should be given to access by mobility and other physically impaired occupants and visitors, as well as providing the ability to move large equipment (e.g., PE equipment, musical instruments, stage sets, risers) from storage, creation, or rehearsal spaces, to performance/display spaces.*

Response: As requested, the District's Preferred Schematic Report will provide neighborhood diagrams that address the adjacency, accessibility and equipment movements noted above.

18) *In response to these review comments, please confirm that first responding emergency representatives will be consulted in the planning process and associated requirements will be incorporated into the Preferred Schematic. Additionally, please further describe the provisions for securing items such as expensive equipment, hazardous materials, balances and scales, musical instruments, chemicals, etc.*

Response: The District's Preliminary Design Program provided meeting minutes from the First Responders / Site Security Meetings in Appendix 3.1.8.11. The Town's first responders will remain engaged in the development of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR). The PSR will describe the provisions for securing the items noted above.

Additional Comments:

- *Please indicate if the District has considered schedules with longer individual instructional periods that meet only four-times per week but for longer sessions. This could enhance the ability of teachers to provide students with longer periods of think-time as they consider, observe, and analyze complex investigations and activities as well as take greater responsibility for finding and caring for materials and resources for their own work.*

Response: Over the past five years, the TMS staff has explored and implemented a variety of scheduling models based on middle school best practices and research. Recent modifications have included the addition of as What I Need (WIN) Block, advisory program, the addition of computer science in the unified arts rotation, and flexible academic team time. Due to our teaming model, each grade level has large blocks of core academic time that are made up of the individual 50-55-minute blocks. As a result, grade level teams may use this time flexibly for a variety of purposes. For example, if the science teacher needs an extended block to provide students with a robust lab/investigative assignment/project, the team may flex their time to engagement accommodate the science need.

- *Similar to getting more thoughtful answers and greater participation of students by "wait-times" that exceed three seconds, longer instructional periods may deepen the engagement of middle-school students enabling them to draw more complex conclusions of their own rather than simply accomplishing an assigned task. Another way of achieving this may be to allow team members to revise the schedules among themselves as they devise project-based and multi-disciplinary instruction and as their students gain experience with investigating and analyzing their own work.*

Response: In addition to the above response, it is important to note that the flexible academic time can be used to implement a variety of collaborative, inter-disciplinary, project-based learning experiences.

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 a preliminary review of the new construction space summary for 480 students in grades 6-8 and offers the following:

- ***Core Academic*** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,140 net square feet ("nsf"). Based on the information provided, the following spaces have been proposed for the District to deliver its educational program:*

<i>Anticipated Core Academic Spaces</i>	<i>Grades 6-8 for 480 students</i>		
	<i>Proposed No. Rooms</i>	<i>MSBA Guidelines No. Rooms</i>	<i>Variance</i>
<i>General Classrooms</i>	17	19	-2
<i>Small Group Seminar (20-30 seats) / Resource</i>	1	1	0
<i>STE Room – Grade 6</i>	2	-	+2
<i>STE Storage</i>	2	-	+2
<i>Science Classroom / Lab – Grades 7-8</i>	4	3	+1
<i>Prep Room</i>	4	3	+1
<i>Central Chemical Storage Room</i>	1	1	0

The District is proposing the following spaces:

- **General Classrooms** – *The District is proposing (17) 950 nsf General Classrooms, totaling 16,150 nsf which is (2) classrooms, totaling 1,900 nsf below the MSBA guidelines.*

Response: No response required.

- **Small Group Seminar (20-30 seats) / Resource** – *The District is proposing (1) 500 nsf Small Group Seminar space, which aligns with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*

Response: No response required.

- **Science/Technology/Engineering (“STE”) Room – Grade 6** – *The District is proposing (2) 1,080 nsf STE Rooms, for grade 6 totaling 2,160 nsf. The information provided states: “to accommodate the District’s Spanish curriculum as noted in the Educational Program.” In response to these review comments, provide additional information that clarifies/describes the intent for providing Spanish curriculum in rooms designed to support STE curriculum.*

Response: The notation should have read “to accommodate the District’s STE curriculum as noted in the Educational Program.” The Spanish curriculum is independent of the STE curriculum.

- **STE Storage** – *The District is proposing (2) 120 nsf STE Storage areas totaling 240 nsf. The information provided states: “to accommodate the District’s Keyboarding program.” In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that clarifies/describes the intent for providing the Keyboarding program in the STE Storage area. Additionally, describe how the proposed Keyboarding Program will be scheduled, staffed, and provide examples of activities that will occur within those spaces.*

Response: The notation should have read “to accommodate the District’s STE curriculum as noted in the Educational Program.” The District’s Keyboarding program is scheduled and staffed in the Art & Music curriculum.

- **Science Classroom/Lab Grades 7-8** – *The District is proposing (4) 1,440 nsf Science Classrooms for grades 7 and 8, totaling 5,760 nsf. In response to these review comments, please describe how the proposed Science Classroom/Labs will be scheduled, staffed, and examples of activities that will occur within those spaces.*

Response: Students participate in a comprehensive science program in grades 6-8 that is designed in a spiraled manner so that students are engaged in developmentally appropriate learning activities that are aligned with the Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework. As such students in grades 7 and 8 apply their developing skills and knowledge in a hands-on, inquiry-based lab environment in an effort to gain an appreciation and understanding of the world around them. It is important to note that as students move into the seventh and eighth grade, they are engaged in more advanced, authentic learning activities which require a larger space and more sophisticated equipment.

Examples of 8th grade labs:

- *Berry Full of DNA Lab - students extract DNA from strawberries using DNA extraction buffer and a solution of ethanol. A centrifuge can also be used to separate the DNA from the solution.*
- *Onion cell lab - students create wet mount slides of onion root tips to view under a microscope to identify the stages of mitosis.*
- *Chemistry Labs - students learn about the collisions of molecules through different labs such as measuring the temperature of a beaker of water heated on a hot plate over time, combining different substances to determine if a physical*

change or chemical reaction occurs, and combining different volumes of different temperatures of water to measure equilibrium temperature.

Examples of 7th grade labs:

- *Density Lab - students will use triple beam balances and electronic balances to measure the mass of several objects. Students will then measure the volume of the objects using either water displacement or length times width times height. They will then use these values to calculate the density of the objects.*
- *Physics Lab - students will design and create scale models of amusement park rides to measure the forces and energy required to make the rides run safely. The scale model rides will then be tested with a marble run.*

- **Prep Room** – *The District is proposing (4) 200 nsf Prep Rooms, totaling 800 nsf associated with the (4) Science Classrooms for grades 7 and 8. No further preliminary comments.*

Response: No response required.

- **Central Chemical Storage Room** – *The District is proposing (1) 150 nsf Central Chemical Storage Room, which aligns with the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.*

Response: No response required.

- **Special Education** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,980 nsf. Please note that the Special Education program is subject to approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (“DESE”). The District should provide the required information required with the Schematic Design submittal. 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.*

Response: The District respectfully requests if additional information is required for this section. The project team and District understands that the Special Education component of the space summary, square footage, and layout/adjacencies within the overall preferred solution/design is subject to DESE approval prior to the execution of a PFA with the MSBA. It is the Designer and OPM’s understanding that a separate Special Education/DESE submittal will be issued in parallel to the Schematic Design submittal. That said, we are confused on how the project will attain DESE approval prior to the submittal of the schematic design submission. It is the Designer and OPM’s understanding that the DESE will review the

Special Education/DESE submittal when it is submitted as part of the schematic design submittal and DESE will typically provide feedback, clarifications, and approval prior to the MSBA Board of Director's vote and or execution of the PFA. Please advise if the District is required to provide additional Special Education clarification now as part of the PSR submittal.

- **Art & Music / Vocations & Technology** – The overall combined proposed square footage for these categories exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,460 nsf. This overage is associated with the inclusion of one (1) 2,000 nsf Flexible Performance Space; and (1) 950 nsf Tech Shop for Computer Science and (1) 950 nsf Tech Shop for Media Arts, totaling 1,900 nsf in place of a (1) 1,440 nsf Technology / Engineering Room. The MSBA does not object to this space being included in the proposed project but encourages the District to seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. Note that the MSBA will consider square footage in excess of the guidelines ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District will seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. The District acknowledges that square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Health & Physical Education** – The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 1,600 nsf. The information provided indicates an increased Gymnasium nsf “to accommodate bleacher seating for 250 people”. The MSBA does not object to this space being included in the proposed project, however, note that the MSBA will consider square footage in excess of the guidelines ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District will seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. The District acknowledges that square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

Additionally, please refer to the attached memo regarding the MSBA's policy on physical education square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines. Note the District may choose to build a gymnasium and related spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines, but in no event shall the gymnasium exceed 12,000 nsf. The MSBA will participate in a gymnasium of up to 6,000 nsf unless adjusted by the MSBA to increase teaching stations for enrollment and/or the educational plan. Additionally, areas in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be at the sole expense of the district; and the MSBA will exclude from its grant the cost of the total gross square foot (“gsf”) in excess of the guidelines for these areas.

Response: The District acknowledges receiving MSBA's memo regarding the policy on physical education square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines.

- **Media Center** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category is below the MSBA guidelines by 690 nsf. The information provided indicates space has been redistributed “to accommodate Neighborhood Libraries as noted in the Educational Program.” In response to these review comments, provide additional information that describes the scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of these spaces.*

Response: Grade level neighborhood libraries will allow teachers to provide students with content specific and appropriate reading level resources in a shared, collaborative setting. Grade level teachers will utilize this space in a variety of ways such as: book groups, research projects, small group learning activities, and interdisciplinary activities. Students will be provided access to these libraries in a structured manner during class times and in a less structured manner before and after school, and during WIN block or lunch. While these libraries will not have a dedicated staff member assigned to them, they will be centrally located in each grade level neighborhood and supervised by middle school staff when being used by students.

- **Dining & Food Service** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category is below the MSBA guidelines by 400 nsf. The information provided indicates space has been decreased to “accommodate space needs for three (3) lunch seating.” In response to these review comments, verify the proposed square footage for the cafeteria/dining area is sufficient to meet the District’s needs and note the MSBA guidelines are based on two lunch seatings for middle school populations to allow for fluctuations in enrollment. Additionally, please describe how fluctuations in enrollment could be accommodated.*

Response: As the building is being designed to accommodate 480 students (160 per grade) the middle school administrative team intends to continue the current practice of running 3 grade level lunch periods per day. This model is aligned with our current grade level team model and will provide students with the opportunity to continue to benefit from this team concept during their lunch period. This three-lunch model provides a more manageable setting in regard to lunch service, supervision, and student socialization.

- **Medical** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 60 nsf. This overage is associated with the inclusion of one (1) additional 60 nsf Medical Suite Toilet. The MSBA encourages the District to seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. Note that the MSBA will consider square footage in excess of the guidelines ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

Response: The District will seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. The District acknowledges that square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Administration & Guidance** – The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 410 nsf. This overage is associated with the inclusion of (1) additional 350 nsf Conference Room and (1) 60 nsf Mother’s Room. The MSBA encourages the District to seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. This could be achieved by incorporating certain square footage into the non-programmed section of the space summary. Note that the MSBA will consider square footage in excess of the guidelines ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District will seek efficiencies in the proposed layout to reduce the overall net square footage. The District acknowledges that square footage in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Custodial & Maintenance** – The overall proposed square footage for this category meets MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.

Response: No response required.

- **Other** – The overall proposed square footage of 3,900 nsf for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines. This is due to the square footage associated with the inclusion of (1) 2,900 nsf Central Offices space and (1) 1,000 nsf District IT Staff Space. Please note that the MSBA will consider square footage associated with the Central Offices and District IT Staff space ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District acknowledges that square footage associated with the Central Offices and District IT Staff space will be ineligible for MSBA reimbursement.

Please 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.

Response: The District acknowledges the preferred solution may be required to adjust spaces/square footage that exceed the MSBA guideline that do not support the Educational Program.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.4 EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

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	Confirmation of legal title to the property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Determination that the property is available for development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Determination of any development restrictions that may apply.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
7	Preliminary evaluation of significant structural, environmental, geotechnical, or other physical conditions that may impact the cost and evaluations of alternatives.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Determination for need and schedule for soils exploration and geotechnical evaluation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

3) The information provided indicates a Project Notification Form (“PNF”) was submitted to the Massachusetts Historical Commission (“MHC”) on February 12, 2021, and MHC approval was obtained on March 16, 2021. No further action required.

Response: No response required.

9) *The information provided indicates that a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (“ESA”) for the existing Tyngsborough Middle School site (located at 50 Norris Road) was not performed due to the presence of snow cover and notes a future site reconnaissance date. In response to these review comments, please provide the schedule associated with completing the Phase I ESA. Additionally, note that costs associated with the removal of fuel storage tanks and associated contaminated soil is considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

Response: The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the referenced property prepared by PEER Consultants, PC was issued on May 5, 2021. A copy of the ESA report is attached.

The District acknowledges that costs associated with the removal of fuel storage tanks and associated contaminated soil are considered ineligible for reimbursement.

10) *It should be noted that all costs associated with the removal of asbestos containing floor and ceiling materials are ineligible for MSBA reimbursement. Additionally, the project team should be aware of the current policies associated with MSBA’s participation in the abatement and removal of hazardous materials. Please note that work associated with the removal of associated contaminated soil and materials are considered ineligible for reimbursement.*

Response: The District acknowledges that costs associated for the removal of asbestos containing floor and ceiling materials are 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
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) *As part of the District’s PSR, provide a site section that illustrates how the Preferred Schematic sits on the site and how the proposed location impacts access and circulation. Please acknowledge.*

Response: A site section illustrating how the Preferred Schematic Design is integrated into the site will be provided with the District’s Preferred Schematic Report (PSR).

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Renovation(s) and/or addition(s) of varying degrees to the existing building(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Construction of new building and the evaluation of potential locations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

7) As part of the Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives, the District explored the following (7) options for grades 6-8 with an enrollment of 480 students. The (3) options denoted with an asterisk () are the options that the District intends to further evaluate as part of its PSR:*

- **Option A*:** Code Upgrade at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School; with an estimated project cost \$66.0 million.
- **Option B:** Addition/Renovation at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School; with an estimated project cost \$84.2 million.
- **Option B.1*:** Addition/Renovation at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School; with an estimated project cost \$75.8 million.
- **Option C:** New Construction at the existing Tyngsborough Elementary School site (located at 205 Westford Road); with an estimated project cost \$75.3 million.

- **Option D:** *New Construction at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School and Tyngsborough High School campus (located at 50 Norris Road, on the site of the existing baseball field north of the proposed high school); with an estimated project cost \$73.5 million.*
- **Option D.1:** *New Construction at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School and Tyngsborough High School campus (located at 50 Norris Road, on the site of the existing parking lots located west of the existing middle school); with an estimated project cost \$71.3 million.*
- **Option D.2*:** *New Construction at the existing Tyngsborough Middle School and Tyngsborough High School campus (located at 50 Norris Road, on the site of the existing softball field located north of the existing middle school and east of the existing high school); with an estimated project cost \$72.2 million.*

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	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification: (original)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

No review comments for this section.

Response: No response required.

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.

Response: No response required.

Additional Comments:

The MSBA issues project advisories from time to time, as informational updates for Districts, Owner's Project Managers ("OPM"), and Designers in an effort to facilitate the efficient and effective administration of proposed projects currently pending review by the MSBA. The advisories can be found on the MSBA's website. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the District's consultants have reviewed all project advisories and they have been incorporated into the proposed project as applicable.

Response: The District's OPM and Designer acknowledge having reviewed all of the project advisories located on MSBA's website and to the best of our knowledge and belief have incorporated the applicable advisories into the proposed project.

Regarding Past Projects:

MSBA records do not indicate previous grants associated with the Tyngsborough Middle School.

End of response.

Please contact our office with any questions.

Very truly yours,



Douglas K. Roberts, AIA, LEED AP, MCPPO
Principal / Managing Director

C: Legislative Delegation

David R. Robson, Chair, Tyngsborough Board of Selectmen
Matthew Hanson, Tyngsborough Town Administrator
Ryan McMahon, Chair, Tyngsborough School Committee
Ms. Hillari I. Wennerstrom, Co-Chair, Tyngsborough School Building Committee
Dr. Michael Flanagan, Superintendent, Tyngsborough Public Schools
David Saindon, Owner's Project Manager, Leftfield, LLC
James E. LaPosta, Jr., FAIA, LEED AP, MCPPO, Designer, JCJ Architecture, PC
Lauren B. Braren, AIA, LEED AP, Designer, JCJ Architecture, PC
File H20039.00 / 25

(PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK)