

June 18, 2018

Fernando Garcia
Project Manager
Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)
40 Broad Street, Fifth Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Re: W. Edward Balmer Elementary School

Northbridge, Massachusetts

*District's Response to the Schematic Design Review
Comments of June 4, 2018*

SMMA No. 17020

Dear Fernando:

Please find the District's Response to the MSBA's Schematic Design Review Comments of June 4, 2018.

Very truly yours,

SMMA



Joel G. Seeley
Principal

cc: Joseph Strazzulla, Melissa Walker (MF)

enclosures: District's Response to the Schematic Design Review Comments of June 4, 2018

W. EDWARD BALMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY – SCHEMATIC DESIGN

TOWN OF NORTHBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY



SCHEMATIC DESIGN SUBMISSION

RESPONSE TO MSBA COMMENTS

JUNE 14, 2018



DORE & WHITTIER
ARCHITECTS, INC.

260 Merrimac St. Bldg. 7, 2nd Floor
Newburyport, Massachusetts 01950

Phone: 978-499-2999

212 Battery Street
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Phone: 802.863.1428
www.doreandwhittier.com



Project Management

1000 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Phone: 617.547.5400
www.smma.com

ATTACHMENT A

MODULE 4 – SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMENTS

District: Town of Northbridge

School: W. Edward Balmer Elementary School

Owner's Project Manager: SMMA Project Management

Designer Firm: Dore & Whittier Architects

Submittal Due Date: May 9, 2018

Submittal Received Date: May 8, 2018

Review Date: May 10-30, 2018

Reviewed by: Gienapp Design, F. Garcia, C. Alles, J. Jumpe

MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments¹ on the Schematic Design submittal are issued pursuant to a review of the project submittal document for the new construction of the proposed project and presented as a Schematic Design submission in accordance with the MSBA Module 4 Guidelines.

4.1 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SUBMITTAL

Overview of the Schematic Design 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>
Schematic Design Submittal Notification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OPM Certification of Completeness and Conformity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.1 DESE Submittal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.2 Schematic Design Binder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.3 Schematic Design Project Manual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.1.4 Schematic Design Drawings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note that Module Four states that "MSBA will not accept incomplete submittals, submittals that have not been reviewed by the OPM or submittals for which the estimated project costs exceed the District's project budget. Updates to the Total Project Budget that do not reflect the scope and schedule represented in the Schematic Design submittal will not be accepted. All value engineering activities must be complete, and the results incorporated into the Schematic Design documentation prior to being submitted to the MSBA."

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

4.1.1 DESE SUBMISSION

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	Cover Letter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Special Education Delivery Methodology Letter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Signed Educational Space Summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Floor Plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Special Education Adjacency Table	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

Please note the Special Education information has been forwarded to DESE for review and approval.

No further review comments for this section.

4.1.2 SCHEMATIC DESIGN BINDER

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	Introduction				
	a) Summary of the MSBA approved Preferred Schematic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Community outreach overview	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) The District's Total Project Budget for the proposed project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Updated description of the project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Site Plan, Floor Plans, and Elevations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) A copy of the MSBA Preferred Schematic Report review and corresponding District response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Final Design Program				
	a) General and specific architectural characteristics desired	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Educational space summary spreadsheets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Narrative of how the proposed educational space summary supports the educational program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Instructional technology (existing and proposed)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Functional relationships and critical adjacencies that informed the basis of design	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Security and visual access requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Site development requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
	h) Description of desired features of the school	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Traffic Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Environmental and Existing Building Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Code Analysis and List of Permitting and other Regulatory Filing Requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Utility Analysis and Soils Analysis for on-site septic/sewage treatment facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Massing Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Narrative Building Systems Descriptions				
	a) Sustainable design elements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Building structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Plumbing and HVAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Fire Protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Verify adequate water capacity for new system	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Confirm if a fire pump will be required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Electrical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Information Technology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Sustainable Building Design Guideline Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Analysis of the design's compliance with ADA and the MAAB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Timeline associated with filing the Project Notification Form with Massachusetts Historical Commission ("MHC") and obtaining MHC approval prior to construction bids.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Room Data Sheets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Proposed construction methodology (DBB / CMR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	District's anticipated reimbursement rate w/ incentive points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Total Project Budget spreadsheet and summary of cost reconciliation of the Designer's and OPM's estimates.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Designer's Construction Cost Estimate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Independent OPM Construction Cost Estimate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	Updated Project Work Plan – indicating changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	a) Project Directory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Roles and Responsibilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Communications and Document Control Procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Designer's Work Plan Project Schedule	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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
20	Local Actions and Approvals Certification				
	a) Completed and signed certification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) SBC meeting dates, agendas, and attendees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Certified SBC meeting notes with vote language and vote results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Description of materials presented at such SBC meetings and where those materials may be viewed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

2b) Please refer to 'Attachment B' for detailed review comments.

Response: Please refer to Attachment B for responses to comments.

2f) The submittal indicates there is vehicular access to the perimeter of the building and multiple locations for safety or fire responders to access the building. However, it is not clear if emergency signage, knox boxes, or other emergency provisions have been incorporated into the scope. Please provide the additional clarification as part of the District's response to these review comments.

Response: In initial discussions with the Northbridge Fire Chief, he indicated he would like to include Knox Boxes at the main entrance on the south (front) of the building, and at a central entrance on the north (rear) elevation of the building, to be determined. Provisionally we have located the second Knox Box at the entrance closest to the Maker Space on the north elevation of the building. The Knox Boxes and all emergency signage, such as stairwell egress signage, exterior door numbering lettering, etc., as well as emergency equipment such as fire extinguishers and an AED device are in the project scope and budget. A complete accessible building and room signage package is also included.

5) The submittal indicates the Geo-Environmental Consultant recommends further follow-up testing to be performed in the soils surrounding the existing underground storage tank as a precaution for presence of fuel oil contaminants. Additionally, the submittal states based on the results of the geotechnical analysis; there were no observations of any adverse conditions. Please note, as stated during the Preliminary Design Program submittal, all costs associated with abatement of contaminated soil from any source, and abatement and removal of fuel storage tanks must be itemized in the cost estimates and will be considered ineligible for MSBA reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged. As we stated in the Project Scope and Budget Meeting, soil contamination is not expected, based upon a clean record of annual underground oil tank pressure testing, an absence of adverse field findings or indications, and an absence of a discrepancy between amount of oil used and output of the boiler at the time the oil was still used. The fuel used in the boilers is now natural gas, and the oil is only a backup fuel (dual fuel burner present). More testing is anticipated at later stages of the project, once funding is secured through construction.

13) The room data sheets do not appear to include security features or acoustic requirements. In the District's response to these review comments, please provide updated room data sheets that include security features, acoustic requirements or a descriptive narrative stating no features will be proposed.

Response:

ACOUSTICAL REQUIREMENTS:

Acoustical requirements were listed on the Room Data Sheets and were not missing. The typical listing was "Meets or exceeds LEED [V4] prerequisite for acoustic performance." This statement specifically incorporates by reference a broad range of minimum standards for:

- *Limitation on Allowable HVAC Background noise*
- *Limitation on Allowable Exterior Noise – both from the exterior as well as from other adjoining spaces in the building*
- *Reverberation time—acoustical performance within the room and minimum performance of components of the room related to sound and noise control*

Room data sheets noted that where required, rooms (typically teaching spaces) will have electronic speech reinforcement/ sound field technology incorporated and available for teacher and student use.

Room data sheets note that "noisy rooms" such as Music classrooms and practice rooms are listed with a "sound-resistant hardware package."

SECURITY FEATURES:

These features were listed on the Room Data Sheets within table entries for other room features; for example:

- *All classrooms with glazed sidelights on doors or large-format folding glass partitions are provided with horizontal mini-blinds to block vision when needed.*
- *Typically educational spaces occupied by students are equipped with room-darkening shades, which also function as blinds to the outside to conceal views into the room.*
- *Door hardware is a key security feature, and the standard specification for the listed "classroom hardware set" and "office hardware set" includes a lockset with a deadbolt—key-operated on the corridor side, thumb-turn with the "locked" position clearly labeled on the occupied side.*
- *Communicating doors between classrooms were listed, and are a security feature that allows a second means of escape if needed.*
- *Storage-function rooms are typically listed with a "passage hardware set". The District has not yet had a conversation about the ability to lock these doors in the event of emergency, and must balance this with day-to-day needs of the room. This will occur early in DD in the Hardware meeting, which will include a range of stakeholders interested in this important issue.*
- *The General Office has listed under Orientation and Views, "Interior views to main entry vestibule, main corridor, and lobby; Exterior views to bus & parent drop-off, parking areas and beyond." The location of this space was carefully selected to provide a main control point for interior and exterior security. Its commanding view location works directly in concert with the "sally port" design of the main entry vestibule, the AI phones and cameras, the electronic door locking mechanisms in both the vestibule and the door from the office into the corridor system, and the duress call button in the Office*

listed elsewhere in the specifications. The General Office personnel have a clear view of the approaches to the entrance, and can observe suspect behavior in the front of the building and the main entry vestibule doors. The office will have strict visitor management practices with sign-in book and required badge credentials for visitors.

Cafetorium: There has been some discussion during design meetings on the openness of the cafetorium and its visibility from the main entrance. The security plan in a lockdown situation is for all occupants of the cafetorium to move next door to the gymnasium, which is nearly opaque at ground level and constructed with walls of reinforced CMU. There are two means to egress from one space directly into the other, and if evacuation was ordered, there are two means of egress from the gym to the outdoors that would not require re-entering the cafeteria space.

Media Center: Likewise, there has been discussion on the openness and transparency of the Media Center and its visibility from common spaces. The security plan in a lockdown situation is for all occupants to move into the Green Screen and Audio rooms, which are directly en-suite within the Media Center, nearly opaque, and at a combined 321 NSF are large enough to hold the expected number of 48-50 occupants (approx. 6 SF per person) during an emergency.

No further review comments for this section.

4.1.3 SCHEMATIC DESIGN PROJECT MANUAL

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	Outline specifications in Unifomat Divisions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Itemization of all proprietary items (if any) with an explanation of each, explanation of the public interest for each item, and certification of local authorization that each item complies with state and local regulations, policies and guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

2) Please clarify if the District intends to propose proprietary items and provide the information listed above regarding proprietary items. If no propriety items are anticipated, please acknowledge accordingly as part of the District's response to these review comments.

Response: *Please see the attached list of Anticipated Proprietary Items, Appendix 1. This list identifies proprietary items included in the SD Specifications submitted to the MSBA on 5/9/2018. This list has been developed after reasonable investigation, in accordance with MGL Chapter 30 Section 39M(b), and based on product performance, reliability, maintenance issues, LEED requirements, anticipated life cycle cost savings, MA-manufactured item, unique and advantageous design/ function, and / or because the item is a District standard. Continued research and product vetting will occur throughout the Design Development phase and in coordination with the School Building Committee.*

No further review comments for this section.

4.1.4 SCHEMATIC DESIGN DRAWINGS

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	Existing site plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Site development plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Schematic building floor plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Interior elevations of a typical general classroom, and typical Pre-K/K Classroom and typical Science Classroom/Lab as applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Schematic exterior building elevations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

2) Please provide updated site development plans that indicate future areas for potential expansion as part of the District's response to these review comments.

Response: Please see attached Site Plan Drawing (Appendix 2) showing future areas for potential expansion. The larger site could be built out to approximately 39,864 GSF on three stories as an addition to the west end of the academic wing. The smaller site could be a one-story addition to the cafeteria of some 2,316 GSF to accommodate the additional population. It should be noted that with a design enrollment of 1,030 students it would be difficult to imagine the desire on the part of the District to make the building larger.

5) Please consider how the inclusion of projecting type windows in first floor locations where adjacent to play areas may pose a potential hazard. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged. The designer may change the operating window type, or create an exclusion zone right next to the building using landscape planting elements, to prevent collisions with projecting window sash.

No further review comments for this section.

Additional Comments: The MSBA issues project advisories from time to time, as informational updates for Districts, Owner's Project Managers (OPM's), 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: Acknowledged, and confirmed that the District's consultants have read and incorporated all applicable Project Advisories.

End

ATTACHMENT B

MODULE 4 – SCHEMATIC DESIGN SPACE SUMMARY REVIEW

District: Town of Northbridge

School: W. Edward Balmer Elementary School

Owner's Project Manager: SMMA Project Management

Designer Firm: Dore & Whittier Architects

Submittal Due Date: May 9, 2018

Submittal Received Date: May 8, 2018

Review Date: May 10-30, 2018

Reviewed by: C. Clement, A. Waldron, F. Garcia, C. Alles, J. Jumpe

The following comments¹ on the Schematic Design submittal are issued pursuant to a review of the project submittal document for the new construction of the proposed project and presented as a Schematic Design submission in accordance with the MSBA Module 4 Guidelines.

The MSBA considers it critical that the Districts and their Designers aggressively pursue design strategies to achieve compliance with the MSBA guidelines for all proposed projects in the new program and strive to meet the gross square footage allowed per student and the core classroom space standards, as outlined in the guidelines. The MSBA also considers its stance on core classroom space critical to its mission of supporting the construction of successful school projects throughout the Commonwealth that meet current and future educational demands. The MSBA does not want to see this critical component of education suffer at the expense of larger or grander spaces that are not directly involved in the education of students.

The following review is based on a new construction project with an agreed upon design enrollment of 1,030 students in grades Pre-K-5.

The MSBA review comments are as follows:

- **Core Academic** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 62,850 net square feet (nsf) which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 18,100 nsf. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 2,150 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. The MSBA notes the following variations to guidelines:

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

- 6,850 nsf of this overage is due to the inclusion of (4) four 1,200 nsf Pre-Kindergarten classrooms, (1) one additional 1,200 nsf Kindergarten classroom, and (3) three 900 nsf general classrooms above guidelines. Based on the information provided, these proposed spaces are consistent with the delivery of the District's educational program. No further action required.
- 9,900 nsf of this overage is due to the inclusion of (7) seven 500 nsf Teacher Planning areas, (6) six 1,000 nsf K-5 Extended Learning areas, and (1) one 400 nsf Pre-K Extended Learning area. Based on the information provided these proposed spaces are consistent with the delivery of the District's educational program. The MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines.
- 1,350 nsf of this overage is due to one 1,200 nsf Maker Space and 150 nsf associated storage. As previously indicated, the MSBA accepts one 1,200 nsf Maker Space/Project Room and a 150 nsf associated storage space. Based on the information provided, the MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines. No further action required.
- **Special Education** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 13,530 net square feet (nsf) which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,460 nsf. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 115 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. Please note that the Special Education program is subject to approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and that formal approval of the District's proposed Special Education program is a prerequisite for executing a Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA.
***Response:** The Designer and District acknowledge that the formal approval of the District's proposed Special Education program is a prerequisite for the executing of a Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA.*
- **Art & Music**– The District is proposing to provide a total of 5,150 nsf which is 2,425 nsf below the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has not changed since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. Based on the information provided and the District's confirmation that the proposed square footage is sufficient in order to deliver their educational program, the MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines. No further action required.
- **Health and Physical Education** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 6,298 nsf which is 2 nsf below the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 2 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. The MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines. No further action required.
- **Media Center** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 5,305 nsf which meets the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has increased by 2 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. No further action required.

- **Dining & Food Service** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 11,955 nsf which is 1 nsf below the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has not changed since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. No further action required.
- **Medical** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 810 nsf which meets the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category not changed since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. No further action required.
- **Administration & Guidance** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 3,040 nsf which is 125 nsf below the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 250 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. This decrease is due to moving the Team Chair space to the Special Education category as requested by the MSBA. The MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines.
- **Custodial & Maintenance** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 2,630 nsf which meets the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has not changed since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. No further action required.
- **Other** - The District is not proposing to provide any additional square footage in this category. The proposed area has decreased by 500 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal due to the elimination of the Family and Community Resource Center. No further action required.
- **Total Building Net Floor Area** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 111,568 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 18,007 nsf. The proposed area has decreased by 2,785 nsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. Based on the comments provided above, the MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines. No further action required.
- **Total Building Gross Floor Area** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 167,352 gsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 18,002 gsf. The proposed area has decreased by 4,178 gsf since the Preferred Schematic Report submittal. Based on the comments provided above, the MSBA accepts this variation to the guidelines. No further action required.

Please note that upon moving forward into subsequent phases of the proposed project, the Designer will be required to provide, with each submission, a signed, updated space summary that reflects the design and demonstrates that the design remains, except as agreed to in writing by the MSBA, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of the MSBA. Should the updated space summary demonstrate changes to the previous space summary include a narrative description of the change(s) and the reason for the proposed changes to the project.

With each submission, the Designer will provide a signed, updated space summary that reflects the design and demonstrates that the design remains, except as agreed to in writing by the MSBA, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of the MSBA. If the updated space summary changes the Designers will demonstrate those changes to the previous space summary and include a narrative description of the change(s) and the reason for the proposed changes to the project.

END

APPENDIX 1 - ANTICIPATED PROPRIETARY SPECIFICATION ITEMS

W. EDWARD BALMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**DORE & WHITTIER ARCHITECTS****SCHEMATIC DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS**

ANTICIPATED PROPRIETARY SPECIFICATION ITEMS

6/14/2018

SECTION	ITEM	LOCATION IN PROJECT	REASON FOR USE
	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE CRITERIA DC B2		
2.01.D.1.b.2	Mineral Wool Insulation Rain-screen Assemblies: Roxul "Cavityrock DD" mineral wool insulation, or Thermafiber "RainBarrier HD" (2 options)	At all exterior metal panel rain-screen walls	Only two products currently on the market comply with testing requirements for NFPA 285 exterior wall construction code, that have the required density.
2.04.D	Insulated Batter-Resistant Glazing: School-Guard "SG-4" OR: 3M S&S Window Films (2 options)	Main entry vestibule, main office windows, and Pre-K Vestibule glazing	School-Guard appears to be the highest effectiveness security glazing for a reasonable cost. School-Guard is based in Adams, MA and manufactured in Pittsfield, MA. <i>Currently researching other security glazing systems.</i>
2.04.F	Translucent Glazing: "Solera" insulated translucent glazing units, OR "Okalux Plus" insulated translucent glazing units (2 options)	Gymnasium clerestory windows	These are only options for a glazed solution that looks like glass (aesthetic requirements), meets the U-value requirement, and is translucent (VLT requirement).
	INTERIOR DOORS CRITERIA DC C1		
2.01.A.1.d	Folding Steel Fire Separation Doors: "Won-Door" Corporation accordion horizontal-acting fire door.	Three (3) fire wall passage doors.	This single manufacturer supplies a large-opening fire door that slides into place when the alarm is sounded, but also has a swinging man-door within its assembly to allow use as a horizontal exit. There are no equals on the market.
2.02.C.5	Lockset Cores and Keys: Schlage "Primus".	All building locksets and locking door hardware	District Standard. (Hardware locksets to be bid from three or more listed, compatible, equivalent products.)

	INTERIOR FINISHES CRITERIA	DC C2		
2.02.A.7	Flocked Flooring: “Flotex” flocked flooring; OR, J+J Flooring group, “Kinetex” ultra-low pile carpet tile, (Two different, alternative products that perform the same function.)	All classrooms and ELA common spaces.	Flotex is the only product of its kind that has all the combined properties of cleanability, durability, water resistance, resilience, sound absorption, and soft texture that is comfortable for kids to sit on, all in one product. We are currently evaluating other types of products that have similar properties.	
C3030 - 2.02.A.4	ACP5 – Direct attach ceiling panels: Armstrong “Tectum” direct attach panels	Gymnasium ceiling	For this type of acoustical panel, Tectum is the only one that meets the LEED V4 criteria. There are others out there, but they do not have the LEED documentation in place (yet). We will keep checking back on this.	
	EQUIPMENT CRITERIA	DC E1		
2.02.B.1.c	Exterior Fire Protection Specialties, “Knox Box” rapid entry system,	Front and rear building entrances. Two locations.	Required by Northbridge Fire Department.	
	COMMUNICATIONS CRITERIA	DC D7		
1.01.A.3.a	Data Communication System, Network Switches: Aruba 5400 series	At MDF Room.	District Standard.	
1.01.A.3.b	Data Communication System, Wireless Access Points: Aerohive, AP250 and/or AP550.	Throughout the school.	District Standard.	
	ELECTRONIC SAFETY AND SECURITY CRITERIA	DC D8		
1.01.A.1-3	Integrated Access Control/ Intrusion Detection/ Video Surveillance Platform/System: S2 Security Corporation, “Unified Access Control and Video Surveillance” platform	Throughout the school.	Northbridge is currently prioritizing and developing a district-wide security upgrade project. It is likely that the decisions made on this current project will be setting a new District Standard for future projects, including the Balmer ES project. The S2 platform has been recommended by EdVance Technology Design to the Northbridge SD Director of Technology. He has been advised to competitively procure the vendor, but keep the system proprietary as a new District Standard. Provisional, final decision TBD.	

END OF LIST

APPENDIX 2 - SITE PLAN WITH POTENTIAL EXPANSION SITES NOTED

