Coakley Middle School Norwood Public Schools

Middle School Building Committee

October 4, 2021

<u>Agenda</u>

- September 13, 2021
 - PSR, FAS, & Schedule update
 - **SD** Design update
- October 4, 2021
 - Public Forum #5 update
 - Schematic Design update
 - D.B.B. vs. CMr update
 - Auditorium size discussion/vote
 - Turf field discussion/vote
 - Sports lighting discussion/vote







Ai3 Architects, LLC Compass Project Management

Community Forum #5

Coakley Middle School



Agenda

Project Schedule & Next Steps

Design update

♦ Floor Plans

♦ Site Plan

Exterior Renderings

Questions & Answers





Project Schedule





CONSTRUCTION

Project Schedule



10,0,0,0 8300 80 og (**Required PV to offset building use** • Approximately 30,000 sf of panels on the roof • Approximately 30,000 sf of panels over parking spaces



SCHEMATIC DESIGN (SD) TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Summary of Preferred MSBA Board Selection **Overview of Process Description of Project Graphic & Visual Aids** MSBA Review & District's Response to PSR Report

4.1.2 PROJECT CONTACTS, COMMUNICATIONS & PROCEDURES

Project Directory Roles & Responsibilities **Communications & Documentation Control Procedures** Work Plan Updated Project Schedule

4.1.3 FINAL DESIGN PROGRAM

Architectural Characteristics Site Development Description **Design Focal Point Functional Relationships & Adjacencies** District's Educational Program & Design Response Existing & Proposed Technology Security & Visual Access Space Summary Narrative Designer Certification Educational Space Summary

4.1.4 SITE ANALYSIS

Traffic Analysis Phase 1 Environmental Assessment Geotechnical Report

4.1.5 CODE ANALYSIS Building Code Analysis Compliance with ADA & MAAB

4.1.6 UTILITIES & SOILS ANALYSIS

4.1.7 MASSING STUDY

4.1.8 BUILDING SYSTEMS DESCRIPTIONS

Building Structure Electrical Systems Mechanical Systems **Plumbing Systems** Fire Protection Systems Information Technology Systems Theater Equipment Foodservice Equipment

4.2.1 SUSTAINABLE BUILDING DESIGN

LEED Scorecard **Designer's Certification Letter**

Dark Gray - Items related to the Building Option that is required for submission



Light Gray - Items submitted in previous PSR report that are required to be submitted again

4.3.1 ROOM DATA SHEETS

4.4.3 TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET

4.4.4 COST ESTIMATES

Cost Comparison Designer's Cost Estimate **OPM's Cost Estimate**

4.4.5 PROPRIETARY PRODUCTS

4.5.1 LOCAL ACTIONS & APPROVALS

Local Actions and Approvals Letters Certification Letter Middle School Building Committee Meeting Minutes School Committee Meeting Minutes Community Forum Information

APPENDICES

A. DESE Submission **OPM DESE Review Cover Letter** Special Education Delivery Methodology Signed Education Space Summary Special Education Adjacency Table **Preliminary Floor Plans**

B. MA Historical Commission Submission

4.4.1 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY

4.4.2 ANTICIPATED REIMBURSEMENT RATE

























STUDENT OUTDOOR ENGAGEMENT



SEAT WALLS/FURNITURE





CLASS & INDIVIDUAL OPPORTUNITIES

LANDSCAPE BOULDERS

Unifying Element

Industrialization -> Mill Buildings

"The industrialization of Norwood is the most significant and distinctive feature of its history. Beginning in the mid-19th century, local tanneries, printing presses, ink manufacturers and other industries helped transform Norwood into a booming and ethnically-diverse industrial town." Norwood Historical Society



Design Parameters: Existing Building Reflection







Massing - Materials - Textures - Color



COAKLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL MATERIALS PALETTE



• UTILIZE DURABLE MATERIALS • PROVIDE IDENTIFIABLE ENTRY POINTS • HIGHLIGHT SPECIFIC BUILDING ELEMENTS • REDUCE BUILDING SCALE & MASSING • RELATE BUILDING AND MATERIALS TO SURROUNDING SITE & TOWN • PROVIDE BRANDING & IDENTITY FOR STUDENTS • DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Taking the traditional

and REDEFINING **THE LIMITS**









South facade of the building





North facade of the building







 UTILIZE DURABLE MATERIALS
 PROVIDE IDENTIFIABLE ENTRY POINTS
 HIGHLIGHT SPECIFIC BUILDING ELEMENTS
 REDUCE BUILDING SCALE & MASSING
 RELATE BUILDING AND MATERIALS TO SURROUNDING SITE & TOWN
 PROVIDE BRANDING & IDENTITY FOR STUDENTS
 DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABILITY

CAMERA LOCATION





ELEMENTS · REDUCE BUILDING SCALE & MASSING · RELATE BUILDING AND MATERIALS TO SURROUNDING SITE & TOWN • PROVIDE BRANDING & IDENTITY FOR STUDENTS • DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABILITY







• UTILIZE DURABLE MATERIALS • PROVIDE IDENTIFIABLE ENTRY POINTS • HIGHLIGHT SPECIFIC BUILDING ELEMENTS • REDUCE BUILDING SCALE & MASSING • RELATE BUILDING AND MATERIALS TO SURROUNDING SITE & TOWN • PROVIDE BRANDING & IDENTITY FOR STUDENTS • DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABILITY



CM at Risk: Rationale

- For complex; phased project on a very tight site with existing school in operation.
- Limited staging/laydown area; The project needs a pro-active; flexible team player.
- Early Release/Enabling Packages (site roads; site demo; temp. facility set-up, etc) are critical to overall schedule and flexibility around the school's operations.
- Larger pool of potential CMs/More competition than "School" GCs.
- 65% of Middle School projects in MSBA uses CM@Risk method.





CM at Risk: Rationale

- Guaranteed Maximum Price "GMP" with open accounting of all costs.
- CM provides full professional team and shares in the "risk" via a GMP/ GMP Contingency.
- CM Pre-Construction services to help mitigate the Owner's risk.
- Owner involved in de-scoping/award of all subcontractors. "Filed/Trade" subs still bid.
- Buy-out savings; unused GMP contingency; holds & allowances returned to the Reduces or "re-uses" some of the initial "cost premium". Owner.





rationale

CM at Risk: Rationale

- CM has more direct knowledge to the market condition and pricing during preconstruction which will allow for Norwood team to plan ahead before bidding and construction.
- CM can participate with the design team to work out options pending on the market condition such as choosing materials which are not in shortage or have delivery issues.
- It is possible to change from CM@Risk if the budget can not be met and move to a traditional Design Bid Build option. This would add three to six months to the project schedule and changes to contract documents. This would also reduce some of the higher cost of CM@Risk.



CM at Risk rationale

CM at Risk: Costs included in est. \$105M construction cost

- **Pre-Construction Fee:**
- General Conditions (i.e increased staffing) vs. DBB (+/-1%)
- CM Fee (in addition to GCs; insurance; bonds, etc): (+/- 2%) negotiated
- CM GMP Contingency (within GMP): (+/- 2%) of cost of work; negotiated
- "Better" non-trade, sub-contractors: (+/-1%)
- Initial "Cost Premium" total: 5-6%
- Often some costs are re-couped in buy-out savings and GMP contingency balances turned back to the Owner. These items are kept by GC in DBB.





\$200-500K

\$2 M

\$1 M

\$2 M

\$1 M

\$5-6 M

CM at Risk: Process, Timeline, Next Steps

Feb. 2022	 Prepare CM@Risk application
March 2022	 Submit CM@Risk Application to IG's Office
March – April 2022	 IG's office reviews the Application / Issues a Notice to
March 2022	 Prepare Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
April 2022	 Create Pre-qualification Committee
	Issue RFQ and Receive Statements of Qualifications
May 2022	Create Selection Committee
1 2000 ·	 Pre-qualify at least three (3) CM@Risk firms
	 Prepare and Issue Request for Proposals (RFPs)
	 Receive, evaluate, and rank proposals
June 2022	Interview finalists
	Award CM@ Risk firm





CM at Risk process, timeline, next steps

AUDITORIUM CAPACITY





Auditorium Capacity

Why Synthetic Turf?

- Playability 24/7/365
- Consistency
 - Field is usable in all seasons
 - Properly drained, field is usable in all weather conditions
 - Field synthetic turf provides a surface that is true and predictable for all athletes and sports. Specifically true for soccer, field hockey and lacrosse.
 - Consistency of field surface improves overall quality of play.
- Maintenance/Value
- Water Conservation















Sport Lighting

- Photometric Study to determine the foot/ candles on the field surface and perimeter of 0.0 light spread
- Number and locations of lights
- Pole height required for lights (70' ideal height for minimum light spread)
- Cut-off fixtures to control light spread
- Site sections and existing tree line to study relationships with abutters

0.0	<u>0.0</u>	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	0.Q_	.0.Q	<u>.0.0</u>	0.0	.0.Q	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	.0.Q	.0.Q	.0.Q	.0.Q	0.0	
.00	.0.Q	.0.Q	.0.Q	.0.1	.p.7	.0.3	<u>.</u> 0.4	.0.3	<u>_</u> 0.2	.0.3	.0.4	.0.3	_0.7	.µ0.1	.0.Q	.0.Q.	0.0,	0.0	
.0.0	.0.Q	"D.1	. 1.3	. 7.5	s₁ _ #0.1	₊ 10.5	₊ 11.7	. 9.0	. 7.0	.9.0	₊ 11.7	₊ 10.5	^{s₂} ⊕ ₊ 10.1	. 7.5	₊ 1.3	.0.1	.0.0	.0.Q	
.0.Q	.p.2	₊ 1.7	₊ 12.4	₄ 30.5	,31.4	<u>,</u> 34.7	, 34.6	" 30.5	27.1	, 30.5	" 34.6	, 34.7	<u>,</u> 31.4	, 30.5	₊ 12.4	₊ 1.7	<u>.</u> 0.2	.0.Q	
.0.Q	.₽.4	. 3.4	₊ 13.7	, 36.3	,35.8	<u>,</u> 36.2	,38.1	, 34.8	.33.8	" 34.8	,38.1	. 36.2	. 35.8	, 36.3	₊ 13.7	. 3.4	.µ0.4	.Q.Q	
0.0ـ	.₽.1	₊ 1.9	₊ 11.0	.27.4	. 31.9	. , 30.9	₄ 33.7	. 32.5	31.5	. 32.5	₄ 33.7	, 30.9	. 31.9	,27.4	₊ 11.0	. 1.9	.₽.1	.Q.Q	
<u>.</u> 0.0	. ₽ .1	₊ 1.5	₊ 11.2	, 22.9	.30.2	, 28.0	₄ 31.5	30.6	€9.4	30.6	₄ 31.5	,28 .0	. 30.2	, 22.9	₊ 11.2	. 1.5	.₽.1	.Q.Q	
.0.Q	.₽.1	₊ 1.9	_ 11.0_	27.4	, 31.9	. _₽ 30.9	₋ 33.7	,32.5	31.5	" 32.5	₄ 33.7	, 30.9	₋ 31.9	.27.4	₊ 11.0	. 1.9	. 0 .1	.Q.Q	
.0.Q	.0.4	. 3 .4	₊ 13.7	₄ 36.3	,35.8	. 3 6.2	,38.1	. 34.8	.33.8	₄ 34.8	,38.1	, 36.2	. 3 5.8	, 36.3	₊ 13.7	. 3.4	.0.4	.0.Q	
.0.Q	.0.2	₊ 1.7	₊ 12.4	₄ 30.5	, 31.4	, 34.7	, 34.6	" 30.5	27.1	" 30.5	" 34.6	, 34.7	. 31.4	, 30.5	₊ 12.4	, 1.7	.0.2	.0.Q	
.0.Q	.0.Q	.0.1	₊ 1.3	. 7.5	,10.1 ⊕	₊ 10.5	₊ 11.7	. 9.0	. 7.0	. 9.0	₊ 11.7	₊ 10.5	+10.1	. 7.5	₊ 1.3	. 0 .1	0.0,	.Q.Q	
.00	.Q.Q	.Q.Q	.Q.Q	.₽.1	.ρ.7	.0.3	. ₽ .4	.D.3	.0.2	.D.3	.µ0.4	.D.3	.Ω.7	.₽.1	.Q.	.0.Q	0.0	.0. 0	
0.0	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	0.0	.0.0	0.0	<u>0.0</u>	0.0	.0.Q	.0.0	.0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	.0.Q	<u>.</u> 0.0	<u>.</u> 0.0	.0.0	0.0	













Question/Discussion



