Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chair, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

May 5, 2026

The Honorable Breanna Lungo-Koehn, Mayor
City of Medford
Medford City Hall
85 George P. Hassett Drive, Room 202
Medford, MA 02155

Re: City of Medford, Medford High School

Dear Mayor Lungo-Koehn:

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") is forwarding review comments for the Module 3 Feasibility Study Preliminary Design Program submission for the Medford High School project in the City of Medford, received by the MSBA on February 25, 2026. The MSBA and the District have agreed to a design enrollment of 1,395 students in grades 9-12, plus Pre-K students, for the proposed project.

Following the submittal on February 25, 2026, the District informed the MSBA that it was in the process of eliminating multiple options from the original twenty-nine (29) options included in the submittal and under consideration by the District at the time. In response, the MSBA held a meeting with the District and its consultants on March 9, 2026, and requested additional information to determine how many options would be formally eliminated and to support the preparation of an addendum to the original submission. Subsequently, the District and the School Building Committee voted to eliminate twenty-three (23) options. The District informed the MSBA of this decision on April 1, 2026.

Based on the Preliminary Design Program submission, the District is examining how additional program and space needs may be built in conjunction with the proposed school building project, including a Welcome Center, Central Offices, Community Partner Rental Spaces, Community Meeting Spaces, Medford Community Media space, Teen Health Center, Medford Family Network, Early Childhood Center, Kids Corner Preschool, and a renovated or new natatorium (pool). The submitted options include these programs and their associated spaces. The resulting estimated total project costs are $825 to $850 million for addition/renovation and $836 to $894 million for new construction.

Based on the information provided, and specific to the options the District has proposed to further evaluate in the Preferred Schematic phase, the MSBA requests that the District establish an alternative option, or series of options, that further explores/demonstrates a proposed building

project scenario that responds more directly to the necessities required to deliver the educational curriculum for a grades 9-12 student population.

The alternative option(s) should focus primarily on a proposed building project that provides a grade 9-12 facility in a more efficient building that better aligns with the MSBA space guidelines and offers more multi-use spaces. The alternative option(s) should be developed to a level of detail as prescribed in the Preliminary Design Program section of Module 3 of the MSBA Guidelines and should be provided as a supplement to the District's original Preliminary Design Program submittal. At least one of these alternative options should be represented in the options to be further evaluated in the Preferred Schematic phase.

The MSBA requests that the Owners Project Manager establish a schedule to provide this information to the MSBA. However, the alternative option(s) must be provided at least 30 days prior to the submission deadline for the forthcoming Preferred Schematic Report in order for the MSBA to review and provide feedback.

In the meantime, responses to the attached comments shall be forwarded to the assigned Senior Project Coordinator, Nina Bordeaux (Nina.Bordeaux@MassSchoolBuildings.org), through the Owner's Project Manager. Please review and return responses within 14 days of receipt of this letter.

Please also note that as part of the upcoming Preferred Schematic submittal process, districts and their consultants are required to provide a summary overview of the proposed project to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (the "FAS"). In preparation, the MSBA requests that the District submit a complete PowerPoint of the FAS presentation with the Preferred Schematic Report. For your reference, the guidance memorandum for preparing an FAS presentation is attached.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Kyra Stark (Kyra.Stark@MassSchoolBuildings.org).

Sincerely,

Michael P McGurl

Michael McGurl
Director of Capital Planning

Attachments: Attachment 'A' – Module 3 Preliminary Design Program Review Comments
Attachment 'B' – Preliminary Design Program Space Summary Review
Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Guidance Memorandum
MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components
Space Summary Guidelines for Auditoriums and Gymnasiums

Cc: Legislative Delegation
Isaac B. Bears, President, Medford City Council
Jenny Graham, Vice Chair, Medford School Committee
Dr. Suzanne Galusi, Interim Superintendent, Medford Public Schools
Dr. Kimberly Talbot, Assistant Superintendent for Academics and Instruction, Medford Public Schools
Jennifer Carlson, Owner's Project Manager, Leftfield, LLC
Matt Gulino, Owner's Project Manager, Leftfield, LLC
Matt Rice, Designer, Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc.
Helen Fantini, Designer, Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc.
File: 10.2 Letters (Region 4)

ATTACHMENT A
MODULE 3 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM REVIEW COMMENTS

District: City of Medford
School: Medford High School
Owner's Project Manager: Leftfield, LLC
Designer Firm: Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc.
Submittal Due Date: April 2, 2026
Submittal Received Date: February 25, 2026
Review Date: February 25, 2026 – May 5, 2026
Reviewed by: J. Adams, K. Stark, V. Dagkalakou, C. Forde, C. Alles

---

MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments[1] 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; *Refer to comments following each section*	Not Provided; *Refer to comments following each section*	Receipt of District's Response; *To be filled out by MSBA Staff*
OPM Certification of Completeness and Conformity	☒	☐	☐	☐
Table of Contents	☒	☐	☐	☐
3.1.1 Introduction	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.2 Educational Program	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.3 Initial Space Summary	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.4 Evaluation of Existing Conditions	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.5 Site Development Requirements	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.6 Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.7 Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s)	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.1.8 Appendices	☒	☐	☐	☐

[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.

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

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	Summary of the Facility Deficiencies and Current S.O.I.	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	Date of invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study and MSBA Board Action Letter	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Executed Design Enrollment Certification	☒	☐	☐	☐
4	Narrative of the Capital Budget Statement and Target Budget	☐	☒	☐	☐
5	Project Directory with contact information	☒	☐	☐	☐
6	Updated Project Schedule	☐	☒	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

4) The information provided as part of the narrative of the 'Capital Budget Statement and Target Budget' indicates that the estimated total project cost could range from $437 million (base repair option) to $893 million. For reference, the OPM Request for Services indicated an estimated total project cost range of $200-$600 million, and the Designer Request for Services indicated an estimated construction cost range of $200-$600 million. In response to these review comments, please respond to the following:

- *Provide the District's not-to-exceed budget for the proposed project.*
- *Describe this variation and provide information that indicates that the District has discussed and acknowledged the increase in estimated costs with District and local officials.*
- *Describe how the District and Design team intend to maintain the District's project budget through schematic design.*
- *Describe how the District and project team are communicating this project, including the budget and anticipated cost, to the community.*

6) The information provided in the Project Schedule for the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee ("FAS") meeting date indicates that the District is targeting the July 15, 2026 FAS meeting. Please note that the specific FAS meeting agendas will be coordinated at a later date and the District should carry both July 15, 2026 and July 29, 2026 FAS meeting dates as options associated with the August 26, 2026 MSBA Board of Directors meeting in its overall project schedule. In response to these review comments, please provide an updated project schedule that includes both FAS meeting dates.

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; *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	Grade and School Configuration Policies	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	Class Size Policies	☐	☒	☐	☐
3	School Scheduling Method	☐	☒	☐	☐
4	Teaching Methodology and Structure				
	a) Administrative and Academic Organization/Structure	☐	☒	☐	☐
	b) Curriculum Delivery Methods and Practices	☐	☒	☐	☐
	c) English Language Arts/Literacy	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) Mathematics	☒	☐	☐	☐
	e) Science	☐	☒	☐	☐
	f) Social Studies	☒	☐	☐	☐
	g) World Languages	☐	☒	☐	☐
	h) Academic Support Programming Spaces	☐	☒	☐	☐
	i) Student Guidance and Support Services	☐	☒	☐	☐
5	Teacher Planning	☒	☐	☐	☐
6	Professional Development	☐	☒	☐	☐
7	Pre-kindergarten	☐	☒	☐	☐
8	Kindergarten	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	Lunch Programs	☐	☒	☐	☐
10	Technology Instruction Policies and Program Requirements	☐	☒	☐	☐
11	Media Center/Library	☐	☒	☐	☐
12	Visual Arts Programs	☐	☒	☐	☐
13	Performing Arts Programs	☐	☒	☐	☐
14	Physical Education Programs	☒	☐	☐	☐
15	Special Education Programs	☐	☒	☐	☐
16	Vocation and Technology Programs				
	a) Non-Chapter 74 Programming	☐	☐	☒	☐
	b) Chapter 74 Programming	☒	☐	☐	☐
17	Transportation Policies	☒	☐	☐	☐
18	Functional and Spatial Relationships	☒	☐	☐	☐
19	Security and Visual Access Requirements	☐	☒	☐	☐

20	Typical Day and Week in the Life of a Student	☐	☐	☒	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

In response to these review comments, address the comments below. Additionally, as part of the District's Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") submittal include (2) copies of the updated educational program, (1) redlined copy and (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. Please acknowledge.

1) The information provided on page 27 and 28 of 2,258, under 'Grade and School Configuration Policies' states the following:

- *"Centralizing our Early Childhood portfolio will increase access to specialized services. We would also house our Medford Family Network (MFN) program and our Parent Information Center in this center. Moving this programming to the campus will also alleviate space issues at our elementary schools to handle growing enrollment and a dire need for expanded after-school programming."*
- *"The Medford Family Network (MFN) is also located on the campus. MFN is Medford's family support and parenting education program that is available free of charge to every child and caregiver who lives or works in Medford with at least one child prenatal to age eight. The goal of the MFN is to create a strong web of support for all families of young children. This is accomplished by making community connections in three ways: connecting families to families; fostering family contact with community resources; and building and promoting collaborative relationships among community agencies. As such, MFN works in conjunction with MPS and our Parent Information Center to provide resources to Medford families and assist with the preschool to kindergarten transition.*

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

- *Provide additional information regarding the proposed Early Childhood programming and the Medford Family Network ("MFN").*
- *Provide further detail on the structure and services that will be included within the centralized Early Childhood portfolio, including how the Parent Information Center and the Medford Family Network ("MFN") will operate within this model.*
- *Provide clarification regarding the current and proposed location of these programs. The information provided indicates that these services would be "moved to the campus" while also stating that MFN "is located on the campus." Please confirm whether these programs are currently housed within the existing Medford High School building or if they are anticipated to be relocated there as part of the proposed project.*

2) The information provided on page 27 of 2,258 under 'Class Size Policies' states:

> *"District and high school administrators agreed to set a maximum class size of 25 students for most curriculum offerings for program planning purposes. This is consistent with the MSBA Guidelines regarding space programming and planning."*

Please note and acknowledge that MSBA guidelines are based on 23 students per classroom and 24 students per science lab for grades 9-12. Additionally, please verify the current class size

policy and confirm the proposed class sizes that will be used to inform the design of the proposed project.

3) The information provided indicates several disadvantages of the current school schedule, such as the lack of a longer block for advanced labs and projects, difficulty scheduling advanced academic courses for students in CTE programming, and lack of time for students to access support and to reach out to staff during the school day. While the District outlines its intent to continue exploring instructional strategies that support authentic learning experiences, project-based learning, and college and career readiness, it also notes that proposed schedule modifications to address current limitations will not occur until the 2028 Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiations.

In response to these review comments, please provide information that describes how the District intends to address the identified disadvantages of the current schedule in advance of the 2028 Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiations. Given that the District is concurrently proposing a renovated or new high school project, please also provide an updated or proposed schedule that demonstrates how these issues will be resolved and how the schedule will support the stated goals of authentic learning, project-based learning, and college and career readiness.

4a) The information provided on page 30 of 2,258 under 'Teaching Methodology and Structure' states:

> *"Medford High School uses a House-structure model to improve the student experience and ensure consistent support. Currently, there are three Houses where students are alphabetically split by last name."*

Given that students are assigned to Houses based on alphabetical order by last name, please describe whether the District conducts periodic reviews of House composition to ensure that this assignment method does not result in unintended demographic imbalances, including potential clustering by ethnicity or other student characteristics.

4b) In response to these review comments, describe the District's current curriculum delivery methods and practices. The information provided references both current instructional practices and a vision for future teaching and learning but does not clearly distinguish between existing practices and proposed changes. Please clarify the District's current curriculum delivery methods and identify any proposed changes, including the associated rationale, or confirm that no changes are proposed.

4g) Please provide additional information regarding the World Language program and how this program allows/encourages English Learners ("EL") to participate in courses involving the EL student's primary language. Describe the District's plan to offer the opportunity to EL students to take World Language courses, if any. Additionally, in response to these review comments, please describe the District's plan to support students in achieving the Massachusetts Seal of Biliteracy.

Furthermore, the information provided on page 38 of 2,258 under 'English Learners ("EL") Department' states:

> *"In our future model, Structured English Emersion ("SEI") and Newcomer classes Alternative Reality ("ARE") content-based classes and should be positioned as such throughout the building...Classrooms are physically integrated throughout the school in the same fashion as all other classrooms."*

In response to these review comments, please verify if these spaces listed above are included in the proposed space summary and coordinate the information accordingly. Additionally, please indicate where this program will occur and confirm that the proposed spaces support the future needs of the District's educational program.

4e) In response to these review comments, please describe how the District is planning to incorporate the MSBA science lab guidelines into the design of science spaces to ensure they are accessible and flexible, support investigative learning beyond scheduled lab times, and can accommodate multiple science subdisciplines and CTE programs with minimal need for future reconstruction.

4h) The information provided on page 40 of 2,258 identifies several educational program drawbacks, including limited longer blocks needed for advanced labs and projects, difficulty scheduling academic courses for CTE students, and constrained time for students to access support or staff during the school day. In response to these review comments, please describe whether, and to what extent, these limitations, particularly those related to longer instructional blocks, could be mitigated by providing flexibility for teachers, individually or in collaboration, to adjust schedules as needed to meet curricular goals.

Additionally, the information provided on pages 38-39 of 2,258, describes how the Medford Academy and Academic Support Hubs curriculum is currently delivered. In response to these review comments, describe any proposed changes to the Medford Academy and Academic Support Hubs and the associated rationale, or provide a statement confirming that no changes are proposed.

Additionally, please provide information that describes how many students are participating in the Medford Academy and Academic Support Hubs program. Also, describe potential adjacencies and common planning time relating to these programs.

4i) The information provided on page 40 of 2,258 under 'Student Guidance and Support Services' states:

> *"To better support postsecondary planning and improve accessibility for students, families, and community partners, MHS proposes a centrally located College and Career Exploration Center between House Offices and the main entrance... The center would ideally house a Career Specialist, Transition Coordinator, Community Service Coordinator, and a School Counselor rotating through on a scheduled basis, and would support a co-op integration position to strengthen ties between MHS and CTE programming."*

As part of the PSR submittal, please verify that the support services listed in the educational program are coordinated with and are included in the 'Administration & Guidance' category in the proposed space summary.

6) In response to these review comments, please describe whether the District has considered incorporating extended professional development opportunities, such as multi-day or week-long summer workshops, to support teachers in collaboratively developing innovative, interdisciplinary, and non-traditional programming.

Additionally, please describe whether the District has explored opportunities within the academic schedule, such as the second semester of senior year, to offer semester-long courses or seminars that allow students to engage in challenging concepts, interdisciplinary study,

community-based projects, and entrepreneurial or charitable initiatives in a manner that minimizes impact on grade point averages.

7) The information provided on page 27 of 2,258 under 'Grade and School Configuration Policies' states:

> *"On the Medford High School campus, we currently host the Kids Corner, our municipal daycare which enrolls children ranging from infants to 4 years old, on this existing site. School and city staff rely on the high-quality care provided at very competitive rates. Additional classroom space will allow us to increase tuition and open additional slots to community members. The lack of childcare in Medford is the subject of much discussion."*

Additionally, the information provided on page 26 of 2,258 under 'Grade and School Configuration Policies' and on page 44 under 'Pre-Kindergarten' states the following:

- *"We plan to add an Early Childhood Center to the Medford High School campus: the creation of space either freestanding structures on the same site or a small wing of the building) will allow us to centralize our early childhood programming into an Early Childhood Center and allow the possibility to expand our pre-K options."*
- *"Creation of an Early Childhood Center within the new high school. MEEP classrooms that are currently dispersed throughout the district would be moved to one central location within the new high school in the same vicinity as the district's day care center and the Ch 74 Early Education program."*

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

- *The anticipated enrollment for the proposed Medford Early Education Program ("MEEP").*
- *The current and the anticipated proposed enrollment for the Kids Corner program.*
- *A description of the administrative structure for each program, including how the programs and associated spaces are managed and staffed.*
- *A description of how students are admitted into the Kids Corner and MEEP programs, including how eligibility and tuition are determined.*

Also, please refer to "Attachment B", for additional comments under the 'Special Education' and 'Other' categories.

9) The information provided on page 44 of 2,258 as part of the 'Lunch Programs' narrative indicates that a proposed café will be co-located within the library/media center. In response to these review comments, please provide additional information regarding the staffing and scheduling of this proposed space.

Additionally, the information provided on page 30 of 2,258 under 'School Scheduling Method' states:

> *"Finally, with a new building that will have fewer cafeterias, the schedule will need to be adjusted to reduce the number of lunch periods (from three to two)."*

In response to these review comments, please note and acknowledge that the MSBA guidelines are based on 3 lunch seatings for high schools.

Furthermore, please confirm that kitchen staff will be included in the review of design and equipment for the kitchen and servery.

10) 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.

Additionally, in response to these review comments, please provide the following information:

- *Clarification regarding the District's 1:1 device expectations, including whether devices are used at home and how equitable access to reliable internet is addressed.*
- *A description of any arrangements that are in place to ensure all the devices are properly licensed to use the software required by the curriculum.*

11) The information provided on page 47of 2,258, under 'Media Center/Library' states the following:

- *"Designed as an open, flexible hub, it should allow students to move easily between the library, a writing lab, and a cultural center, making the connection between literacy, academic learning, and hands-on experiences visible and intentional."*
- *"In addition to traditional library functions, the new library should include integrated technology support offices, technology learning areas, a makerspace, and an esports room, reflecting how students use libraries today for research, digital creation, project-based learning, and academic support."*

In response to these review comments, please clarify if a writing lab, a cultural center, a makerspace, and an esports room are proposed spaces within the Media Center. Please verify if these spaces are included in the space summary and coordinate the information accordingly.

12) In response to these review comments, please respond to the following items:

- *Please note and acknowledge that art storage should include secure and appropriately ventilated space for toxic and hazardous materials as well as an accessible file of safety data sheets ("SDS").*
- *Please note and acknowledge that kiln rooms should be secure but also include a window or external "in-use" light.*

13) The information provided on pages 50, 51 and 52 of 2,258, under 'Performing Arts Program' state the following:

- *"Create two large ensemble spaces, each with a capacity of 75-100 students..."*
    - *"Develop small breakout rooms adjacent to larger ensemble rooms, equipped with windows for supervision. These should include:*
    - *A smaller ensemble space (25–30 students, including large instruments) with soundproofing, humidity control, recording/playback capabilities, and ample outlets for amplifiers.*

- *Multiple individual and small-group practice rooms, soundproofed and designed for 1–2 students.*
- *A flexible piano/technology lab accommodating up to 20 students, with storage for mid-sized electronic keyboards.*
- *A small recording studio to support music technology and composition.*
- *Stagecraft room will serve as a shared instructional space with heavy, consistent use throughout the school day."*

However, the proposed space summary only includes (1) 950 nsf Ensemble space. Additionally, the proposed space summary does not indicate a piano/technology lab, small recording studio, or stagecraft room.

In response to these review comments, please verify that the Performing Arts spaces described in the educational program are coordinated with and included in the proposed space summary as intended and coordinate the information accordingly.

15) In response to these review comments, please include the number of Special Education students currently served in each program and the anticipated number of students in the proposed project.

Additionally, the information provided on page 58 of 2,258 under 'Special Education' states:

> *"The last Coordinated Program Review for Medford Public Schools was in School Year 2023-2024. The issues identified were special education process related and not regarding specific space or location issues."*

In response to these review comments, please provide the status and/or remedy of any issues identified as part of the Coordinated Program Review.

16a) Not provided. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:

- *Describe each of the existing and proposed Non-Chapter 74 programs, the basis of the curriculum that is offered, the proposed enrollment capacity and any potential changes to educational programming and activities planned once the proposed project is complete.*
- *Describe how the Non-Chapter 74 Programming curriculum is currently delivered, the number of periods per academic cycle, and the number of students participating in each program.*
- *Describe Non-Chapter 74 Programming programs new to the school, proposed learning activities, and how each will be coordinated with other curriculums.*
- *Describe how the Non-Chapter 74 Programming curriculum will be delivered, number of periods per academic cycle, and number of students anticipated to participate in the proposed program.*
- *Describe the proposed program requirements (continuing and new programs) including equipment, practices, safety measures, training, and partnerships.*

Additionally, as part of the District's PSR submittal, please include the desired features and layout considerations associated with each Vocational and Technical program, including all the Non-Chapter and Chapter 74 programs.

19) Please confirm that first responding emergency representatives will be consulted in the planning process and associated requirements will be incorporated into the Preferred Schematic.

20) Not provided. In response to these review comments please provide a schedule that describes a typical day and week in the life of a student.

Additional Comments:

The information provided in the Educational Program on page 78-80 of 2558 indicates multiple spaces that are being offered at the Medford High School as 'Other specialty Spaces':

- *The District is proposing a Welcome Center. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:*
    - *A narrative describing where the Welcome Center is currently located and how it is currently operated, including the number of staff and business hours.*
    - *A description of how the proposed Welcome Center will be accessed and secured after typical school hours.*
- *The District is proposing a Teen Health Center. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:*
    - *A narrative describing where the Teen Health Center is currently located and how it is currently operated, including the number of staff and business hours.*
    - *A description of how the proposed Teen Health Center will be accessed and secured after typical school hours.*
- *The District is proposing a Medford Community Media space. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:*
    - *A description of how the proposed Medford Community Media space will be accessed for community use and secured after typical school hours.*
- *Additionally, the information provided on page 80 of 2,258 states:*

    "MHS anticipates that the Food Pantry will operate independently from the MHS Food Service Department."

    In response to these review comments, please provide the following:

    - *A narrative describing how the Food Pantry will be operated, including anticipated staffing, business hours, and the entity responsible for managing day-to-day operations.*
    - *A description of how the proposed Food Pantry space will be accessed and secured after typical school hours.*
    - *A description of the anticipated adjacencies.*

- *The District is proposing Community Partner Spaces. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:*
    - *A description of how the proposed Community Partner Space will be accessed for community use and secured after typical school hours.*
    - *A description of the anticipated adjacencies.*

Furthermore, the information provided states:

> *" The existing building has a pool that is an integral part of the Medford community offering adult lap swim, free public swim, and is home to MHS Swim Team and neighboring high school swim programs as well."*

Please note and acknowledge that newly constructed Natatoriums (pools) cannot be included or incorporated in the scope of work and/or associated budget for projects seeking MSBA grants. If a District wishes to construct a Natatorium (pool) as a component of their school buildings in a new construction scenario, the procurement, design, and construction associated with this work must be separate from the MSBA project scope and budget and must be detached from the proposed school building. Further, this work cannot be combined or 'bundled' in any contracts or bidding documents associated with the MSBA project, either as base scope or as a construction alternate. Please acknowledge.

Please also refer to the attached MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components (Project Advisory 96) regarding MSBA policies associated with Natatorium components.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.3 INITIAL SPACE SUMMARY

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	Space summary; one per approved design enrollment	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	Floor plans of the existing facility	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Narrative description of reasons for all variances (if any) between proposed net and gross areas as compared to MSBA guidelines	☒	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

1) Please refer to "Attachment B" for detailed review comments.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.4 EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

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	Confirmation of legal title to the property.	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	Determination that the property is available for development.	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Existing historically significant features and any related effect on the project design and/or schedule.	☐	☒	☐	☐
4	Determination of any development restrictions that may apply.	☐	☒	☐	☐
5	Initial Evaluation of building code compliance for the existing facility.	☒	☐	☐	☐
6	Initial Evaluation of Architectural Access Board rules and regulations and their application to a potential project.	☒	☐	☐	☐
7	Preliminary evaluation of significant structural, environmental, geotechnical, or other physical conditions that may impact the cost and evaluations of alternatives.	☐	☒	☐	☐
8	Determination for need and schedule for soils exploration and geotechnical evaluation.	☐	☒	☐	☐
9	Environmental site assessments minimally consisting of a Phase I: Initial Site Investigation performed by a licensed site professional.	☐	☒	☐	☐
10	Assessment of the school for the presence of hazardous materials.	☐	☒	☐	☐
11	Previous existing building and/or site reports, studies, drawings, etc. provided by the district, if any.	☒	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

3) The information provided indicates that a Project Notification Form ("PNF") will be filed with the Massachusetts Historic Commission ("MHC") during the Preferred Schematic phase. In response to these review comments, please include the PNF submission date into the overall project schedule. Additionally, please note and acknowledge that MHC approval is required prior to construction bids. The District should keep the MSBA informed of any decisions and/or proposed actions and should confirm that the proposed project is in conformance with Massachusetts General Law 950, CRM 71.00. Please acknowledge.

4) The information provided on page 198 of 2,258 indicates that the environmental impact of the project will be reviewed with respect to Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act ("MEPA") thresholds. As part of the District's PSR submittal, please provide the following:

- *Analysis performed by the Design team intended to determine the outcome associated with the requirements of a MEPA review and a workplan and timeline associated with a MEPA review.*

- *Also, please note that if MEPA review and approval is required for the proposed project, the MSBA Board of Directors authorization to enter a Project Funding Agreement ("PFA") will be conditioned upon the District fulfilling the applicable MEPA requirements associated with the MEPA review.*

Additionally, the information provided on page 198 of 2,258 states:

> *"A review of the Massachusetts Historical Commission, MHC, online Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System, MACRIS, performed in December, 2025, documents that the portion of the property containing the Edgerly Sports Complex and approximately 7,250-square feet of open space in the southeast corner of the property are within the Middlesex Fells Reservation, with the MHC identification number MDF.T."*

In response to these review comments, please provide a timeline and any potential challenges and steps that may be required for these resolutions, if any. Additionally, please ensure that future versions of the project schedule will include dates of anticipated approvals and key steps of the proposed site.

As part of District's PSR submittal, provide additional information for the items listed above and any local steps and timeline regarding the permitting/ review and approval that are required for the Preferred Schematic.

7) The information provided on page 339 of 2,258 under 'Wetland Resources' states the following:

- *"An investigation into the high school parcel and adjacent properties was performed in December of 2025 by CDW Consultants. Several wetland resource areas were identified on neighboring properties, and are included in the exiting conditions survey. A full report is in progress and will be included in the final draft of the PDP Report."*
- *"An Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD) will be filed with the Medford Conservation Commission to confirm the location of the flagged wetlands in Schematic Design."*
- *"There are three extant wetland systems in close proximity to the property that were identified during the site inspection conducted on December 10, 2025. The three wetland areas were delineated on or near the Site: one to the north, one to the east, and one at the southern end of the Site."*

In response to these review comments, identify any potential challenges and steps that may be required for these resolutions. Additionally, please ensure that future versions of the project schedule will include dates of anticipated approvals and key steps of the proposed site.

As part of District's PSR submittal, provide additional information for the items listed above and any local steps and timeline regarding the permitting/ review and approval that are required for the Preferred Schematic.

In addition, please note and acknowledge that all permitting requirements and approvals must be obtained prior to construction bidding.

8) The information provided on page 364 of 2,258 states:

"Geotechnical consultant, Haley & Aldrich, has begun borings and test pits on the Medford High School site in December, 2026. Geophysical testing is planned to take place in March, 2026. No information is available on findings at this point in time, but will be provided in the Preferred Schematic Report."

In response to these review comments, please provide the status of the additional testing and confirm that this information will be included as part of the District's PSR submittal. Also, please note and acknowledge that all cost increases subsequent to a Project Scope and Budget approval from the MSBA's Board of Directors will be the sole responsibility of the District. Please acknowledge.

9) The information provided on page 365 of 2,258 indicates that a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment is needed and is currently underway. As part of the District's PSR submittal, please provide the following:

- *An anticipated timeline associated with the Phase II Environmental Assessment.*
- *Any additional findings from the Phase II investigation when available.*

Additionally, the information provided in the Phase I ESA Report on pages 377 and 378 of 2,258 states the following:

- *"There were no written records found of the condition of these underground storage tanks (USTs) upon their removal, or if contamination was evident or not evident in the soil surrounding the tanks. If excavation is planned in the areas of these former USTs as part of the new school construction, explorations are recommended to assess soil and, if encountered, groundwater, in these areas as part of the planning stages."*
    - *"ADS was informed that a portion of the subject property was previously used as a municipal dump, and items such as a car frame were observed during prior excavation at the school... If excavation is planned in this area as part of the new school construction, explorations are recommended as part of the planning stages to assess soil and, if encountered, groundwater, in this area."*
    - *"Areas of contamination may be encountered during construction or demolition of the school building. If stained soils or soils with an odor are encountered, work should stop in the area of concern in order to mitigate the spreading of possible contaminants to a larger area, and an environmental consultant should be contacted to assess the condition."*

Note that all costs associated with abatement of contaminated soil from any source, and abatement of fuel storage tank must be itemized in the cost estimates in subsequent submittals and will be considered ineligible for MSBA reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

10) Please note that the project team should be aware of the current policies associated with MSBA's participation in the abatement and removal of hazardous materials.

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.	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	Existing site plan(s)	☐	☒	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

1) The information provided on page 1,146 of 2,258 under 'Wetlands and/or Flood Restriction' states:

> *"The Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act regulates work in proximity to existing wetlands. Work within the 100' buffer zone around wetland resources requires a Stormwater Management Plan per state standards. In addition, the City of Medford Wetlands Ordinance (Chapter 87) requires a permit from the Conservation Commission for work within 100' of a wetland resource area."*

In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:

- *Identify any potential challenges and steps that may be required for these resolutions. Additionally, please ensure that future versions of the project schedule will include dates of anticipated approvals and key steps of the proposed site.*
- *Please note and acknowledge that all permitting requirements and approvals must be obtained prior to construction bidding.*

As part of District's PSR submittal, provide additional information for the items listed above and any local steps and timeline regarding the permitting/ review and approval that are required for the Preferred Schematic.

Additionally, the information provided on page 1,147 of 2,258 under 'Safety and Security Requirements' indicates that the project is designed to balance community access to outdoor spaces and shared-use resources—such as Career and Technical Education ("CTE") programs, pool facilities, and the Medford Family Network—while significantly enhancing school safety.

In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that demonstrates how the proposed natatorium, gymnasium, performance spaces, Welcome Center, Teen Health Center, Medford Community Media, Clothing Closet, Food Pantry, and Community Partner Spaces will be scheduled, monitored, and secured after typical school hours.

Furthermore, in response to these review comments please provide the following:

- *As the project further develops, please include information that describes the process, including those involved in the decision-making, associated with incorporating site improvement components such as landscape features, trees, plantings, irrigation, rain garden, etc. The MSBA encourages the District to include facilities and maintenance personnel responsible for the future care and maintenance of the proposed site components in an effort to fully understand the time, care and resources, including*

budget, equipment, and personnel, required to maintain the intended site features. Please acknowledge.

Also, as part of the District's PSR submittal, please provide the following:

- *A description of how the number of parking spaces for staff and visitors will be determined, i.e., based on daily school needs, after-hours athletic/performance needs, and/or local zoning requirements.*
- *A timeline associated with any permits, filings, and other reviews discussed in this section. Please identify all utility providers associated with the project and include estimated dates for required coordination, applications, and approvals with each provider, including Medford's Engineering Division.*
- *A site section(s) that illustrates how the Preferred Schematic sits on the site and how the proposed location impacts access and circulation. Please acknowledge.*

2) In response to these review comments, provide an existing site plan that includes the following, as outlined in Module 3, Item 3.1.5 Site Development Requirements:

- *Structures and fences;*
- *Site access and circulation;*
- *Parking and paving;*
- *Zoning setbacks and limitations;*
- *Accessibility requirements;*
- *Easements;*
- *Wetlands and/or flood restrictions;*
- *Emergency vehicle access;*
- *Safety and security features;*
- *Utilities;*
- *Athletic fields and outdoor educational spaces; and,*
- *Site orientation and other location considerations and issues.*

Additionally, as part of the PSR submittal, please provide site plans that include the above-mentioned features for the Final Evaluation of Alternatives and Preferred Solution that also include bus and parent drop-off areas as well as vehicular and pedestrian access. Please acknowledge.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.6 PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

	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	Analysis of school district student school assignment practices and available space in other schools in the district	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	Tuition agreement with adjacent school districts	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Rental or acquisition of existing buildings that could be made available for school use	☒	☐	☐	☐
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	☒	☐	☐	☐
5	Renovation(s) and/or addition(s) of varying degrees to the existing building(s)	☐	☒	☐	☐
6	Construction of new building and the evaluation of potential locations	☐	☒	☐	☐
7	List of 3 distinct alternatives (including at least 1 renovation and/or addition option) are recommended for further development and evaluation.	☐	☒	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

As part of the Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives, the District explored (29) initial options, all of which include varying scenarios at the existing Medford High School site, designed for 1,395 students in grades 9-12, plus Pre-K, and include the following:

- *(1) Base Repair Option*
- *(25) Addition / Renovation Options ranging from $807 to 880 million for the total project cost.*
- *(3) New Construction Options ranging from $859 to 893 million for the total project cost.*

Following the District's PDP submittal on February 25, 2026, the District informed the MSBA that it was in the process of eliminating multiple options under consideration. In response, the MSBA held a meeting with the Project Team on March 9, 2026, and requested additional information to determine how many options would be formally eliminated and to support the preparation of an addendum to the PDP submission. Subsequently, the District and the School Building Committee voted to eliminate 23 options. The District informed the MSBA of this decision on April 1, 2026.

Based on this decision, the District has indicated that they intend to further evaluate the following (6) options as part of its Final Evaluation of Alternatives included in the PSR as described below.

- ***Option A.1**: Base Repair at the existing Medford High School facility; with an estimated total project cost of $437,180,506 million.*
- ***Option B.1.2**: Addition/renovation (On the Existing Footprint) which proposes 141,510 sf of new construction above the existing Central Academic and PE/Dining Wings, selective demolition of 23,835 sf of the existing Central Academic Wing to bring daylight to windowless classrooms, Light Renovation of 36,902 sf of the existing Pool Wing, and Heavy Renovation of 461,467 sf of the remaining existing school building; with an estimated total project cost of $824,820,634 million.*
- ***Option C.2.2**: Addition/renovation (On the existing building footprint, on the Hillside and Parking Lot to the west and a portion of Edgerly Field to the north), which proposes 471,280 sf of new construction (5 stories), in place of the existing Arts Wing, Central Academic Wing, Western Academic Wing and Vocational Wings; proposes Light Renovation of 36,902 sf of the existing Pool Wing; and proposes Heavy Renovation of 131,697 sf of the remaining existing school building; with an estimated total project cost of $849,727,830 million.*
- ***Option C.3.4**: Addition/renovation (On the existing building footprint, on the Hillside to the west and a portion of Edgerly Field to the north), which proposes 586,247 sf of new construction as 4 stories, in place of the existing Arts Wing, Central Academic Wing, Western Academic Wing, Vocational Wings and PE/Dining Wing; proposes Light Renovation of 36,902 sf of the existing Pool Wing; and proposes Heavy Renovation of 16,730 sf of the remaining existing school building; with an estimated total project cost of $832,122,092 million.*
- ***Option D1.1**: New Construction (on the existing southern Parking Lot and the southern portion of the existing building footprint – the Arts Wing and the southern Vocational Wing), which proposes 607,250 sf (6 stories) and a new Pool; with an estimated total project cost of $893,653,373 million.*
- ***Option D.2.1**: New Construction (On Edgerly Field and the adjacent Hillside), which proposes 607,250 sf as 6-stories and a new Pool; with an estimated total project cost of $859,469,647 million.*

As part of the elimination of PDP options and following conversations with MSBA staff about 'MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components' the District added the following (2) options to be studied in the PSR:

- ***Option D1.1NP**: New Construction (On the existing southern Parking Lot and the southern portion of the Existing Footprint – the Arts Wing and the southern Vocational Wing), which proposes 607,250 sf as 6-stories without a Pool; with an estimated total project cost of $870,540,600 million.*
- ***Option D2.1NP**: New Construction (On Edgerly Field and the adjacent Hillside), which proposes 607,250 sf as 6-stories without a Pool; with an estimated total project cost of $836,356,874 million.*

Please note and acknowledge the following from the 'MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components':

- *Consultant and contractor services must be procured separately from an MSBA-funded Core Program project, with contracts separate from the MSBA-funded project, at the sole expense of the district. Furthermore, bundling of projects for the purpose of local appropriation votes is prohibited.*
- *The District must demonstrate that the MSBA-funded Core Program project takes priority over the Natatorium construction in the placement of the Natatorium on the site and in the sequence of construction phasing. This must be demonstrated in the project schedule at the time of schematic design, throughout the development of construction documents, and through construction.*
- *The scope and estimated cost of a Natatorium shall not be included in the total project budget. However, the proposed scope shall be referenced in the feasibility study, schematic design, design development, and construction/bid documents only to the extent that the potential location of such Natatorium structures and the construction schedule of the Natatorium impact the proposed MSBA-funded Core Program project.*
- *A new Natatorium shall be physically detached from an MSBA-funded Core Program project.*
- *District must plan and demonstrate separate central plant and building utility connections for a new Natatorium.*
- *In the district's final evaluation of options included in the Preferred Schematic Report, at least one of the district's options, should consist of a scenario that does not include a Natatorium component.*

As stated in the cover letter associated with these review comments, the MSBA requests that the District establish an alternative option, or series of options, that explores/demonstrates a proposed building project scenario that responds more directly to the necessities required to deliver the educational curriculum for a grades 9-12 student population with a design enrollment of 1,395 that results in smaller and more efficient building that better aligns with the MSBA space guidelines. The MSBA understands that a Pre-Kindergarten program component will contribute to the proposed square footage of a project and aligns with the Enrollment Certification; however, additional options should focus primarily on a building project that responds to delivering a grade 9-12 facility. At least one of these alternative options should be represented in the options to be further evaluated in the Preferred Schematic phase.

Please note the PSR submittal must include a thorough evaluation of each option the District has chosen to move forward with as part of its Final Evaluation of Alternatives, including cost estimates and detailed rationale for why options were eliminated from consideration. As stated above, adjustments and/or the addition of individual options should be communicated in writing to the assigned MSBA project team well in advance of the District's PSR submission. The MSBA will review any adjustments to this list and will communicate appropriate actions.

5) Subsequent to receiving the PDP submittal, the District provided narratives that described the reasons each of the (22) of the Addition/renovation options would be eliminated from further consideration. No response required.

6) Subsequent to receiving the PDP submittal, the District provided a narrative that described why 'Option D.1.2' was eliminated from further consideration. No response required.

7) In response to these review comments, please note and acknowledge that the Final Evaluation of Alternatives included in the District's PSR submittal must include the following:

- *Floor plan diagrams for each of the options studied including a key/legend for clarity that showcase all the spaces with adjacencies to further understand the connections of the proposed spaces.*
- *Please provide the first-floor plan within the proposed site plan.*
- *The District must provide detailed narratives that clearly describe the rationale for why options were eliminated from further consideration.*
- *As the designs further develop, continue to describe and illustrate the separation, safety provisions, and possible construction laydown areas that will be applied during construction on the occupied site.*
- *Continue to use the same naming convention of options that was provided in the PDP submittal for clarity and consistency.*

Additional Comments:

- *The information provided on page 2,170 of 2,558 as part of the 'Comparative Cost Analysis' indicates the District is examining how additional needs (Medford Community Media, Community Partner Rental Spaces, Welcome Center / Central Offices, Community Meeting Spaces, Teen Health Center, Early Childhood Center, and a renovated or new natatorium) may be built in conjunction with the school building project, and lists all these programs as potential alternates.*
- *Please note that the project team should be aware of and adhere to the current policies associated with MSBA's participation in natatorium (pool) and central administration components, as outlined in the "MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components", issued under Project Advisory 96. This guidance was previously transmitted to the District via email and acknowledged by the Owner's Project Manager on January 7, 2026.*
- *If the District elects to further develop any options that include a natatorium and/or central administration component, the requirements outlined in this guidance must be followed. Please acknowledge.*

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.7 LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVAL

	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	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification: (original)	☒	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☒	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

2) Subsequent to receiving the PDP submittal, the MSBA received a certified copy of the February 23, 2026 School Building Committee meeting minutes. Following the February 23 School Building Committee meeting, the SBC voted to eliminate certain options from further consideration.

Please provide a certified copy of the March 23, 2026 School Building Committee meeting minutes when available. Please acknowledge.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.8 APPENDICES

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	Current Statement of Interest	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	MSBA Board Action Letter including the invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Design Enrollment Certification	☒	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

No review comments for this section.

Additional Comments:

- *Please note that as part of the upcoming Preferred Schematic submittal process, districts and their consultants are required to provide a summary overview of the proposed project to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (the "FAS"). In preparation, the MSBA requests that the District submit a complete PowerPoint of the FAS presentation with the PSR submittal. For your reference, the guidance memorandum for preparing an FAS presentation is attached.*
- *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.*

Regarding Past Projects:

Both the MSBA's enabling legislation, M.G.L. c. 70B, and the MSBA's regulations, 963 CMR 2.00 et seq. specifically address the issue of past projects. MSBA records show the following previous projects were completed with MSBA-assisted funding:

- *A total MSBA payment of $1,026,109 for the Medford High School Window/ Doors, Boiler Replacement Project #201301760505.*
- *A total MSBA payment of $6,506,701 for the Medford High School Science Lab Initiative Project #201201760505.*
- *A total MSBA payment of $950,960 for the Medford High School Phase III Renovation Project #200801760505.*
- *A total MSBA payment of $1,349,209 for the Medford High School Waitlist Project for Major Repair Roof (Phase I) #W20024279.*
- *A total MSBA payment of $465,197 for the Medford High School Waitlist Project for Major Repair Roof (Phase II) #W20024293.*

Pursuant to these requirements and depending on the School District's ultimate plan for the School, the MSBA may recover a pro-rated portion of the financial assistance that the School District has received for previous grants. The exact amount recovered will be established at the conclusion of the Schematic Design / Total Project Budget phase. Please see the MSBA website to view the MSBA's regulations, statute, and closed school bulletin for additional information.

End

ATTACHMENT B
MODULE 3 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM SPACE SUMMARY REVIEW

District: City of Medford
School: Medford High School
Owner's Project Manager: Leftfield, LLC
Designer Firm: Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc.
Submittal Due Date: April 2, 2026
Submittal Received Date: February 25, 2026
Review Date: February 25, 2026 – May 5, 2026
Reviewed by: J. Adams, K. Stark, V. Dagkalakou, C. Forde, C. Alles

---

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") has completed a preliminary review of the proposed space summary as produced by Symmes Maini & McKee Associates, Inc. and its consultants. This review involved evaluating the extent to which the Medford High School's proposed space summary conforms to the MSBA guidelines and regulations.

Please note 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.

Please note that any spaces in new construction or substantially renovated spaces must be compliant with MSBA space standards for both allotted area and room quantity unless otherwise approved in writing by the MSBA.

The MSBA has attempted to identify potential eligible and ineligible square footage based on the information provided in conjunction with the associated space summary and educational program for the executed design enrollment. The proposed square footage associated appear to result in a significant number of spaces in several categories that exceed the MSBA guidelines and will likely be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Information provided by the District in response to these review comments is critical for the MSBA to ultimately determine an allowable square footage.

The following preliminary review is based on the submitted new construction project space summary with an agreed upon design enrollment of 1,395 students in grades 9-12, plus Pre-Kindergarten.

In response to these review comments, please note that based on the Enrollment Letter, issued on December 18, 2024, the MSBA understands that the District would like to include space for district-wide Pre-Kindergarten and the District's therapeutic high

school program, currently located at the Curtis-Tufts School. If this configuration is determined to be the Preferred Solution, the District will be required to establish in the Preferred Schematic Report the proposed future use or disposition of any existing spaces vacated or otherwise repurposed by this proposed project. The District will also be required to illustrate that the Preferred Solution has been approved by the School Committee and necessary District officials. Further, the MSBA will require a written plan from the District, describing the process for determining local support for this potential configuration. Please acknowledge.

As referenced in the cover letter associated with these review comments and 'Attachment A', the MSBA is interested in comparing an alternative option, or series of options, that responds more directly to the necessities required to deliver the educational curriculum for a grades 9-12 student population with a design enrollment of 1,395 and that better aligns with the MSBA space guidelines. Please acknowledge.

The MSBA review comments are as follows:

- **Core Academic** – The District is proposing a total of 80,565 net square feet ("nsf") which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 12,185 nsf. The District is proposing the following spaces:
    - **General Classroom** – The District is proposing (48) 950 nsf General Classrooms, totaling 45,600 nsf, which exceeds MSBA guidelines by (1) General Classroom and 3,300 nsf. In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following:
        - As the project further develops, please note and acknowledge that 825 nsf is the minimum size for a newly constructed General Classroom for grades 9-12, and 950 nsf is the maximum size for all newly constructed General Classrooms for grades 9-12.
        - An additional (25) classroom and/or lab spaces are proposed in association with the (19) Chapter 74 Programs and six Non-Chapter 74 Programs described in the comments below. Please describe the anticipated utilization impact these spaces will have on the proposed (48) General Classrooms.
    - **Teacher Planning** – The District is proposing (9) 500 nsf Teacher Planning spaces, totaling 4,500 nsf, which is below the MSBA guidelines by (38) Teacher Planning spaces and 200 nsf. In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that describes the desired location and adjacencies of the (9) Teacher Planning areas and confirm the proposed area is sufficient to meet the goals of the educational program.
    - **Small Group Seminar –** The District is proposing (3) 500 nsf Small Group Seminar spaces, totaling 1,500 nsf, which meets the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.
    - **Science Classroom / Lab** – The District is proposing (11) 1,440 nsf Science Classrooms, totaling 15,840 nsf, which is below MSBA guidelines by (1) Science Classroom / Lab and 1,440 nsf. The information

provided on page 163 of 2,258 under 'Narrative Description of Reasons of all Variances' states:

> *"Medford High School requires 11 Science Labs to support its proposed Science curriculum. Under Special Education, the program includes one Science Resource Room to support pull-out Science instruction when needed beyond co-taught Science labs."*

In response to these comments, please provide an updated space summary that relocates the (1) 1,440 nsf Science Lab from the 'Special Education' category back to the 'Core Academic' category.

- **Prep Room** – The District is proposing (6) 400 nsf Prep Rooms, totaling 2,400 nsf, which meets the MSBA guidelines. Please note that MSBA guidelines require 200 nsf per Science Classroom/Lab or 400 nsf if combined and shared between two Science Classroom/Lab. Also, please see the comment above regarding Science Classrooms / Labs and the comment below under 'Special Education' category regarding the proposed Science Resource Room.
- **Central Chemical Storage Room** – The District is proposing (1) 200 nsf Central Chemical Storage Room, which meets the MSBA guidelines. No further preliminary comments.
- **Medford Academy – Classroom** – The District is proposing (2) 950 nsf Medford Academy – Classrooms, totaling 1,900 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that describes the following:
  - The anticipated adjacencies.
  - Scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of these spaces.
- **Medford Academy – Workspace** – The District is proposing (1) 475 nsf Medford Academy – Workspace, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:
  - Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
  - Describe the scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas.
  - Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.
- **Language Lab** – The District is proposing (1) 1,200 nsf Language Lab, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:
  - Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
  - Describe the scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of the proposed area.

        - Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.
    - **Academic Support Hub** – The District is proposing (2) 475 nsf Academic Support Hubs, totaling 950 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:
        - Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
        - Describe the anticipated scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of the proposed areas.
        - Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.
    - **Large Group Instruction** – The District is proposing (2) 2,000 nsf Large Group Instruction spaces, totaling 4,000 nsf, which exceeds MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:
        - Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
        - Describe the anticipated scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas, and how these spaces will be supervised and staffed.
        - Describe why the proposed use could not be supported in the proposed auditorium.
    - **Black Box Theater** – The District is proposing (1) 2,000 nsf Black Box Theater, which exceeds MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:
        - Relocate the Black Box Theater to the 'Auditorium & Drama' category and provide an updated Space Summary.
        - As part of the District's PSR submittal, the District must fully describe the function, intended utilization, and scheduling of this space.
- **Special Education** – The District is proposing a total of 37,990 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 23,890 nsf. The District is proposing spaces associated with the Medford Early Education Program ("MEEP") as part of the Special Education category. In response to these review comments, please provide an updated space summary and relocate the following spaces to the 'Other' category:
    - (1) 100 nsf Reception Waiting
    - (1) 175 nsf Director's Office
    - (1) 100 nsf Director's Administration Assistant Office
    - (1) 150 nsf Team Chair
    - (2) 150 nsf Evaluation Team Leader
    - (2) 150 nsf Evaluation / Observation

- (2) 150 nsf Related Services Office
- (1) 250 nsf Conference Room
- (1) 600 nsf Occupational Therapy
- (1) 600 nsf Physical Therapy
- (1) 600 nsf Play Room
- (1) 600 nsf Room
- (1) 300 nsf Staff Room
- (2) 150 nsf Breakout Room

Please note and acknowledge that all support spaces associated with the MEEP program exceed the MSBA guidelines and will be considered ineligible for reimbursement.

Additionally, the District is proposing (1) 1,440 nsf Science Resource Room as part of the Special Education category. In response to these review comments, and as requested in the comment above under 'Science Classrooms/ Labs', please provide an updated space summary that relocates this space to the 'Core Academic' category.

Also, please refer to additional comments for the 'Special Education' category in "Attachment A", Section 3.1.2, Item 15.

Furthermore, the District is proposing (10) 150 nsf Breakout Rooms, totaling 1,500 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:

- Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
- Describe the anticipated scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas, and how these spaces will be supervised and staffed.
- Moreover, the MSBA notes that the proposed spaces significantly exceed those typically proposed in MSBA funded high school projects. Please describe the scheduling of these services and why the Special Educational programming cannot be delivered within fewer rooms.

Lastly, the information provided indicates that the District is including as part of the proposed Medford High School project, the "Curtis-Tufts Therapeutic Day Program". The District is proposing a total of 7,140 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please review and confirm whether the following spaces are exclusive to the use of the Special Education Program and the Curtis-Tufts Therapeutic Day Program:

- (1) 300 nsf Games Room;
- (1) 950 nsf Community / Lunch Room;
- (2) 150 nsf Breakout Rooms;

- (1) 250 nsf Sensory Room;
- (1) 200 nsf Waiting / Reception area;
- (1) 300 nsf Principal's Office;
- (1) 100 nsf Admin Assistant space;
- (2) 200 nsf Adjustment Counselor Offices; and,
- (1) 300 nsf Conference Room.

Please note that the Special Education program is subject to approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ("DESE"). The District should provide this information for this submittal 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. Please acknowledge

- **Art & Music** – The District is proposing a total of 11,150 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,950 nsf. Please note that the MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

- **Vocations & Technology (Non-Chapter 74 Programs) –** The District is proposing a total of 11,280 nsf, which is below the MSBA guidelines by 3,120 nsf. The District is proposing the following (6) Non-Chapter 74 Program spaces, which includes (3) existing programs and (3) new programs:

Non-Chapter 74 Programs	Total Proposed NSF
Digital Art / Photography Lab (new program)	1,440
Media & Tech Labs (existing program)	2,880
Makerspaces (existing program)	2,880
Engineering / Robotics Lab (new program)	1,440
Family and Consumer Science ("F.A.C.S.") Lab (new program)	1,440
Scene Shop (existing program)	1,200
Total Proposed NSF	**11,280**

Please refer to additional comments for the Non-Chapter 74 Programming category in "Attachment A", Section 3.1.2, Item 16a.

- **Vocations & Technology (Chapter 74 Programs) –** The District is proposing a total of 109,925 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. The District is proposing the following (15) existing Chapter 74 Programs and (4) new Chapter 74 Programs:

Proposed Chapter 74 Programs	Total Proposed NSF
(1) Automotive Technology (existing program)	**10,620**
Automotive Technology Shop	8,250

Automotive Technology Related Classroom	950
Automotive Technology Storage Room	300
Automotive Technology Tool Room	200
Automotive Technology Office	120
Automotive Technology Toilet Room	130
Automotive Technology Changing Area	170
Automotive Technology Loft	500
(2) Biotechnology (existing program)	**5,970**
Biotechnology Shop	4,400
Biotechnology Related Classroom	950
Biotechnology Storage Room	300
Biotechnology Office	120
Biotechnology Toilet Room	60
Biotechnology Changing Area	140
(3) Business Marketing (existing program)	**2,900**
Business Marketing Shop	2,200
Business Marketing Mustang Mail Retail Area	500
Business Marketing Storage Room	200
(4) Carpentry (existing program)	**9,120**
Carpentry Shop	6,750
Carpentry Related Classroom	950
Carpentry Tool Room	200
Carpentry Storage Room	300
Carpentry Office	120
Carpentry Toilet Room	130
Carpentry Changing Area	170
Carpentry Loft	500
(5) Construction Craft Laborers (existing program)	**9,120**
Construction Craft Laborers Shop	6,750
Construction Craft Laborers Related Classroom	950
Construction Craft Laborers Storage Room	300
Construction Craft Laborers Tool Room	200
Construction Craft Laborers Office	120
Construction Craft Laborers Toilet Room	130
Construction Craft Laborers Changing Area	170
Construction Craft Laborers Loft	500
(6) Cosmetology (existing program)	**4,870**
Cosmetology Shop	3,000
Cosmetology Related Classroom	950
Cosmetology Aesthetics Room	300
Cosmetology Storage Room	200

Cosmetology Office	120
Cosmetology Toilet Room	130
Cosmetology Changing Area	170
(7) Criminal Justice (new program)	**3,450**
Criminal Justice Shop	2,200
Criminal Justice Related Classroom	950
Criminal Justice Storage Room	200
Criminal Justice Office	100
(8) Culinary Arts (existing program)	**9,995**
Culinary Arts Shop / Kitchen	5,625
Culinary Arts Related Classroom	950
Culinary Arts Office	120
Culinary Arts Toilet Room	130
Culinary Arts Changing Area	170
Culinary Arts Bistro 489	3,000
(9) Dental Assisting (new program)	**3,425**
Dental Assisting Shop	1,875
Dental Assisting X-Ray Room	150
Dental Assisting Sterilization Room	150
Dental Assisting Related Classroom	950
Dental Assisting Storage Room	200
Dental Assisting Office	100
(10) Early Education and Care (existing program)	**2,880**
Early Education and Care Shop	1,500
Early Education and Care Related Classroom	950
Early Education and Care Storage Room	200
Early Education and Care Toilet Room	130
Early Education and Care Office	100
(11) Electricity (existing program)	**8,620**
Electricity Shop	6,750
Electricity Related Classroom	950
Electricity Storage Room	300
Electricity Tool Room	200
Electricity Office	120
Electricity Toilet Room	130
Electricity Changing Area	170
(12) Engineering and Robotics (existing program)	**6,270**
Engineering and Robotics Shop	4,400
Engineering and Robotics Related Classrooms	950
Engineering and Robotics Storage Room	300
Engineering and Robotics Tool Room	200

Engineering and Robotics Office	120
Engineering and Robotics Toilet Room	130
Engineering and Robotics Changing Area	170
(13) Graphic Communications (existing program)	**3,500**
Graphic Communications Shop	2,250
Graphic Communications Related Classroom	950
Graphic Communications Storage Room	200
Graphic Communications Office	100
(14) Health Assisting (existing program)	**7,145**
Health Assisting Shop	5,625
Health Assisting Related Classroom	950
Health Assisting Storage Room	150
Health Assisting Office	120
Health Assisting Toilet Room	130
Health Assisting Changing Area	170
(15) Information Systems (new program)	**3,450**
Information Support Services & Networking Shop	2,200
Information Support Services & Networking Related Classroom	950
Information Support Services & Networking Storage Room	200
Information Support Services & Networking Office	100
(16) Metal Fabrication (existing program)	**6,370**
Metal Fabrication Shop	4,000
Metal Fabrication Related Classroom	950
Metal Fabrication Storage Room	300
Metal Fabrication Tool Room	200
Metal Fabrication Office	120
Metal Fabrication Toilet Room	130
Metal Fabrication Changing Area	170
Metal Fabrication Loft	500
(17) Plumbing (new program)	**4,100**
Plumbing Shop	2,250
Plumbing elated Classroom	950
Plumbing Storage Room	300
Plumbing Tool Room	200
Plumbing Office	100
Plumbing Toilet Room	130
Plumbing Changing Area	170
(18) Programming / Web Development (existing program)	**3,450**
Programming / Web Development Shop	2,200
Programming / Web Development Related Classroom	950
Programming / Web Development Storage Room	200

Programming / Web Development Office	100
(19) Radio and Television Broadcasting (existing program)	**3,770**
Radio and Television Broadcasting Shop	2,500
Radio and Television Broadcasting Related Classroom	950
Radio and Television Broadcasting Storage Room	200
Radio and Television Broadcasting Office	120
CTE Commons	(3) x300
Total Proposed NSF	**109,025**

The District is also proposing (3) 300 nsf CTE Commons spaces, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following:

- Please describe the scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of the (3) proposed CTE Commons spaces. Also, describe anticipated adjacencies and provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.

Additionally, please note that DESE and the MSBA will continue to work with the District to confirm agreement with the proposed Chapter 74 programs and monitor the proposed programs in subsequent submittals to confirm consistency with the District's pre-submission documentation and alignment with program and safety recommendations. Please acknowledge.

- **Health & Physical Education** – The District is proposing a total of 31,887 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 7,875 nsf. Based on the information provided and the enrollment of 1,395 students, the MSBA will accept (1) one additional physical education station totaling 3,000 nsf beyond guidelines. This would result in the remaining 4,875 nsf exceeding MSBA guidelines and therefore will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge and refer to the attached Space Summary Guidelines for Auditoriums and Gymnasiums regarding the MSBA's policy on physical education square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines.

  Additionally, the District is proposing (3) 300 nsf Wellness Rooms, totaling 900 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:

  - Describe the anticipated adjacencies.
  - Describe the anticipated scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas, and how these spaces will be supervised and staffed.
  - Provide examples of activities that will occur in these spaces.

- **Media Center** – The District is proposing a total of 8,619 nsf, which meets the MSBA guidelines. The District is proposing (1) 300 nsf Café / Snack Shop as part of the Media Center. In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that describes this space.

- **Auditorium / Drama** – The District is proposing a total of 13,800 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 3,400 nsf. Please note that the MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. In response to these review comments, please provide the proposed number of seats for the Auditorium.

  Please acknowledge and refer to the attached Space Summary Guidelines for Auditoriums and Gymnasiums regarding MSBA policies associated with auditorium spaces exceeding MSBA guidelines.

  Additionally, the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines.

- **Dining & Food Service** – The District is proposing a total of 14,068 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,700 nsf. Please note that the MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

  Additionally, in response to these review comments, please provide additional information that describes the District's need to provide a larger kitchen area and serving area that exceed the MSBA guidelines.

- **Medical** – The District is proposing a total of 1,660 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 450 nsf. Please note that the MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

  Additionally, the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines.

- **Administration & Guidance** – The District is proposing a total of 14,264 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 9,051 nsf. The District is proposing the following spaces:

  - **Driver's Education** – The District is proposing (1) 150 nsf Driver's Education space, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines.
  - **STEPS Suite –** The District is proposing the following multiple spaces as part of the STEPS suite, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines:
    - (1) 950 nsf STEPS Classroom;
    - (1) 120 nsf Office / Workroom;
    - (1) 120 nsf Adjustment Counselor Office;
    - (1) 250 nsf Conference / Flex Room;
    - (1) 80 nsf Toilet; and,

- (1) 40 nsf Phone Booth.

In response to these review comments, provide the following:

- Provide information regarding the intended use of these spaces.
- Describe the anticipated scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of these spaces.

Additionally, the District is proposing (2) 80 nsf Mother's Rooms, totaling 160 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please relocate the two Mother's Rooms in the 'Non-Programmed Spaces' category and provide an updated space summary. As a reminder, the Designer must coordinate a space planning scenario where the grossing factor does not exceed 1.50.

Furthermore, please note and acknowledge that MSBA does not object to the District including these additional spaces in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines in this category will be considered ineligible for reimbursement.

Moreover, the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines.

- **Custodial & Maintenance** – The District is proposing a total of 2,822 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 151 nsf. Please note that MSBA does not object to the District including this additional space in the project; however, all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement.

  Additionally, the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines.

- **Other** – The District is proposing a total of 67,703 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. The District is proposing the following spaces:

  - **Pop-Up Shop / Gallery** – The District is proposing (1) 300 nsf Pop-Up Shop / Gallery space. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

  - **Clothing Closet** – The District is proposing (1) 300 nsf Clothing Closet space. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

  - **Food Pantry** – The District is proposing (1) 300 nsf Food Pantry space. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

- **Pool** – The District is proposing (1) 10,933 nsf Pool space. Please note and acknowledge that newly constructed Natatoriums (pools) cannot be included or incorporated in the scope of work and/or associated budget for projects seeking MSBA grants. If a District wishes to construct a Natatorium (pool) as a component of their school buildings in a new construction scenario, the procurement, design, and construction associated with this work must be separate from the MSBA project (scope and budget). Further, this work cannot be combined or 'bundled' in any contracts or bidding documents associated with the MSBA project, either as base scope or as a construction alternate. Please acknowledge.

  As previously communicated to the District and design team, and based on current practice, the MSBA would not support a project that includes a newly constructed swimming pool. Please acknowledge. The proposed design and space summary should be adjusted accordingly in advance of further development of new construction option. Please acknowledge.

  Please also refer to the attached MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components (Project Advisory 96) regarding MSBA policies associated with Natatorium components.

  Also, refer to additional comments in "Attachment A", Section 3.1.1, Item 4 and Section 3.1.6, Item 4.

- **Early Childhood Center** – The District is proposing a total of 3,280 nsf associated with Early Childhood Center spaces, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

- **Medford Early Education Program ("MEEP")** – The District is proposing (11) 1,200 nsf Pre-Kindergarten Classrooms, totaling 13,200 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:

  - As the project becomes further developed, please note and acknowledge that 1,100 nsf is the minimum size for all newly constructed Pre-Kindergarten Classrooms.
  - Provide further information that clarifies how the District calculated the number of classrooms needed for Pre-Kindergarten, including the proposed enrollment numbers for half-day and full day programs.

  Also, refer to additional comments for the Pre-Kindergarten category in "Attachment A", Section 3.1.2, Item 7.

- **Kids Corner Preschool** – The District is proposing a total of 6,550 nsf associated with Kids Corner Preschool spaces, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this

space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Also, refer to additional comments for the Pre-kindergarten category in "Attachment A", Section 3.1.2, Item 7.

- **Medford Family Network ("MFN")** – The District is proposing a total of 3,115 nsf associated with Medford Family Network spaces, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.
- **Central Office** – The District is proposing a total of 13,430 nsf associated with Central Office spaces, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

  Please also refer to the attached MSBA Guidance for Central Administration, Field House, and Natatorium Components (Project Advisory 96) regarding MSBA policies associated with Central Offices.
- **Welcome Center** – The District is proposing a total of 10,255 nsf associated with Welcome Center spaces. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.
- **Teen Health Center** – The District is proposing a total of 1,460 nsf associated with Teen Health Center spaces. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.
- **Medford Community Media** – The District is proposing a total of 1,820 nsf associated with Medford Community Media spaces. Please note that the MSBA does not object to including this space; however, square footage associated with this component will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.
- **Community Partner Rental Spaces –** The District is proposing (1) 2,760 nsf Community Partner Rental Space. In response to these review comments, please provide the following:
  - Describe the desired adjacencies.
  - Describe the anticipated scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of the Community Partner Rental Space.

- **Non-Programmed Spaces** – Please note this section must be completed as part of the Schematic Design submittal. Please acknowledge.

- **Total Building Net Floor Area** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 405,733 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 237,160 nsf, including 106,805 nsf in Vocations & Technology and 67,703 nsf in Other. Please address the comments provided in the categories above as part of the District's response to these comments.

- **Total Building Gross Floor Area** – The District is proposing to provide a total of 607,250 gross square feet ("gsf") which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 354,391 gsf. Please address the comments provided in the categories above as part of the District's response to these comments.

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.