ATTACHMENT A
MODULE 3 – PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT 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: June 25, 2026
Submittal Received Date: June 25, 2026
Review Date: June 25, 2026 – July 28, 2026
Reviewed by: J. Adams, V. Dagkalakou, C. Forde, C. Alles

MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments[1] on the Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") 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.

3.3 PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT

Overview of Preferred Schematic 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	☒	☐	☐	☐
3.3.1 Introduction	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.3.2 Evaluation of Existing Conditions	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.3.3 Final Evaluation of Alternatives	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.3.4 Preferred Solution	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.3.5 Local Actions and Approval Certification	☐	☒	☐	☐

[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.

3.3.1 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	Overview of the process undertaken since submittal of the Preliminary Design Program that concludes with submittal of the Preferred Schematic Report, including any new information and changes to previously submitted information	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	Summary of updated project schedule, including:				
	a) Projected MSBA Board of Directors Meeting for approval of Project Scope and Budget Agreement	☒	☐	☐	☐
	b) Projected Town/City vote for Project Scope and Budget Agreement	☒	☐	☐	☐
	c) Anticipated start of construction	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) Target move in date	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Summary of the final evaluation of existing conditions	☒	☐	☐	☐
4	Summary of final evaluation of alternatives	☒	☐	☐	☐
5	Summary of District's preferred solution	☐	☒	☐	☐
6	A copy of the MSBA Preliminary Design Program project review and corresponding District response	☒	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

1, 5) The information provided as part of the 'Overview of the Process since PDP Submission' on page 3 of 11 states the following:

- *"The MCHSBC voted to advance the addition/renovation Option C.2.2A into the Schematic Design Phase as the preferred solution at their June 10, 2026 meeting."*
- *"The City of Medford and the Project Team will continue to develop this alternative and seek ways to reduce the overall project cost in Schematic Design to aid in a successful debt override in May of 2027."*
- *"The City of Medford is conducting a survey of other available space throughout the city that could potentially house any of the non-high school-specific community spaces currently located in the high school building to assist in the reduction of the overall area and total project cost. This additional study will be completed during the summer of 2026, with the goal of having the final list of non-high school-specific spaces to be included in the building confirmed at the October 6, 2026 MCHSBC meeting so that the Schematic Design plans and cost estimate can be completed accordingly."*

Based on the information provided above, the District selected Option C.2.2A as its Preferred Solution, which includes specific educational and programmatic spaces within the high school

building that were as necessary to meet the District's educational program. The District's narrative indicates that, following the Board's selection of the Preferred Solution, the City will conduct a survey of available space throughout the community to determine whether certain non-high school-specific community spaces currently planned within the building could instead be accommodated elsewhere.

In response to these review comments, please clarify how the results of this survey could affect the Preferred Solution and the program of spaces that the District has previously determined are necessary to support the educational program. Specifically, if the survey results lead to the relocation or elimination of spaces currently included in Option C.2.2A, describe how resulting programmatic changes will be evaluated and incorporated without affecting the integrity of the Preferred Solution or the educational program on which it was based.

In addition, given that the survey will not be completed until summer 2026 and the final determination of the community spaces is anticipated at the October 6, 2026 meeting, please describe how the project scope and associated budget will be sufficiently defined during Schematic Design to support the establishment of the MSBA's potential grant. Please explain how the District intends to ensure that the scope and cost estimate presented for Project Scope and Budget approval accurately reflect the final building program.

Further, it is critical that the MSBA be kept informed related to the decisions/planning/adjustments to the design concept presented in this Preferred Schematic Report. The MSBA requests that the Owner's Project Manager coordinate monthly meetings throughout the schematic design phase that will include the District, design team, and MSBA in order to understand the potential impact to the design concept presented in this Preferred Schematic Report. Please acknowledge.

No further review comments for this section.

3.3.2 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	A narrative of any changes resulting from new information that informs the conclusions of the evaluation of the existing conditions and its impact on the final evaluation of alternatives	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	If changes are substantive, provide an updated Evaluation of Existing Conditions and identify as final. Identify additional testing that is recommended during future phases of the proposed project and indicate when the investigations and analysis will be completed	☐	☒	☐	☐
3	Site vulnerability risk assessment evaluation for each site under consideration, including a description of specific identified site resiliency concerns, design mitigation options, and resulting	☐	☒	☐	☐

	design decisions by the District				

MSBA Review Comments:

1, 2) The information provided on pages 19-223 as part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Report by Haley & Aldrich indicates the following additional investigations and analysis:

- *Conducting a supplemental subsurface exploration program (i.e., test borings and test pits) to support geotechnical design for the final site development;*
- *Evaluation of locations for on-site stormwater infiltration/management and performance of site infiltration tests; and,*
- *Geotechnical Report including final foundation design recommendations and construction considerations.*

Additionally, the information provided by ADS regarding the preliminary Phase II Environmental Analysis states the following:

> *"Finally, given that the environmental site history of the subject property includes underground storage and use of fuel oil to heat the school building, and the use of automobile maintenance fluids and petroleum products associated with the automotive shop and other shops, it is possible that isolated areas of soil exhibiting petroleum odors could be encountered during construction or demolition of the existing building. If odors or indications of petroleum or other products are noted during future excavation activities, work should stop in these areas, and the suspect soils should be stockpiled separately until an environmental professional can assess the conditions and make recommendations on how to proceed."*

Please note that any costs associated with the removal of fuel storage tanks and associated contaminated soil will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

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

- *A detailed narrative that describes the potential impact remaining site testing/analysis may have on the conceptual design;*
- *A narrative that describes the potential impact the existing conditions impose on the buildable area and site development associated with preferred building location and conceptual design;*
- *Describe how the proposed scope and associated budget will be established at schematic design as this is the phase in which the MSBA will establish a potential grant;*
- *Initial analysis performed by the Design team that determined the outcome associated with the requirements of a MEPA review; and,*
- *A workplan and timeline associated with a MEPA review and approval.*

Also, please note 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.

Furthermore, the information provided on page 205 of 223 under 'Legal Title to Property & Deed Restriction' states the following:

- *"In late April, the design team was made aware of a deed restriction by DCR representatives. Before the existing high school was built in 1970, the City and MDC (the predecessor to DCR) exchanged land to expand the available site area for the high school. As part of that land transfer, a 999-year deed restriction was put in place that prevents a building/structure from being built on the lands that were conveyed for a portion of Edgerly Field and the practice football field."*
- *"The City is consulting with land counsel, KP Law, to understand the limitations the deed restrictions place on activities on these portions of the site. Before the end of SD, the implications of these restrictions will be understood and incorporated into the project plan."*

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. Additionally, in response to these review comments, please provide a letter that confirms that the deed restriction will not prevent further development of the property.

3) Although the submittal references an RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool Report / site vulnerability risk assessment for the site and describes design mitigation options addressing these potential hazards based on these risk assessments, the submittal does not include the RMAT report. Please provide this document in response to these review comments.

No further review comments for this section.

3.3.3 FINAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Include at least three potential alternatives, with at least one renovation and/or addition option. Include the following for each alternative where appropriate:

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	An analysis of each prospective site including:				
	a) Natural site limitations	☒	☐	☐	☐
	b) Building footprint(s)	☒	☐	☐	☐
	c) Athletic fields	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) Parking areas and drives	☒	☐	☐	☐
	e) Bus and parent drop-off areas	☒	☐	☐	☐
	f) Site access and surrounding site features	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	Evaluation of the potential impact that construction of each option will have on students and measures recommended to mitigate impact	☐	☒	☐	☐
3	Conceptual architectural and site drawings that	☒	☐	☐	☐

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*
	satisfy the requirements of the education program				
4	An outline of the major building structural systems	☒	☐	☐	☐
5	The source, capacities, and method of obtaining all utilities	☒	☐	☐	☐
6	A narrative of the major building systems	☐	☒	☐	☐
7	A proposed total project budget and a construction cost estimate using the Uniformat II Elemental Classification format (to as much detail as the drawings and descriptions permit, but no less than Level 2)	☐	☒	☐	☐
8	Permitting requirements and associated approval schedule	☐	☒	☐	☐
9	Proposed project design and construction schedule including consideration of phasing	☐	☒	☐	☐
10	Completed Table 1 – MSBA Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing spreadsheet	☐	☒	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

As part of the Final Evaluation of Alternatives, the District explored the following (7) options:

- ***Option A.1****: Base repair at the existing Medford High School facility; with an estimated total project cost of $528.9million.*
- ***Option B.1.2****: Addition/renovation (5 stories) at the existing Medford High School facility, which proposes 169,571 sf of new construction and 439,221 sf of renovated space, including the existing Pool Wing and Gymnasium; with an estimated total project cost of $809.1 million.*
- ***Option C.2.2A****: Addition/renovation (6 stories) at the existing Medford High School facility, which proposes 489,925 sf of new construction and 118,867 sf of renovated space, including the existing Pool Wing and Gymnasium; with an estimated total project cost of $794.4 million.*
- ***Option C.2.2A-HS:*** *Addition/renovation (5 stories) at the existing Medford High School facility, which proposes 401,866 sf of new construction and 118,867 sf of renovated space, including the existing Pool Wing and Gymnasium; with an estimated total project cost of $697.7 million.*
- ***Option C.3.4A****: Addition/renovation (5 stories) at the existing Medford High School facility, which proposes 525,072 sf of new construction as 4 stories and 83,720 sf of renovated space, including the existing Pool Wing and Gymnasium; with an estimated total project cost of $805million.*
- ***Option D1.1****: New construction (5 stories) at the existing Medford High School site, which proposes 577,663 sf and a new Pool; with an estimated total project cost of $754.2 million.*

- ***Option D1.1NP****: New construction (5 stories) at the existing Medford High School site, which proposes 559,763 sf (without a Pool); with an estimated total project cost of $754.8 million.*

2) As part of the schematic design documents, provide further detail that clearly describes and illustrates the separation, safety provisions, and possible construction laydown areas that will be applied during construction on the occupied site for the Preferred Schematic. Please acknowledge.

Additionally, as part of the schematic design documents, please provide a detailed plan of how the project team intends to maintain the noise and dirt levels, so as not to disrupt the daily academic needs of the students during construction.

6) The information provided references a Building Management System ("BMS"). In response to these review comments, confirm that building and District maintenance personnel have been included in discussions regarding the selection and long-term operational and maintenance costs of the BMS and mechanical systems and that the training program will be coordinated with the District's facility staff and will include sufficient training hours to learn how to operate the proposed BMS before the opening of the proposed project as well as hours post turnover. Further, please indicate and describe the process/limitations associated with providing access required to update software and to operate systems remotely. The MSBA encourages the project team to ensure that coordination between maintenance personnel and district IT/security personnel is being promoted during design, construction, and project turnover to understand systems expectations and operations. Please acknowledge.

Additionally, please confirm that the District's consultants will provide the life-cycle costs and payback for all the options studied, including incorporating the Mass Save rebates and the tax credit available to municipalities through the Inflation Reduction Act, as part of the Schematic Design submittal. Also, provide information that demonstrates the variation in mechanical space required to accommodate the various HVAC systems being considered for this project.

Also, the MSBA encourages the project team to engage District personnel in the design and anticipated operation of all proposed systems, with particular emphasis related to lighting function and controls. Please describe the process in which the Project team will undertake to ensure the end users have a thorough understanding of the intended design related to lighting operation and associated lighting controls and access to software for the purposes of providing system updates.

7) As part of the schematic design documents, please provide the following:

- *The District must include negotiated costs for OPM and Designer fees for the remainder of the project as part of their Total Project Budget. The fees must be listed separately by the applicable line items that are included in the MSBA's Total Project Budget Template. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the District and its consultants will negotiate fees for the remainder of the project that are to be included in the District's schematic design documents.*
- *Identify estimated cost associated with removal of any existing fuel storage tanks.*
- *Complete the "CSI" tab within the MSBA's total project budget spreadsheet.*

- *If add/deduct construction alternates are proposed, please complete the "Alternates" tab within the MSBA's total project budget spreadsheet detailing the cost and the rationale associated with each alternate. Please acknowledge.*

8) The information provided under the 'Evaluation of Existing Conditions' narrative indicates the following permitting requirements:

- *A Notice of Intent ("NOI") will need to be filed with the Conservation Commission to perform activities that are within or that affect the resource buffers.*
- *An Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation ("ANRAD") will be filed with the Medford Conservation Commission.*

Additionally, the information provided on page 18 of 72 under Permitting Requirements within the 'Final Evaluation of Alternatives' section states:

> *"Alterations to the deed restricted areas, such as new parking spaces and access roads to facilitate athletic use, geothermal wells, and temporary construction uses, will be constructed with DCR's coordination and consent."*

In order for the MSBA to better understand the requirements and associated timeline to gain all State and local approvals, please provide a description and work plan that clearly outlines the work involved in satisfying all requirements associated with the District's Preferred Schematic.

As part of the schematic design documents, please provide an updated project schedule that includes the timeline for all the permitting requirements with the anticipated filing dates and approval dates for the District's Preferred Schematic. Additionally, please review the project's anticipated permit date based on the project schedule and verify coordination with the code analysis and all systems basis of design narratives.

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

9) In response to these review comments, provide information and/or analysis that demonstrates comparison of the design-bid-build and construction manager-at-risk project delivery methods, variations in the construction schedule and the potential advantages and disadvantages of both methods. The project schedule must include a sufficient timeframe to complete work, punch list items, move-in, and training. Please acknowledge.

10) The information provided indicates the District's Preferred Schematic includes an estimated total construction cost of $651.1 million ($1,070/sf) and an estimated total project cost of $794.4 million. Please provide information that clearly describes the cost drivers that contribute to an estimated total construction cost of $1,070/sf and describe opportunities associated with adjusting the proposed design to reduce the per square foot cost during the schematic design phase.

Additionally, the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to further evaluate the proposed design, including a review of the proposed educational spaces to maximize multiple and flexible uses that would minimize the overall square footage required, and provide the most efficient layout while continuing to meet the goals of the education program.

No further review comments for this section.

3.3.4 PREFERRED SOLUTION

	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	Educational Program				
	a) Summary of key components and how the preferred solution fulfills the educational program	☒	☐	☐	☐
	b) Design responses including desired features and/or layout considerations	☐	☐	☒	☐
	c) Proposed variances to, and benefits of, any changes to the current grade configuration (if any) and a related transition plan	☒	☐	☐	☐
2	Preferred Solution Space Summary				
	a) Updated MSBA Space Summary spreadsheet	☐	☒	☐	☐
	b) Itemization and explanation of variations from the initial space summary (and MSBA review) included in the Preliminary Design Program	☒	☐	☐	☐
3	Preliminary NE-CHPS or LEED-S scorecard	☐	☒	☐	☐
4	Narrative descriptions and diagrams showing sustainable design "best practices"	☒	☐	☐	☐
5	Conceptual floor plans of the preferred solution, in color that are clearly labeled to identify educational spaces	☒	☐	☐	☐
6	Clearly labeled site plans of the preferred solution including, but not limited to:				
	a) Structures and boundaries	☐	☒	☐	☐
	b) Site access and circulation	☒	☐	☐	☐
	c) Parking and paving	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) Zoning setbacks and limitations	☐	☐	☒	☐
	e) Easements and environmental buffers	☒	☐	☐	☐
	f) Emergency vehicle access	☐	☒	☐	☐
	g) Safety and security features	☐	☐	☒	☐
	h) Utilities	☐	☒	☐	☐
	i) Athletic fields and outdoor educational spaces (existing and proposed)	☐	☒	☐	☐
	j) Site orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐
7	An overview of the Total Project Budget and local funding including the following:				
	a) Estimated total construction cost	☒	☐	☐	☐
	b) Estimated total project cost	☒	☐	☐	☐

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*
	c) Estimated funding capacity	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) List of other municipal projects currently planned or in progress	☒	☐	☐	☐
	e) District's not-to-exceed Total Project Budget	☒	☐	☐	☐
	f) Brief description of the local process for authorization and funding of the proposed project	☒	☐	☐	☐
	g) Estimated impact to local property tax, if applicable	☒	☐	☐	☐
	h) Completed MSBA Budget Statement	☐	☒	☐	☐
8	Updated Project Schedule including the following projected dates:				
	a) Massachusetts Historical Commission Project Notification Form	☐	☒	☐	☐
	b) MSBA Board of Directors meeting for approval to proceed into Schematic Design	☒	☐	☐	☐
	c) MSBA Board of Directors meeting for approval of project scope and budget agreement and project funding agreement	☒	☐	☐	☐
	d) Town/City vote for project scope and budget agreement	☒	☐	☐	☐
	e) Design Development submittal date	☒	☐	☐	☐
	f) MSBA Design Development Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	☐	☒	☐	☐
	g) 60% Construction Documents submittal date	☒	☐	☐	☐
	h) MSBA 60% Construction Documents Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	☐	☒	☐	☐
	i) 90% Construction Documents submittal date	☒	☐	☐	☐
	j) MSBA 90% Construction Documents Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	☐	☒	☐	☐
	k) Anticipated bid date/GMP execution date	☒	☐	☐	☐
	l) Construction start	☒	☐	☐	☐
	m) Move-in date	☒	☐	☐	☐
	n) Substantial completion	☒	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

1b) In response to these review comments, please provide an updated educational program that includes the design response for each category identified in MSBA's Educational Program Requirements.

2a) Please refer to "Attachment B" for detailed review comments.

3) The submittal indicates the District's intent to meet the minimum requirements of the MSBA Green Schools Program using USGBC LEED Version 5, a goal to meet the "Specialized" energy code for an additional 3% reimbursement, and to potentially meet the additional Indoor Air Quality standards for an additional 1% reimbursement (note that the submitted LEED scorecard currently meets the required points for 4% additional reimbursement).

As part of the Schematic Design submittal, the Designer and OPM must:

- *Confirm that the project will be designed to comply with the MA "Stretch" energy code and "Specialized" energy code as required by the City of Medford.*
- *Describe in detail how compliance with the Opt-in Specialized Energy Code goals will be met (I.E. describe proposed compliance pathways, coordinate with the systems designs, etc.).*

If the District does not meet the requirements of the Green Schools Program, the District will not qualify for some or all of these incentive points, and the MSBA will adjust the reimbursement rate accordingly. Please acknowledge in response to this review.

5) The conceptual floor plans should be further developed in order to clearly demonstrate the proposed circulation and should include at minimum the following items: (Provide in response to these review comments.)

- *door openings/door swings for all rooms; and,*
- *exterior door locations for accessory buildings.*

In response to these review comments, provide interior circulation diagrams that illustrate how students will:

- *transition into the school from the drop off areas;*
- *transition from the classrooms to the cafeteria; and,*
- *exit the school at time of dismissal.*

Also, provide the same information for an individual that is physically challenged as the intent is to understand how students will be traveling through the building daily.

Additionally, the information provided indicates that the proposed building is intended to be used by the community. In response to these review comments, provide a narrative that describes how:

- *the proposed building will be used by the community;*
- *the proposed building will be secured and monitored; and,*
- *the community will enter and use the proposed building.*

6a) In response to these review comments, please confirm that roof access provisions have or are being discussed with the District's facilities personnel and local safety officials to ensure an appropriate level of access and safety will be incorporated into the schematic design documents.

Please provide any preliminary details or supplemental information that may be available relevant to the proposed roof access.

6d, f, g, h) In response to these review comments, please provide site plans that address the following items:

- *Zoning setbacks and limitations;*
- *Emergency vehicle access;*
- *Safety and security features; and,*
- *Utilities.*

6f) In response to these review comments, please confirm that local emergency representatives have been consulted in the planning process and associated requirements have been incorporated into the Preferred Schematic.

6i) In response to these review comments, please include information that describes the process including those involved in making decisions associated with incorporating site improvement components such as landscape features, trees, plantings, irrigation, rain gardens, 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 required to maintain the intended site features. Please acknowledge.

7h) The information provided in the Budget Statement does not include amounts associated with the C74 Occupational Day, Adult Education, Other Programs and Undistributed categories for all three years. In response to these review comments, please review and confirm whether this information is accurate.

8a) The information provided indicates that the Design team submitted a Project Notification Form ("PNF") to the Massachusetts Historical Commission ("MHC") on June 19, 2026. In response to these review comments, please provide a copy of the form transmitted to MHC, and provide MHC's response when available. Please include this, and all other approvals, in the Project Schedule. Additionally, 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.

8f, h, j) For reference, the schedule associated with Design Development ("DD") and 60% and 90% Construction Documents ("CD") submittals must include 21 calendar days for the MSBA to review each submission. Additionally, the schedule should include 14 calendar days for the project team to respond to MSBA's review comments and incorporate those responses into the project documents prior to the next submission or finalizing project documents to make available to bidders. Please note that the minimum duration between each MSBA design submission (DD, 60% CD, and 90% CD) is 35 calendar days. In subsequent submittals, continue to provide project schedules that include these minimum review durations. Please acknowledge.

No further review comments for this section.

3.3.5 LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVALS

	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	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.	☐	☒	☐	☐
2	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s):				
	a) Submittal approval certificate	☒	☐	☐	☐
	b) Grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting approval certificate (if applicable)	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Provide the following to document approval and public notification of school configuration changes associated with the proposed project:				
	a) A description of the local process required to authorize a change to the existing grade configuration or redistricting in the district	☐	☐	☐	☐
	b) A list of associated public meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials	☐	☐	☐	☐
	c) Certified copies of the governing body (e.g. School Building Committee) meeting notes showing specific grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting, vote language, and voting results if required locally	☐	☐	☐	☐
	d) A certification from the Superintendent stating the District's intent to implement a grade configuration or consolidate schools, as applicable. The certification must be signed by the Chief Executive Officer, Superintendent of Schools, and Chair of the School Committee.	☐	☐	☐	☐

MSBA Review Comments:

1) Please provide a certified copy of the approved School Building Committee ("SBC") meeting minutes as soon as they are available.

No further review comments for this section.

Additional Comments:

- *The MSBA issues project advisories from time to time, as informational updates for Districts, Owner's Project Managers ("OPM"), 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