The needs of the FHS facility are real and urgent:

- Urgent Accreditation and ADA Compliance issues
- 23 separate entrances and lack of private/public space separation
- Sprawling layout
- Inadequate classroom space which limits programming
- Undersized library, auditorium and cafeteria
- Inefficient building envelope

Full Summary of Needs can be found [here](#).
Learn More About the Needs of FHS

3 minute summary that highlights the Needs of FHS:

https://vimeo.com/388766228
FHSBC Charge

Part 1:

a) Review reference docs
b) Engage multiple architectural firms for competitive conceptual designs
c) Review pricing with Owner’s Rep/Estimator
d) Report findings to Town Council
e) Consider alternate locations

Part 2: - Phase 1

a) Receive project scope and net project cost range from Town Council
b) Continue with preliminary plan development
c) Bring plan to referendum
FHSBC Process and Timeline

**Conceptual Option Phase**
Evaluate conceptual design options from multiple architects to provide Town Council with the information they need to set the net municipal project cost range and overall project scope.

- Establish FHSBC and Sub-Committees
- Begin Communications Planning
- Complete Site Analysis
- Select firm for Owner's Representative Services (RFP & Interviews)
- Select firms for Architect Services (RFP & Interviews)
- Review Educational Specifications
- Create Conceptual Design Options (Maintain/Renovate/New)
- Review and Analyze Conceptual Design Options
- Present Conceptual Design Options to Town Council

Town Council sets net municipal project cost range and overall project scope (Feb 2020)

**Preliminary Plan Phase**
Design a comprehensive solution to address the BOE Statement of Needs that falls within the net municipal project cost range and overall project scope set by Town Council

- Select Project Architect
- Schematic Design Creation
- Schematic Design Review and Analysis
- Schematic Design and Budget Presented to Town Council
- Schematic Design and Budget Approved by Town Council

Town Meeting/Referendum (Fall 2020)

(This is a planning document that represents high-level tasks and will be updated continually.)
What is a Conceptual Design Option?

The primary function of a conceptual design is to determine a starting point.

- High Level Design Concept
- Categorized as either a Maintain, Renovate or New Building Option
- Focus on meeting the Statement of Needs
- High level costs using an independent estimator
- Estimated Tax Impact for conceptual design comparison is calculated using basic financing methods for a stand-alone project.
1.) Review reference documents and hire experts – CSG (3 months)

2.) Interview and select two architects as part of competitive design process – (3 months)
   - Conducted in Executive Session per Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-200(6) and 1-210(b)(24)
   - Standard practice for responses to proposals/selection of a finalist

3.) Design & Evaluate Conceptual Options – (4 months)
   - Designated design discussions with each architect
   - Creation of the Conceptual Option Evaluation Matrix
   - Option evaluation discussions after each presentation
   - Community feedback via online and public comments
   - Community Meeting w/Tours – October 2019
   - Community Meeting w/Tours – January 2020
FHS Maintain Conceptual Options

**QA&M ($99M/$81M)**
- A renovate-light option
- Includes addition
- Does not address the full statement of needs
- Disruption to learning through construction (internal swing space)

**TSKP ($49M/$46M)**
- Maintain only option
- Includes additional capital expenditures
- Does not address the full statement of needs
- Disruption to learning through construction (portables)
FHS Renovate Conceptual Options

QA&M ($140M/$99M)

• Learning communities in back of building
• Meets the statement of needs
• Disruption to learning through out construction (internal swing space)

TSKP ($138M/$97M)

• Learning houses in front of building
• Meets the statement of needs
• Disruption to learning through out construction (portables)
FHS New Build Conceptual Options

QA&M ($145M/$116M)
- “River” Approach
- Meets Statement of Needs
- Built on student parking side of current facility
- Learning Community Based
- No disruption to learning

TSKP ($142M/$114M)
- “Main Street” Approach
- Meets Statement of Needs
- Built on student parking side of current facility
- Learning Community Based
- No disruption to learning
1. **Select project scope**
   - Maintain/Renovate/New

2. **Select the option within the project scope**
   - TSKP or QA&M
## Conceptual Option Scope Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Matrix Score Range (Max 28) (Statement of Needs and Ed Specs)</th>
<th>Maintain</th>
<th>Renovate</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3 - 17.0</td>
<td>25 - 26.3</td>
<td>25.8 - 27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe and Flexible Learning Environment**
- Maintain: Minimal safety requirements addressed; No flexible learning environments
- Renovate: Most safety requirements addressed; Addition of flexible learning environments
- New: All current safety requirements addressed; Provides fully flexible learning environment

**Education Disruption**
- Maintain: Significant educational disruption through construction
- Renovate: Significant educational disruption through construction
- New: No education disruption through construction

**Maximum Value with Minimal Risk**
- Maintain: HAZMAT Risk; Unknowns could affect project duration and cost
- Renovate: HAZMAT Risk; Unknowns could affect project duration and cost
- New: No HAZMAT Risk; Duration and Cost Risks are minimized

**Community Asset**
- Maintain: Public/Private space separation remains a concern
- Renovate: Public/Private space separation concerns are minimized
- New: Public/Private Space separation obtained

**Net Project Cost Range**
- Maintain: $45M - $81M
- Renovate: $97M - $99M
- New: $114M - $116M
Based on a full evaluation of the potential project scopes, the FHSBC is recommending a project scope of: **New Build**
Based on a full evaluation of both new conceptual options, the FHSBC is recommending a project option of: **TSKP New Build (3)**
# FHSBC Conceptual Option Evaluation

## FHSBC Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Total Points Available</th>
<th>PRESENTATION 1 OF 3-JANUARY 8, 2020</th>
<th>PRESENTATION 2 OF 3-JANUARY 15, 2020</th>
<th>PRESENTATION 3OF 3-JANUARY 22, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OPTION 1: MAINTAIN EXISTING FIS</td>
<td>OPTION 2: RENOVATE EXISTING FIS AS NEW WITH ADDITIONS</td>
<td>OPTION 3: NEW FHS BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TSKP</td>
<td>QA&amp;M</td>
<td>TSKP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PROGRAMMATIC NEEDS</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CONSOLIDATION OF SPACE</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BUILDING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 FIT AND FEEL FOR FARMINGTON</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# New Conceptual Option Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Matrix Score (Max 28) (Statement of Needs and Ed Specs)</th>
<th>27.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site Layout and External Traffic Flow | ● Ease of site usage  
● Simplified traffic flow |
| Surrounding Neighborhood Considerations | ● Surrounding neighborhood impact mitigation strategies |
| Design Flexibility | ● Ease of design customization |
| Internal Design and Traffic Flow | ● Learning Common and Cafeteria placement  
● Collaboration space placement |
| Fit and Feel for Farmington | ● Reuse of resources (900 Wing)  
● Efficient but effective design |
| Net Project Cost | $114M |
External Elements

- Improvements to parking and circulation
- 1 student entrance
- Site ADA addressed
- Loop road around facility
- 1 Field Addition
- Surrounding neighborhood impact mitigation strategies
- Flexible approach to the 1928 Building
Internal Elements

- Ease of design customization
- Learning Common and Cafeteria placement
- Collaboration space placement within learning communities
Fit and Feel for Farmington

- Reuse of resources (900 Wing)/Separation of Central Office
- Efficient but effective design
- Exposure to natural lighting
FHSBC Option Recommendation

Option 3 | First Floor

Option 3 | Second Floor

Option 3 | Third Floor
FHSBC Option Recommendation
The FHSBC is committed to working collaboratively to maximize reimbursement and reduce the net municipal project cost by finding efficiencies in design elements that minimize impact on educational programs.
The FHSBC would like to extend a sincere thank you to both architects that have supported us through the competitive conceptual design process. We acknowledge that this process has been unique and challenging. The support and collaboration is greatly appreciated.
• Receive Net Municipal Project Cost Range and Scope from Town Council
• Plan Part 2/Phase 1 of Charge in preparation for referendum

**IMPORTANT:**
• Only a conceptual design has been determined at this time (a starting point)
• FHSBC will work with the selected architect to complete a detailed design once Town Council has set the Net Municipal Project Cost Range and Scope
  — The design and cost will be modified through a more detailed evaluation
• FHSBC will continue to collaborate with the community, impacted neighborhoods and Town Council on the detailed design prior to referendum