Ipswich Elementary School Building Project

Board of Selectman - April 2016
MSBA Building Process

Steps primarily for:

Districts

Construction Professionals

ELIGIBILITY PERIOD

FORMING THE PROJECT TEAM

FEASIBILITY STUDY

SCHEMATIC DESIGN

July 2014 - Mar 2015

April - Dec 2015

Jan – Sept 2016

Sept 2016 – Feb 2017

FUNDING THE PROJECT

DETAILED DESIGN

CONSTRUCTION

COMPLETING THE PROJECT

May 2017 – Town Vote for Full Project Funding

June 2017 – Spring 2018

Summer 2018– Summer 2020

Fall 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2014</td>
<td><strong>Statements of Interest (SOI)</strong> – Document outlining building deficiencies which are inhibiting educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012, 2013, 2014</td>
<td>Winthrop SOI submitted to MSBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013, 2014</td>
<td>Doyon SOI submitted to MSBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td><strong>June 2014</strong> Winthrop SOI accepted to MSBA Core Program – Building Renovation, Addition or Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July / Aug 2014</strong> School Building Committee (SBC) formed by BOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oct 2014</strong> Town votes to fund $945,000 Feasibility Study/ Schematic Design Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2015       | **March 2015** MSBA recommends enrollment studies:  
|           | K-5 (420 students)  
|           | K-2 (355 Students)  
|           | K-3 (490 Students)  
|           | K-5 (775 Students)  |
|           | **July 2015** Owners Project Manager (OPM) interviews               |
|           | **September 2015** Hire PMA Consultants                            |
|           | **November 2015** Architect Request for Services submitted, reviewed |
|           | **December 2015** MSBA – Designer Selection Panel – Perkins Eastman selected |
| 2016       | **January 2016** Hired Perkins Eastman – Feasibility Study Begins  |
|           | **February - April 2016** Research period:  
|           | - Educational Teams  
|           | - Community Forums  
|           | - Site research  
|           | - Existing Conditions both Winthrop and Doyon  
|           | - Faculty Meeting                                                  |
|           | **April 2016** – School Committee Vote  
|           | Educational Model / Site Selection                                  |
|           | **June 2016** – Preferred Design Plan                              |
MSBA Recommended Configuration Options – March 2015

- **K-5 School**
  - New K-5 Facility
  - 775 Students + PK

- **K-2/3-5 Schools**
  - Winthrop: K-2 355 Students + PK
  - Doyon: 420 Students

- **K-3/4-5 Schools**
  - Winthrop: K-3 490 Students + PK
  - Doyon: 285 Students

- **K-5 Schools**
  - Winthrop: K-5 420 Students + PK
  - Doyon: K-5 355 Students
Many Key Decisions April-May

Key Dates:
3/31 - SBC/SC meeting (7pm, Town Hall room A)
4/1 - Develop Educ Prgm & Prelim Space Summ (MSBA Conf?)
4/7 - SC meeting - Grade Config. Decision (7pm, Town Hall room A)
4/8 - Start Preliminary Design Options (Incl. Site Layouts)
4/13 - SBC Meeting - Site Selection Discussion (7pm, T.H. room A)
4/14 - Start Refined Design/Site Options & Space Summ
4/27, 28 - SBC, SC meeting - Program/Space Summary Approval
5/2 - Refine & Evaluate Options.

Site, Size/Config. Program, Opt's

MSBA | Refine/Eval.4 Options | MSBA | Detailed Design/Scope of 1

Perkins Eastman | DPC
Information Gathering and Analysis – February thru April 2016

2016 FEBRUARY

2016 MARCH

2016 APRIL

Educational Leadership Team
Educational Working Group
Faculty Meeting
Community Forum
School Committee
School Building Committee

Kick Off 1/19, (2) Meetings January, (2) February, (1) March
Working Session February 29th and March 14th
Joint Winthrop / Doyon Faculty Meeting, March 17th
(3) Community Forums - February 10th, March 10th, March 23rd
Bi-Weekly Meetings, joint SC/SBC Meeting March 23rd, March 23rd - Vote April 7th
Bi-Weekly Meetings, Special Joint SC/SBC Meeting March 23rd, March 23rd
Guiding Principles

- **Vibrant and Joyful Learning Community**
  - Joy of learning through play
  - Comfortable environment
  - Emphasis on whole child
  - Compassion and empathy
  - Self-expression and confidence
  - Social decision making
  - Habits of mind

- **Outdoor Connections and Stewardship**
  - Natural environments
  - Sustainability

- **Small Learning Communities**
  - Academic neighborhoods
  - Small school feel, Large school pride
  - Civic engagement and leadership
  - Civic responsibility (being proactive)

- **Inquiry-based cooperative learning**
  - Student centered
  - Relevance and applicability of learning
  - Focused and visible learning
  - Project-based learning
  - Collaboration
  - SHOMs
Guiding Principles

• **Flexibility and adaptability**
  - For teaching and learning Today and Tomorrow
  - Flexible learning communities

• **School as community resource**
  - Ability to provide varied community use
  - Whole community collaboration

• **Embodies rich history of Ipswich**
  - A building that is aesthetically appropriate
  - Supportive of town values
  - Town is the foundation
  - Welcoming
# Design Patterns

- **Agile & Flexible Space/Classrooms**
  - Varied spaces
  - Areas of interaction, performance, plays, small and large group work
  - Right-sized spaces
  - Flexible and ergonomic furniture
  - Pull out spaces
  - Zoned

- **Clusters of Learning**
  - Classroom neighborhoods
  - Small school feel
  - Learning hubs
  - Pods

- **Outdoor Connections**
  - Natural light
  - Indoor/outdoor connections
  - Sustainability
  - Bring the outdoors in

- **Common Spaces**
  - Community learning spaces
  - Gathering spaces
  - Media space and library
Design Patterns

• Visible Learning
  - Display & Exhibition of student work
  - Giving students independence
  - Storytelling

• Teacher Teaming
  - Professional work and collaboration space
  - With distributed resources

• Distributed Resources
  - Student and teacher
  - Distributed dining

• Greeting and Gatekeeping
• Distributed resources
• Building as teacher
• Cafetorium
• Full sized gym
• Maker spaces
• Storage and lockers outside classrooms
• Wayfinding and digital bulletin board
• Natural light
• Noise mitigation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Facilities Equality</td>
<td>High-quality classroom, speciality and support spaces</td>
<td>65% of students benefit from new facility</td>
<td>65% of students benefit from new facility</td>
<td>65% of students benefit from new facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ADA Compliance and</td>
<td>Access and environment that can be used by all students and teachers, to the</td>
<td>60% of students benefit from full ADA compliance and universal design focus</td>
<td>60% of students benefit from full ADA compliance and universal design focus</td>
<td>100% of students benefit from full ADA compliance and universal design focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Design</td>
<td>greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>Replicable at each grade with special considerations that support equitable</td>
<td>Replicable at each grade with special considerations that support equitable</td>
<td>Replicable at each grade with special considerations that support equitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ogunquit programming</td>
<td>Ogunquit programming</td>
<td>Ogunquit programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Program Equity</td>
<td>Grade level alignment of educational programming</td>
<td>Equitable at each grade</td>
<td>Equitable at each grade</td>
<td>Equitable for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 K-5 Program Alignment</td>
<td>Degree of alignment maintained. Natural differentiation between schools</td>
<td>Fully aligned</td>
<td>Fully aligned</td>
<td>Fully aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Continuity of Relationships</td>
<td>The continuity of relationships and</td>
<td>Continuity of relationships within separate K-5 schools</td>
<td>Continuity of relationships within separate K-5 schools</td>
<td>Continuity of relationships maintained within larger school K-5 experience. Possible academic and physical cohorting to preserve smaller school experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-15 educational experience</td>
<td>Grade three transitions with student cohorts remaining constant</td>
<td>Grade four transitions with student cohorts remaining constant</td>
<td>Continuity of relationships maintained within larger school K-5 experience. Possible academic and physical cohorting to preserve smaller school experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Shared Resources</td>
<td>The ability to easily share and access</td>
<td>Potential limitations in access to part-time specialists. Grade level resources all together</td>
<td>Potential limitations in access to part-time specialists. Grade level resources all together</td>
<td>Increased access to part-time specialists and grade level resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational resources and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grade Level Collaboration</td>
<td>The opportunity for inter-grade partnerships among staff/students</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The opportunity for cross-grade partnerships among staff/students</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
<td>Potential for increased district-wide collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sm School Experience/</td>
<td>A common sense of both intimate (classroom) and broader (small school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Community</td>
<td>5-15 educational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Experience</td>
<td>Siblings spanning multiple grades in the same building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Population Demographics</td>
<td>Ability to balance the district's diverse student backgrounds and needs within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom and specialized settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Transitions</td>
<td>Ability to minimize transitions that can negatively impact learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Technology</td>
<td>The access to reliable technology tools and internet access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Security</td>
<td>Safety/planing for modern day passive and active safety/security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to the IPS district education plan</td>
<td>Access to learning environments that promote the teaching and practice of IPS's 21st Century learning expectations (Successful Habits of Mind)</td>
<td>94% of students benefit from access to 21st century learning environments</td>
<td>95% of students benefit from access to 21st century learning environments</td>
<td>100% of students benefit from access to 21st century learning environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services and Facilities</td>
<td>Facilities and services needed to provide healthy meals</td>
<td>Current facilities maintained at Leon, 54% of students benefit from new services and enhanced facilities</td>
<td>Current facilities maintained at Leon, 46% of students benefit from new services and enhanced facilities</td>
<td>Current services maintained at Leon, 63% of students benefit from new services and enhanced facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (MSBA)</td>
<td>The ability to meet and/or exceed established regulations</td>
<td>85% of Pre-K/5 students in right-sized classes, 54% of students would benefit from Art, Music, Gym, Kitchen, Admin &amp; support spaces sized per MSBA standards</td>
<td>100% of Pre-K/5 students in right-sized classes, 54% of students would benefit from Art, Music, Gym, Kitchen, Admin &amp; support spaces sized per MSBA standards</td>
<td>100% of Pre-K/5 students in right-sized classes, 54% of students would benefit from Art, Music, Gym, Kitchen, Admin &amp; support spaces sized per MSBA standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Delivery of Special Education services and programming within a co-teaching model</td>
<td>Resources remain between two schools, 54% of students benefit from spaces purpose-built for co-teaching, varied groupings and differentiated instruction</td>
<td>Resources all together for each grade, 54% of students benefit from spaces purpose-built for co-teaching, varied groupings and differentiated instruction</td>
<td>Resources all together, full elementary, 54% of students benefit from spaces purpose-built for co-teaching, varied groupings and differentiated instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacencies</td>
<td>The ability to create adjacencies that maximize the potential for teacher learning and differentiated instruction</td>
<td>54% of students benefit from planned ideal adjacencies and connectivity</td>
<td>46% of students benefit from planned ideal adjacencies and connectivity</td>
<td>63% of students benefit from planned ideal adjacencies and connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Sizes</td>
<td>The ability to balance and maintain equitable average class sizes</td>
<td>Balanced at each grade</td>
<td>Balanced at each grade</td>
<td>Balanced at each grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broader Community/Financial Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>(2) K-5 Schools:</th>
<th>(3) 6-3 / 5 Schools:</th>
<th>(4) 6-3 / 4-5 Schools:</th>
<th>(5) K-5 School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Townwide Support of Option</td>
<td>Likelihood of gaining final town approval</td>
<td>More flexibility with grade crossing - collaborate more opportunity for other town needs</td>
<td>More educational experience for all students</td>
<td>More educational experience for all students</td>
<td>Likely, would enhance community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on the future shape and feel of school</td>
<td>Likelihood (same as now)</td>
<td>Not as likely</td>
<td>Not as likely</td>
<td>Likely, would enhance community resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resource</td>
<td>The ability to interact, develop and sustain community connections and partnerships through use of the school facilities</td>
<td>Separate schools would offer dispersed spaces for more, smaller functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td>Separate schools would offer dispersed spaces for separate functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td>Combined school spaces would yield opportunities for larger functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Learning Spaces</td>
<td>Characteristics of shared spaces such as gymnasium, food service space(s), art room(s), music maker space(s), etc.</td>
<td>Separate schools would offer dispersed spaces for more, smaller functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td>Separate schools would offer dispersed spaces for separate functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td>Combined school spaces would yield opportunities for larger functions, usage may be site dependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>Cost of constructing and outfitting the building</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of completing the elementary schools and/or replicating fields</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs</td>
<td>Costs of maintaining building including utilities, custodial, preventive maintenance, etc.</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
<td>Currently being estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESEARCH
GRADE CONFIGURATION

RESEARCH ON GRADE CONFIGURATION*
No Definitive Answer on Most Effective Grade Configuration
Each Community Considers Different Factors in the Determination
Most Studies Identify More Significant Factors Being:
  • Quality of School, Leadership and Instruction
  • Degree of Parent & Community Involvement
  • Transitions Can Have An Impact Learning
  • Longer Span in One School (helps builds relationships, stronger support)

Advantages of K-2 and 3-5
More Grade Specific Resources
More Classrooms per Grade
Students Feel Safe with Similar Age Groups
More Opportunities Among Grades

Advantages of K-5
More Convenient for Families/Involvement
Builds Familiarity & Communication Spans
Less Transitions Between Schools
More Opportunities Between Grades

*Cache County Utah summary on grade configuration studies
## Building Comparisons

### MSBA 2008-2014 Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Building Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>Bancroft</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>106,904</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline</td>
<td>Devotion</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>227,087</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>Carver ES</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>112,350</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>140,107</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Penn Brook</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>132,539</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>Gr 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revere</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>103,650</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>131,630</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Park Avenue</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>109,067</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman Hanson</td>
<td>Maquan</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>132,841</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>Pk-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburyport</td>
<td>Bresnahan</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>112,517</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Pk1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Repair Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Building Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marblehead</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>Gr 4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needham</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>119,264</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsfield</td>
<td>Gov Winslow</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elementary Schools Student sizes 2008-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total ES projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700 or more</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 699</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 to 399</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Building Sites

- Mile Lane: 27.3 Acres
- Doyon School: 17.2 Acres
- Bialek Park: 14.2 Acres
- Green Street (Town Hall): 9.9 Acres
- Winthrop School: 6.8 Acres
Site Considerations – Winthrop – 6.8 acres

Pros
- Neighborhood, walkable site
- Been a school site for over 100 years
- Water, sewer, gas and electric/communication utilities on Central Street

Cons
- Some environmental issues – Manning School debris, potential ash burial, asbestos
- Small site with fire station located at only site entrance
- Construction issues with active school on site.
- All options require a three story building along Central Street
- Current traffic issue
- High ground water
Site Considerations – Doyon (775 K-5 only) – 17.2 acres

Pros
- Been a school site for over 50 years
- Water, and electric/communication utilities on Linebrook
- Large site

Cons
- No sewer or gas utilities
- Some environmental issues – Septic system, asbestos
- Construction issues with active school on site
- Loss of athletic fields
- Narrow site
Site Considerations – Bialek Park – 14.2 acres

Pros
• Neighborhood, walkable site
• Water, sewer, gas and electric/communication utilities on Linebrook
• Large site
• Opens Winthrop site for a future Public Safety Building

Cons
• Replace athletic fields
• Possible Ch 97 Park compliance
• High ground water
Site Considerations – Mile Lane (775 K-5 only) – 27.3 acres

Pros
• Water, and electric/communication utilities on Mile Lane
• Large site

Cons
• No sewer or gas utilities
• Loss of the primary athletic fields for school and town use
• Wetlands
• Building septic system within drinking water conservation area

• Same Pros as Doyon but Athletic field loss and proximity Town water source issues
Site Pros and Considerations – Green Street/Town Hall – 9.9 acres

Pros
- Neighborhood, walkable site
- Been a school site in the past
- Water, sewer, gas and electric/communication utilities on Green Street
- River front property

Cons
- River front property – setbacks greatly reduce buildable site area
- Potential site traffic issues with Town Hall and secondary streets
- Environmental issues – Buried former town dump, and jail building debris, unknown other buried containments
## Estimated Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>K-3 490 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-3 490 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Bialek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. Total Project Costs</td>
<td>$ 43,687,314</td>
<td>$ 40,060,855</td>
<td>$ 61,626,922</td>
<td>$ 43,512,042</td>
<td>$ 39,897,857</td>
<td>$ 59,711,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBA Grant</td>
<td>$ 17,030,210</td>
<td>$ 15,635,707</td>
<td>$ 24,632,979</td>
<td>$ 16,750,653</td>
<td>$ 15,277,001</td>
<td>$ 24,962,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Share</td>
<td>$ 26,657,104</td>
<td>$ 24,425,148</td>
<td>$ 36,993,943</td>
<td>$ 26,761,389</td>
<td>$ 24,620,856</td>
<td>$ 34,749,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated Tax Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-3 490 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-3 490 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Bialek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIMUM DISTRICT SHARE Estimated</strong></td>
<td>$26,657,104</td>
<td>$24,425,148</td>
<td>$36,993,943</td>
<td>$26,761,389</td>
<td>$24,620,856</td>
<td>$34,749,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX IMPACT Estimated</strong></td>
<td>$0.67 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.62 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.94 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.67 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.63 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.88 per 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL IMPACT FY2021 Estimated</strong></td>
<td>$306.19</td>
<td>283.34</td>
<td>$429.58</td>
<td>$306.19</td>
<td>$287.91</td>
<td>$402.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a $457,000 median home value
## Tax Impact over existing bond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMUM DISTRICT SHARE Estimated</th>
<th>K-3 490 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Winthrop</th>
<th>K-3 490 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 420 at Bialek</th>
<th>K-5 775 at Bialek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$26,657,104</td>
<td>$24,425,148</td>
<td>$36,993,943</td>
<td>$26,761,389</td>
<td>$24,620,856</td>
<td>$34,749,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TAX IMPACT Estimated | $0.67/1000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.22/1000 | $0.621000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.17/1000 | $0.94 /000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.49/1000 | $0.67/1000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.22/1000 | $0.63/1000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.18/1000 | $0.88/1000 Minus $0.45/1000 Minus $0.43/1000 |

| ANNUAL IMPACT FY2021 Estimated | $100.54 | 77.69 | $223.93 | $100.54 | $82.56 | $196.51 |

---

HS/MS Bond retires in FY20. Based on $457,000 median home value
DOYON - Options

- **MSBA – Three Programs**
  - Core Building – Renovating or replacing buildings that do not meet the City/Town’s educational program
    - Or
  - Base Repair – For existing buildings that meet the City/Town’s educational program but the base building systems require upgrade to extend building life.
    - Or
  - Accelerated Repair - Streamlined program to repair roofs, windows and boilers. One system at a time

- MSBA reimbursement available

- Must select one program. One building cannot participate in more than one program
- If Base Repair is selected, MSBA then determines building meets Educational program
- If a second MSBA project replaces equipment MSBA funded within 20 years, MSBA will reduce funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BASE REPAIR No Education Program In 10 years</th>
<th>BASE REPAIR W/ Education Program Addition In 10 years</th>
<th>NEW DOYON K-5 (355) In 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</td>
<td>$15,420,000</td>
<td>$20,800,000</td>
<td>$49,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM DISTRICT SHARE Estimated</td>
<td>$8,877,600</td>
<td>$11,729,000</td>
<td>$31,361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX IMPACT Estimated</td>
<td>$0.22 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.30 per 1000</td>
<td>$0.79 per 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL IMPACT FY2026 Estimated</td>
<td>$100.54</td>
<td>$137.10</td>
<td>$361.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ipswich - Total Potential Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Winthrop K-5 Plus Doyon Base Reno</th>
<th>Winthrop K-5 Plus Doyon Reno w/ 8,700 SF Add</th>
<th>Winthrop K-5 Plus New Doyon</th>
<th>K-5 775 Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Share</strong></td>
<td>$24,620,856</td>
<td>$24,620,856</td>
<td>$24,620,856</td>
<td>$34,749,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doyon Town Share in 10 Years</strong></td>
<td>$8,877,600</td>
<td>$11,729,000</td>
<td>$31,361,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Total Town Share</strong></td>
<td>$33,498,456</td>
<td>$36,349,856</td>
<td>$55,981,856</td>
<td>$34,749,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doyon – What Does $700,000 buy?

- Doyon value $2,482,000 – AAB value $744,780. Spending over this limit in any three year period requires ADA and seismic structural compliance.
- Adding or relocating walls would trigger Building Code Ch. 34 compliance for upgrading systems to meet present day codes.
- Base renovation estimates:
  - New Flooring – $800,000 (includes Hazmat removal)
  - New Electrical System – $1,300,000
  - New Fire Alarm System - $200,000
  - New Sprinkler System - $325,000
  - Replace 30 HVAC UVs - $250,000
  - New Plumbing - $900,000 (includes new ADA toilet rooms with HVAC, electrical)
  - New Kitchen Equipment - $350,000 (includes HVAC, Fire Alarm, Electrical, Anbul System)
  - Clean, repair and repoint exterior brick - $300,000
  - 8,700 SF Educational space addition - $4,000,000