	Estimated Capital Cost	Summary of Major Cost Categories	Estimated State/Federal Reimbursement	Neary Site Demolition & Remediation Cost	Operational Savings or Added Costs (e.g., busing, staffing, utilities)	Operational Cost/Savings Summary	Net Town Cost (after reimbursement and offsets)	Expected Renovation or Construction Timeframe	Life Expectancy (in years)
A: Finn serves Pre-K - 2 Trotter serves Grades 3-4, Woodward serves Grades 5-8	Renovations (Existing Buildings — Heavy ~76%) Woodward (68,000 SF × 75% @ $635.78/SF): $32,417,025 (2024 baseline, incl. soft costs) Trotter (130,000 SF × 75% @ $635.78/SF): $61,004,062 (2024 baseline, incl. soft costs) 2024 baseline (renovations total): $93,421,087 Totals with escalation (renovations only, incl. soft costs) 2024 baseline: $93,421,087 2025 (+4%): $97,157,930 2026 (+8%): $100,894,774 2027 (+12%): $104,631,617	"Option A assumes **Heavy (~75%) renovations"* in both Woodward (68,000 SF) and Trotter (130,000 SF). Costs primarily driven by: - Conversion of **Trotter's** cafeteria, auditorium, gym/locker rooms, and performance spaces** — oversized and inappropriate for elementary grades. - Conversion of **Woodward's** small elementary classrooms, undersized cafeteria, and lack of science lab/locker rooms** to meet middle school program needs. - Major rework of circulation, cafeteria/kitchen layouts, and building systems (MEP/FP) to adapt to new grade configurations. The **"minimum cost baseline"* may rise significantly depending on program conversion and compliance with Massachusetts Stretch/Specialized Energy Code. Committees have consistently noted that Option A focus substantial logistical hurdles and is a weaker scenario relative to other configurations."	MSBA eligibility uncertain; statistically lower reimbursement % than new construction (inference, § 05 p.4444). Base Rate: Each district is assigned a base reimbursement rate (typically 40–65%). Incentive Points: Additional 1–2% may be awarded for factors such as: • Energy efficiency / green building design • Maintenance practices (capital planning, audits) • Educational program alignment • Community use of facilities • 21st century learning features (Maximum capped reimbursement ~50–55%.) Ineligible Costs: MSBA will not reimburse for certain categories, including: • Site work over 8% of building cost • Soft costs above set caps (DPM, designer fees, legal, etc.) • Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) beyond caps • Technology hardware/software • Moving expenses, insurance, contingencies Effective Rate: After ineligible costs are excluded, the effective reimbursement is usually much lower than the base rate. Most districts see 30–35% of total project cost reimbursed by MSBA.	If Neary was to be demolished and not repurposed (add to estimated capital cost total): ~$2.6–$3.0M (Metcalf Demolition $667,750 (+$10/LF× 66,775 sf) + Remove hazardous materials $1,500,000 + Site restoration to grass ~$0.39–$0.78M @ $5–$10/LF× 78,000 sf, assumption). (§ 05 pg674)					30–40 years for new additions; renovated/incidental rework extends utility (inference; § 05 p.4444).
B1: Finn serves Pre-K to 2, Woodward serves 3–5, Trotter serves 6–8 (no addition)									
B2: Finn serves Pre-K to 2, Woodward serves 3–4, Trotter serves 5–8 (with renovation)	Addition Finn ~9,000 NSF + Trotter ~7,200 NSF = 16,200 NSF → ×1.5 grossing factor = 24,300 GSF Costed at $1,158.12/GSF (incl. soft costs), +4%/yr escalation 2024 baseline (addition only): $28,142,316 Sources: 4.07 (Finn ~9,000 sf net); 4.08 (Trotter ~7,200 sf net); § 05 p.444 (§/sf, adjusted +21.1% soft). Renovations (Existing Buildings: Light Renovation 15–25%) Finn (76,000 SF @ $635.78/SF): • 15% = $7,247,862 → +25% = $12,079,820 Trotter (130,000 SF @ $635.78/SF): • 15% = $12,397,718 → +25% = $20,662,850 2024 baseline (renovations subtotal): $19,645,602 – $32,742,670 (Apply +4%/yr escalation to the renovation subtotal as well.) 3. Combined Total (Addition + Light Renovations) 2024 baseline: $47,797,918 – $60,884,986 2025 (+4%): $49,699,435 – $63,320,385 2026 (+8%): $51,600,953 – $65,755,785 2027 (+12%): $53,522,468 – $68,191,186	Finn adds ~9,000 net of per 1,110; world language 950; SPLiang 500; pop/cyberwater ~1,000; PT/Adaptive PE 950; OLD 500; reading ~1,450; conference 700; teacher workspace 300; cafeteria 1,500 per 6.07. Trotter adds ~7,200 net of for music (2,750), art (1,150), teacher workspace (650), small-group dining (850), conference (550), etc., per 6.08. Both are grossed by 1.5 and costed at $968.50/sf from § 05 p.444. No extra allowances. Note: Massachusetts Stretch Energy Code / Specialized Code may apply; higher envelope/MEP performance could increase costs beyond baseline §/SF.	MSBA eligibility uncertain; statistically lower reimbursement % than new construction (inference, § 05 p.4444). Base Rate: Each district is assigned a base reimbursement rate (typically 40–65%). Incentive Points: Additional 1–2% may be awarded for factors such as: • Energy efficiency / green building design • Maintenance practices (capital planning, audits) • Educational program alignment • Community use of facilities • 21st century learning features (Maximum capped reimbursement ~50–55%.) Ineligible Costs: MSBA will not reimburse for certain categories, including: • Site work over 8% of building cost • Soft costs above set caps (DPM, designer fees, legal, etc.) • Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) beyond caps • Technology hardware/software • Moving expenses, insurance, contingencies Effective Rate: After ineligible costs are excluded, the effective reimbursement is usually much lower than the base rate. Most districts see 30–35% of total project cost reimbursed by MSBA.	If Neary was to be demolished and not repurposed (add to estimated capital cost total): ~$2.6–$3.0M (Metcalf Demolition $667,750 (+$10/LF× 66,775 sf) + Remove hazardous materials $1,500,000 + Site restoration to grass ~$0.39–$0.78M @ $5–$10/LF× 78,000 sf, assumption). (§ 05 pg674)	Staff sharing across school increases travel stipends and may be inefficient considering travel time; staff have reduced belonging (4.07, 4.08). Utilities scale with additions.	Neary Administrative and Building support eliminated/decreased.	~$47,797,918 – $60,884,986 pre-escalation; assume local share unless MSBA add/Neary pathway applies. Sources: 4.07, 4.08; § 05 p.444 (unit costs adjusted +21.1% soft).	Phased delivery focused at Finn and Trotter (~24 months combined); escalate to midpoint per calc sheet. Sources: 4.07, 4.08; § 05 p.444.	30–40 years for new additions; renovated/incidental rework extends utility (inference; § 05 p.4444).
C1: Minimal renovation of Neary (only items identified by school committee as required immediately)	~$1.5M-4.5M	Roof replacement and targeted asbestos abatement. Feasibility studies are underway to have a more specific estimated cost and lifespan.	No MSBA reimbursement expected due to advanced timeline	N/A	N/A	N/A	~$1.5M-4.5M	Fall 2024	Roof life expectancy 40-50 years School use of building TBD
C2: Minimal renovation of Neary (assumed "deferred maintenance" only) *Different levels of investment and investment timeline trigger various code/compliance milestones. Investment and timing levels would need to be well understood to maximize the total financial impact of this option	~$4,750,000 (Neary Roof Replacement, ADA Compliance of Neary, Deferred Maintenance Package; Neary Renovations Phase 2 & 3) (§ 05 pg 9-10) (§ 05 pg 7) Optional Sprinkler Upgrade (not in Advisory baseline) ~$500K baseline (§ 05 pp.678–687, Option B.1 @ $8/sf for Neary's 62,736 SF). Escalates to ~$520K in 2025, ~$540K in 2026, ~$560K in 2027. Note: deferred maintenance scope does not typically trigger sprinklers (§242). However, if the district elected to add a system or if scope expanded into substantial renovation, sprinklers could be required.	Roof replacement; ADA compliance upgrades; deferred maintenance scope (mechanical/plumbing/finishes); window & wood cabinetry; pavement & sidewalks; playground equipment; stucco repair & exterior painting (1.08 pp.8–10); scope is consistent with "Base Repair/Code Update" option (§ 05 p.444). (§ 05 pg 7) ADA improvements (§ 05 FCA, Apr 2021 — Table 1): $179,089 in 2021 → $200,326 (2024 baseline), $208,339 (2025), $216,352 (2026), $224,365 (2027) using +4%/yr escalation. Roof Replacement (§ 05 FCA, Apr 2021 — pg 7 Table 3.3.1): $1,406,021 in 2021 → $1,585,000 (2024 baseline), $1,648,000 (2025), $1,711,000 (2026), $1,775,000 (2027) using +4%/yr escalation. Window Replacement (§ 05 FCA, Apr 2021 — pg 7 Table 3.3.2): $1,089,000 in 2021 → $1,226,000 (2024 baseline), $1,275,000 (2025), $1,325,000 (2026), $1,374,000 (2027) using +4%/yr escalation. Compliance triggering: Certain deferred maintenance items (roof replacement, windows, ADA, kitchen equipment) must be upgraded to current prescriptive code standards at the time of replacement. These are triggered by the act of replacing a system, even if the overall building is not undergoing full renovation. Additional projects costs not included, only defined cost items	No MSBA reimbursement in No-Vote scenario; full local burden (1.08 p.8, pp.7-8)	No building demolition, abatement/allowances as needed (1.08 p.10; § 05 p.444 hazmat allowance)	No material operational savings; ongoing repairs and rising O&M expected (§ 1.08 p.8, p.10).	Short-term capital avoids new build debt; future larger project still likely (1.08 pp.1-2; 5).	~$4,750,000 local share (1.08 pp.8-10).	Debt service for listed items spread FY2027–FY2031, multi-year implementation (1.08 p.9).	Documented scope is "Base Repair/Code Update" (§ 05 p.444). No explicit lifespan stated in 1.08; given roof/windows/ADA/deferred maintenance are included (1.08 pp.8–10), a planning range of 10–15 years is reasonable (inference) assuming systems are executed as listed and maintained; educational adequacy remains unaddressed. (§ 05 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline)
D: Finn expanded or renovated to serve five grades (Pre-K to 5)	Addition (classrooms + PK-3 Support) 8 general education classrooms @ 900 NSF each = 7,200 NSF Support/program spaces (4.07 scaled for PK-5) doubled to ~18,000 NSF Total Addition = 25,200 NSF → ÷ 1.5 grossing factor = 37,800 GSF Costed at $1,158.12/GSF (§ 05 p.444 +21.1% soft), +4%/yr escalation 2024 baseline: $43,797,936 2025: $45,549,853 2026: $47,301,770 2027: $49,053,687 Light Renovation of Finn (15–25% of 76,000 SF) =11,400–19,000 SF × $635.78/SF (incl. +21.1% soft) 2024 baseline: $7,249,992 – $12,079,820 (+4%/yr escalation) Combined Total (Addition + Light Reno) 2024 baseline: $51,047,928 – $55,877,756 2025: $53,206,727 – $57,954,766 2026: $54,963,626 – $60,031,776 2027: $56,918,526 – $62,108,786 Optional Reference — If Renovation Scope is Heavier Medium (30–50% of 76,000 SF) = $14.5M – $24.2M (2024 baseline) Heavy (~75% of 76,000 SF) = $36.4M (2024 baseline)	Addition at Finn: 8 general education classrooms (7,200 NSF) plus a dedicated PK-3 support/program space (~18,000 NSF, 4.07 space needs doubled for third grade). Total ~25,200 NSF → ×1.5 gross = 37,800 GSF, costed at $1,158.12/GSF (incl. +21.1% soft). 2024 baseline = $43.8M, escalating to ~$49.0M by 2027 (§ 05 p.444; 4.07). Light Renovation at Finn: 15–25% of existing 76,000 SF (~11,400–19,000 SF) for twins, corridors, and limited reconfiguration. 2024 baseline = $7.2M–$12.1M, escalating with construction inflation (§ 1.2; 4.07). Woodward: Minimal targeted reconfiguration only (room swaps, furniture/fixtures, limited ADA/code touch-ups). Budgeted allowance $1–3M (2024 baseline) (§ 06). Combined Capital Costs: ~$51.0M–$55.9M (2024 baseline), escalating to ~$54.9M–$62.1M by 2027. Note: Massachusetts Stretch Energy Code / Specialized Code may apply at time of bidding. Higher envelope/MEP performance requirements could increase costs beyond baseline §/SF; carry premium in escalation/scope contingency.	MSBA eligibility uncertain; statistically lower reimbursement % than new construction (inference, § 05 p.4444). Base Rate: Each district is assigned a base reimbursement rate (typically 40–65%). Incentive Points: Additional 1–2% may be awarded for factors such as: • Energy efficiency / green building design • Maintenance practices (capital planning, audits) • Educational program alignment • Community use of facilities • 21st century learning features (Maximum capped reimbursement ~50–55%.) Ineligible Costs: MSBA will not reimburse for certain categories, including: • Site work over 8% of building cost • Soft costs above set caps (DPM, designer fees, legal, etc.) • Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) beyond caps • Technology hardware/software • Moving expenses, insurance, contingencies Effective Rate: After ineligible costs are excluded, the effective reimbursement is usually much lower than the base rate. Most districts see 30–35% of total project cost reimbursed by MSBA.	If Neary was to be demolished and not repurposed (add to estimated capital cost total): ~$2.6–$3.0M (Metcalf Demolition $667,750 (+$10/LF× 66,775 sf) + Remove hazardous materials $1,500,000 + Site restoration to grass ~$0.39–$0.78M @ $5–$10/LF× 78,000 sf, assumption). (§ 05 pg674)	Staff sharing across schools can add travel stipends and reduce belonging/efficiency; cafeteria scheduling pressures with mixing grades at Finn (based "actual exploration of pressure"); additional parking/drop-off capacity needed. Utilities rise with added area (§ 07; 4.06).	No expected net savings, partial staffing efficiencies may be realized in library/media coverage (4.07; 4.06).	~$49M-$60M local share after MSBA add/reno reimbursement, based on ~$51.0M–$55.9M total baseline (2024) escalating to ~$54.9M–$62.1M by 2027. Range reflects reimbursement assumptions for eligible additions/reno scope, escalation and contingency carried. Sources: 4.07; 4.06; § 05 p.444; 6.12.	Phased multi-year delivery (~30 months) allowing occupied renovations where feasible; escalation to midpoint should be applied per parametric model assumptions. (§ 05 p.444 references for cost basis; § 05 outlines process steps).	30–40 years for new additions; renovated/incidental rework extends utility (inference; § 05 p.4444).
E: Full ADA/current code-compliant renovation of Neary	$42,977,869 (DBB) / $45,156,472 (CMR) (§ 05 p.467) 2024 PDP Baseline: DBB $42,977,869	CMR $45,156,472 2025 Escalated (+4%): DBB $44,696,916	CMR $47,378,731 2026 Escalated (+8%): DBB $46,484,793	CMR $49,273,880 2027 Escalated (+12%): DBB $48,244,185	CMR $51,244,815 (Source: § 05 p.467 Main Construction Cost Summary)	Full ADA/code-compliant renovation of Neary: roof replacement, windows, accessibility upgrades, mechanical/electrical/plumbing overhaul, hazmat abatement, general conditions, phasing, bonds, insurance. (§ 05 p.467); (§ 05 pg 16 – ADA/code compliance baseline)	Only potentially eligible for MSBA reimbursement if projected lifespan of building fits within MSBA qualifications; full local burden (§ 05 p.467).	No full demolition; limited abatement and hazmat removal allowances included (§ 05 p.467).	Does not significantly change operations; utilities improved with new systems, but staffing/busing unchanged (inference, § 05 p.467).	Marginal operating efficiency gains from new systems (§ 05 p.467).	$43M-$46M, all town-funded (§ 05 p.467).	Approx. 24 months construction, phased to maintain partial occupancy (§ 05 p.467).	30–40 years; renovated/incidental rework extends utility (inference; § 05 p.444).
F: New four-grade school	$509,517,205 (§ 1.06 pg5)	New build at existing Neary footprint, includes demo, geothermal HVAC, high-performance envelope (§ 09 pg32, § 09 pg61) Some project cost incurred in FY26 (2025), but full project scope would incur beginning FY27 (2026)	Anticipated MSBA grant: $35,279,262; anticipated geothermal rebates (IRA + Massave): $5,055,697 (§ 1.06 pg5, pg7) *MSBA grant is no longer valid, costs above represent the project details	Included in est. cost (§ 09 pg32)	Recurring operational savings — staffing efficiencies ~$1.0M/yr claimed for consolidation (§ 1.06 pg 4). (To be confirmed: • World Language (K-6): 3 school model needs ~3 FTE; consolidation assumes ~2 FTE → potential ~1.0 FTE avoided. Basic period counts & duty schedules. • Librarian: Avoid Finn librarian backfill in consolidation scenario → ~1.0 FTE avoided. • English Language Development (ELD): assumption of ~1.0 FTE reduction due to reduced travel between buildings — to be vetted. • Special ed: ~1.0 FTE listed; flagged for review. • IT position: currently unfilled ~1.0 FTE; flagged for review against actual needs. • Admin/Custodial at Finn: ~2 admin + ~2 custodial reductions listed; note Finn remains a town building and certain costs may shift to town operations rather than disappear. Notes: This line intentionally excludes capital/program space reductions (e.g., guidance offices) — those are not recurring OPEX savings.) Detailed vetting to follow.	Net annual budget impact ~$1.1M in early years when factoring debt service; ~$2.0M Finn reopen; ~$0.9M Woodward reconfig (§ 1.06 pg8)	$68,202,266 after MSBA grant and anticipated geothermal rebates (§ 1.06 pg8)	5M at Risk, design development ~1 year, construction ~2026–2028 (midpoint ~June 2027) (§ 09 pg61, § 1.06 pg4)	40-50 years
G: New Pre-K to 5 school at a suitable location (excluding possible use of the Finn site)	Estimated Capital Cost (based on ~15k–16.5k GSF derived in the summary): 2024 baseline: ~$168M-$171M 2025 (+4%): ~$174M-$178M 2026 (+8%): ~$180M-$184M 2027 (+12%): ~$186M-$191M (Unit cost source: § 05 PDP p.444; includes major off-site/site improvements; range reflects uncertainty in PK program size.) (Costs based on "New Neary" total project divided by 4 grades and then multiplied by 6 grades)	Cost categories included in §/sf benchmark: structure/envelope, interiors, mechanical/electrical/plumbing, fire protection, and technology systems. Site development, athletic fields, and off-site work are not included in this first-pass estimate. Unit cost applied: $968.50/GSF (§ 05 PDP p.444). See Executive Summary for greater detail	Base reimbursement rate: 44.87% (§ 09 SD submission). Possible incentive points (energy efficiency, maintenance) could raise this to ~60% (MSBA's cap). Effective reimbursement: After ineligible costs are excluded (site work, soft costs, furniture/technology, etc.), the effective reimbursement is estimated at 30–35% of total project cost. Financial impact: At 2024 baseline cost of $168M–$171M → MSBA estimated share ~$45M–$50M; local share ~$100M–$105M. At 2027 escalated cost of $186M–$191M → MSBA estimated share ~$50M–$55M; local share ~$130M–$135M.		Reduction of three elementary schools into one.		**Expected after MSBA reimbursement** 2024 baseline: ~$100M-$105M 2027 escalated: ~$115M-$120M		40-50 years
H: Finn Pre-K 2 Woodward 3-5 Trotter 6-8 (Concept: Permanent build out at Finn & Woodward with necessary extra space to accomodate educational excellence inspired by the temporary move plans of the 4 grade Neary)	Possibly similar cost to Option B2, similar space needs would apply.	Possible additions to Finn and Woodward							

Safety Considerations (e.g., egress, suppression, lead/asbestos)	Educational Considerations (Hall Sites 1-4)	Domino Effects (e.g., reuse or sale of other town properties, additional investment in other structures for modified use)	Home Value Implication (e.g., proximity to a school changes)	Other Pro/& Cons	Total Town Project Cost including domino effects and secondary investments	Executive Summary of Scenario
		Article 97 covers Mooney field conversion from recreation use. Reference 13.04: Only portions of the property historically used for sports and recreation are subject to Article 97 protection; other deeded uses (public assembly, defense) are not. Any conversion of Article 97 land requires demonstrating no feasible alternative, securing equivalent replacement land to ensure "no net loss," and obtaining EOA approval. While special legislation offers a potential path, it will likely still require replacement land or other compensatory benefits.	n/a			Option A explores a major reconfiguration of existing facilities, effectively swapping the footprints of Trottier Middle School and Woodward Elementary. To accomplish this, both schools would require heavy (~75%) renovations to adapt spaces not originally designed for those grade levels. Key challenges include the fundamental differences between a purpose-built middle school and an elementary school: Trottier (currently grades 6–8): Equipped with science labs, auditorium, gym/locker rooms, music and performance spaces — facilities that are oversized, specialized, or inappropriate for younger elementary students. Woodward (currently grades 2–5): Lacks science labs, locker rooms, and adequate auditorium space, and has smaller classrooms not designed for middle-school team teaching, science programs, or performance needs. Both schools: Circulation, cafeteria/kitchen layouts, and support services would require major redesign to suit a swapped grade structure. The expected cost is a minimum baseline and could escalate significantly depending on the level of program conversion required. Both the Pre-K to 8 School Building Committee and the School Committee have noted that, while theoretically possible, this option faces major logistical hurdles and mismatches in facility design. For these reasons, Option A has not been developed in detail and has generally been viewed as a weaker scenario relative to other configurations. Article 97 considerations need to be addressed as part of any potential expansion of Fine school into Mooney field.
New additions to current code/ADA; allowances for minor code/ADA in affected areas; site circulation addressed per implications. Sources: 4.07; 4.08. Plumbing capacity needed to meeting restroom requirements needs further study (4.2) Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Additions vs. Separate Structures: • If the addition is a SEPARATE structure (not wall-connected), only the new building must fully comply; the existing building is not automatically triggered. • If the addition shares a wall, energy/fire/code requirements may extend to the entire combined building. • Stretch Code (225 CMR 23, Doc 4.13): additions <20% of meet prescriptive standards for the new area; Specialized Opt-In does not apply in Southborough. • Sprinklers (§D62): any addition to >7,500 sf requires sprinklers throughout – for Finn/Trottier (already sprinklered), systems would be extended. • IBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required due to building volume >35,000 cf. RDP/consultant must file Investigation & Evaluation Report covering structural, egress, fire, energy, hazardous materials, accessibility, ventilation. • Compliance Alternatives: Chapter 34 allows alternatives if strict compliance is impractical, subject to Building Official & Fire Chief approval.	**Implications:** Stronger alignment than B3, with new space created through renovations. Still maintains multiple transitions and requires significant investment. Specialized programming space may be limited. **Goal Alignment:** Yellow—meets with trade-offs.	Parking/drop-off changes at both. Sources: 4.07; 4.08. Further assess air quality standards across all Southboro schools Study needs to be conducted to review Finn/Trottier drop off and dismissal procedures **Article 97 covers Mooney field conversion from recreation use.** Reference 13.04: Only portions of the property historically used for sports and recreation are subject to Article 97 protection; other deeded uses (public assembly, defense) are not. Any conversion of Article 97 land requires demonstrating no feasible alternative, securing equivalent replacement land to ensure "no net loss," and obtaining EOA approval. While special legislation offers a potential path, it will likely still require replacement land or other compensatory benefits. New additions to current code/ADA; allowances for minor code/ADA in affected areas; site circulation addressed per implications. Sources: 4.07; 4.08. Plumbing capacity needed to meeting restroom requirements needs further study (4.2) Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Additions vs. Separate Structures: • If the addition is a SEPARATE structure (not wall-connected), only the new building must fully comply; the existing building is not automatically triggered. • If the addition shares a wall, energy/fire/code requirements may extend to the entire combined building. • Stretch Code (225 CMR 23, Doc 4.13): additions <20% of meet prescriptive standards for the new area; Specialized Opt-In does not apply in Southborough. • Sprinklers (§D62): any addition to >7,500 sf requires sprinklers throughout – for Finn/Trottier (already sprinklered), systems would be extended. • IBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required due to building volume >35,000 cf. RDP/consultant must file Investigation & Evaluation Report covering structural, egress, fire, energy, hazardous materials, accessibility, ventilation. • Compliance Alternatives: Chapter 34 allows alternatives if strict compliance is impractical, subject to Building Official & Fire Chief approval. (4.16)	National and regional real estate studies (e.g., Appraisal Institute; National Bureau of Economic Research; Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics) generally show a positive correlation between residential property values and proximity to schools, particularly when safe walking access is available. Offsetting factors include increased traffic congestion during morning commute hours and special events. Research also indicates that properties near recreational parks—often co-located with schools—tend to experience stronger value premiums, appealing to a broader pool of buyers beyond those with school-aged children. In Southborough's case, the presence of adjacent recreation fields may help stabilize values even if a school were to be decommissioned, as the recreational amenity continues to provide a community benefit despite reduced school-related activity. Sources: Appraisal Institute (Residential Property Proximity Studies), NBER Working Paper 23684 (Kane & Staiger, 2017), Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics (Brasington & Hauerin, 2006).	Pro: Leverage existing buildings; scaped to documented program needs. Conc: Increases capital vs. 'recycling only'; cafeteria/traffic constraints to address. Sources: 4.07; 4.08.	~Combined Total (Addition + Light Renovations) 2024 baseline: $47,797,918 – $60,884,986 2025 (~4%): $49,699,435 – $63,320,385 2026 (~8%): $51,603,951 – $65,755,785 2027 (~12%): $53,522,468 – $68,191,184 Note: All unit costs per 9.05 p.644 (adjusted +21.1% soft); existing building GFA per 6.03 (Mar 2024).	Finn 45,000 net (+13,500 GSF) and Trottier +7,200 net (+10,800 GSF) cooked at $1,158.12/sf produces +$28,142,206.00 total in 2024 dollars, before escalation. Citations: 4.07; 4.08; 9.05 p.644 (unit costs adjusted +21.1% soft). Renovation categories applied in B2: Finn = Light (15–25%) of existing 76,000 SF; Trottier = Light (15–25%) of existing 130,000 SF — to network corridors, tie-ins, and room conversions alongside the documented additions from 4.07. Renovation overlay for B2: apply Light (15–25%) reconfiguration to existing Finn (76,000 SF) and Trottier (130,000 SF) to align corridors/tie-ins with the additions; costs included in combined totals. Additions <20,000 SF follow base energy code for new space only; §D62 requires sprinklers throughout (already present at Finn/Trottier). (8.12) Article 97 considerations need to be addressed as part of any potential expansion of Finn school into Mooney field.
Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Renovations & IEBC: • Renovations do not automatically trigger full Stretch compliance; only altered components must meet prescriptive standards (225 CMR 23). • Southborough is a Stretch Code community only; Specialized Opt-In does not apply. • IEBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required for work in buildings >35,000 cf. Investigation & Evaluation (I&E) Report must document impacts to structure, egress, fire protection, energy, accessibility, ventilation, hazardous materials. • Compliance Alternatives: If strict compliance is impractical, alternatives can be approved by the Building Official (with Fire input for sprinklers). • Sprinklers (§D62): triggered if deemed 'substantial renovation' or in combination with additions.	**Implications:** Renovating Neary ensures compliance, safety, and modern learning environments for core subjects and specials. However, multiple transitions remain, and some student services (specialized special education) face space constraints. Staffing and collaboration improve but are not optimal. **Goal Alignment: Yellow—meets with trade-offs.**	One extremely important part of an aging building would be made sinlt allowing for re-wave or renovation. If the building would be renovated or repurposed, the roof upgrade would not need to be redone.	No change	Pro: The worst part of the Neary building would be fixed. Con: Other parts of the building would still require investment and the future of the building is uncertain.	~$34M-$ 51M	Targeted renovation at Neary focuses only on the most essential items (roof replacement and targeted asbestos abatement). A capital cost study is currently underway. If funding is pursued at the spring 2026 annual town meeting, improvements are anticipated for fall 2026. Per 780 CMR Ch. 34 (Existing Building Code), roof and window replacement are excluded from the 30% improvement value threshold that would otherwise trigger a full building code upgrade (4.14). Deferred maintenance items (roof, windows, ADA, kitchen) are considered "alterations" under the code. These trigger prescriptive standards only for the replaced systems but do not require full Stretch Energy Code compliance for the entire building (4.12).
ADA compliance package included (11.08 p.9); hazardous materials allowance noted in PDP estimate (9.05 p.664). Fire suppression not added under minimal renovation; legacy egress/fire protection issues largely persist unless separately funded (9.05 p.55 context). No fire suppression system (5.02; pg2; pg10) (5.01 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline) Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Renovations & IEBC: • Renovations do not automatically trigger full Stretch compliance; only altered components must meet prescriptive standards (225 CMR 23). • Southborough is a Stretch Code community only; Specialized Opt-In does not apply. • IEBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required for work in buildings >35,000 cf. Investigation & Evaluation (I&E) Report must document impacts to structure, egress, fire protection, energy, accessibility, ventilation, hazardous materials. • Compliance Alternatives: If strict compliance is impractical, alternatives can be approved by the Building Official (with Fire input for sprinklers). • Sprinklers (§D62): triggered if deemed 'substantial renovation' or in combination with additions.	**Implications:** Renovating Neary ensures compliance, safety, and modern learning environments for core subjects and specials. However, multiple transitions remain, and some student services (specialized special education) face space constraints. Staffing and collaboration improve but are not optimal. **Goal Alignment: Yellow—meets with trade-offs.**	None noted; status quo at Woodward/Finn; future larger capital project still required (11.08 pp.12-15).	No Change	Pro: lower immediate capital than new build, avoids tax spike. Conc: sunk cost; does not solve 20-year needs; escalates future replacement risk (11.08 pp.12–15; 9.05 p.644). Renovations would likely be staggered across several fiscal years.	~$6-.750,000 (sum of line items across ADA, roof, deferred maintenance, phases 2–3) (11.08 pp.9–10); (5.01 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline);	Minimal renovation package total: ~$6-.75M, comprising Neary Roof Replacement, ADA Compliance, Deferred Maintenance, and phased renovations, with detailed line items (windows, wood cabinetry, pavement/sidewalks, masonry repair, playground, exterior painting) documented in 11.08 pp.9–10. No MSBA reimbursement; fully local. PDP § 05 p.664 classifies this scope as 'Base Repair/Deferred Maintenance.' Lifespan not explicitly stated; based on scope, a 10–15-year planning horizon is a defensible inference. (5.01 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline) Deferred maintenance + 'alterations' (roof, windows, ADA, kitchen). Prescriptive standards apply to replaced systems; not a full Stretch Code trigger. (4.12) Sprinkler installation is likely code-triggered under MGL §D62. 2.2 and MGL Ch. 148 §26G if >50% renovation or major alteration (5.02 pp. 2–7)
Additions built to current code; renovated areas include ADA compliance, egress improvements, fire/life safety upgrades, and hazardous materials abatement allowances (9.05 p.664; 4.07 notes on bathrooms/fixtures). Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Additions vs. Separate Structures: • If the addition is a SEPARATE structure (not wall-connected), only the new building must fully comply; the existing building is not automatically triggered. • If the addition shares a wall, energy/fire/code requirements may extend to the entire combined building. • Stretch Code (225 CMR 23, Doc 4.13): additions <20% of meet prescriptive standards for the new area; Specialized Opt-In does not apply in Southborough. • Sprinklers (§D62): any addition to >7,500 sf requires sprinklers throughout – for Finn/Trottier (already sprinklered), systems would be extended. • IBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required due to building volume >35,000 cf. RDP/consultant must file Investigation & Evaluation Report covering structural, egress, fire, energy, hazardous materials, accessibility, ventilation. • Compliance Alternatives: Chapter 34 allows alternatives if strict compliance is impractical, subject to Building Official & Fire Chief approval.	**Implications:** Expanding Finn to serve PreK-3 and repurposing Woodward as 4-5 creates cleaner grade spans and modernized facilities. Supports core academics and specials well. However, transitions remain and construction requirements are significant. **Goal Alignment:** Yellow—meets with trade-offs.	Maintains three building model (Finn PK-3, Woodward 4-5, Trottier 6-8); no Neary reuse; site circulation and parking investments shift to Finn/Woodward (8.07; 4.08).	Neutral to modestly positive due to investment in youngest grades' facility (reference).	Pros: Reduces transitions; concentrates investment where youngest learners benefit; modernizes key systems via renovations. Cons: Potential lawsuit issues at Finn (4.07; 4.08).	~$144M-$ 40M local share after MSBA aid/reimbursement, based on ~$51.6M-$55.3M total baseline (2024) escalating to ~$56.9M-$62.1M by 2027. Range reflects reimbursement assumptions for eligible additions/new scope; escalation and contingency carried. Sources: 4.07; 4.08; 9.05 p.664; 6.12.	Scope for Option B (Finn PK-3; Woodward minor; Trottier none): Finn PK-3 detailed program breakdown (NSF and counts): • Art: 1 × ~1,150 NSF = ~1,150 NSF • Speech Language: 2 × 500 NSF = ~1000 NSF • Music/Behavior: 2 × ~1000 NSF = ~2000 NSF • PT/Adaptive PE: 2 × ~950 NSF = ~1900 NSF • World Language: 2 × ~1,100 NSF = ~2175 NSF • ELD: 2 × ~925 NSF = ~1,250 NSF • Reading rooms: 2 × ~1812 NSF = ~3624 NSF • Conference: 2 × ~875 NSF = ~1750 NSF • Teacher workspace: 2 × ~375 NSF = ~750 NSF • Cafeteria capacity add: 2 × ~1875 NSF = ~3750 NSF • General Classrooms (grade 9.09): 8 × 900 NSF = 7200 NSF *[It is expected that not every one of these classrooms needs to double to accomodate adding third grade to Finn, but under a worst case scenario, every room was doubled]* Totals: Support = ~18,000 NSF, Classrooms = 7,200 NSF → Finn Total = ~25,200 NSF → 1.5 grossing factor =37,800 GSF [8.07] Woodward: 11–1M allowance to reconfigure from Grades 2–3 to Grades 4–5 (room swaps, fixtures, ADA/code adjustments only) (4.06). Trottier: no scope/cost. Contingency Note: "If additional program rooms are required beyond the 2 included for each type, add: N × 900 NSF × 1.5 (grossing) × $1,158.12/GSF × $1.56M per room (2024 baseline, incl. +21.1% soft), escalated +8%/yr." Existing Finn footprint: include light Renovation (15–25%) of ~76,000 SF to network corridors, tie-ins, and classroom conversions (coded at renovation rate) (8.12).
Includes fire protection upgrades, egress/code compliance, and hazardous materials removal allowances (9.05 p.647). (5.01 pg 42 – Fire protection deficiencies baseline) Doc 4.13 & 4.14 – Additions vs. Separate Structures: • If the addition is a SEPARATE structure (not wall-connected), only the new building must fully comply; the existing building is not automatically triggered. • If the addition shares a wall, energy/fire/code requirements may extend to the entire combined building. • Stretch Code (225 CMR 23, Doc 4.13): additions <20% of meet prescriptive standards for the new area; Specialized Opt-In does not apply in Southborough. • Sprinklers (§D62): any addition to >7,500 sf requires sprinklers throughout – for Finn/Trottier (already sprinklered), systems would be extended. • IBC Report (780 CMR Ch.34, Doc 4.14): Required due to building volume >35,000 cf. RDP/consultant must file Investigation & Evaluation Report covering structural, egress, fire, energy, hazardous materials, accessibility, ventilation. • Compliance Alternatives: Chapter 34 allows alternatives if strict compliance is impractical, subject to Building Official & Fire Chief approval.	**Implications:** The option fully renovates Neary to meet modern ADA, safety, and code requirements, while also addressing deferred maintenance. The building would remain in service as an elementary school, but the cost would be substantial and the project may be disruptive while construction is underway.	None, maintains status quo of other schools (9.05 p.647).	Limited positive impact. ADA/code compliance improves safety but facility remains programmatically outdated (reference, 9.05 p.647). (5.01 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline)	Pro: Extends Neary life by 20–30 years, improves compliance/safety. Con: High cost likely with no MSBA support; does not meet educational goals and vision (9.05 p.647).	~$15M-$46M, full local share (9.05 p.647).	Option C represents a full ADA/code-compliant renovation of Neary (~$15–46M). Scope includes roof/windows replacement, full accessibility, mechanical/electrical/plumbing overhaul, hazardous materials abatement, and fire/life-safety upgrades as outlined in 9.05 p.647. Extends building life 20–30 years but does not resolve programmatic/educational limitations; MSBA reimbursement unlikely. (5.01 pg 15 – ADA/code compliance baseline)
New build to current code; separated bus/parent traffic; secure main entry; after-hours security gates; modern fire protection (9.08 pg16, pg44)	**Implications:** Creates modern and facilities and stronger program alignment. Reduces transitions, supports dedicated spaces, and improves collaboration. Requires major capital investment. **Goal Alignment:** Supported. Meets goals.	Reopen Finn as town building (~$4.0M); Woodward minor reconfig (~$0-1M); operational savings scale over time (11.06 pg8, 4.03)	Not assessed in M&K documents National and regional real estate studies (e.g., Appraisal Institute; National Bureau of Economic Research; Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics) generally show a positive correlation between residential property values and proximity to schools, particularly when safe walking access is available. Offsetting factors include increased traffic congestion during morning commute hours and special events. Research also indicates that properties near recreational parks—often co-located with schools—tend to experience stronger value premiums, appealing to a broader pool of buyers beyond those with school-aged children. In Southborough's case, the presence of adjacent recreation fields may help stabilize values even if a school were to be decommissioned, as the recreational amenity continues to provide a community benefit despite reduced school-related activity. Sources: Appraisal Institute (Residential Property Proximity Studies), NBER Working Paper 23684 (Kane & Staiger, 2017), Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics (Brasington & Hauerin, 2006).	CMR/SMR to mitigate IR/inflation risk, contingencies ~$12.3M; inflation carry ~$1.15M (11.06 pg8)	$71,730,244 (Net town cost + Finn reopen + Woodward reconfig) (11.06 pg8)	Build a new 8 grade school at Neary site (99,564 GSF, 660 students) with modern program, safer circulation, and consolidated operations; highest MSBA support among options; net town share ~$68.2M before secondary investments; schedule targets mid-2027 mid-point (9.08 pg32; 11.06 pg8)
New build to current code; separated bus/parent traffic; secure main entry; after-hours security gates; modern fire protection	**Implications:** A single, large new building would consolidate all early childhood and elementary grades (PreK through 5) under one roof. This maximizes efficiency, reduces the number of transitions, and provides a fully modern facility. However, it requires the highest capital investment and a suitable building site.	Potentially multiple school buildings available for other town uses depending on building site. (Finn, Woodward, Neary)	National and regional real estate studies (e.g., Appraisal Institute; National Bureau of Economic Research; Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics) generally show a positive correlation between residential property values and proximity to schools, particularly when safe walking access is available. Offsetting factors include increased traffic congestion during morning commute hours and special events. Research also indicates that properties near recreational parks—often co-located with schools—tend to experience stronger value premiums, appealing to a broader pool of buyers beyond those with school-aged children. In Southborough's case, the presence of adjacent recreation fields may help stabilize values even if a school were to be decommissioned, as the recreational amenity continues to provide a community benefit despite reduced school-related activity. Sources: Appraisal Institute (Residential Property Proximity Studies), NBER Working Paper 23684 (Kane & Staiger, 2017), Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics (Brasington & Hauerin, 2006).			How the square footage for a new Pre-K through Grade 5 school was estimated: 1. Starting point – New Neary design (Grades 2-5): The Schematic Design submission (9.08) shows a new Neary elementary sized at 99,564 Gross Square Feet (GSF). This design included four grade levels (2, 3, 4, and 5) plus core spaces such as cafeteria, gym, library/media, and special education rooms. 2. Expanding to cover Kindergarten through Grade 5 (six grades instead of four): The Neary design only included four grade levels (2–5). To cover six grade levels (K–5), we scale the design by 6 ÷ 4 = 1.5, or 50% larger. 99,564 GSF × 1.5 = approximately 149,000 GSF. 3. Adding Pre-Kindergarten classrooms: Pre-K classrooms are not in the Neary plan, so we add them. MSBA guidelines call for 1,100 Net Square Feet (NSF) per Pre-K classroom. When circulation and bathrooms are included (grossing factor of 1.5), each Pre-K room totals 1,650 GSF. Assuming four Pre-K classrooms: 4 × 1,650 = about 6,600 GSF. 4. Total size range: With 4 Pre-K rooms → about 156,000 GSF. With 8 Pre-K rooms → about 163,000 GSF. So the range is 156,000–163,000 GSF. 5. Applying construction costs: Using the building cost benchmark from 9.05 (§948.50 per GSF) and escalating that by 4% per year for inflation, we get: • 2024 baseline: ~$148M-$154M • 2025: ~$154M-$160M • 2026: ~$160M-$166M • 2027: ~$166M-$172M Sources: 9.09 SD Space Summary (99,564 GSF), MSBA Pre-K standards (1,100 NSF/classroom, 1.5 grossing factor), 9.05 PDP p.664 (unit costs).
	Implications: This option reorganizes the schools into a traditional three-tier system but relies on additions at one or more sites to accommodate enrollment.					