

Town of Southborough, Massachusetts

Neary Building Committee

February 13, 2025

7:30 PM

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, signed into law on June 16, 2021, this meeting will be conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance by members of the public will be permitted.

Neary Building Committee:

Members Present: Roger Challen, Mark Davis, Denise Eddy, Andrew Pfaff, Kathryn Cook, and Jason Malinowski

Members Absent: Chris Evers

Ex-Officio

Members Present: Gregory Martineau Superintendent of Schools, Stefanie Reinhorn, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, Keith Lavoie Assistant Superintendent of Operations, Rebecca Pellegrino, Assistant Superintendent of Finance, Steven Mucci, Principal of Woodward School, Mark Purple, Town Administrator, and Brian Ballantine Town Treasurer/ Finance Director

Members Absent: Kathleen Valenti, Neary School Principal

I. Call Meeting to Order

Jason Malinowski called the Neary Building Committee meeting to order at 7:31 pm.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 10, 2025

Jason Malinowski asked for a discussion and a vote.

Jason Malinowski moved, Denise Eddy seconded, and it was voted 5-0-1 (Kathryn Cook abstained), "To approve the minutes as presented."

MOTION TO APPROVE
MEETING MINUTES

Roll Call

For: Andrew Pfaff, Denise Eddy, Roger Challen, Mark Davis, and Jason Malinowski

Opposed: None

Abstained: Kathryn Cook

III. Skanska/Arrowstreet Updates

a. Schematic Design Report – Review and authorize OPM to submit to MSBA

Katy Lillich from Arrowstreet stated that the schematic design report consists of three parts: the narrative, the drawings, and the budget. The revised narrative report, incorporating the changes, will be sent out.

- b. Financial Update – Review of latest project cost estimates, discussion of value engineering, and vote on updated cost projections

Kathryn Cook presented financial data regarding cost implications for taxpayers. She explained that for every million dollars reduced from the current \$78 million debt, homeowners with an average house value of approximately \$1 million would save \$14.20 annually.

Jim Burrows, Project Manager at Skanska, introduced various cost reduction options categorized into building elements and scope groups. Several proposed reductions in the building exterior include decreasing acoustical roof screens (\$360,000 savings), changing brick to CMU at the gym (\$66,528 savings), and eliminating curtain walls and storefronts at the front entrance to masonry (\$24,600 savings). Additional savings could be achieved by implementing a uniform brick masonry (\$85,728 savings) and replacing ACM panels with aluminum corrugated panels. Interior cost-cutting measures include eliminating gym bleachers and reallocating them within the FF&E budget (\$70,200 savings), reducing the gym size (\$163,200 savings), and decreasing the number of movable partitions in classroom wings (\$48,600 savings). Further savings would result from removing adjoining classroom doors (\$27,072 savings), eliminating borrowed light from classrooms (\$29,376 savings), and omitting tile behind classroom sinks (\$49,613 savings). Proposed changes to the HVAC system could yield significant savings. Switching to a VRF system without geothermal would save \$4,081,417 while opting for air-source heat pumps instead of ground-source systems would save \$2,669,712. Kathryn Cook noted that state and federal rebates, expected to exceed \$5 million, were not included in this estimate but would be reflected in future calculations. Moving the soil allowance from the construction budget to construction contingency would shift \$750,000 while reducing the state soil allowance to \$500,000 would save \$900,000. Further reducing the allowance to \$250,000 could result in \$1.2 million in savings. Proposals to replace concrete sidewalks with bituminous or asphalt sidewalks would save \$90,000 while switching the emergency drive from asphalt to crushed stone would yield an additional \$108,000 in savings. Eliminating planting in the courtyard between classroom wings and replacing it with grass could save \$306,000.

Mark Davis raised concerns about acoustical roof screens, particularly regarding the noise impact on nearby residential areas. He suggested utilizing a secondary roof structure to mitigate sound. Denise Eddy requested visual examples to assess the impact on aesthetics. For the interior, Stephanie Reinhorn, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, advocated for keeping movable partitions in classroom wings to support flexible learning environments. Discussions also covered the potential swap of borrowed light windows for sliding storefront doors and exploring cost-effective alternatives for sink backsplash materials.

The Committee discussed soil contingencies, balancing risks while ensuring adequate funding. Jason emphasized the importance of not depleting contingency funds too early in the project. If soil work exceeds estimates, a Value Engineering (VE) exercise may be required to maintain full contingency when setting the budget with the MSBA. If the soil work comes in under budget, the unused funds would return to the town. Keith Lavoie opted to retain concrete sidewalks due to their durability and

lower maintenance costs compared to asphalt. He raised concerns about high maintenance costs associated with crushed stone pathways. For the courtyard, the preference leaned toward a simplified design with functional grassy areas, artificial grass mounds, and potential outdoor seating while keeping costs at \$153,000.

The existing playground will be approximately 30 years old when the new building is completed. The current add/alternate estimate for a new playground is \$1,053,506. The design team stated that the estimate is based on the number of students, equipment, and area preparation. They will revisit the estimate as well. Some Committee members suggested seeking alternative funding, such as CPC or SOS funds, or handling the playground as a separate bid outside the CM's oversight. Jason proposed including it in the town's capital plan. The estimated cost for 10 sliding doors is \$207,000, with a potential reduction to \$170,000 if windows are removed. Jason suggest the construction contingency related to soil should be \$350,000.

Discussions focused on accurately communicating project costs to taxpayers. Based on the latest calculations, the town share is \$74,972,490, when including the incentives of \$5,035,897, the final bond is \$69,936,593. The Mass Save program has confirmed \$1.268 million in funding, while an additional \$4 million remains uncertain. The cost to a house valued in five years will be \$1,150,000 in Southborough would be \$981 annually. Jim emphasized the importance of setting the budget for submission to the MSBA. The Committee will continue refining details related to grossing factor, soil contingency, and playground scope while awaiting further financial updates.

Jason Malinowski asked for a discussion and a vote.

Jason Malinowski moved, Roger Challen seconded, and it was unanimously voted by roll call, "The Margaret E. Neary Elementary School Building Committee has completed its review of the schematic design for a total project budget of \$108,517,025 and approves submission to the MSBA for its consideration."

MOTION TO APPROVE SUBMISSION TO THE MSBA
--

Roll Call

For: Roger Challen, Andrew Pfaff, Kathryn Cook, Mark Davis, Denise Eddy, and Jason Malinowski

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

IV. Community Feedback and outreach plan

Mark Davis believes that one crucial aspect missing from the outreach efforts is the perception of a "no" vote as unacceptable. He argues that the issues currently facing the Neary School building should not be ignored in the future. The website fails to highlight that the school is not equipped with sprinklers, does not address some of the materials used in the building, and does not mention the lack of handicap accessibility. Mark emphasizes that no one should feel comfortable attending the town meeting and voting "no."

Jason Malinowski expressed his greatest disappointment with the project so far, noting that public outreach has not been effective in encouraging community participation. He

believes the best way for residents to form their own opinions is by visiting the building in person. However, despite opening the building twice for community observation, the attendance has been dismal.

Kathryn Cook suggested that the spreadsheet updated by Jim Burrows, which includes information on B1, C1, C4, and base repair, should be made available to the public. She believes this would provide a clearer understanding of why a new four-grade school is the better option. Additionally, she highlighted two key concerns among the senior population: cost and the comparison between Finn School and Neary School.

V. Public Comment (None at this time)

VI. Meeting Schedule – February 20, 2025

VII. Other business that may properly come before the Committee (None at this time)

VIII. Adjournment

Jason Malinowski requested a motion to adjourn.

Jason Malinowski moved, Andrew Pfaff seconded, and it was unanimously voted by roll call, “To adjourn.”

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Roll Call

For: Andrew Pfaff, Kathryn Cook, Mark Davis, Denise Eddy, Roger Challen, and Jason Malinowski

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Jason Malinowski adjourned the meeting at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mariana Silva, Central Office Administrative Assistant

Office of Superintendent

List of documents used at this meeting:

1. Neary Building Committee Agenda of February 13, 2025
2. Neary Building Committee Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2025
3. Skanska/ Arrowstreet VE/VM Draft Items dated February 11, 2025
4. Updated Cost Incentives Summary
5. Skanska/ Arrowstreet VE/VM Scenarios dated February 11, 2025

Town of Southborough, Massachusetts**Neary Building Committee****February 13, 2025****7:30 PM****Virtual Zoom Meeting**

May be watched or may participate in the meeting remotely with the meeting link at: <https://ma-southborough.civicplus.com/674/Virtual-Meetings>

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, signed into law on June 16, 2021, this meeting will be conducted via remote participation. No in person attendance by members of the public will be permitted.

Agenda (all items may have one or more votes taken to the extent action is required):

- I. Call Meeting to Order
- II. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 10, 2025
- III. Skanska/Arrowstreet Updates
 - a. Schematic Design Report – Review and authorize OPM to submit to MSBA
 - b. Financial Update – Review of latest project cost estimates, discussion of value engineering, and vote on updated cost projections
- IV. Community Feedback and outreach plan
- V. Public Comment
- VI. Meeting Schedule
- VII. Other business that may properly come before the Committee
- VIII. Adjournment

Jason W. Malinowski, Chair

Town of Southborough, Massachusetts

Neary Building Committee

February 10, 2025

7:00 PM

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, signed into law on June 16, 2021, this meeting will be conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance by members of the public will be permitted.

Neary Building Committee:

Members Present: Roger Challen, Mark Davis, Denise Eddy, Andrew Pfaff, Kathryn Cook, Chris Evers and Jason Malinowski

Members Absent: None

Ex-Officio

Members Present: Gregory Martineau Superintendent of Schools, Stefanie Reinhorn, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, Keith Lavoie Assistant Superintendent of Operations, Rebecca Pellegrino, Assistant Superintendent of Finance, Kathleen Valenti, Neary School Principal, Mark Purple, Town Administrator, and Brian Ballantine, Town Treasurer/ Finance Director

Members Absent: Steven Mucci, Principal of Woodward School

I. Call Meeting to Order

Jason Malinowski called the Neary Building Committee meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 16, 2024, December 17, 2024, January 6, 2025, and January 8, 2025

Jason Malinowski asked for a discussion and a vote.

Jason Malinowski moved, Roger Challen seconded, and it was unanimously voted by roll call, "To approve the meeting minutes for December 16, 2024, December 17, 2024, January 6, 2025, and January 8, 2025, as presented."

MOTION TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES

Roll Call

For: Kathryn Cook, Andrew Pfaff, Chris Evers, Mark Davis, Denise Eddy, Roger Challen, and Jason Malinowski

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

III. Approval of Outstanding Sustainability Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Roger Challen moved, Mark Davis seconded, and it was voted 3-0-4 (Jason Malinowski, Kathryn Cook, Denise Eddy, and Andrew Pfaff abstained), "To approve the meeting minutes of the NBC – Sustainability Subcommittee for November 6, 2024 and January 2, 2025."

MOTION TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES

Roll Call

For: Chris Evers, Mark Davis, and Roger Challen

Opposed: None

Abstained: Jason Malinowski, Kathryn Cook, Denise Eddy, and Andrew Pfaff

IV. Dissolve Sustainability Subcommittee (Not at this time)

V. Community Feedback and outreach plan

Jason Malinowski mentioned that they continue to hold open office hours. During their last session, the focus was on why the Committee did not consider the Finn School as a viable option, as well as questions surrounding the Neary School site compared to the Finn School site. Jason also shared that the Council on Aging has voted that, when discussions about repurposing the Finn School take place, they prefer to have full access to Cordaville Hall. They suggest that the departments currently occupying the building should be relocated so that the Finn School can be repurposed as a senior center. Lastly, Jason reminded the Committee about the upcoming ballot question in the spring and cautioned everyone to ensure compliance with campaign finance rules when sending out materials related to the project.

VI. Skanska/Arrowstreet Updates

a. Schematic Design Report – Review and possible vote to approve

Katy Lillich from Arrowstreet shared they submitted the narrative portion of the report to the Committee, Arrowstreet received approximately 20 comments, which they will incorporate into the revised report. A set of construction documents, consisting of about 17 pages of drawings, was also distributed. Project updates include the exterior and landscape plans, which show the bus entry, drop-off area, and emergency access at the back of the building. The building's massing indicates that the gym is located at the front, with the music room and cafeteria to the right. The central section consists of the media center and art rooms, while the classroom wings are positioned behind, and the fields remain unchanged. There will be no drastic changes to the floor plan, which will also be included in the schematic design report. Katy plans to send an email responding to each question received and will issue a new version of the report. She intends to have the updated report ready before the February 13, 2025, meeting, incorporating all the feedback.

b. Financial Update – Review of latest project cost estimates, discussion and possible vote to continue with Schematic Design submission

Kathryn Cook reported that the town's share of the total project cost is approximately \$78 million, a decrease of \$6 million from the August estimate of \$84 million. The goal is to finalize these cost projections for submission to the Massachusetts School Building Authority by early next week. The approved article for the town meeting scheduled for May 10, 2025, must include the full project cost, which is currently estimated to be around \$110 million.

The Finance Subcommittee has asked Arrowstreet to provide an accurate estimate of the federal and state geothermal system credits, which could total between \$3 million and \$4 million. There are also discussions about removing the contingency of \$1.25 million that was added for the potential cost of removing contaminated soil from the site, assuming that half of the soil needs to be transported out of state. Additionally, they are considering whether the current gross-up factor for non-classroom spaces can be reduced from 1.50 to 1.45, which could save around \$3 million in additional costs. Brian Ballantine, the Town Treasurer/Finance Director, is collaborating with a bond consulting firm to project the debt service and update the five-year town budget projection, which will be presented on February 13, 2025.

Jim Burrows, Project Manager at Skanska, noted that if the contingency is not retained and soil removal is needed later, it would draw from the construction contingency, potentially using over 50% of it. He emphasized that change order pricing typically exceeds base bid pricing. Mark Davis believes the site is manageable, but still feels a contingency is necessary. Larry Spang from Arrowstreet indicated that the current estimate includes 18,000 cubic yards of soil that must be removed offsite, which is categorized as clean soil. He recommended that instead of including this in the construction cost, it should be allocated to a larger contingency fund. This approach ensures that adequate funds are prepared in case of delays, as funding allocations can lead to expensive schedule overruns. For further analysis, they can explore onsite disposal options.

Larry Spang added that the grossing factor encompasses everything that is not designated for educational purposes. He explained that adjusting the multiplier is not straightforward, as it would require eliminating square footage of non-programmed areas, and currently, they do not believe there is sufficient space to eliminate. They would have done so otherwise. The objective is to reduce the factor below 1.50, and Arrowstreet will provide updates as the project progresses. They plan to evaluate not only square footage but other aspects of the building for potential reductions. A list of value engineering (VE) items will be compiled and distributed to the Committee for discussion. More information will be provided to the Committee during their February 13, 2025, meeting to take a vote.

VII. Public Comment (None at this time)

VIII. Meeting Schedule – February 13, 2025

- IX. Other business that may properly come before the Committee (None at this time)
- X. Adjournment

Jason Malinowski requested a motion to adjourn.

Jason Malinowski moved, Roger Challen seconded, and it was unanimously voted by roll call, "To adjourn."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Roll Call

For: Kathryn Cook, Andrew Pfaff, Chris Evers, Mark Davis, Roger Challen, Denise Eddy, and Jason Malinowski

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Jason Malinowski adjourned the meeting at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mariana Silva, Central Office Administrative Assistant

Office of Superintendent

List of documents used at this meeting:

1. Neary Building Committee Agenda of February 10, 2025
2. Neary Building Committee Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2024
3. Neary Building Committee Meeting Minutes of December 17, 2024
4. Neary Building Committee Meeting Minutes of January 6, 2025
5. Neary Building Committee Meeting Minutes of January 8, 2025
6. NBC – Sustainability Subcommittee Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2024
7. NBC – Sustainability Subcommittee Meeting Minutes of January 2, 2025

VE/VM items

	Estimated Total Value
Building Exterior	
Decrease acoustical roof screens by 50%	-\$360,000
Change brick to CMU on gym	-\$66,528
Delete curtainwall/storefront at front entrance change to masonry	-\$24,600
Uniform color pattern for brick masonry	-\$85,728
Exterior wall EWA-5 - in lieu of ACM panels provide deduction to go to aluminum, corrugated panels	-\$398,580
Building Interior	
Delete bleachers at gym >> FF&E	-\$70,200
Reduce gym size	-\$163,200
Reduce number of moveable partitions in classroom wings	-\$48,600
Remove adjoining doors between classrooms	-\$27,072
Remove borrowed light from classrooms to learning commons	-\$29,376
Remove tile behind sinks in classrooms	-\$49,613
HVAC - TAKE ONLY ONE	
Air Source VRF - No Geothermal	-\$4,081,417
Air Source Heat Pump Chillers - No Geothermal	-\$2,669,712
Site	
Decrease out of state soils allowance to \$500K	-\$900,000
Decrease out of state soils allowance to \$250K	-\$1,200,000
Reduce concrete sidewalk to bituminous	-\$90,000
Change bituminous drive at rear loop to crushed stone	-\$108,000
Delete plantings and outdoor seating at center courtyard	-\$306,000
-Values based off current estimates and subject to change	

LCCA SUMMARY

QUALITIES

COSTS

ROI

	Net Zero	EUI	Indoor Air Quality	Thermal Comfort	Acoustics	Service Life	Ease to Maintain	Annual Energy	Annual Maintenance	Annual Savings	Lifetime Replacement	Capital Investment	Payback	w/ Mass Save Incentive	Payback	w/ All Incentives	Payback
								\$/sf	\$/sf	\$/sf	\$/sf	\$/sf		\$/sf		\$/sf	
VRF		27.6	○	○	○	○	○	\$2.16	\$0.64	-	\$39	\$83	-	\$80	-	\$80	-
Ground Source Heat Pump	✓	24	●	●	●	●	●	\$1.75	\$0.54	\$0.51	\$30	\$111	no	\$99	no	\$61	0 yr
ASHP		26	●	○	○	○	○	\$1.99	\$0.54	\$0.26	\$46	\$98	no	\$95	no	\$95	no



Updated 2/11/2025 to reflect reconciled SD estimate.
Updated 1/7/2025 incentives to include ITC 40% rate (34% w/ tax exempt bonds) and include Mass Save verifications incentive

LCCA SUMMARY

QUALITIES								COSTS				ROI					
	Net Zero	EUI	Indoor Air Quality	Thermal Comfort	Acoustics	Service Life	Ease to Maintain	Annual Energy	Annual Maintenance	Annual Savings	Lifetime Replacement	Capital Investment	Payback	w/ Mass Save Incentive	Payback	w/ All Incentives	Payback
								\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	
VRF		27.6	○	○	○	○	○	\$215,295	\$63,443	-	\$3,877,500	\$8,308,330	-	\$7,899,875	-	\$7,899,875	-
Ground Source Heat Pump	✓	24	●	●	●	●	●	\$174,545	\$53,880	\$50,313	\$3,007,500	\$11,080,068	no	\$10,822,240	no	\$6,044,371	0 yr
ASHP		26	●	○	○	○	○	\$198,514	\$53,891	\$26,333	\$4,533,500	\$9,767,368	no	\$9,402,913	no	\$9,402,913	no

Scale

●

○

○

Best ← Good

Updated 2/11/2025 to reflect reconciled SD estimate.
Updated 1/7/2025 incentives to include ITC 40% rate (34% w/ tax exempt bonds) and include Mass Save verifications incentive

POTENTIAL INCENTIVES
SUMMARY

GSHP

	Technology	Estimated Construction Cost	Rate ¹	Estimated Incentive
Sec 48 Alternative Energy	Ground Source Heat Pump	\$11,080,068	34%	\$3,767,223
Mass Save	Path 1			\$1,268,474
		\$11,080,068		\$5,035,697
		Construction Cost Total		Potential Incentive Total
		\$6,044,371		
		w/ Incentive		

VRF

Estimated Construction Cost	Rate ¹	Estimated Incentive
\$8,308,330 but does not qualify	34%	\$0
		\$358,455
\$8,308,330		\$408,455
Construction Cost Total		Potential Incentive Total
\$7,899,875		
w/ Incentive		

1. Assumed using tax-exempt bonds

Notes: Cost of GSHP and EV updated to PM&C 2/6/25 reconciled estimate .

Mass Save updated to reflect tonnage in GGD SD.

Current Estimate	\$89,281,032	\$89,281,032	\$89,281,032	\$89,281,032	\$89,281,032	\$89,281,032
Accepted VE/VM	\$0	-\$1,467,497	-\$2,967,497	-\$2,727,497	-\$3,027,497	-\$7,209,714
Revised Const Total	\$89,281,032	\$87,813,535	\$86,313,535	\$86,553,535	\$86,253,535	\$82,071,318
Revised TPB		\$108,262,336	\$107,257,336	\$106,788,136	\$106,437,136	\$101,543,942
Town Share	\$77,884,513	\$75,871,347	\$74,869,917	\$74,400,169	\$74,049,853	\$69,164,654
Incentives	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$0
Final Bond	\$73,884,513	\$71,871,347	\$70,869,917	\$70,400,169	\$70,049,853	\$69,164,654

VE/VM items

	Estimated Total Value	Accepted	Scenario 1	Scenario 1A	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
			Full Soils Contingency	\$750K Soils Contingency Carried in Const Cont	\$500K Soils Contingency	\$250K Soils Contingency	\$250K Soils Contingency
			No Decrease in Roof Screens	No decrease in Roof Screens	50% Reduction in Roof Screens	50% Reduction in Roof Screens	50% Reduction in Roof Screens
							NO Geothermal
Building Exterior							
Decrease acoustical roof screens by 50%	-\$360,000				-\$360,000	-\$360,000	-\$360,000
Change brick to CMU on gym	-\$66,528		-\$66,528	-\$66,528	-\$66,528	-\$66,528	-\$66,528
Delete curtainwall/storefront at front entrance change to masonry	-\$24,600		-\$24,600	-\$24,600	-\$24,600	-\$24,600	-\$24,600
Uniform color pattern for brick masonry	-\$85,728		-\$85,728	-\$85,728	-\$85,728	-\$85,728	-\$85,728
Exterior wall EWA-5 - in lieu of ACM panels provide deduction to go to aluminum, corrugated panels	-\$398,580		-\$398,580	-\$398,580	-\$398,580	-\$398,580	-\$398,580
Building Interior							
Delete bleachers at gym >> FF&E	-\$70,200		-\$70,200	-\$70,200	-\$70,200	-\$70,200	-\$70,200
Reduce gym size	-\$163,200		-\$163,200	-\$163,200	-\$163,200	-\$163,200	-\$163,200
Reduce number of moveable partitions in classroom wings	-\$48,600		-\$48,600	-\$48,600	-\$48,600	-\$48,600	-\$48,600
Remove adjoining doors between classrooms	-\$27,072		-\$27,072	-\$27,072	-\$27,072	-\$27,072	-\$27,072
Remove borrowed light from classrooms to learning commons	-\$29,376		-\$29,376	-\$29,376	-\$29,376	-\$29,376	-\$29,376
Remove tile behind sinks in classrooms	-\$49,613		-\$49,613	-\$49,613	-\$49,613	-\$49,613	-\$49,613
HVAC - TAKE ONLY ONE							
Air Source VRF - No Geothermal	-\$4,081,417						-\$4,081,417
Air Source Heat Pump Chillers - No Geothermal	-\$2,669,712						
Site							
Move out of state soils allowance to Construction Contingency (\$750,000)	-\$1,500,000			-\$1,500,000			
Decrease out of state soils allowance to \$500K	-\$900,000				-\$900,000		
Decrease out of state soils allowance to \$250K	-\$1,200,000					-\$1,200,000	-\$1,200,000
Reduce concrete sidewalk to bituminous	-\$90,000		-\$90,000	-\$90,000	-\$90,000	-\$90,000	-\$108,000
Change bituminous drive at rear loop to crushed stone	-\$108,000		-\$108,000	-\$108,000	-\$108,000	-\$108,000	-\$129,600
Delete plantings and outdoor seating at center courtyard	-\$306,000		-\$306,000	-\$306,000	-\$306,000	-\$306,000	-\$367,200

VE/VM savings based off current estimates and are subject to change

Town Share estimated final grant to be determined by MSBA review

Feasibility Study/Schematic Design Funds have been deducted from above totals. MSBA considers these funds as part of the Total Project Budget

Alt Energy and Mass Save Incentives are currently estimated at \$5,035,697. Projecting lower value to allow for any variance

MSBA does not consider incentives in their calculation of Total Project Budget and are noted for reference only