TOWN OF GROTON FINANCE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 14th, 2018: 7:00 p.m.
GDRSD High School Library
703 Chicopee ROW. Groton, MA

Present for Finance Committee: G. Green (Chair), B. Robertson (Vice Chair), D. Manugian, S. Whitefield, L. Leonard, A. Prest

Absent: J. Sjoberg

Present for GDRSD School Committee: M. Gilbert (Chair), J. Kubick (participating remotely), J. McKenzie, A. Donahue, P. Cronin, R. McLane

Present for the Groton Board of Selectmen: B. Pine, A. Manugian, J. Petropoulos (arrived 7:30 p.m.)

Also Present: P. Dufrèse (Town Accountant), Dr. L. Chesson (Superintendent), M. Knight (GDRSD Director of Business & Finance), D. Palma (Groton Police Chief), R. Mead (School Resource Officer)

Documents available at the meeting: MSBA Process Power Point Presentation

Mr. Green called the Finance Committee meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.
Ms. Gilbert called the School Committee meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

School Resource Officer: Officer Mead provided a summary of her duties in the district, and said she spends around 99% of her time at the district schools, and very little at the private schools. In addition to providing ALICE training, and DARE classes, she would like to be able to do more mentoring of the students. She informed the group that while the previously recommended ratio of Student Resource Officers to students was 1 to 1,200, the National Association of School Resource Officers has revised its recommendation to 1:1,000. She noted the increase in marijuana usage and vape pens as current issues that must be dealt with in the schools. If a second SRO were to be added, 1 would be dedicated to the Middle School, and 1 to the High School and Florence Roche. Boutwell could be supported by either officer. Dr. Chesson mentioned a new set of procedures developed to ensure student safety in the event of a bus accident and commended the public safety departments for collaborating on this effort. Chief Palma elaborated on Officer Mead’s SRO duties noting that she is an integral part of the emergency response planning team.

MSBA Presentation: The School Committee distributed a summary of the MSBA process (see presentation document attached). The district is currently in the “Pre-Eligibility Phase”. Following a successful district-wide feasibility study (estimated to cost $750,000) the state has agreed to reimburse GDRSD 48% of elementary school construction costs. Dr. Chesson stressed that the cost of the study represents
approximately 2,500 hours of work, and while the cost is technically set by the towns, the study is heavily restricted by the MSBA. She noted that architects tend to lose money on feasibility studies if the project does not advance through construction. Study costs for similar projects in comparable communities were discussed, with costs ranging between $600,000 and $1.7 million. Ms. Manugian asked when a committee would be appointed to oversee this project. Mr. Knight replied that this would take place before June and would likely include members from the towns’ Finance Committees, Select Boards, School Committees, and possibly Councils on Aging and members at large. Ms. Pine asked how the decision would be made on whether or not to include Dunstable in the funding plan. Ms. Gilbert said that the final decision rests with the School Committee, but the study must be done. She welcomes any feedback from the community before a decision is made. Ms. Gilbert feels that the main concern is resolving the issues at Florence Roche and also decreasing operational and capital expenditures. She added that if the study is district-wide, both towns can contribute to the funding, or the District can pay for it in part or in whole from their own E&D. The group discussed the impact to the towns if the study included both FloRo and Swallow Union buildings, but construction were limited to FloRo. Dr. Chesson explained that the MSBA has a formula to pro-rate reimbursement funds between towns. She went on to say that enrollment in Swallow Union could be bumped up to increase the likelihood of being eligible for reimbursement. Ms. Gilbert noted that there are different ways of investing in school buildings; it may be possible to avoid renovation or rebuilding at FloRo if the district can take advantage of empty space in other buildings. The feasibility study will help identify these opportunities. In response to a question from a FinCom member, Ms. Gilbert said that even if the district funds the study through its own E&D, the town will still need a warrant article authorizing the expenditure in its capital budget (to be offset with E&D funds). Mr. Knight explained that MSBA will reimburse expenditures relatively quickly, within 15 to 30 days of receiving the paid invoices. Ms. Gilbert stressed that the district is in a fairly unique situation in that the state has allowed Dunstable to be part of the study (and reimbursement) process.

Ms. Gilbert informed the group that the FY19 budget has been revised to include $20,000 toward the additional SRO, adjustments for athletic fees and the MSBA Feasibility Study. Mr. Robertson said he supports funding the feasibility study using district E&D, especially as the reimbursement rate is now 48%. The group briefly discussed the way in which the new SRO position should be funded in future years. While the School Committee members generally favored using $20,000 of their own budget for FY19 (in the interest of expediency), they feel that this is ultimately a municipal expense and should be funded by the Towns in future years. Mr. Green reminded the committee members that whether it is funded out of the municipal or district: budget, the impact will be borne by the taxpayers. Ms. Leonard noted that there are several district budget revenue lines that seem to reflect substantial carry forward balances which could be used to offset the SRO cost. Mr. Knight replied saying that some of those balances have diminished sharply since the report was created and may in fact be running close to deficit. He agreed to provide an updated report to the Finance Committee. Mr. Petropoulos disagreed that the SRO should be classified as a municipal expense. He suggested that the position remain part of the municipal police department, but that the district assign a line item within their budget for a portion of the costs. He noted that other town entities have shown a willingness to pay for a share of the services they will receive. Ms. Gilbert disagreed with this but said she appreciated his point. She believes the respective town leaders will be able to determine the best funding options for FY19 as well as iron out the details for retaining two (2) SRO’s in future budgets.

**FY19 GDRSD Budget Vote:** Mr. Cronin moved to approve a total appropriation for FY19 of $42,554,277 (including the feasibility study for $750,000 funded from E&D, and a $20,000 reduction in Groton’s assessment for the SRO). The assessment to Groton will be $21,858,954 and the assessment to Dunstable
will be $6,380,383. The School Committee roll call vote was unanimous in favor of the appropriation as stated. (6-0-0)

Approval of Minutes: No votes taken

Mr. Green officially adjourned the Finance Committee meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Dufresne, Recording Secretary
Florence Roche Elementary - MSBA Process

Laura Chessen, Ed. D. Superintendent
Agenda

- Abrahams' report on building inventory.
- Statement of Interest (SOI) to MSBA.
- MSBA process.
- Module 1 & 2 Eligibility.
- Module 3 Feasibility Study - why is the important to both towns.
- Overall projected timeline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Enrollment 10/17</th>
<th>Renovation or Addition</th>
<th>Ownerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swallow</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>61,143</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1975 &amp; 1995</td>
<td>Town of Dunstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Roche</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>69,468 (including 7 portables)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>Town of Groton</td>
<td>GDRSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutwell</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>8208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GDRSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current concerns with buildings

Swallow Union

- Severe dampness in basement
- New boiler in capital plan for 2019 - 2020
- Will need new roof in 2024 - 2025
- Abrahams’ report indicates major reno/replacement in 12 - 15 year.

Boutwell

- No gymnasium.
- Limited appropriate play space outdoors

GDRMS

- Portions of building under-utilized
- Duplication of kitchen services
- Needs some security upgrades
Current concerns with buildings

Florence Roche

- Irregular heat - some classrooms too hot, some no heat.
- Steam traps clogged, piping corroded.
- Roof at life expectancy.
- Some plumbing shut-offs do not work.
- Asbestos in crawl space where steam pipes located.
- Fire alarm system goes off when not appropriate.
- Telephone and intercom systems do not work intermittently.
- Many toilets/bathroom fixtures original to 1951 building.
- Fire alarm not audible throughout the building.
- Floor asbestos tile.
- Storage area being used for social/emotional support services.
- Dropped ceiling beginning to fail in cafeteria.
- 150 students in portables that are passed life expectancy.
- Much of electrical system is original circa 1951
- Heat can not be regulated.
MSBA Building Process

Steps primarily for:

- Districts
- Eligibility Period
- Forming the Project Team
- Detailed Design
- Construction
- Completing the Project
- Schematic Design
Eligibility Period

Board of Directors authorizes Invitation to Eligibility Period

- ICC up to 30 days
- Local Authorization of Funding (Submit Votes and Sign FSA) up to 270 days

- SBC up to 60 days
- Maintenance Documents and Enrollment Certification up to 180 Days

- Educational Profile up to 90 days
- Online Enrollment Projection up to 90 days

Board of Directors authorizes Invitation to Feasibility Study and authorizes Executive Director to enter into a Feasibility Study Agreement

Upon Invite to Eligibility Period, Districts complete defined requirements within the timeframes listed above
What Is The Eligibility Period

Overview:
- Board votes to invite small number of districts in based on their available budget and SOL’s.
- Maximum 270 day eligibility period.
- Groton-Dunstable’s eligibility period to begin June 1, 2018

Work products:
- Initial compliance certification.
- Form School Building Committee.
- Educational Profile Questionnaire.
- Online Enrollment Projection.
- Maintenance and Capital Plan.
- Local Vote Authorization.
- Enrollment/Certification Agreement.
- Feasibility Study Agreement
WHERE ARE WE NOW?

- CURRENTLY IN ELIGIBILITY PERIOD
- MSBA HAS AGREED TO PARTICIPATE IN REIMBURSEMENT FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY WHICH LOOKS AT ALL ELEMENTARY STUDENTS AND BUILDINGS
- MSBA HAS AGREED ONLY TO CONSIDER REIMBURSEMENT FOR FACILITY TO SUPPORT GROTON ELEMENTARY STUDENTS
WHAT DOES THAT MEAN FOR EACH TOWN AS WE CONSIDER FEASIBILITY?

- Major information to be gained by both towns.
- Information about condition and future expenses needed for Swallow critical.
- Because space for pre-K could be included in new/renovated building, location of pre-K would definitely be part of feasibility study. Location of pre-K could impact future capital expenses of both towns.
- Grade reconfigurations suggested for consideration by Abraham’s report (should Swallow/Flo Ro be K-5? K-6?)
- Flo Ro SOI approved for number of reasons but MSBA emphasized in their presentation to their board desire to bring Groton students back to Flo Ro.
MSBA Building Process

Steps primarily for:

- **Districts**
  - **Construction Professionals**

  270 days

  - Eligibility Period
  - Forming the Project Team
  - Feasibility Study
  - Schematic Design

  Approximately 1.5 - 2 years.

  - Funding the Project
  - Detailed Design
  - Construction
  - Completing the Project

  Approximately 2 - 3 years
Feasibility Study - Approximately 2,500 Hours - Cost is by bid. Heavily cost restricted by MSBA.

- Educational Program*
- Visioning Program*
- Building Evaluation*
- Structural Evaluation*
- Heating & Ventilation Evaluation*
- Haz Mat Inspection & Report*
- Phase 1 Environmental Assessment*
- Plumbing Evaluation*
- Electrical Evaluation*
- Site Evaluation*
- Comparison Matrix*
- Costs Analysis*
- Options Narratives*
- Space Summary Spreadsheets*

*** ALL MARKED WITH ASTERISK WOULD INCLUDE FLO-RO AND SWALLOW UNION
Educational Program - INCLUDES BOTH SCHOOLS

Grade/school configuration policies
Class size policies
School scheduling method
Teaching methodology and structures
Teacher planning and room assignment policies
Pre-kindergarten design
Lunch programs
Technology instruction policies and program requirements
Art programs
Music & Performing Arts programs
Special Education Programs
Vocational Education Programs
Transportation policies
Functional and spatial relationships
Key programmatic adjacencies
Security and visual access requirements
Initial Space Summary - INCLUDES BOTH SCHOOLS

- Based on educational program and agreed upon enrollment.
- Must be agreed upon by MSBA
- Will inform development of alternatives to be studied
- Itemization of each existing educational space
- Total gross square footage of existing facility
- Itemization of each proposed educational space
- Assessment of current hazardous materials including but not limited to lead, lead paint, PCBs, mercury, radon, mold, and asbestos.
Evaluation of Existing Conditions - INCLUDES BOTH SCHOOLS

- Determine legal title, ability to be developed, historic regulations etc.
- Initial evaluation of building code compliance for existing facility
- Initial evaluation of architectural access board rules and regulations
- Preliminary evaluation of significant structural, environmental, geotechnical or other physical conditions that may impact cost and evaluation of alternatives
- Determination of need and schedule for soils exploration & geotechnical eval
- Environmental site assessment
- Total gross square footage for the proposed renovated/added-to/new facility
Site Development Requirements - ALL ALTERNATIVES

Description in general terms of project requirements related to site development to be considered during the preliminary and final evaluation of alternatives and submit an existing site plan including but not limited to:

- Structures and fences
- Site access and circulation
- Parking and paving
- Code requirements
- Zoning setbacks and limitations
- Accessibility requirements
- Easement
- Wetlands/flood restrictions
- Emergency vehicle access
- Safety and security requirements
- Utilities
- Athletic fields and outdoor educational spaces
- Site orientation and location consideration and issues
Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives

- Based on Educational Program, Initial Space Summary, evaluation of existing conditions, and site development requirements.
- Sufficiently comprehensive to ensure most appropriate educational solution AND most cost effective.
- Must be supported by community and MSBA board of directors.
- Each alternative should satisfy significant components of Educational Program, Standards, Policies, and Guidelines of the MSBA.
- Must include analysis of school district student school assignment practices and other available space in the district.
- Must consider tuition agreements with adjacent school districts.
- Must consider rental/acquisition of existing buildings that could be made available for school use.
- Must consider code upgrade options must include repair of systems and/or scope required for purposes of compliance with no modification to existing spaces.
- Must consider renovation and/or additions to existing building(s)
- Must consider construction of new building and evaluation of potential locations
For each alternative there must be:

- Description of the alternative
- Examination of the degree to which the alternative fulfills/does not fulfill educational program requirements.
- Description of the variation in spaces identified by the Initial Space Summary.
- How it addresses site and facility goals and objectives.
- Assessment of the impact of construction phasing.
- Estimated preliminary construction and project costs.

List of alternatives must include:

- List of at least three alternatives.
- At least one renovation/addition to existing facility which makes maximum use of existing building.
- MSBA will only comment if conditions above are met.
Following preliminary alternative selection:

- Provide documentation of local actions and approvals.
- MSBA will review preliminary design program.
- Preferred schematic report is created and issued.
- Documentation of process used to select preferred schematic and analysis.
- Further analysis of existing conditions and identify as final.
- Final evaluation of alternatives.

### Table 1 – Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option (Description)</th>
<th>Total Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost/sf)</th>
<th>Square Feet of New Construction (cost/sf)</th>
<th>Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Total Construction** (cost/sf)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1A (Repair)</td>
<td>XXX sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2A (Renovation)</td>
<td>XXX sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3A (Addition/ Renovation)</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3B (Addition/ Renovation)</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4A (New)</td>
<td>XXX sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4B</strong>* (New)</td>
<td>XXX sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>XXX sf $/sf</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Marked Up Construction Costs
** Does not include Construction Contingency
*** District's Preferred Solution
Preferred Solution:

- Educational Program.
- Preferred Solution Space Summary.
- Sustainability Document.
- Building Plans.
- Site Plans.
- Budget including total project budget and local funding.
- Updated project schedule including key tasks with durations.

Upon Submission

- MSBA Staff review
- Facility Assessment Subcommittee Review
- MSBA Board Approval
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Feasibility Study</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>1 of 3 projects; Urban site.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$750K</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$850K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easthampton</td>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>Pk-4</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$850K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkinton</td>
<td>Early Childhood Ctr.</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$600K</td>
<td>K-1</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Early Childhood Ctr.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$850K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Early Childhood Ctr.</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>Early Childhood Ctr.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>Urban site</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the historical costs for a new elementary school for feasibility and construction as reported in media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Open</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Sq. Footage</th>
<th>Feasibility Study</th>
<th>Construction ONLY Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021* Est.</td>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>Chapin School</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$800K</td>
<td>$60 M* Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Est.</td>
<td>Millis</td>
<td>Clyde Brown</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>$51.8 M* Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Nelson Place</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>111,256</td>
<td>$635K</td>
<td>$46.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northborough</td>
<td>Lincoln St.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>52,920</td>
<td>$345K</td>
<td>$18.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>132,539</td>
<td>$548.6K</td>
<td>$48.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>West Parish</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>65,679</td>
<td>$365K</td>
<td>$29.9M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is covered by the cost of feasibility

- Owner's Project Manager.
- Preliminary Design Architectural Fees (Schematics design/site design).
- Visioning and educational programming consultant support.
- Feasibility Study (site(s) civil engineering analysis, wetlands delineation, traffic studies etc.)
- If excess funds remain can be returned to E & D or other funding source
IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS TO NOTE!

- These **UNOFFICIAL** estimates **DO NOT** take into consideration any costs for special studies or designs that community might make.
- These **UNOFFICIAL** estimates are for **COMPARISON PURPOSES ONLY**.
- These **UNOFFICIAL** estimates are to be used to **BEGIN DISCUSSIONS ONLY**.
- These **UNOFFICIAL** estimates **ARE NOT FOR DECISION-MAKING**.
WHY IS THIS INFORMATION IMPORTANT TO BOTH TOWNS?

- If Dunstable supports maintaining Swallow and Groton students are moved to new/renovated school Dunstable (after 5 year exit roll-out) will need to support all capital expenditures for Swallow (NOTE MSBA PRESENTATION TO THEIR BOARD ASKING FOR APPROVAL MENTIONS THE DESIRE TO BRING STUDENTS BACK).
- If moving Pre-K to new school then Dunstable would be responsible for some portion of cost of new school.
- If moving Pre-K to Swallow then this may affect enrollment and therefore capital assessments of both towns.
- Grade configurations will need to be examined (Elementary K - 5? K - 6? K - 4? PreK - 4? etc.)
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 1

- Swallow to remain open, grades K - 4. Enrollment is 173.
- Maintenance costs (heat, light etc.) to be handle as part of operational assessment as is now.
- Dunstable will be responsible for capital costs on a 5 year increasing basis due to apportioning based on 5 year rolling average of enrollment.

See below:
- 1st year 69.1%
- 2nd year 77.25%
- 3rd year 84.5%
- 4th year 92%
- 5th year 100%
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 1

- Major capital expenditures that are upcoming - roof $1.2M in 2023, windows $1M in 2025.
- Swallow estimated to need major renovation/rebuild in 12 - 15 years.
- Minimum size for elementary with 170 students is 43,898 square feet.
- Construction cost in today’s dollars $17.9 million, project costs $22.1 million.
- Unlikely MSBA will approve for renovation/rebuild given enrollment.
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 2

- Swallow to remain open, grades K - 4.
- Maintenance costs (heat, light etc.) to be handle as part of operational assessment as is now.
- Boutwell Pre-School to be relocated to Swallow. Enrollment 240.
- Dunstable will be responsible for capital costs on a 5 year increasing basis due to apportioning based on 5 year rolling average of enrollment.

See below:
1st year 65%
2nd year 68.9%
3rd year 72%
4th year 75%
5th year 79%
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 2

- Major capital expenditures that are upcoming - roof $1.2M in 2023, windows $1M in 2025.
- Swallow estimated to need major renovation/rebuild in 12 - 15 years.
- Minimum size for elementary with 230 students is 49,500 square feet.
- Construction cost in today’s dollars $20.2 million, project costs $24.7 million.
- Dunstable would incur 77.2% of cost approx.$19.0.
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 3

- New elementary building site adjacent to GDRHS
- Dunstable students to move to new building, combining elementary school.
- Swallow and Union buildings returned to town.
- Dunstable would incur additional costs to increase enrollment of new building from 650 to approx. 830 - 850. This would be estimated at approximately $12 - 15 million.
- No reimbursement from MSBA at this time per conference call.
- Sharing of capital costs after rebuild as per agreement - which would be estimated at 23.5% Dunstable. Therefore a decrease in the long-term capital costs.
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 4

Addition added on to middle school south.
New building becomes K - 5 - only Groton students.
Swallow becomes K - 5.

Dunstable would incur increase in capital assessment for Swallow but decrease in capital assessment for middle school.

Major renovations possible to Swallow in 12 - 15 years.
DRAFT... Possible Scenario 5

- Addition added on to middle school south.
- New building becomes K - 6 - only Groton students.
- Grade 6 students moved to middle school north.
- Swallow becomes K - 6.
- Dunstable would incur increase in capital assessment for Swallow but decrease in capital assessment for middle school.
- Major renovations possible to Swallow in 12 - 15 years.