

A

Historic Properties Reuse Study of the Annandale Public School Annandale, MN

John Lauber and Company LLC Claybaugh Preservation Architecture Inc

October 2013

Table of Contents

Project Background The Reuse Team Approach	1 2 5
Issues Analysis	
Building Condition and Design	7
Site and Parking	8
School District	9
Historic Preservation	11
Compatibility	12
Time	13
Community	14
Local Government	15
Tourism	16
Recreation and Community Center	17
Youth	
Senior	19
Housing	20
Organizational	21
Philanthropy	22
Financial	
Ownership and Developer	25

Disposition Alternatives

Continued school Use	
Demolition	
Do-Nothing	27
Interim Use	27
Phased Rehabilitation	
Full Rehabilitation	

Use Alternatives

Community Center	29
Technology Center	
Affordable Housing	
Upscale Condominiums	
Recommendations	
Next Steps	
Interim Use Implementation Strategy	

Appendices

- Appendix A: Historical Background
- Appendix B: Original Architectural Drawings
- Appendix C: Existing Conditions Photos
- Appendix D: Existing Conditions, Code Analysis and Rehabilitation Recommendations
- Appendix E: Design Concepts and Cost Estimates
- Appendix F: Financial Analysis
- Appendix G: Other School Reuse Projects
- Appendix H: List of Interviewees
- Appendix I: Results of Public Meeting



Prepared for The Citizens Committee to Reuse the '22 Annandale, MN

John Lauber and Company LLC, *Minneapolis* Claybaugh Preservation Architecture Inc, *Taylors Falls* Donjek, *St. Paul* Professional Project Management, *Minneapolis* Engineering Design Initiative, *Minneapolis* LS Engineers, *Le Sueur*

October 2013



Project Background

Designed by the Minneapolis architect C. Howard Parsons and completed in 1922, the Annandale Public school building has been the focus of academic and vocational training, as well as a venue for athletic and social events for many generations of Annandale residents. The building originally served students from first grade through high school. It contained traditional classrooms, a gymnasium and a stage, as well as spaces where pupils could study agriculture, the industrial arts, and home economics.

The facility was expanded five times between 1954 and 1991 to meet the changing needs of the school district. Following construction of new elementary school in 1971 and a new high school in 1991, the complex became the Annandale middle school, and portions of the 1922 building were closed. With the opening of a new elementary school building in the spring of 2013, the building was vacated altogether.

The 1922 building's future has been uncertain for more than fifteen years. It was slated for demolition as early as 1997, and demolition remains a distinct possibility. Local citizens' groups have advocated for preservation of the building for the past five years, and sought unsuccessfully to have funding for rehabilitation included in a 2008 bond referendum. A grass-roots organization, The Citizens Committee to Reuse the '22, recently renewed local efforts to retain the building, soliciting bids for a team to lead a Historic Properties Reuse Study of the building.

In response to that solicitation, preservation consultants and experienced reuse study leaders John Lauber and Bob Claybaugh made a scoping visit to Annandale on 17 January 2013, meeting with school Superintendent Steve Niklaus and Citizens Committee Co-chair Jill Bishop. They also had an opportunity to examine architectural drawings, and other documents, to tour and photograph the building.

The Reuse Team

The team assembled for the Annandale school Reuse Study has extensive experience in the assessment, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. Team members have also demonstrated their collective commitment to community-driven, process oriented planning through past participation in more than two dozen historic properties reuse studies, Minnesota Design Team visits, and a host of design charrettes intended to capture the imagination and vision of community members.



John Lauber, MA Architectural Historian/ Preservation Planner

John Lauber of Minneapolis served as Co-principal Investigator for the Annandale school Reuse Study and his firm, John Lauber and Company LLC, served as prime contractor. John exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for both History and

Architectural History.

During a historic preservation career that has spanned more than two decades, John has participated in more than two dozen historic properties reuse studies, most of them in collaboration with Robert Claybaugh. John's experience includes reuse studies for school buildings in Kasson, Red Wing, Morris, International Falls, and Chaska, as well as a historic structures report for the Lamar school in rural Polk County, Wisconsin and a recent determination of National Register eligibility for the District 26 school in Blue Hill Township, Sherburne County. He has written about the reuse study process and its application to school buildings for the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota; has given presentations on the process to statewide preservation conferences in Minnesota and Kansas; and planned a conference on school preservation during his tenure with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office.

John has also completed designation studies, preservation plans, structures reports, and documentation projects for city, state and federal agencies, non-profit organizations, educational institutions, and private developers in more than a dozen states.



Robert Claybaugh, AIA Historical Architect

Robert Claybaugh of Taylors Falls served as Co-principal Investigator for the Annandale school Study. Bob exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Architecture.

Bob is a licensed architect in the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

Bob's experience includes nearly two-dozen reuse studies including projects completed for school buildings in Red Wing, Morris, International Falls, and Chaska, as well as a historic structures report for the Lamar school in rural Polk County, Wisconsin. His project list also includes rehabilitation and design work for a number of school and college buildings throughout the Midwest. Bob has provided restoration and design services for Minnesota Historic Society properties at the Mille Lacs Indian Museum, the Lindbergh Boyhood Home, Historic Fort Snelling, the Sibley House Historic Site, Split Rock Lighthouse, the Folsom House, Historic Forestville, the Lower Sioux Agency, Fort Ridgely, and the Northwest Fur Post.



Jon Commers *Financial Analyst*

Jon Commers served as financial analyst for the Annandale Reuse Study. Jon is a principal of Donjek, a multi-faceted, Public Finance, Project Management, and Public Policy consulting firm based in St. Paul. He participated in interviews, helped the team assess local market

conditions, and identified incentives and revenue streams that could contribute to a successful reuse of the 1922 building. He also prepared *pro formas* for the final report.

Jon represents Saint Paul on the Metropolitan Council, where he chairs the Land Use Advisory Committee and is a member of the Transportation and Community Development Committees. He served on the Saint Paul Planning Commission and is also a co-founder of Strong Towns, a virtual nonprofit organization focused on improving the fiscal health of communities through productive land use.

Donjek urban planner Adam Moore provided additional support for the Annandale project.

LS Engineers *Structural Engineers*

Gene Dwyer, PE, of LS Engineers in Le Sueur served as the structural consultant for the Annandale Reuse Study, evaluating structural conditions in the 1922 building. Gene has worked on a number of previous preservation projects, including buildings at the Lower Sioux Agency, Split Rock Lighthouse; Historic Fort Snelling; and several structures at the Lindberg National Historic Landmark. He recently collaborated with the Co-principal investigators on studies at the Stoppel Farmstead in Rochester, the Mille Lacs Indian Museum, and St. John's Lutheran Church in Red Wing.

Engineering Design Initiative Mechanical and Electrical Analysis

An assessment of the 1922 building's mechanical and electrical systems was completed by Larry Svitak, PE, of Engineering Design Initiatives. EDI is a mechanical and electrical engineering firm headquartered in Minneapolis. The firm has worked with the Coprincipal investigators on several previous Reuse Studies and Historic Structures Reports.

Professional Project Management *Cost Estimates*

Cost estimates for proposed work on the Annandale school building were prepared by Cole Holmber of Professional Project Management, a Twin Cities-based construction management firm that has worked with the project team on a number of previous historic preservation projects.

Approach

The Reuse Study for the Annandale school was completed according to a well-defined process that has been developed, improved and implemented in Minnesota over the past twenty-five years. The goals of the Reuse Team for the 1922 building included:



-Evaluating the historical integrity, current condition, and adaptability of the building.

-Engaging and leading the residents of Annandale through a systematic and inclusive study process, gathering and providing the facts they need to make an informed decision about the future of an important community asset.

-Examining the realities of the local social, cultural, political and economic conditions; and outlining a range of alternatives for the future of the building and site, including demolition, interim use, partial rehabilitation, and full rehabilitation.

-Providing information about the costs, incentives, and revenue potential for various reuse scenarios.

Specific steps in the study process included:

Pre Contract Site Visit

On 7 January 2013, team leaders John Lauber and Bob Claybaugh traveled to Annandale to tour the building and discuss the project with local sponsors and school district officials. Information gathered during this visit was used to assemble the project team and develop the project proposal.

Background Research

Once the contract was awarded, team members worked closely with the local sponsors to collect as much information as possible about the history, operations, and evolution of the 1922 building and the remainder of the middle school complex. Materials examined included original architectural drawings, historic photos, maps and site plans, newspaper clippings, maintenance and repair records, and planning documents.

Building Evaluation Visits

The evaluation of the 1922 building's physical condition had to be completed in two stages due to an unusually long and severe winter. John Lauber and Bob Claybaugh traveled to Annandale for a startup meeting with local sponsors, city and school district officials on 20 March 2013. During that visit Lauber and Claybaugh examined the building's interior spaces, including classrooms, the gymnasium, the attic and boiler rooms, documenting conditions with measurements, photographs and field notes. Information gathered during this visit was used to prepare base drawings for the building. Team leaders returned to Annandale on 25 April to complete an exterior evaluation of the 1922 building, examining and documenting masonry, window and door openings, and

roof surfaces. They also had an opportunity to walk through the structure with the school district engineers who have been responsible for maintenance and operation of building systems.

Interviews and Public Meeting

John Lauber and Bob Claybaugh were in Annandale from 18-20 June 2013 for three days of intensive interviews with school district representatives, city staff, civic and political leaders, local business owners, representatives of non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders with an interest in the future of the 1922 school building. More than 40 individuals were interviewed during the three-day visit. Team members Jon Commers and Adam Moore from Donjek participated in interviews with financial and real estate professionals on the first day.

Annandale area residents were invited to learn about the reuse study process and share their ideas and opinions about the future of the 1922 building at a public meeting held at City Hall on the evening of 18 June. More than 60 individuals attended the session, which was facilitated by Urban Designer Peter Musty with help from team members John Lauber, Bob Claybaugh, Jon Commers and Adam Moore.

Team Meetings, Issues Analysis and Draft Report Preparation

In July and August, the reuse team examined the information gathered during the fieldwork and interview phases of the project in order to identify and analyze issues likely to affect the future of the 1922 building. Team members Lauber, Claybaugh, Commers and Moore met on 24 July and 6 August to discuss and refine potential reuse alternatives, review schematic drawings, and develop ownership and financial strategies models for various alternatives. Bob Claybaugh worked with structural engineer Gene Dwyer to evaluate structural conditions in the building and calculate floor load capacities to ensure that alternatives met load requirements. Lauber and Claybaugh met with mechanical engineer Larry Svitak on 7 August to review existing mechanical and electrical systems, discuss potential energy efficiency and stabilization measures and outline systems requirements for a full rehabilitation of the building. Claybaugh submitted schematic drawings and rough specifications to Cole Holmber of Professional Project Management to serve as a basis for cost estimates, and John Commers used the estimates to prepare a financial plan for the project. The various components were assembled into a draft report that was submitted to the local sponsors for review in early September.

All work on the Annandale school Reuse Study was completed in accordance with guidelines established in *A Primer for Historic Properties Reuse Teams in Minnesota*.

ISSUES ANALYSIS

Building Condition and Design Issues

The 1922 building is eminently reusable. It was originally well constructed of high quality materials, and featured a number of simple details, including Bedford limestone water tables, stringcourses, and corbels; a rusticated base; and ornamental panels and belt courses created by two shades of dark brown brick. Interior features included maple floors, plaster walls and ceilings, simple moldings, doors and cabinets of dark-stained birch. The building contained a large gymnasium and specialized spaces for a wide range of vocational activities, and also featured a large, skylit study hall on the top level. The heating and ventilation system was state of the art for its time. Despite some rearrangement and cosmetic changes on the interior, many of these features remain intact. Missing features could be replicated at reasonable cost.

The building's structure is carried by bearing walls around the perimeter and along the central corridor. Steel beams and trusses provide clear spans over the study hall and gymnasium; and a simple system of wood trusses supports the roof above the classroom areas. This structural system allows a great deal of flexibility for rearranging interior spaces.

The 1922 building was incrementally expanded several times between the time of its original construction until 1991. The building is structurally sound, has been generally well maintained, and is fully sprinklered. The building is physically connected to the rest of the middle school complex at its southwest corner, and shares restrooms, mechanical systems, and an accessible entry with the remainder of the complex. According to District officials, the 1922 building accounts for a significant portion of the heating costs for the overall complex. Continued use of the building would require some hazardous materials mitigation, some repairs to the building envelope, and alterations to improve mechanical systems, energy efficiency, and accessibility.

Site and Parking Issues

The 1922 school building is part of a sprawling complex of interconnected buildings occupying about twelve acres at the center of town, across from the City Hall and Public Library and just a block off Oak Avenue, which links Highway 55 with Pleasant Lake, and serves as the spine of the community's traditional central business district.

The school property has been assembled from several individual parcels as well as vacated street/alley right of ways. Parcel boundaries pass through the gymnasium, and redevelopment could require redrawing current parcel boundaries.

Portions of the site are currently used as a playground area for recess and for outdoor physical education activities. School buses are loaded on the west side of the property on Cherry Street. Otherwise, the District does not appear to have any immediate need for or plans to redevelop the area currently occupied by the 1922 building.

The school district has indicated that its middle school program will be headquartered in the current location for at least five to twenty years, regardless of what happens to the 1922 building. The District could maintain control over the site even if the 1922 building were to be redeveloped by entering into a long-term lease (25 years) with the developer. This would enable the developer to utilize the Federal and State Rehabilitation Tax Credits if the building is determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The eleven-acre school site could be an important component in the eventual success of any redevelopment plan. Its location near the center of town, its relative abundance of green space, and the presence of a number of buildings containing large gymnasiums would seem to make the property a nearly ideal location for a long-anticipated community center if and when the middle school program moves into new facilities on the new school campus. If the property is sold, a covenant could be placed on the deed to ensure that a community center use would be considered as part of any future transfer of the property.

There appears to be enough space on the property to create an accessible entrance at the intersection of the gymnasium wing and the main classroom section of the 1922 building.

School buses use the street on the west side of the building, making this area unavailable for parking. Any redevelopment of the site would require facilities for off-street parking. Some sort of shelter would have to be provided for residential uses. Parking requirements would have to be considered when determining how much land should be included in redevelopment plans for the 1922 building.

School District Issues

Annandale area citizens are justifiably proud of their public school system, consistently listing the schools and lakes as the community's most important assets. Like districts throughout Minnesota, Annandale has expanded its physical plant incrementally (and not always gracefully) over time to reflect changing student populations and state requirements. As a result the existing middle school complex, which at one point served students of all ages, is a sprawling complex assembled from a series of additions appended to the original 1922 building.

The District took the first step toward creation of a second school campus in the early 1970s with construction of the Bendix open school adjacent to Highway 24 on the north side of town. The focus on the new campus was reinforced with construction of a new high school adjacent to the Bendix building in 1990, and again with completion of a new pre-kindergarten-fifth grade school in 2013. The District's middle school program remains on the original campus at present, although most interviewees expect that a new middle school would be erected on the new campus in the future—defined as anywhere from five to twenty years. The difficulty of passing recent bond referenda and the need for an operating levy this fall were cited as reasons for the delay in moving the middle school program to the new campus.

As the district shifted the focus of its activity to the new campus over the past several decades, the 1922 building has been vacated in stages. The upper levels have been closed off and unused for several years, due to concerns over accessibility and life safety. The lower level remained in use until the new elementary building was completed earlier this year.

The abandonment and potential demolition of the 1922 building have been contentious issues within the community for many years, with many local residents asserting that the building could and should remain in use as an educational facility. The condition assessment completed as part of the Reuse Study indicates that the building is basically sound, and could have many years of useful life ahead of it; and that accessibility, life safety, and code issues could be resolved to enable it to remain in use for a variety of purposes, including continued use as a school.

The District, however, has determined that building has no further utility. The 1922 school building is seen as a liability, serving no useful purpose, costly to maintain and heat, and difficult to adapt for continuing educational use. Reflecting that point of view, the District has issued a Request for Proposals to redevelop the 1922 building. If the RFP fails to elicit a viable proposal, the District plans to demolish the building—perhaps as soon as the summer of 2014. The District has not identified any pressing need or vision for the greenspace that would result from demolition.

A number of questions relating to the ultimate disposition of the 1922 building have not been fully addressed. These include the costs of removing or remediating asbestos and other hazardous materials remaining in the 1922 building; the cost to demolish the building and restore the site; the cost to repair the northwest corner of the remaining

middle school complex and replace restrooms; the cost to repair or relocate the boiler room that is now shared by the 1922 building and the later additions. Although these costs have not been fully quantified, they could easily total in excess of half a million dollars. District officials have indicated that the funding to complete this work was factored into the bond referendum for the new elementary school. The District could reduce this expenditure by contributing some or all of these funds toward rehabilitation of the 1922 building. District officials seem willing to consider actions such as a dollar sale, redrawing parcel boundaries to facilitate a sale, or contributing some of the costs of demolition toward a compatible reuse of the building.

Historic Preservation Issues

Designed by the prolific and progressive firm of Howard C. Parsons 1922 the Annandale school building is one of few architect-designed buildings in the community. It has played an important role in the lives of many generations of Annandale residents, serving as an educational and cultural institution, a vocational school, and a social center. The building is not currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Although its physical presence has been somewhat diminished over time by a number of additions, the building remains an important local landmark.

Annandale has only one designated National Register property—the Thayer Hotel--a former railroad hotel that was rehabilitated a few years ago as a bed-and-breakfast/restaurant. The business was ultimately unsuccessful and the building has stood vacant for many months.

Only two properties (the Thayer and the former public library building) are included in the State Historic Preservation Office's statewide inventory of historic properties, although the community was last surveyed in the early 1980s. There are a number of interesting and potentially historic buildings in Annandale but none of theses properties are presently listed on the National Register. The city does not have a Heritage Preservation Commission or a local preservation ordinance.

A large contingent of area residents has worked informally for many years to preserve the 1922 building. These advocates recently formed The Citizens Committee to Save the '22, a non-profit organization whose mission is to "find a new use for the school building and save it from demolition." The Citizens Committee sponsored and funded the Annandale school Reuse Study.

A successful National Register nomination for the 1922 school building could make the property eligible for a number of preservation-related incentives, including State and Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits, Minnesota Cultural and Historical Heritage (Legacy) Grants, and State Capital Grants-in-Aid. These incentives could be instrumental in helping to buy down the cost of rehabilitation.

Compatibility Issues

Regardless of what ultimately happens to the 1922 building, it is clear that the middle school program will continue to be housed in the adjacent building complex for the foreseeable future. Interviewees were unanimous in emphasizing that any redevelopment of the 1922 building would have to be fully compatible with middle school program; and that ensuring the safety and security of students would be a primary consideration in evaluating any redevelopment plans.

Interviewees felt that under any reuse scenario, it would be important to avoid any activity that would interfere with school operations (parking and loading of school buses, for example), to minimize noise, and to allow the District to continue controlling and monitoring access to the complex. Reuses that would increase vehicle traffic or attract a large number of "strangers" were generally seen as incompatible, suggesting that reuse of the building for retail or office space would be difficult. A number of individuals expressed concern about redevelopment of the building for low-income housing, which many felt had the potential to attract "questionable" tenants.

From another point of view, new users of the 1922 building could consider the middle school program to be an undesirable neighbor. For example, a number of interviewees suggested that the 1922 building could be rehabilitated as condominiums targeted toward retirees. The high level of activity, noise, bus and parent traffic that naturally emanate from a middle school might make this sort of redevelopment less attractive to buyers of means seeking a quiet, well-appointed place in which to enjoy retirement.

Time Issues

When the 1922 building was closed and vacated in the spring of 2013, it had been in continuous use for more than 90 years. During that time, it was well maintained, and upgraded on a regular basis to meet evolving state requirements and the changing needs of the school district. As result the building is generally in very good condition, despite a few shortcomings.

As part of the divestiture process, the school district has issued a Request for Proposals, seeking a developer with the wherewithal to successfully complete a compatible repurposing of the 1922 building. The RFP calls for proposals to be submitted by 15 November 2013, with the understanding that they may not be changed for at least one year after the submittal date. In the event no viable proposal is forthcoming, the District has indicated its intention to proceed with demolition of the 1922 building, perhaps as early as the summer of 2014.

Under even the most ideal circumstances, evaluating proposals, selecting a developer, negotiating terms, completing legal work, finalizing a rehabilitation plan, and putting financing into place is likely to take both time and patience—perhaps beyond the 15 November 2014 deadline implied in the RFP. The District has indicated that it would be willing to allow a "reasonable" amount of time for this process to unfold.

The deadline for completion of the present Reuse Study is 15 September 2013, with a public presentation of results slated for 29 October. The Reuse Study document includes a wealth of information about the condition of the building, the state of public opinion, potential reuse scenarios, the costs of rehabilitation, and financial incentives that could be used to buy down the cost of rehabilitation, thereby increasing the likelihood for a successful redevelopment. The school district could realize a significant cost savings if the building were to be rehabilitated by an outside party rather than being demolished with District funds. An extension of the submittal deadline would allow potential developers to utilize the information gathered as part of the Reuse Study Process, and could increase the possibility of finding a developer for the property.

A self-sustaining interim use could help to stabilize and preserve the 1922 building, make the structure available for a community purpose, reduce or eliminate the short term financial burden that the 1922 building presents to the school district, and allow time for the community to thoroughly investigate potential reuse of the building.

Community Issues

Annandale is located on Minnesota Highway 55, approximately sixty miles west of Minneapolis and about twenty-five miles south of St. Cloud. Both Buffalo and Monticello are less than a half hour's drive away, and offer a variety of shopping, medical and recreational facilities that are not available in Annandale.

Annandale residents rely heavily on these nearby communities for employment, entertainment and satisfying basic needs. To a considerable extent, Annandale is a bedroom community, with much of its employment base centered in the western suburbs of the Twin Cities and in St. Cloud. There is little local industry.

Annandale's downtown business district is still headquarters to a hardware store, a pharmacy, a thriving family jewelry business, financial institutions, a couple of gift shops, a few offices, several bars and a good coffee shop. The City Hall, Library and Post Office are still located downtown. Nonetheless, this traditional "Main Street" appears to be struggling. There are many vacant or underutilized storefronts, suggesting that there is little or no market for office or retail space. Basic services such as the grocery store and medical clinics are now located along the Highway 55 corridor, and two of the community's newest businesses, a Dollar General store and a McDonalds restaurant are also located on Highway 55. There is concern that moving the school out of downtown will further diminish the traditional central business district.

Despite their apparent reliance on nearby economic centers, Annandale residents do not consider the community to be a suburb. Most of the individuals interviewed still think of Annandale as a small town, and want it to remain that way. Projected improvements to Highway 55 could work against the community's desire to retain its small town feel. Conversely, high fuel prices or shortages could stimulate more local economic growth.

There is a great disparity in income levels between residents of the city proper and residents of the greater Annandale area, conforming roughly to the boundaries of the school district. There has been some tension between residents of the city and those who live in the surrounding area about who should pay for what.

Local Government Issues

The reuse team's conversations with Annandale officials suggested that there is no overt political opposition to preservation of the 1922 building, as long as a project could be completed without an infusion of local tax dollars. One interviewee expressed the opinion that the city's primary role in the process was "to be an advocate" and "show the benefits" that could accrue to the community from a successful redevelopment.

There are a number of things that the city could do to foster redevelopment of the 1922 building without tapping into local taxes including:

-Abate property taxes for the redeveloped property. The school building and site have never been on the local property tax rolls. Abatement would provide some financial relief to a developer without diminishing net local tax revenues.

-Serve as fiscal agent for a non-profit developer as a means of making the project eligible for certain types of grants, such as the State Capital Grants-in-Aid Program offered through the Minnesota Historical Society.

-The school property includes a vacated alley right-of-way between Cherry and Myrtle Avenue, as well as a vacated extension of the Myrtle Avenue right-of-way. It could be possible for the city to deed this property to a developer to allow creation of a new entrance access road on the north side of the building.

-Allow a zoning variance to reduce the amount of parking required for a redeveloped property.

Tourism Issues

The Annandale area boasts more than two-dozen lakes. Area residents universally describe the lakes as one of the area's greatest assets. Historically the lakes supported a number of small resorts, as well as modest seasonal cabins, many owned by families from the Twin Cities and St. Cloud.

Although the lakes are a significant attraction, the tourism industry in Annandale is almost entirely focused on semi-permanent residents rather than on short-term vacationers. Businesses targeting transient visitors have found it difficult to succeed in Annandale. Many residents commented on the lack of good restaurants in the area, and at least one long-established lakeside restaurant recently went out of business. The Thayer House, a historic bed-and-breakfast/restaurant went out of business after operating for many years despite a significant investment of time and money on the part of the owners.

In recent decades the small resorts have disappeared, and many of the small cabins have been converted into year-around homes for people whose families "summered" in Annandale for generations, and who have now opted retire along the lakes, or to manage metro-area businesses from a distance.

As the supply of lakeshore property has diminished and as small cabins have been converted into substantial and comfortable year-round residences, property values—and property taxes—around area lakes have soared. Meanwhile, property values in town have remained relatively stable. The school district, which encompasses not only the city of Annandale, but also a large part of the surrounding area, has benefitted from a growing tax base, much to the consternation of some lakeshore residents. The city, however, has found itself in the position of having to maintain a steady level of services with a steady or dwindling tax base, reduced local government aid payments from the state, and everincreasing costs. This suggests that any substantial community project is more likely to succeed if it can serve the larger community and tap into the expanded tax base.

Recreation and Community Center Issues

Annandale offers many opportunities for outdoor recreation, including a network of bike/running/walking trails, a swimming beach, parks and a number of athletic fields. Despite this apparent abundance of recreational facilities, local residents have consistently expressed a desire not only for additional outdoor sports fields and a hockey rink, but also for a community center that would include an indoor pool and ice sheet, workout rooms, and space for classes, child care, gallery and studio space, a theater and meeting rooms.

Local advocates have established an organizational infrastructure for these projects over the past decade. Nonetheless, neither project has materialized. The cost to construct athletic fields, which would include baseball, softball, tennis and multipurpose fields, was projected at \$5 million in the district's 2008 Facilities Task Force Report. It has not moved forward despite an offer of land at the city's sewage treatment pond site. The community center project, which has repeatedly been identified as a top priority in a visioning sessions conducted by the Annandale Area Community Team has languished due to a lack of funding, development and promotion.

Although some of the costs of a building and operating a community center would presumably be covered through donations to a capital campaign and membership or user fees, it seems likely that the project would also be dependent on tax revenue. Many interviewees indicated that the project would be unlikely to succeed if it drew only on the tax base of Annandale proper, but that the likelihood of success would increase significantly if the project could draw on the tax base of entire school district.

The capital cost of building a community center with a pool, ice sheet, workout spaces and other facilities would be considerable in its own right. But a number of individuals indicated that the costs of staffing and operating such a facility would also be considerable and challenging. Local advocates for the project have explored the potential for entering into a partnership agreement with an experienced fitness center operator such as Gold's Gym to provide management services. Other communities have been successful in developing partnership agreements with YM/YWCAs or local school districts. Examples include a field house in Minneapolis that was developed as a partnership between the YWCA and the Minneapolis Public Schools; and a community center in Morris that was a partnership between the city of Morris and the University of Minnesota.

If and when the district does vacate the middle school complex, the site would provide an ideal location for a community center, and portions of the existing building complex, which include three gymnasiums (including the gym in the 1922 building) could potentially be incorporated into a fully developed community center. Redevelopment of some or all of the 1922 building as the nucleus of the community center would enable to community to make significant progress toward its ultimate goal, and would serve as a "placeholder" that would place a claim on the school property pending the construction of a new middle school on the recently developed north campus.

Youth Issues

The community of Annandale has demonstrated a strong commitment to its youth. This is evidenced by the community's large investment in athletic facilities, school buildings, etc. Young people enjoy and appreciate the community, and many of them have returned as young adults to make Annandale their permanent residence.

Nonetheless, the community is home to a number of underserved, and potentially at risk youth--primarily from economically distressed families. In an effort to address the needs of this population a local non-profit organization called Youth First was created in 1997. Initially funded in part with state and county funds, Youth First provides a variety of after school activities, a summer camp, and mentoring programs to children of high school age and below.

Although local residents have expressed a strong verbal commitment to this program, this verbal support has not translated to strong financial or facility support. The program operates with two half-time staff and a shoestring budget of about \$60,000 per year, half of which is provided by a single local family foundation. The school district has allowed the program to use a small amount of space in the cafeteria of the1954 addition, which requires daily setup and takedown. Participants in the program have no access to a gymnasium or other recreational space. The spacious, light filled classrooms and gymnasium in the 1922 building would provide ideal program and recreational space for Youth First.

Although Youth First seems to be the type of undertaking that could attract substantial foundation, corporate, and individual financial support, the program lacks the human resources required to implement an effective fundraising effort.

Senior Issues

According to a Business Retention and Expansion Survey prepared for the city in 2011, nearly 18% of Annandale's residents are 65 or older, making seniors a significantly higher proportion of the population than surrounding communities.¹ A number of individuals interviewed during the Reuse Study process indicated that at least some of the community's senior population is made up of people who have spent summers in family cabins in the area, and who have elected to retire in Annandale.

Annandale's older residents have no dedicated senior center. A number of programs, including congregate meals and social activities currently take place in a large assembly room in City Hall.

Annandale Health and Community Services is a local non-profit organization that operates a multifaceted, continuum-of-care residential facility for seniors. AHCS offers a variety of living situations, including a 60-bed skilled nursing facility, Centennial Villa assisted living and independent living apartments, a memory care unit, and a wellness center. The assisted living units are in especially high demand, and some of the apartments earmarked for independent living are currently used by residents requiring additional services.

Some interviewees felt that seniors might be reluctant to move from homes that are paid for into a rental situation. Others felt that seniors might welcome the social opportunities and freedom from lawn care, snow removal and home maintenance provided by a rental arrangement.

¹ Heidi Peper, "Annandale Business Retention and Expansion," prepared for the City of Annandale by Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc., April 2011; 1, 2.

Housing Issues

A number of interviewees indicated that the city of Annandale is experiencing a shortage of affordable housing for first-time homebuyers. Others indicated that there is a severe shortage of economical rental apartments for schoolteachers and other young professionals, noting that that it is "almost impossible" to find rental property in town. Earning modest incomes and faced with a dearth of affordable housing, some new teachers must rent rooms in private homes or look for apartments in other communities. Others indicated that the market for affordable housing could include recent widows, retirees moving to town after living on farms, and young couples with no families.

One interviewee posited that a "really nice" apartment with two bedrooms and two bathrooms could rent for \$1000/month in Annandale. Another opined that a senior condominium with 1400 square feet could sell for \$140,000 to \$160,000 with association fees added on.

The 1922 building would lend itself to redevelopment for residential use, including as affordable housing. However, there is some perception that affordable/low-income housing targeted toward a general population could attract a clientele that would be incompatible with the adjacent middle school. Affordable housing targeted toward seniors does not seem to have the same stigma. Redevelopment for affordable housing would allow developers to take advantage of a number of tax credits and subsidies that could significantly buy down the cost of rehabilitation.

Annandale currently has a small number of low-income housing developments, including the Knollwood Apartments, Annandale Square, Goldendale, and Oakdale. Some of these properties have been developed with assistance from the city's Housing Redevelopment Authority. Some of the community's most economically challenged families have mobile homes in the Eastview Trailer Court.

Several recent market-rate residential developments, including Southbrook and Triplett Farms have been successful, with one interviewee describing the Patio Homes in Southbrook as "a transition between the lake and the care center."

Some individuals identified a potential market for upscale condominiums targeted toward retirees or other owners of lake homes who want to remain in Annandale, but no longer wish to incur the cost and work required to maintain buildings, docks, lawns, etc.

Organizational Issues

Annandale has a well-established organizational structure that could play an important role in facilitating a successful reuse of the 1922 school building. In 2002 a group of area advocates established the Annandale Area Community Team (ACT) to identify and catalyze projects that would strengthen and benefit the Annandale Area. Leaders of the nascent group participated in training provided by the Healthy Communities Partnership of the Central Minnesota Initiative Fund.

Since then ACT has facilitated a series of visioning sessions to identify and prioritize community aspirations. Projects receiving the most support include development of a community center, support for the arts, construction of a skateboard park, development of a trail system, downtown revitalization, and operation of a beach house at Pleasant Lake. Although the community center concept has progressed slowly, the organization has been able to achieve a number of the other goals.

As discussed above, a number of area individuals, including many alumni of the Healthy Communities Partnership training, recently formed The Citizens Committee to Save the '22, a non-profit organization dedicated specifically to the successful preservation and reuse of the 1922 school building. This organization sponsored the current reuse study and could spearhead the effort to implement a rehabilitation plan.

Philanthropy Issues

A number of local projects, including not only the reuse of the 1922 Annandale school building, but also such projects as the Community Center effort, the effort to bolster the community's athletic facilities, or the highly-touted mentoring program called Youth First could benefit from grants, partnerships, program funds or other forms of philanthropy.

Although Annandale does not have a strong community foundation or large corporate philanthropists, there is by all accounts a considerable amount of personal wealth in the area. If this perception is accurate, it suggests that the potential for local philanthropic investment may be substantial. This source of revenue seems to have been largely untapped, however, perhaps because individual philanthropy is carried out quietly behind the scenes rather than by a highly visible, easily accessible philanthropic institution. As one interviewee put it "there's a lot of money in town. It's frustrating that it's so much work to get things done."

Although the capacity for philanthropic investment seems to be present, projects such as the efforts to build a the community center or build new athletic fields have languished—at least in part to a lack of funding. Similarly, the Youth First program receives nearly universal approbation, but operates on a minuscule budget—half of it provided by a single-family foundation.

A contribution/investment of \$500,000 has been offered by anonymous donors as an incentive to redevelopment of the 1922 building. Funding would be available to a non-profit organization or the school district and could be used to pay for legal expenses, interim operations, and under certain circumstances for bricks and mortar work. This offer could serve as an important catalyst for redevelopment.

Financial Issues

The 1922 school has been a *public* building for more than ninety years. It was erected to provide a universally accepted public benefit; and was built, staffed, and maintained with public tax dollars. It has never been expected to contribute to the local tax base. As taxpayers, many generations of Annandale have made significant investments in the property. They should be considered stakeholders and should have an opportunity to help determine its future.

A number of individuals expressed concern over the potential use of tax dollars to pay for rehabilitation of the 1922 building. A private or non-profit redevelopment of the building could be completed with no infusion of local property tax dollars, and could put the school property on the tax rolls for the first time in more than ninety years. Tax abatement would result in no net loss for the city, and could serve as an incentive for redevelopment.

The Annandale school district could make a significant contribution to rehabilitation of the 1922 building, and still spend less than it would to demolish the building, restore the site, and repair damage to the remainder of the middle school complex. Some of the measures available to the District include:

-Sell the building and land to a developer for one dollar.

-Contribute a portion of the costs of hazardous materials remediation, demolition, site restoration, and repair toward rehabilitation of the building. Although these costs have not been quantified, this could significantly reduce the cost of rehabilitation. Professional Project Management has estimated the demolition cost alone at between \$193,000 and \$321,000. Applied Environmental Sciences estimated the costs of hazardous materials remediation at \$160,000. No estimates have been prepared for building repairs, site restoration, or replacement of restrooms.

Depending on the nature of the developer, building ownership, and type of reuse, a number of other incentives may be available to buy down the cost of rehabilitation. These include:

-A group of anonymous local donors has offered an outright grant of up to \$500,000 for rehabilitation of the building if it is used as a school or for a non-profit organization.

-State and Federal Rehabilitation Tax credits (contingent on National Register status).

-Federal tax credit (available for non-National Register buildings placed in service before 1936).

-Federal tax credits for redevelopment as affordable housing.

-Minnesota Cultural and Historical Heritage (Legacy) Grants. Administered by the Minnesota Historical Society, these include planning grants of up to \$7000 and capital (bricks and mortar) up to \$50,000.

-State Capital Grants-in-Aid for certain types of owners (units of government, non-profit preservation organizations; and for projects that serve a public purpose.) Also administered by the Minnesota Historical Society, these grants are available in amounts of up to \$150,000, depending on legislative funding. Grants are available for specific types of projects including general restoration work and upgrading of HVAC and other building systems.

-Corporate and foundation grants to support programs provided by non-profit organizations such as Youth First, or for a public purpose such as a community center.

Ownership and Developer Issues

The school district has been clear in stating that it does not want to remain responsible for maintaining and operating the 1922 building. This does not necessarily mean that the building and land would have to be sold outright in order to allow redevelopment of the property.

For example, the district could facilitate rehabilitation and divest itself of responsibility for maintenance and operations by entering into a long-term lease (25 years) with a developer for both the land and building. This option would enable the developer to utilize Federal and State Rehabilitation Tax Credits, but it would carry some risk for the school district—leaving ultimate responsibility for the structure in the hands of the District in the event of a default on the lease.

The district could also sell the building to a developer, but retain ownership of the land, leasing it to the developer. This would facilitate rehabilitation of the building, but enable the District to retain control of the site.

The district could sell both the land and the building to a non-profit or for-profit developer. Outright sale of entire property would require defining and re-drawing parcel boundaries so that the entire building footprint was included within the parcel boundaries.

School district and school board members interviewed by the reuse team seemed generally amenable to taking steps that would foster a successful reuse of the 1922 building in lieu of demolition. One option that received a favorable response was the sale of the building to a redeveloper for a dollar.

A non-profit owner would have access to wide assortment of grants that might not be available to for-profit developers. A non-profit owner could also could syndicate credits and sell to for-profit partner

DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES

The 1922 school building has been closed down in stages over the past several years, but it was completely vacated only a few months ago. It has been heated, ventilated, and maintained as needed to remain in use for students, and is consequently in very good condition. Because it is directly part of the middle school campus, snow removal, lawn care and other exterior maintenance continue to be provided by the school district.

Continued School Use

Under this scenario, the 1922 building would be rehabilitated and remain in use as an integral part of the existing middle school complex. The school district would restore the integrity of the exterior envelope (roof replacement, window replacement, masonry repair) and build a new accessible entrance. Interior work would include installation of an elevator, construction of fully accessible restrooms, reconfiguring partition walls to maximize the efficiency and utility of classroom spaces; restoration of the gymnasium; installation of new mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and telecommunications systems; and restoration of interior finishes. The entire building would be rehabilitated as part of this plan. This approach would provide the middle school with an additional gymnasium and an abundance of classroom space. A number of local residents have suggested that this scenario would also provide an opportunity to reconfigure some or all of the building as a commons and cafeteria, facilities which are grossly inadequate in the current middle school complex. Although this would require a significant investment of time and money, the reuse team's assessment of the building suggests that the work could be done.

The 2008 Facilities Task Force Report stated that "our school district should begin a plan of phasing out the use of [the existing middle school complex] and site as part of its long range plan, ... The school district should not invest significant funds into a major remodeling of the current middle school building.... The first step in [the] phase out should be the discontinued use of the 1922 building. Since the funds required to refurbish the building ... are greater than replacement expenditures, the building should be either demolished or offered to individuals or groups in the community for non-school public or private use." This seems to be a very clear statement of the District's ultimate goal to consolidate all of its Pre-K-12 programs in new facilities on the developing campus on the north side of Annandale. Although this long-range vision has engendered considerable resistance from some residents who would prefer to see the 1922 building remain in service for its original purpose, the district has taken significant steps toward realizing this vision in the past five years—mounting a successfully bond referendum for a new elementary school on the new campus, demolishing the Bendix elementary building, vacating the 1922 building, and moving Pre-K through 5th grade programs to the new site as of the fall, 2013 school year.²

Demolition

Under this scenario, the 1922 building would be completely demolished and the site would be restored as a green space. The school district would incur costs for hazardous materials removal, demolition costs, and site restoration. At least one wall of the existing

² "ISD No. 876 Facilities Task Force Report, 2007-2008," Unpublished study prepared for the Annandale school district, 2008; 4.

boiler room would be exposed to the weather and would have to be repaired. The restrooms housed in the southeast corner of the 1922 building, which also currently serve the main level of the 1954 addition, would be demolished. The northwest corner of the 1954 addition would be exposed by the demolition, and would have to be repaired. New restrooms would have to be constructed to serve this part of the 1954 building. Professional Project Management estimated the cost of demolition for the building and foundation at \$193,000 to \$321,000 (643,275 cubic feet at \$0.30 to \$0.50 per cubic foot.) Although other costs for this work have not been fully quantified, the total would easily exceed \$500,000. The community would lose potentially useful classroom and gymnasium space. For its part, the District would reduce heating and utilities costs, lower its insurance costs, and gain a modest amount of green space.

Do Nothing

Under this scenario, the 1922 building would remain standing but would no longer be occupied for any purpose. Heat and utilities would be cut off; all interior and exterior building maintenance would cease. The school district would presumably continue to insure the building, and would maintain lawns and sidewalks. The District would realize some cost savings by not having to heat the building, although severing the connection to the remainder of the middle school complex would presumably require some mechanical work and potentially a minimal amount of construction. With no active maintenance, heat or ventilation, the condition of the building would deteriorate over time, and could eventually become an eyesore. The vacant space would present security and liability risks. Although the structure would remain standing, it would serve no useful community function.

Interim Use

Under this scenario, the 1922 building would remain standing for a defined period of time (2-5 years), and portions of it would remain available for activities that provide some public benefit and that are deemed compatible with the middle school program. Although the school building would retain ownership of the building, programming, staffing and operational costs would be assumed by a non-District administrative entityprobably a non-profit organization formed specifically for this purpose. The administrative organization would fund and implement low-cost measures intended to stabilize and reduce operating costs of the building. The District and the administrative organization would negotiate fees to cover utility costs, insurance and other expenses required to keep the building open. The District would retain the right to use the existing restrooms at the junction of the 1922 and 1954 buildings, and would work with the administrative group to provide secure, accessible after hours use through the current main entrance to the complex. Activities would be limited to the gymnasium and lower level classrooms. This approach would require little or no infusion of funds from the school district, would keep the building available for a variety of community functions, would prevent it from deteriorating and becoming an eyesore, and would allow time to fully investigate the redevelopment potential for the site.

Phased Rehabilitation

Under this scenario, the 1922 building would be rehabilitated in stages as needs arise and funds become available. This would allow the building to remain in service, and be improved while avoiding the costs of a comprehensive rehabilitation. This approach would take the interim use scenario one step further, completing substantial improvements to restore the integrity of the exterior envelope (roof replacement, window replacement, masonry repair) and construction of a new accessible entrance. Interior work would be limited to the main floor and gymnasium, focusing on improvements that would equip the building to serve as a freestanding community center. Interior work would include installation of independent, and expandable mechanical systems, installation of an elevator, construction of fully accessible restrooms on the main level, and restoration of interior finishes. Upper levels of the building would remain in stabilization mode, with minimal heat and ventilation, and would be restored in subsequent phases of the project.

This approach would enable the community to take a major step toward creation of the much discussed and much desired community center. However, it would also require a significant financial commitment with no assurance that there would be a revenue stream sufficient to make the project self-sustaining. It seems unlikely that the school district would be willing to retain ownership of the building.

The school district could reduce its expenditures for demolition and site restoration while helping move the project forward by selling the building for a dollar and contributing some portion of the projected costs of demolition toward completion of the project. It is conceivable that the project could be completed in partnership with a partner such as a YM or YWCA or a private health club that would provide an infusion of funds. Programming and some bricks-and-mortar work could be funded through grants. Patrons could be required to pay membership or user fees. Nonetheless, it is likely that the community center would have to be publicly subsidized in order to cover the costs of physical improvements and ongoing operational expenses.

A partial rehabilitation could make it difficult to maximize the use of incentive programs, such as housing or rehabilitation tax credits. Rental income that could accrue to the project through rehabilitation of the upper levels would not be immediately available. Cash flow from redevelopment of the upper levels could be crucial to the ultimate success of the project.

Full rehabilitation

Under this scenario, the entire 1922 building would be rehabilitated as a single project, with the main level serving a public function and the upper two levels providing a revenue stream that would help to support the public use. The project could be undertaken by either a non-profit organization or by a for-profit developer. In either case, the development entity would be able to maximize the use of incentive programs. The potential for school district involvement, membership revenue and partnerships would be the same as described above.

USE ALTERNATIVES

The reuse team solicited information and ideas about potential uses or the 1922 building through individual interviews and a public meeting. Residents offered a range of ideas for reuse that included continued use as a school, redevelopment for restaurant, retail or office space (including one suggestion that the building be converted into a Wal-Mart); reuse as a business incubator; headquarters for a microbrewery; and a variety of housing options including senior housing, market rate apartments, and upscale condominiums. Respondents were unanimous in their view that any reuse would have to be compatible with the existing middle school program, and that the safety and security of students and staff was of paramount importance. Many expressed the view that property tax revenue should not be used to fund rehabilitation of the building. Most individuals seemed to feel that demolition should be considered only if a viable reuse could not be found.

A significant number of people felt that the building could serve in some capacity as part of a community center. Most individuals indicated that a mixed-use redevelopment could meet a number of local needs and would offer the greatest likelihood of success.

Based on the a careful examination of the building, and the information gathered through background research, individual interviews, and the public meeting, the reuse team considered four potential uses for the 1922 building. The basic ideas included:

Community Center Technical Center Affordable housing Upscale Condominiums

Each of these ideas has been expanded and explored below.

Core of a Community Center

Residents of the Annandale area have repeatedly and vociferously identified their desire for a fully developed community center that would include workout space, an indoor swimming pool, an indoor ice sheet, theater, studio and gallery space, and rooms for classes, childcare activities, and large gatherings. This is a big vision—and a big project for a small community, and progress toward the goal has been slow. Many residents indicated that the middle school *site* would be ideal location, for a community center and felt that the site would eventually become available for redevelopment as the school continued to develop a newer campus on the north side of town.

Although the 1922 building by itself does not contain sufficient space to provide all the services that residents are hoping eventually to incorporate into a community center, it could serve as the core and starting point for a longer-term project. Reuse of some portion of the building for community center functions would help to transform the project from an abstract idea into a tangible reality. It would provide a relatively cost-effective way to demonstrate and test the community center concept and could provide impetus to the fundraising effort that would be required to complete the larger project.

Telecommuting/Co-working/Technology Training Center

By all accounts Annandale is home to a large number of commuters. Some individuals make a daily drive to work in the western Twin City suburbs or St. Cloud. Others may be senior business executives who live on the lakes manage their commercial affairs electronically, traveling to urban headquarters only for occasional meetings. Still others may be independent contractors and entrepreneurs who are attracted to the area by its many lakes and its semi-rural environment, but whose client base is located elsewhere. To address the needs of this constituency, the reuse team considered adapting some or all of the 1922 to serve as a telecommuting or Co-working center that would enable these individuals to go to work without leaving town.

This type of reuse would require state-of-the-art broadband and telecommunications connections, but otherwise relatively little in the way of specialized rehabilitation work. Annandale currently lacks adequate broadband service, but community has already commissioned a broadband feasibility study. There are a number of people in the area with extensive experience in the telecommunications industry, and it is conceivable that the community could tap this body of knowledge to help with the project.

Redevelopment as a technology center could also create an opportunity to return some of the space in the building to educational use. For a number of years the Annandale school district has partnered with a number of surrounding districts to offer vocational training to high school students. Thus far the focus has been on "hard industries," such as auto mechanics and welding. This program, headquartered in Buffalo, does not currently offer training technology—computers, telecommunications and evolving energy technologies. If the 1922 building were equipped with the appropriate technological infrastructure, it could house programs targeted toward not only high school students but also to non-college-bound high school graduates or to mid-career adults seeking re-training to work in these fields. The program's proximity to the Co-working/telecommuting site could lead to mentorship or on-the-job training opportunities for participants.

Affordable Housing

A number of interviewees stated their objection to redevelopment of the 1922 building for "low-income" housing, citing their concern that such projects had the potential to attract a constituency that would be incompatible with the middle school program that would continue to operate in the remainder of the complex. Many of the same individuals, however, noted the severe lack of decent rental property in town and identified several groups of people who would benefit from the addition of affordable rental units. A number of people mentioned young unmarried teachers, some of whom must presently rent apartments in other communities or are relegated to renting rooms in private homes in Annandale. Other constituencies mentioned included seniors seeking opportunities for independent living without the burden of caring for their homes; older individuals who had lost spouses; and seniors who were moving into town from rural areas.

The upper levels of the 1922 building could easily be adapted to meet the needs of these individuals, most of whom live on modest or fixed incomes. The building could be

reconfigured into spacious, light-filled, well-situated efficiency, one-and two-bedroom units targeted toward these individuals.

Many incentives and tax credits are available for these types of redevelopment. The school district could justify a dollar sale of the building and contribution of some or all of the projected costs of demolition as an investment in housing for teachers. Rental fees would create a revenue stream that would offset the costs of rehabilitation. This type of reuse could also create a market for a small coffee shop, a hair salon or another compatible business that would serve residents and generate additional rental income.

Although the building is located in the center of town, Annandale's downtown does not seem to be thriving, and such desirable amenities as a grocery store, medical services, restaurants, etc. are not located nearby.

Condominiums for High-Income Retirees

In recent decades the Annandale area has attracted a significant, and growing, number of prosperous retirees or semi-retirees. Some of these individuals have long histories in the area, spending summers in family cabins on the shores of the area's many lakes. Others are relative newcomers looking for lakefront property close to family and friends in the metro area.

A number of interviewees suggested that some or all of the 1922 building could be converted into high-end condominiums for prosperous retirees who enjoy the area's many recreational opportunities and relaxed lifestyle, and want to remain in greater Annandale, but are tired of caring for the buildings, beaches, boats, docks, and lawns that are part and parcel of owning lakefront property.

Candidates for this type of redevelopment would be individuals of means who have retired but do not have health issues that require professional care. The building would be rehabilitated by a private developer who would define the square footage of individual units and install the basic infrastructure. Units would be built out to meet the requirements of individual owners. Amenities such as a party room, guest housing, and sheltered parking would be created as part of the basic rehabilitation. Owners would pay association fees to cover the costs of routine maintenance. The project could be completed as part of a mixed-use redevelopment, with the upper levels reserved for residential use and the lower level serving another purpose, possibly for a public purpose.

Considering the site's constituency, landlocked site, location in the center of town, and proximity to the ongoing middle school program, a well thought-out landscape/environmental plan could be crucial to the success of the project.

This type of redevelopment would be costly, and some incentive programs that could be applied to other types of redevelopment would not be available. Consequently, unit prices would be correspondingly high, with potential owners incurring much of the cost. Although the clientele for this type of redevelopment would be unlikely to present compatibility concerns from the point of view of the school district, the 1922 building's

proximity to an active middle school program could be perceived as undesirable to potential residents. And in the case of a mixed-use redevelopment, potential residents might be reluctant to share the building with a community center or other public uses.

If the entire building were to be redeveloped as condominiums, the gymnasium could be converted into sheltered parking and the roof could be transformed into an elevated private terrace. This would add considerable expense to the project and would effectively preclude the potential to use the existing gymnasium as part of a nascent community center.

Recommendations

The citizens of Annandale have repeatedly and emphatically expressed their desire to create a multifaceted community center, providing facilities for recreation, the arts, continuing education, events and gatherings, and serving all age groups. The seed of an organizational structure is already in place as a subcommittee of ACT, but the project has languished due to uncertainty about location, funding, and ongoing operations.

The community should pursue a two-stage redevelopment of the 1922 building. During the first stage, the ACT committee or a newly formed community center task force would negotiate an interim use agreement with the school district for a period of at least two years. This agreement would be configured to remove administrative and financial responsibility for the building from the school district, would help to demonstrate the viability of the community center concept, and would provide sufficient time to develop a stakeholder base and undertake fundraising activities.

This approach could also serve as placeholder—keeping the 1922 building and the middle school site in reserve for redevelopment as a more extensive community center if and when the school district abandons the remainder of the complex.

With the first stage of the project under way, the community should lay the groundwork for a full redevelopment of the 1922 building as a mixed-use community center and affordable housing facility. This approach would ensure full utilization and preservation of the building while maximizing the use of credits and incentives to buy down the overall cost of the redevelopment.
Next Steps

-Designate or establish a local non-profit organization to manage interim use, and assist with marketing of the building.

-Negotiate with the school district to extend redevelopment and allow interim use. -Implement strategy for low-cost stabilization (especially energy efficiency measures) and interim use. (this would require an arrangement with the school district to allow restrooms to remain in service; to arrange payment for heat, electricity, water; to allow after hours access).

-Take community leaders on a tour to examine other examples of successful school reuse. -Nominate the building to the National Register of Historic Places as a means of maximizing potential tax credits.

-Use information gathered as part of the reuse study to actively market the building, or as basis redevelopment by a local group.

-Contact experienced developers of affordable housing to serve as consultants or developers for the housing component of the school redevelopment plan. Examples include:

MetroPlains Development LLC

1600 University Avenue, Suite 212 St. Paul, MN 55104 651-646-7848 http://www.metroplains.com

Landon Group

475 Cleveland Avenue, Suite 325 St. Paul, MN 55104 651-447-2330 http://landon-group.com/home

Aeon

901 North Third Street, Suite 150 Minneapolis, MN 55406 612-341-4208 http://www.aeonmn.org/contact_us.aspx

Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative

2610 University Avenue West, Suite 100 St. Paul, MN 55114 651-789-6260 http://www.beaconinterfaith.org

Artspace

250 Third Avenue North, Suite 500 Minneapolis, MN 55401 612-333-9012 www.artspace.org -Develop a program plan for the building, describing local needs, programs that will be developed to meet those needs, and constituencies that will be served. This information can be used as the basis for conversations with charitable foundations, government agencies and other potential funding sources.

-Develop a capital campaign case statement for a community center, describing the facilities that will be needed to deliver programs and outlining the benefits the community will realize from the facility.

-Initiate a capital campaign. Seek funding from area individuals, businesses and foundations as well as from regional foundations whose missions include constituencies served and programs provided within the facility.

Interim Use-Implementation Strategy

-Identify non-profit organization to administer use agreement (ACT, Citizens Committee to Save the '22, Youth First)

-Negotiate use agreement with school district

District, non-profit define maximum term for interim use—at least two years, perhaps as much as five years. District retains ownership, non-profit leases space on lower level for one dollar District retains right to use lower level restrooms New user negotiates right to use existing accessible entrance New user provides insurance New user accepts responsibility for any required maintenance—with opt out clause in case of pre-defined major work District determines utility fees; new user agrees to pay utility costs New user establishes programming for building New user provides operating and administrative staff for building

-Clear building of all stored materials, junk, etc., and complete thorough cleaning. This could include removal of carpet from upper levels. Could be completed by volunteers

-New user takes low-cost steps to reduce energy consumption while providing minimum level of heat and ventilation to forestall further deterioration of building. Steps would include:

-Installation of insulating foam panels in all upper level window opening (panels could be painted black or covered with asphalt paper to minimize visual impact from exterior.)

-Installation of clear plastic sheeting over all main floor classroom windows and gymnasium windows to reduce air infiltration and heat loss.

-Turn down or turn off radiators in upper levels to reduce heat consumption -Install temporary "dampers" (SEE EDI)

-Cover leaking roof ventilator(s) to stop water infiltration

-Convert the former shower room/storage area adjacent to the existing lower level restrooms in the 1922 building in to a new accessible restroom

-If desired, it would be possible to create an accessible entrance to the gymnasium by constructing an exterior ramp on the north side of the gym wing (optional)

Advantages

-District would retain control of the land and the building, and would have the option of demolition if no developer is found by the end of the interim use period

-District would save costs of ongoing operation of the 1922 building.

-District would not have to incur any immediate cost for remediation, demolition or repair work resulting from demolition of the building.

-Simple, low-cost stabilization work would minimize further deterioration of the building.

-Continuing use of the building by Youth First, Community Center organization, seniors, arts groups and others would serve community purpose and keep the building in the public eye.

-Interim use would serve as a "place holder" for eventual use of the building as a Community Center.

-Interim use would provide a low-cost way to test the viability of the community center idea. The much talked-about, but long dormant interest in creating a community center – assess amount of public use, evaluate level of support, test fund-raising ability.

-Interim use would allow time for local capacity building to establish administrative organization, raise funds, etc.

-Interim use would allow time to actively market the building to potential developers. Successful marketing campaign would result in preservation of the building and enable the school district to reduce cost of disposition.

-An interim use would allow an evaluation of the building's National Register eligibility. A successful National Register nomination could open the door to a number of significant incentives to redevelopment, including planning grants, bricks and mortar grants, and federal and state tax credits

-A group of local donors has agreed to provide up to \$500,000 to cover some of the legal and operating expenses that might be involved in maintaining operations of the building.

APPENDIX A: Historical Background

A Note About the Architect

The Architect for the 1922 Building was C. (Cyrus) Howard Parsons. He began his practice in partnership with his father (William R. Parsons) and W.R.'s spouse, Hattie.E. Parsons. The firm was initially established in Topeka as W.R. Parsons & Son, but had moved its headquarters to Des Moines by 1891. According to notes held by the Northwest Architectural Archives at the University of Minnesota, the firm was one of the biggest firms in Des Moines, and also had offices in Duluth, and Fort Smith, Arkansas. An advertisement for the office describes the company as "School House Architects." The firm was in business in Des Moines until about 1910.

W.R. Parsons and Son designed a number of schools, courthouses and banks throughout the Midwest, including school buildings in Chisholm and Hibbing, MN. The firm also published a number of architectural treatises, including *the Designs for Public Schools; Designs of City School Buildings; Designs for Village Schools; Designs for Country District School Houses; and Designs for Bank Buildings.*

By the time he was retained to design the Annandale Building C. Howard had established an independent practice in Minneapolis. The Northwest Architectural Archives at the University of Minnesota has a small collection of materials relating to his work in Minnesota.



February 18, 1922.

er Bethany Home, Mrs. W. Ensign, pres., 3715 Bryant av. Conc. & brk. Owner may take bids this spring. Drawing plans.

*Laundry Bidg.: \$70,000. 2 sty. 132x128. Site not selected. Archt. Perry E. Crosier, 915 N. Y. Life bidg. Owner City Dye House, Inc., Morris Eisenstadt, pres., 2637 Nicollet av. Brk. Drawing revised plans. (Note changes.)

*Plant (electric light): Hillsboro, N. D. Engr. C. L. Pillsbury Co., 1200 2nd av., S., Minneapolis. Owner City of Hillsboro, W. G. Nyhus, clk., Hillsboro. Drawing plans.

Res. (several): Ea. abt. \$6,000, 2 sty. Site not selected. Priv. plans. Owner & Bidr. H. E. Johnson, 2445 Fremont av., S. Stucco. Mature in spring. Contemplated.

Res.t 2 sty. Site not selected. Owner A. W. Nelson, 4203 13th av. Frame. Conteemplated.

Rea.: 2 sty. Site not selected. Priv. plans. Owner & Bidr. Wm. F. Unger. 2521 Emerson av. N. Stucco. Mature in spring. Contemplated.

Res.: 2 sty. Lake of Isles blvd. & Dean blvd. Priv. plans. Owner Thos. M. Wallace. 420 .Lumber Exch. Stucco. Plans drawn.

*Rea.: 2 sty. 6th st. 6th av. S. E. Archt. Loren F. Collins, 907 E. Hennepin av. Owner Mr. Wallace Denblet, 303 E. Hennepin av. Frame. Contemplated.

Res.: 2 sty, & bas. 24x32. Site not selected, St. Paul. Archt, E. C. Haley, 832 Palace bldg., Minneapolis. Owner withheld, care archt. Stucco. Drawing plans. "School (public): \$150,000, 2 sty. &

*School (public): \$150,000, 2 sty. & bas, 154x110, Annandale, Minn. Archt. C. Howard Parsons, 600 Builders Exch., Minneapolis, Owner Bd. of E., Dist. No. 71, W. H. Towle, cik., Annandale, Brk. & stone, Owner taking bids on gen. contr. to close 2 p. m., Feb. 24.

Owner will take bids on gen. contr. abt. Feb. 20.

Hotel (summer) & Bathing Resort: \$60,-000. 2 sty. & bas. 90x160. Lake Owasso, nr. St. Paul. Archt. Carl N. Buetow, 428 N. Victoria st., St. Paul. Owner H. H. Chapman, Lake Owasso, via St. Paul. Reinf. conc. & frame, Sketches drawn.

"Res. (several): Ea. \$4,000. 2 sty. Site not selected. Priv. plans. Owner & Bldr. Gerard Rowe, 321 Brimhall. Frame & stucco. Mature in spring. Contemplated.

*Rem. (several): 1 sty. Site not selected. St. Paul. Priv. plans. Owner & Bidr. Fred Anderson, 2816 Bryant av. S., Minneapolis, Minn. Frame & stucco. Contemplated.

Res.: 2 sty. Site not selected. Priv. plans. Owner & Bidr. John Florin, 1396 Van Buren st. Stucco. Mature in spring. Contemplated.

School (normal): \$250,000. 3 sty. & bas. Mankato, Minn. Archt. C. H. Johnston, 715 Capital Bank bldg., St. Paul. Owner State Bd. of Control, D. F. Mullen, secy., State House, St. Paul. Brk. & reinf. conc. Drawing plans.

*Theatre (M. P.): \$20,000, 1 sty. 52x 110. Hastings, bet. Cypress & Earl. Archt. Carl H. Bustow, 422 N. Victoria st. Owner J. A. Frismuth, 913 Mound st. Brk., cut stone trim. Archt. selected.

DULUTH, MINN.

"Jall: \$400,000. 3 sty. 145x100. W. Ind st. Archt. Holstead & Sullivan, Palladio bldg. Owner St. Louis County, W. H. Borgen, auditor, Duluth. Brk., tile, conc. or gypsum blk., frpf. Owner taking blds on gen. contr. to 1 p. m., Mar. 7.

*School (high, add.): \$800,000. 3 sty. & bas. Hibbing, Minn. Archt. W. T. Bray, Torrey bldg., Duluth. Owner B. of E., Ray Kreis, clk., Hibbing. Brk. Excav. & fdn. contr. to Jacobson Bros., 410 Columbia bldg., Duluth.

This notice soliciting bids for a general contractor s appeared in *The American Contractor* on 18 February 1922.

Construction-related Articles from the Annandale Advocate

These articles are excerpted from a column that appeared weekly in the Annandale Advocate. The column is a compilation of school news that appears to have been written by students. 5 October 1922

School Furnishes Many Interesting Notes

Our new school building is progressing very rapidly. The roof on the main part being nearly completed, partitions are all up on the third floor and the first floor cemented, the steps are completed and the lathing is under way.

19 October 1922

Social Program for School Year Planned

Work on the new schoolhouse has been delayed because the material has not arrived for further work. The workmen will enjoy the rest.

26 October 1922

School Brimming Over with News

Our new schoolhouse is progressing very rapidly. The windows are painted, the plastering is well under way, lathing on the second floor almost done. All partitions on first floor completed, heating system connected, and four rooms wholly completed. At present the grading and removing the trees occupies some time. Who said we wouldn't have a new schoolhouse soon?

9 November 1922

Visitors Welcome to Visit School-Good

The third floor of our new school is complete plastered, while the second one is well under way. They have started to lathe the first floor. The front and back yard has been graded so that coal can be put into the bin. 23 November 1922

Six Weeks Exams Again Trying the Brains

Our new building is progressing rapidly, for the second and third floors are completely plastered, while the first floor is well under way. The millwork has arrived and the carpenters are putting it up on the third floor.

Mr. Andrews [the Superintendent] will be glad when it is completed, for he thinks fewer pupils will bother him. He thinks we will get lost trying to find him. Don't fool yourself, Prof.!

30 November 1922

Building Inspector, Chapman, Pleased with Schoolhouse

S.A. Challman [this is how it appeared in the article, despite the headline], Inspector of Buildings from the State Department of Education inspected our new school and reported the building to be very satisfactory. We agree with you, Mr. Challman.

Unless something unexpected turns up, the plastering in the new building will be completed by Thanksgiving. A carload of flooring arrived recently, and in a short time our school will be all finished. The woodwork is to be done in dull mahogany.

14 December 1922

Annandale Won Second in Declamatory Contest

Our new schoolhouse is progressing rapidly. The woodwork on the third floor is completely finished and that on the second is well under way. A crew of floor layers are about to begin flooring the third story.

Madsen and Peterson, the contractors, visited the building last week and announced that it would be entirely completed by January 1. Hurrah for the new schoolhouse!



warded to Madsen and Peterson, count on. of Minneapolis, the bid being for Chas. Wilkins and Co. of Minne- ing. 8. apolis, at \$5,295. The electrical work was given to Fred I. Page of St. Paul, the amount being be completed by next January.

quote the lowest bids offered at Minneapolis which is also to be and dressing rooms where plays is a feature on this floor. The that time:

General Construction	\$153,10
Plumbing	\$8,57
Wiring	\$1,800
Heating .	\$27,900
This represents a	saving of
over \$70,000 on the bu	uilding thru

lage hall, the construction bids the general construction price, present site. On the first floor Annandale has felt the need of on the new schoolhouse were op- owing to the fact that the bid will be found rooms for the just such a place for some time ened and passed upon. The gen- was based on a price for brick special departments and the since the Village hall is not only eral construction work was a the district should have a dis- gymnasium .-- auditorium. Seven too small but also inconvenient

the amount of \$85,967. / The day were: General Construction, cludes a cooking, sewing, and poses, a large library, two redi-plumbing contract was given to 10; Plumbing, 7; Wiring, 8; Heat- a large lunch room for the home tation rooms and a suite of

\$1190. The heating apparatus Madson & Peterson are a very contract fell to A. B. Donaldson, reliable firm and the board feels

waiting. In addition there will three story structure to be erect- most of the school and commu- this section of the state

large rooms are planned for the economics department; Work on the new building will for manual training. On this private office and a teachers' start early this spring and is to floor also are found the boys rest room off from the re eption and girls toilets and showers. room.

The gymnasium - auditorium is Minneapolis, for \$21,335 making confident that a fine building sbout the size of the one at Bufbrick has been selected running booth will be constructed for a recitation rooms, normal train. in several well blending shades. motion picture machine. The ing and laboratories. This brick comes from the gymnasium, of course, will appeal When completed the school The building itself is a huge eral public, for it is here that county and hard to surpass in

On the second floor will be The number of bids put in Fri- special departments which in- found six rooms for grade pur two rooms for the superintendent Work on the new building will rooms for agriculture and two consisting of a reception room

The third floor will be given over to high school work and a total of \$113,787. Two years ago bids were re-same firm is now building the um it will seat 600. On one end 7th and 8th grodes. A large ceived for this work, and we Bryant Junior High School in it equipped with a large stage study hall seating 150 students completed by Jannary first Or can be effectively presented. At rest of the space is devoted to the outside work a hard shale the opposite end a regulation

Springfield Minnesota factory. to the students and to the gen- will be second to none in this











This article announcing the opening of the new school building appeared in the *Annandale Advocate* on 15 February 1923.



Historic view 1. The Annandale High School building as it appeared ca. 1925. Note the horse-drawn school buses.



Historic view 2. The school building as it appeared in 1951.



Historic view 3. The building in 1955



Historic view 4. The building as it appeared in 1960. The 1954 addition is visible at right.



Historic view 5. Undated view of the north end. Note the ventilator hoods flanking the doorway.



Historic view 6. Undated view of the building in recent years.

APPENDIX B: Architectural Drawings



Annandale Public School **Original Architectural Drawings**



Basement Plan



First Floor Revised



🔄 First Floor Plan



🔝 Second Floor Plan



Principal Façade and South Elevation



Rear and North Elevations



Annandale Public School Original Architectural Drawings

APPENDIX C: Existing Conditions Photos

Notes on naming conventions for building levels. On the original architectural drawings, the lower floor of the School building is identified as the basement level. The intermediate level is identified as the first floor, and the upper level is identified as the second level. This numbering system was apparently changed at some point so that the building had a first, second and third floor. The original identification system is used throughout this report.



Basement





Second Floor



Map 1. Vicinity map of Annandale.



Map 2. Street map of Annandale. The site of the 1922 building is highlighted in green.



Aerial view 1. The school site, showing parcel boundaries. Footprint of 1922 building is outlined in green.



Aerial view 2. Construction dates of components of the complex.



Birdseye view 1. Looking east at the school complex.



Birdseye view 2. Looking south at the school complex.

Annandale School Reuse Study Maps and Photos



Birdseye view 3. Looking west at the school complex.



Birdseye view 4. Looking north at the school complex.



Photo 1. General view, looking east toward the principal (west) façade. The addition at right was built in 1954.



Photo 2. The principal façade of the 1922 building. The original wood double-hung windows have been replaced with single-glazed aluminum units.



Photo 3. General view of the 1922 building, looking northeast.


Photo 4. Looking northeast, showing the connection between the 1922 building and the 1954 addition. The main entrance to the complex is in the 1954 section.



Photos 5-6. Detail of the north entrance bay (left). The entrance doors are not original. Profile of stone and brick detailing in the entrance bay as seen from the parapet (right).



Photo 7. Looking southeast toward the west and north elevations.



Photo 8. Detail of windows at the north end of the principal façade. The lower level is partially below grade. Note the limestone stone water table, string and belt courses, and corner medallions. Also note the ornamental brickwork, including the rusticated base, window frames, and panel in the corner pilaster. See photo 13 for detail of highlighted area.



Photos 9-10. Details of the windows on the lower level (left). Limestone sills have been sheathed with aluminum.



Photos 11-13. Window openings have steel lintels (left). Detail of aluminum muntin, (center). There is a small stress crack at the upper corner of the window opening at the north end of the lower level. (See photo 8 for area of detail.)



Photos 14-15. Variegated, wire cut face brick was used on the exterior of the building (left). Brick in the rusticated base is slightly darker in color (right). Mortar joints have been repointed, and are in exceptionally good condition.



Photos 16-17. Steps at both the north and south entrances show signs of significant settlement and will need to be rebuilt. Side view of north steps (left). Detail, showing broken and loose stone at base, eroded mortar joints, and damaged brick (right).



Photos 18-19. Loose and eroded mortar beneath the cap (left). Some joints have been repointed in an effort to repair the damage. The bulkhead adjacent to the steps is in poor condition (right).



Photo 20. The south steps are also in poor condition.



Photos 21-22. Detail of bulkhead on south steps showing missing mortar, attempts to repair joints, and damage to brick and stone.



Photo 23. Close up view of north wall, showing area that apparently supported a plaque or sign.



Photo 24. Anchors and green stains suggest that a bronze plaque may have been affixed to the wall in this location. Areas around the anchors have been repointed, leaving a "shadow" that indicates the size and shape of the plaque.



Photo 25. Northeast corner of the school building. Note two colors of brick used in in corner pilasters. Brick infill beneath windows may indicate former location of fire escape. There is a similar infill panel on the other side of the gymnasium wing.



Photo 26. Looking south toward the gymnasium wing projecting from the back of the building.



Photos 27-28. Windows in the gymnasium wing are separated by brick pilasters (left). Detail of pilaster cap, showing minor cracking. The upper walls of this wing exhibit dark stains, suggesting possible water infiltration through the parapets.



Photo 29. The east end of the gymnasium wing. The entrance door and glazing are not original.



Photo 30. Detail of foundation damage beneath doorway at east end of the gymnasium wing.



Photo 31. Negative drainage at the base of the gymnasium wing has caused significant damage to the foundation walls. Foundation walls elsewhere in the building are intact.



Photo 32. Looking southwest toward the back of the building. The low concrete structure extending beyond the gymnasium wing houses boiler equipment that was not part of the original building.



Photo 33. Detail of boiler room extension, showing damage to foundation wall.



Photo 34. A large crack runs across the slab above the boiler room extension. The slab covers the original coal room. There is some evidence of water infiltration in the area directly beneath the slab.



Photo 35. Looking east toward the boiler room. The concrete structure in the foreground was added to house larger boilers for the expanding complex and is not part of the original building



Photo 36. Looking northwest toward the back of the building. The upper portion of the original chimney has been removed.



Photo 37. View of the gym roof, looking northeast. Note standing water along the parapet.



Photos 38-39. Standing water adjacent to drain in southwest corner of the gym roof. The pitch and gravel roof surface is in poor condition.



Photo 40. The roof above the main section of the 1922 building, looking southwest.



Photo 41. The roof is reputed to date from the late 1950s, and has functioned remarkably well, although some areas, such as this section adjacent to a drain are badly eroded.



Photos 42-44. Detail of pitch and gravel surface (left). Roof ventilators are part of the original air circulation system, which remains in use (center). There is some evidence of water infilatration through the ventilators. A wooden hatch sheathed with sheet metal provides access to the roof from the attic (right).



Photo 45. The northeast corner of the roof, showing limestone coping, full-height sheet metal counter flashing, and a turbine-type ventilator.



Photo 46. Full-height sheet metal counter flashing is installed on the backsides of the parapets. Iron rods help to stabilize the parapet above the main entrance.



Photos 47-48. Sheet metal counter flashing has pulled loose in some areas, exposing the soft common brick that was used on the backsides of the parapets (left). Barbed flanges atop sheet metal panels were inserted beneath the coping stones (right).



Photo 49. Detail of soft common brick used on the backsides of the parapets. Brick has been damaged by exposure to elements. Wooden plugs set into the wall served as anchors for the sheet metal counter flashing.



Photos 50-51. The original coal room is now used as a shop/storage space (left). Coal was loaded through hatches in the ceiling (circled, right). Spalled concrete and exposed reinforcing bars were caused by water infiltration. The coal room roof has been covered with a concrete slab.



Photos 52. A wooden stairway in the corner of the original boiler area provides access to the roof of the coal room (left). The original boiler room contains water heaters and a shop (right). The opening in the back corner of the room opens into a large boiler room that was added later to serve the expanded school complex.



Photo 53. Looking across the original boiler room. The original chimney stack is visible at right, and water heaters are visible in the background at left.



Photo 54. Two large, aging Kewaunee boilers in the newer boiler room generate steam to heat the entire school complex.



Photo 55. Looking west inside the gymnasium. The original stage is visible at the center of the photo. Stairways on each side provide access to the backstage area. The gymnasium currently provides space for a community gymnastics program.



Photo 56. Looking northeast inside the gymnasium



Photo 57. The ceiling above the north windows shows evidence of water infiltration.



Photo 58. Detail of water-damaged ceiling tiles above the north windows.



Photo 59. Looking across the gymnasium toward the southeast. Staircases adjacent to the windows on each side open to the exterior.



Photos 60-61. Exit stairs and windows at the southwest corner of the gymnasium (left). Window sills are essentially at grade. There is evidence of significant water infiltration through the walls just beneath the sills (right).



Photos 62-63. The proscenium in the original stage area has been filled in to create additional classroom space (left). A section of the flooring near the front of the stage was hinged to cover footlights. Shadows of the hinges remain visible (right).



Photo 64. Junction between 1922 building (through doorway at left) and 1954 addition. Restrooms for main floor are located at this intersection in the original building.



Photos 65-66. Looking down the main corridor on the lower level (left). The corridor is gently sloped to adjust for differing floor levels between the original and newer sections of the complex. A plenum above the corridor is part of the ventilation system. A series of dampers in the plenum (detail right) allows building engineers to adjust airflow to rooms throughout the building.



Photos 67-68. Cross halls on either side of the stage area provide access to the gym from the lower level corridor (left). The stage floor is located midway between the level of the main corridor and the gym floor (right).



Photos 69-70. The original stage area has been partitioned into a series of small offices (left). The original floor remains in place. A tall, narrow room between the stage and the corridor acts as a plenum for the ventilation system (right).



Photos 71. Located in the corridor just outside the gymnasium, the faculty lounge originally served as the girls' shower room. A window unit provides air conditioning (upper right).



Photos 72-73. Two of the original classrooms were combined to create a single large space in the southwest corner of the main level. This area was once used as a woodshop and drafting room. The main level once provided specialized spaces for students to pursue other vocational activities, including ironwork, cooking, and sewing. An entire section was devoted to agricultural education, featuring a classroom, laboratory and seed room. A lunchroom for students occupied space in the northeast corner.



Photos 74-75. The original double entrance doors, transom, and sidelights remain in place. The original exterior doors have been replaced with steel flush doors (left). Original newels and balustrades remain in place in the main stairways.



Photos 76-77. Steel flush doors have been installed in the stairwells at each level as a fire safety measure (left). Large windows admit ample light to the stairwells (right).



Photos 78-79. Inside the central corridor on the second floor, looking north (left). The partition wall on left is not original—note the partial skylight, which provided light to a large study hall on this level. Looking south in the second floor corridor (right).



Photos 80-81. Floors were originally surfaced with tongue-and-groove maple (left); walls were finished with sand-float plaster applied to wood lath or key tile (center and right).



Photos 82--85. The original frame-and-panel doors and transoms remain in place throughout the building. The stained and varnished birch doors are in good condition.



Photos 86-87. Ventilation equipment for the entire building is located in a large room on the first floor. The original equipment remains in use. Manifolds within the fan chamber helped to pre-heat cold air during the winter months (right).



Photo 88. The central section on the west side of the first floor originally housed the high school's library and the principal's office. The area was later subdivided into a rabbit's warren of small administrative offices.



Photo 89. This spacious classroom was created by removing the original partitions between rooms 205 and 206. The building's structural system, with bearing masonry walls on the perimeter and along the central corridor, made it relatively simple to reconfigure the floor plan by adding or removing non-bearing partitions walls.



Photo 90. Detail of the circled area in Photo 92. Celotex ceiling tiles in one corner of room 205-206 have been removed, exposing the building's wood-framed floor system.



Photos 91-92. Two views of the boys' restroom on the second floor. Restrooms throughout the building have been updated since the original construction.



Photos 93-94. The transverse wall outside the boys' restroom on the second floor (left) exhibits minor shear cracks (detail at right). There is no evidence of active movement in this area.



Photo 95. Room 304 was originally part of a large, skylit study hall on the upper level. Steel beams in the ceiling allowed the room to be free of columns. The room was later partitioned into a series of smaller spaces, but the skylight framing remains visible here and in the corridor.



Photos 96-97. Room 304, looking southeast (left). Ceiling damage is directly beneath one of the large rooftop ventilators, and it is possible to see daylight through the lath (right), suggesting that the damage may have been caused by windblown rain infiltrating the roof through the vent.



Photos 98-99. A window unit in room 304 (left). Single-glazed aluminum framed windows with hopper-type ventilators were installed throughout the building to replace the original wood double-hung windows. Detail at right shows construction of the window, configuration of the sill, and paint damage typical of that found beneath all of the upper level windows.



Photos 100-101. Room 305 was also originally part of the study hall (left). Curtains here and in many other rooms are drawn to reduce heat loss through the single-glazed, aluminum-framed replacement windows. The skylights in this room retain their original finishes. They were hidden for many years above a suspended ceiling system.



Photo 102. Situated directly across from the original study hall, room 312 was originally partitioned into separate coat rooms for boys and girls. The main corridor on this level passed through the space on the left side of the photo.



Photo 103. Although little evidence of its original purpose remains today, room 307 was initially used as a science laboratory for the high school.



Photo 104. Now subdivided into a series of connected class spaces, room 308 originally housed Annandale's normal school program, where high school students once received the training they needed to teach in elementary and rural schools.



Photos 105-106. Roof framing is visible in the attic. The system is built entirely of wood, with the roof deck supported by a series of simple site-built trusses. The attic contains a thick layer of cellulose insulation.



Photos 107-108. Joists for the roof deck rest on a tile ledger/inner wythe capped by brick. Spaces between the joists are filled with mortar (left). An I-beam carries the roof over the original study hall (right) making it possible to create an open space uninterrupted by columns.



Photos 109-110. The building is fully sprinklered (left). Vestiges of the original knob-and-tube wiring remain in place (right), although active wiring is routed through metal conduit.

APPENDIX D: Existing Conditions, Code Analysis and Rehabilitation Recommendations

August 13, 2013

Existing Condition Report for Reuse Study 1922 Annandale School Annandale, Minnesota Based on March 20 and April 25, 2013 Site Visits

Project Team on Site:

- Robert J. Claybaugh AIA: Preservation Architect
- John Lauber MA: Architectural Historian and Photographer

Existing Conditions

- Heating, Cooling and Ventilating Systems:
 - Heating for the entire complex is provided by two steam boilers in an addition behind the 1922 building boiler room. We were told that these boilers date from 1954.
 - 0 The perimeter wall radiation in the 1922 building is steam and consumes about 70% of the heat produced.
 - The remainder of the complex uses hot water converted from steam for radiation. 0
 - The original boiler flue is not used by the current boilers. 0
 - The original air circulation system in the 1922 building is still in use. 0
 - A large fan is located in a plenum on the second floor that draws air in that passes 0 through steam heat coils and is circulated to all of the rooms in the building. Return air ducts bring air back to the fan plenum. The fan motor has been recently replaced.
 - The system is functioning as designed but is not suitable for air conditioning or 0 for zoned HVAC controls.
 - The basement floor corridor ceiling is lower to conceal the ducts that feed to the 0 classrooms on either side.
 - There are large original roof ventilators that exhaust air from the building. 0
 - There is no air conditioning in the 1922 building except for a few window units. 0

Fire Protection System:

- The 1922 building is fully sprinklered. 0
- The main water line for the sprinkler system is located in the original boiler room 0 and feeds the entire building complex.

Electrical and Alarm Systems:

- The electrical service for the entire building complex is located in the middle 0 school addition.
- The fire alarm control panel is also located here. 0

• Exterior:

• Masonry:

- The building is faced with a high quality wire cut brick in two colors accented with limestone trim.
- The mortar joints are in very good condition throughout the building. The masonry was completely repointed at some point with a fairly hard mortar with coarse sand aggregate. The joints were cut back 3/8" and repointed with a concave tooled joint.
- The following areas of mortar and masonry deterioration were noted:
 - The wing walls of the two front entry steps have settled and most of the joints are in bad condition. The some joints on the wing walls have been recently repointed, however all of the mortar joints on the wing walls will need to be repointed. These may also require some foundation repair to prevent any further settlement.
 - There is some cracking at the top of the brick pilasters on the north façade of the gymnasium.
 - The mortar joints on the upper portion of the brick chimney are weathered and will need to be repointed.
 - The north facades have accumulated more soiling due to the lack of sun exposure.
 - The caulk joint between the steel window lintels and the brick above is opening up and will need to be recaulked. There is some surface rust the bottom of the steel lintels.
- There have been very few modifications to the original exterior of the building except for the following:
 - The brick chimney has been reduced height.
 - The attachment of the middle school at the south façade has eliminated windows on the basement floor level.
 - Two window openings on the east façade at the second floor appear to have had fire exit doors a one time. The space below the window sills have infilled with brick. This is not an original feature of the building but was added a later date.

• **Roofing, Flashing and Drainage:**

Main and Gymnasium Roofs:

- Flat roof sloped to two interior roof drains.
- Tar and gravel roofing over wood sheathing and joists that we were told dates from the late 1950s. The roof surface is bubbled and cracked in many areas but is still performing. There is evidence of previous roof leaks adjacent to the north roof drain.
- The roofing turns up the parapet wall with a beveled cant strip and terminates about 8" above the roof.
- The parapet is capped with 10" x 5" stone coping.
- The back of the parapet is covered with heavy gauge galvanized sheet metal let into the coping stone bed joint and extending to just

above the roofing cant.

- The sheet metal is generally in very good condition except where it has come loose at the high parapets in the center of the west façade.
- The sheet metal covers a soft brick so the sheet metal was mostly likely part of the original construction.
- Main roof penetrations include:
 - Original large roof ventilators on wood curbs.
 - Newer turbine ventilators that extend straight through the roof.
 - Goose neck vents probably to ventilate the restrooms.
 - Plumbing vents.
 - Wood roof hatch on a wood curb.
 - Gymnasium roof penetrations are only the two interior roof drains toward the west end and the brick chimney.

Boiler Room Roof:

- The boiler room has a reinforced concrete roof structure with a roof membrane and a concrete overlay slab above. The roof is flat without roof drains.
- The roof membrane is turned up the brick walls above and terminated with bar flashing.
- The topping slab is cracked and there is water seeping out under the slab at the east end.
- The underside of the concrete roof structure shows evidence of water damage.
- The corners of the exposed concrete walls are deteriorated from water damage.

New Boiler Room Roof:

• Flat built up tar and gravel roof with metal gravel stops and no roof drains. The roof appears to be functioning well.

• Windows:

- All of the original wood double hung windows were replaced with single glazed aluminum windows that are in good condition but are very energy inefficient.
- There are hopper vents on some of the windows.
- The aluminum window sill extends over the stone window sill.

• Doors:

- The west entry doors are a pair of 38" wide hollow metal doors in hollow metal frames with panic hardware in good condition.
- The gymnasium exit doors are hollow metal in good condition.
- The doors at the top of the boiler exit stair are hollow metal in hollow metal frames and are in good condition.
- Site:
- The site is fairly level all around the 1922 addition. The basement floor level is about 40" below the surrounding grade.
- Interior:
 - General:
 - The school has a long active life and all of the interior finishes show the signs of wear and replacement of deteriorated materials over the life of the building.
 - Many of the original plaster ceilings have been replaced or covered by acoustic tile and suspended lay-in tiles. Our assumption would be that all of the later ceiling material would be removed and replaced with gypsum board or plaster and that existing plaster ceilings would be repaired.
 - Our assumption would be that all of the floor coverings would be removed and that the original wood flooring would be restored.
 - The plaster walls are generally in fairly good condition and can be restored. There are some minor movement cracks in the corridor walls that will need repair.
 - Most all of the varnished original doors and frames and much of the wood cabinetwork remain and could be restored.

• Stairways:

- The two original egress/exit stairs are in place and generally in good condition.
- The stairs were enclosed at a later date pairs of 48" x 72" hollow metal doors in hollow metal frames on each floor. The doors are equipped with panic hardware. The doors swing out in the direction of egress but the landings are not long enough to meet current codes for door swing clearance.
- The stairs are wood with carpet on the treads and risers.
- The 6" risers, 11" treads and 55" width meet current code requirements.
- The wood railings are in good condition. The height of the guard railing does not meet current code requirements and the handrail does not meet ADA requirements.

• Doors:

- Most doors are original wood doors in wood frames with glass transoms above. These doors are not smoke or fired rated.
- Door hardware has been replaced restrooms, offices and classrooms with new stainless steel lever handled locksets that should meet ADA requirements.

• Basement:

Modifications:

- The original floor layout is generally intact.
- The original gymnasium stage has been closed off and sub-divided into office.
- The original boys and girls shower rooms have been converted to

classroom and lounge uses.

- Some of the partitions between classrooms have been removed to make larger classrooms.
- One original classroom was converted to restrooms serving the middle school addition.
- Gymnasium:
 - <u>Floor:</u> Wood gym floor that appears to be in fairly good condition but mostly covered with tumbling mats so hard to tell.
 - <u>Ceiling:</u> 2x4 wood fiberboard, painted. Appears to be in good condition. Some water damage at north side from roof leaks.
 - Walls:
 - Lower walls are plaster on concrete foundation wall. The south wall has water damage that is probably coming through the wall. The assumption is that there is no water proofing and that the concrete has deteriorated over time.
 - The upper walls are single glazed aluminum framed windows.

Corridor:

- <u>Floor:</u> The floors are carpet over earlier composition floor tiles. We assume that the floor is a concrete slab on grade but there could have been a wood floor on wood sleepers over the concrete slab. The corridor floor slopes up the meet the middle school addition floor level.
- <u>Ceiling</u>: Plaster in good condition. This ceiling is a lower ceiling on wood joists to conceal the supply air ductwork.
- <u>Walls:</u> Painted plaster over wood lath on wood partitions and over clay tile on the structural bearing walls.
- <u>Fire Separation</u>: Fire doors at the juncture of the 1922 building with the middle school addition provide fire separation between the buildings.
- **Classrooms:**
 - <u>Floor:</u> Generally the same as the corridor except the teachers' lounge that has composition floor tile and some ceramic tile in an area that was originally a shower room.
 - <u>Ceiling:</u> 12'x12" wood fiber acoustic tile. It appears that the original plaster and wood lath ceilings were removed to install the acoustic tile.
 - <u>Walls:</u> Same as the corridor.

Restrooms:

- <u>General:</u> The restrooms were constructed in an original classroom space at the floor level of the middle school addition. These restrooms serve the middle school and have fire rated doors to separate the 1922 building from the addition. These restrooms predate ADA and are not accessible.
- <u>Floor:</u> Tile?
- <u>Ceiling:</u> Plaster.

• <u>Walls:</u> Tile with plaster above.

• First Floor

.

Modifications:

- The original floor layout is generally intact.
- Some of the partitions between classrooms have been removed to make larger classrooms.
- The original school office area has been enlarged to take over the original library space.
- The original wardrobe areas and each end of the corridor have converted to office use.
- Corridor:
 - Materials and conditions are similar to the basement floor.
- Classrooms:
 - Materials and conditions are similar to the basement floor.
 - **Restrooms:**
 - The restrooms are in their original location and configuration.
 - The floor tile may be original but the 4x4 wall tiles are later.
 - The original plaster ceiling is in place above the suspended 2x4 lay-in ceiling.
 - The restrooms are not accessible.
- Offices:
 - The office area is completely finished in plywood paneled walls, carpet flooring and suspended 2x4 lay-in ceiling.
 - All of these are easily removed.
 - The office area was provided with window air conditioning units.
- Fan Room:
 - The fan room is very original.
 - This is the best room to see the original wood flooring.
 - The ceiling has panels over the original plaster. Check the hazardous material report to see if they contain asbestos.

• Second Floor:

Modifications:

- The original floor layout is generally intact with one major modification.
- The original study hall created a jog in the corridor. The corridor has been straightened to eliminate the jog and the adjacent areas converted to classrooms. The wood and glass ceiling panels that were below the skylights are still in place.
- Some of the partitions between classrooms have been removed to make larger classrooms.
- The original wardrobe areas and each end of the corridor have converted to office use.
- Corridor:

- Materials and conditions are similar to the basement floor.
- **Classrooms:**
 - Materials and conditions are similar to the basement floor.
 - There is missing plaster in the ceiling of the original study hall from previous roof leaks.
 - The skylights have been roofed over but the wood and glass ceiling panels are still in place.

Restrooms:

- The restrooms are in their original location and configuration.
- The floor tile may be original but the 4x4 wall tiles are later.
- The original plaster ceiling is in place above the suspended 2x4 lay-in ceiling.
- The restrooms are not accessible.

Accessibility:

- The building was constructed long before accessibility codes were enacted.
- The building does not have an accessible entry that accesses any of the floors and there is no elevator to provide access between floors. This is the major accessibility issue in the building.
- The corridor and door widths generally meet accessibility requirements.
- The exit stairs generally meet current accessibility and life safety code requirements.
- The existing restrooms do not have accessible doors and the restroom layout does not meet accessibility requirements.

Energy Efficiency:

- **Roof:** There is existing blown insulation in the ceiling joist area about 6" thick. That would provide about R19 U value. The material has been tested and does not contain asbestos. The roofing is applied directly to the wood sheathing without insulation.
- **Walls:** The walls are plaster directly on the exterior masonry walls. There are no cavities or insulation in the exterior walls.
- **Windows:** The aluminum windows are single glazed without thermal breaks in the frames.
- **Doors:** Un-insulated hollow metal doors with single glazing.

Hazardous Materials:

- Hazardous materials surveying was performed in the 1922 building by Applied Environmental Sciences, Inc. in September and October 2012.
- The complete report is available to review.
- The estimated cost for removal of asbestos containing materials is \$166,000.
- \circ The inspection did not include portions of the occupied 1st floor or the roof.
- Asbestos was found in a variety of floor and ceiling tiles, adhesive and caulking materials and was assumed to be in pipe insulation, roofing and other materials.
- The insulation above the second floor ceiling does not contain asbestos.
- Lead based paint was found in some of the samples tested.

Uniform Building Code Analysis:

• **Building Size:**

Basement: 12,285 sf

	Gymnasium:	4,260 sf
--	------------	----------

- Boiler Roof: 1,260 sf
- First Floor: 12,285 sf
- Second Floor: 12,285 sf
- Total Floor Area: 42,375 sf
- Height: 3 Stories

• Construction Type and Allowable Area and Height:

- **Construction Type IIIA:** Masonry bearing walls with wood framed floors and roof. Fully sprinklered building provides equivalent of 1 hour fire rated floors and roof for the IIIB classification.
- **Business Group B Occupancy:**
 - Uses include educational above 12th grade, offices, laboratories, etc.

5 stories

- Allowable floor area per floor: 28,500sf
- Allowable height:

Educational Group E Occupancy:

- Educational uses through 12th grade.
- Allowable floor area per floor: 23,500 sf
- Allowable height: 3 stories

Residential Group R2 Occupancy:

- Apartment buildings
- Allowable floor area per floor: 24,000 sf
- Allowable height: 4 stories

• Corridors:

- Width: Actual width 12'-0" Min. 44" except E occupancy min. 72"
- Dead End: Actual 28'-0". Maximum 20 ft except if dead end less than
 2.5 width. 2.5 x 11.5'= 28'-0"

• Floor Load Capacity:

- **Basement:** Slab on grade. 100psf meets current requirements for corridors, offices, dining and other assembly occupancies.
- 1st & 2nd Floors:
 - Corridors: 100psf meets current corridor load requirement.
 - Classrooms: 40psf meets current code requirements for residential and classroom occupancies.
- Assumptions: The live load capacities are based on review of the original drawings and observation of the wood floor joist sizes and spacing in a classroom.

Prepared by,

CLAYBAUGH PRESERVATION ARCHITECTURE INC Robert J. Claybaugh AIA, President RJC:co File: ANN-Extg Cond-081313

CLAYBAUGH PRESERVATION ARCHITECTURE 361 W. Government St. Taylors Falls, Minnesota 55084

August 19, 2013

Rehabilitation Recommendations 1922 Annandale School Annandale, Minnesota

• **Selective Demolition:**

- Remove the existing boiler room expansion and flue construction. The boilers 0 and equipment to be removed by the School district.
- Infill the east wall with face brick and CMU. 0
- Remove all existing floor coverings. 0
- Remove all suspended ceilings and original plaster ceilings. 0
- Remove existing restrooms. 0
- Remove partitions to accommodate new construction. 0

Heating, Cooling and Ventilating Systems: •

- The attached EDI letter dated August 2013 outlines the scope of work for HVAC 0 systems.
- The existing systems will be completely removed within the building. 0
- The existing boilers and the boiler room expansion will be demolished. 0
- The school district will install new boilers to service the Middle School in a 0 different location

Fire Protection System: •

- The main water line for the sprinkler system is located in the original boiler room 0 and feeds the entire building complex and will remain.
- The existing sprinkler system will be modified to accommodate the new building 0 layout.

Electrical and Alarm Systems: .

- A new independent electrical service will be installed for the rehabilitated 1922 0 building. The service panels will be in the original boiler room.
- A new independent fire, smoke and security alarm system will be installed for the 0 rehabilitated 1922 building.

Exterior:

- **Masonry:** 0
 - **Front Entry Wing Walls:**
 - Rebuild the masonry wing walls utilizing the existing brick.
 - Replace the concrete steps and exterior landing at the front entries. •

- Repointing:
 - Repoint the brick chimney mortar joints.
 - Repoint the brick pilasters on the north façade of the gymnasium.
 - Repoint all parapet wall coping stone joints.

Window Openings:

- Clean and repaint all steel window lintels after the existing windows have been removed.
- Clean out and recaulk the joint between the steel lintel and the masonry above.

• **Roofing, Flashing and Drainage:**

Main and Gymnasium Roofs:

- Remove all existing roof ventilators and wood curbs. Patch roof openings with plywood sheathing.
- Remove all existing roof covering down to the wood sheathing. Repair wood sheathing as required.
- Remove the existing roof hatch and replace with a new code compliant metal roof hatch on a new curb.
- Repair the loose portions of the parapet wall metal covering.
- Install R40 rigid insulation over the existing wood sheathing.
- Install fully adhered single membrane roof over cover board. Turn the membrane up the parapet wall and terminate under the sheet metal parapet covering.

• Original Skylight Openings:

• The original skylights are not shown to be restored. This is always and option depending on the developer of the upper floors of the building.

Boiler Room Roof:

- Remove the existing concrete topping and waterproof membrane.
- Remove all deteriorated concrete and apply a minimum 2" concrete topping.
- Install fully adhered single membrane roof over the concrete topping.

• Windows:

- Remove all existing aluminum framed windows.
- Install new thermal glazed clad Marvin windows in the existing masonry openings. Refer to attached Marvin proposal dated 6/5/2013 for details of the window design. The intent of the proposal is to furnish windows that match the original window style and configuration.
- Contact Ken Modeen at Marvin Windows for further information or questions. Email: <u>kenmod@marvin.com</u> tel: 612-720-8118.

• Doors:

- Clean and repaint existing hollow metal entry doors and frames.
- Install new accessible entry with clad Marvin entry doors and frames with

accessible hardware.

- Site:
 - We do not currently have a site plan of the property. The intent is to shown site development for the building reuse when that information becomes available.
 - Parking requirements for proposed uses:
 - 2 off street parking spaces per dwelling unit.
 - 1 off street parking space per elderly dwelling unit.
 - 1 space per 200 gross sf. of office or professional space.

• Interior:

• Accessibility:

- Install 2500 lb. capacity hydraulic elevator with 5 stops and front and rear entry. This elevator will connect the new accessible entry to the existing three floors and gymnasium.
- The machine room will be adjacent to the elevator shaft on the basement level.

• Stairways:

- Remove existing tread and riser coverings.
- Replace existing doors and frames to the corridors with new hollow metal doors and frames with accessible hardware.
- Repair plaster walls and ceiling and repaint.
- Refinish wood stairs and railings.
- Install new rubber treads.

• Exterior Walls:

- Remove existing finishes on the exterior masonry walls.
- Spray dense foam to R10 on all exterior wall surfaces.
- Install metal stud partition inside of the insulation. Finish partition with 5/8" gypsum board painted.

• Basement:

Gymnasium:

- <u>Floor:</u> Sand and refinish existing wood gymnasium floor.
- <u>Ceiling</u>: Replace water damaged fiber board ceiling panels. Repaint entire ceiling.

Accessible Entry:

- The existing stair connection to the stage and gymnasium level will be removed on this side and new stairs constructed to connect the entry level to the basement floor.
- This new entry will require removing a portion of the basement floor and excavating down the gymnasium floor level. This will create a two level entry area that connects the accessible entry and the gymnasium to the elevator.

- The entry finishes would be quarry tile floor and base, gypsum board walls with vinyl wall covering and concealed spline acoustic tile ceilings.
- Accessible Restrooms:
 - The new accessible restroom will require raising the floor level to the basement floor level.
 - The restroom finishes would be ceramic tile floors and walls with concealed spine acoustic tile ceiling.
 - Provide toilet partitions and lavatory counters as shown.
- Corridor:
 - The corridor walls are structural bearing walls.
 - All interior plaster walls are to be repaired, skim coated and painted.
 - Replace ceilings with concealed spline acoustic tile.
 - Provide linoleum flooring.

Studio/Classroom Spaces:

- All interior plaster walls are to be repaired, skim coated and painted.
- New partitions are to be painted gypsum board on metal studs.
- Replace ceilings with concealed spline acoustic tile.
- Provide Carpet tile floors.

• First and Second Floors:

General:

- The upper floors are proposed to be developed as rental or condominium residential living units.
- The first floor plan shows four possible unit layouts that could be replicated on both sides of both floors.
- These are intended to show possible layouts that could be accommodated in the building.
- The cost estimates will be based on square foot costs rather than detailed takeoffs.

Corridor:

- The corridor walls are structural bearing walls.
- All interior plaster walls are to be repaired, skim coated and painted.
- Replace ceilings with concealed spline acoustic tile.
- Provide carpet flooring over the existing wood flooring.

Living Units:

- All new partitions are to be 5/8" gypsum board on metal studs with sound insulation.
- Replace ceilings with painted $\frac{1}{2}$ " gypsum board.
- Repair, sand and refinish wood flooring in all spaces except bathrooms and kitchens.
 - Provide linoleum flooring in kitchens and bathrooms.

- Provide ceramic tile wainscots in bathroom.
- Provide ranges, refrigerators, double sinks, dishwashers and disposal units in kitchens.
- Provide washers and dryers in all units.
- Provide wood doors and frames in units.
- **Community Room:**
 - The first floor community room will be available to all residents.
 - Provide two unisex accessible toilets.
 - Provide a kitchenette with the same appliances as in the living units.

• Hazardous Materials:

• The estimated cost for removing hazardous materials from the building based on a 2012 survey prepared for the School district was \$166,000.

Prepared by, CLAYBAUGH PRESERVATION ARCHITECTURE INC

Robert J. Claybaugh AIA, President RJC:co File: ANN-Recommend-081913



August 14, 2013

Claybaugh Preservation Architecture BOB CLAYBAUGH 361 W. Government St. Taylors Falls, MN. 55084

Re: Annandale School Reuse Study-Mechanical EDI Project No. 13-058

Dear Bob.

Described herein are two reuse scenarios with associated mechanical discussions.

Scenario 1:

This scenario assumes that the school district will retain the existing building and occupy the basement level only. The upper floors will be conditioned minimally to not only conserve energy but also to maintain the building integrity.

Consideration should be given to insulating windows in areas that will not be occupied to reduce the heating load. In addition, the heating terminal devices should be adjusted to maintain a reduced space temperature. This can be accomplished by manually closing the terminal units (steam radiators) heating valves or, if controls exist, adjusting the thermostat.

The air distribution system is centralized, delivering ventilation air to the entire facility. Consideration should be given to look at the feasibility of isolating the ductwork serving the unoccupied spaces from the occupied spaces. The intent would be to reduce the fan speed to an airflow that is adequate to support the occupied spaces only. This would reduce the energy costs by heating only the amount of outdoor air required for the occupied basement level and not the entire building.

Scenario 2:

This scenario assumes that the 1922 building is separated from the adjacent building and is no longer owned by the school district. With this scenario, the heating and cooling systems would also need to be separated as well.

The portion of the building retained by the school district will need to be served by its own heating plant. A new boiler room will need to be created in that building with consideration given to the feasibility of converting the boiler plant from steam to hot water.

The 1922 building that no longer is owned by the school district will also require its own boiler plant. This new heating system would consist of high efficiency, gas fired, condensing hot water boilers that serve the entire building. It is recommended that a minimum of two boilers

be provided with each sized at 2/3 the building load. This will give the facility redundancy in the event of a failure of any single boiler. Anticipated capacity for each boiler is 1500 MBH. This plant would provide heating water to air handler coils and terminal devices such as fintube radiation, cabinet unit heaters and reheat coils. It is anticipated that each living space on the two upper floors would be heated with fin-tube perimeter radiation. Areas such as entrance vestibules, lobbies and stairways would be heated utilizing cabinet unit heaters.

In the event that not all floors will be developed at the same time, the boiler plant can be incrementally expanded over time.

On the air side, a variable air volume (VAV) system with hot water reheat coils would be proposed for the basement space as well as the common spaces (hallways) located on the upper two floors. This system would also provide ventilation air for those spaces. Anticipated capacity is 20,000 cfm with 50 tons of DX cooling using an air cooled condensing unit.

In addition to that unit, the living spaces would be supplied with 100% outdoor air for ventilation purposes. A dedicated outdoor air unit will provide this function and would include features such as energy recovery wheels for enhanced energy savings. Anticipated capacity is 1500 cfm with 7 tons of DX cooling using an air cooled condensing unit.

Each living unit would be cooled utilizing ductless split system cooling units (mini-splits). Each mini-split system would include a wall mounted evaporator and an outdoor air cooled condenser. The approximate load for each two bedroom unit is 4 tons with two units at 2 tons each advisable. The approximate load for each single bedroom unit is 3 tons.

A separate HVAC system will serve the current gym space. If the space becomes a parking garage, then a ventilation system that monitors and controls the concentration of carbon monoxide will be required. If the space becomes a common space for occupants, then a rooftop heating (hot water coils) and cooling unit would provide heating, cooling and ventilation. With this usage, the anticipated capacity would be 4000 cfm and 10 tons of cooling.

A web-based Direct Digital Control (DDC) system would control all HVAC building functions. This computer based system would include features such as scheduling, alarms and remote access.

Sincerely, engineering design initiative

any D. Late

Larry D. Svitak, PE Vice President

APPENDIX E: Design Concepts and Cost Estimates







· · · · ·	· .	· ·		· ·		· ·		· ·		· ·		· .		• .			· ·		· .		
	· · ·		· · ·	· · ·	· · ·	· . ·	· ·		· ·		· ·		· .	· · ·		•	· . · . ·	· ·	• .	• • •	· ·
	· · ·	· ·			· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	• • •			•			· ·	• • •	•	•	•
		· . · ·		· . · ·	. ·	· . ·	. ·		. [.]	· . · ·		· .				· ·	· . · ·		· . ·		
	· · ·	· .	· · ·	· . ·	· ·	· . ·		• •	· · ·	•	· ·	· · ·	· .	· · ·		· ·	• •	· ·	•	•	
	·		· ·		· ·		· ·		· ·	· ·	• • •	•	· · ·	· .	•	· ·	· ·	• • •	· .		
	· · ·			· . · ·	. ·	· . · ·	•	· . ·		· · ·		• . • .	· · ·	•		· ·	· .		· .		
		· .	· · ·	· . · . ·	· · ·	· . · . ·		· .	· · ·	· . · .	· ·		•				· .	· ·	· · ·		
	· · ·	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	•	• •	· · ·	•		•	· ·	• • •	· .		
 	· · · ·	· . ·		· . · ·		· . ·		· . · ·				•				· ·	· .	. ·	• •		
		•	· · ·	· · ·	· · ·	· · ·		•	· · ·	•	· ·						•	· ·			
	· . · .	· ·		· ·	· ·	roo	of ba	مام	 	· ·		••••	· · ·	· .			· ·		· .		
	• • • • •	• . • •	· ·	· . ·		100			V	· . ·	. ·	· · . · .		• •	• •	•	· . · ·	. [.]	· · . ·		
· · · · · ·	· · ·	•	· · ·		 	· ·	• •	• • •	· · ·	· .	· ·		• .		•		• • •			•	
	· · ·		· · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· ·	•••	· · ·	· · ·		· · ·		· ·	• •	• • •	
	· · ·		· ·	· . · ·	· ·	· . · ·		· . · .	· · ·	•		· · · ·	· .	· ·	•	•	· . · .		· · ·	· ·	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · ·	· ·	· · ·		· ·	· · .	•	· .	· · ·	· ·	• • •				•	•	· .	· · ·	· · ·	•	
	· · ·	 	· · ·	 	. · ·		· · ·		· · ·		· ·	• • •	· · ·	· · .	•	· · ·		· ·			
	· · ·	•		· · ·	· ·	· · ·		• .	· .	• •		· · · · ·	· .			•	•••		•	· ·	•
	· · ·		· · ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	•	· ·	· · ·	· · ·			· · ·			•	•	• • •		•	
	· · ·		· · ·	· ·	 		· · ·	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· · ·	• .		· ·		· ·	· ·		
182 sq. ft.	· · ·	•	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· · ·	•	· . · .	· .	•		· · ·	· .			•	• •			· · ·	
		· ·	· ·		· ·		· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·		· .		· ·	• •	• • •	• •		· .	•	
				· · ·	· · ·	· . ·		· · ·	· · · ·	· · ·	· · ·	•	· · ·	•		· ·		· · ·	· . ·	•	•
bedroom	· · ·	• •	· · ·	· . ·	· .	· . ·	•	· · ·	· .	• •		· · ·	· .			•	•		•		
closet		• •	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· · ·	· ·	· ·	•		· .	· ·	•		• • •	•		· .	· ·	
bath				· · ·	· · ·	· . ·	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·		· · ·	· .	· ·	•		· ·		· · ·	•	· ·	•
closet	· · ·	• •	· · ·	· . ·	· .	·		· .	· .	•		· · · .	• . •			•	•				•
edroom (· ·	· · ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·	· ·		••••	· · ·	· .			· ·		· .		
earoom .				· . ·	. ·	· . · ·		· . · ·		•		· .			• •		· . · ·	. [.]	· . ·		
	· · ·	· .	· ·	· .		· .		· .	· ·		· · ·		· . · .	· ·		•	• . • .	· ·		· ·	
g/dinina											 	• .	· · ·	•	•	•	· ·	• • •	· .		
<u>a, sin ing</u>												· · ·		· ·	· · ·		· .	· ·	· .		



	ro	of below		
t 1189 sq, ft, jundry, kitchen				
.,				
en			<u> </u>	<u> </u>





<u>Project Name:</u> <u>Annandale School Renovation Project</u>

Location: Annandale, MN

Construction Budget Cost Estimate:

A/ E: Claybaugh A/E Contact: Robert Claybaugh A/E Commission No.: TBD A/E Client: TBD

Summary of Contents:

Documents Provided

Assumptions & Qualifications

Proposed Construction Schedule

CSI Division Cost Summary

Gross Area Summary

Take-Off Breakdown

Project Phase:

Program Design Phase Budget Estimate

Date Prepared:

Mon, 10/21/13

Prepared By:

Douglas L. Holmberg, PE/CPE President, PPM, Inc. Number of Pages:

Pages 1 - 13 <u>PPM Project No.:</u> 1371.1361.003.ch.10.21.13

> Professional Project Management, Inc. 1858 East Shore Drive St. Paul, MN 55109 (612) 919-4000 fax: (651) 774-0935 dougppm@gmail.com

© PPM Inc. 2013



					(Fioparo	u by and riopony		nno.)				
CSI												
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
		+									A 4 700 070 00	
				TOTAL DIRECT COST							\$4,528,373.00	\$5,664,525.50
						1					A A A A A A A A A A	
				Deduct Sales Tax	(Reduction = Total Direct Cost x 40% (Material	s) x 0???%)					<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>
				Subtotal							\$4,528,373.00	\$5,664,525.50
				2	100/						¢450.007.00	
	┣┣			General Conditions =	10%						\$432,037.30	\$300,432.33 \$6,330,079,05
	\vdash			Subiolai							\$4,961,210.30	\$0,230,976.05
		+			49/						¢100 249 41	\$240,220,12
				Subtotal (W/Out Contingonaios)	470						\$5 199,240.41	\$6 / 120 217 17
				Subtotal (Wood Contingencies)							ψ3,100,430.71	ψ0,400,217.17
		++		Gross Square Foot Area							42.637	42.637
		++	-+-+-								,	
		++		Cost Per Sauare Foot (Without Contingency)							\$121.50	\$151.99
					Low	High						
				Design Contingency =	10%	15%					\$518,045.87	\$972,032.58
		+-+									······	
				atal Construction Budget on of	Manday, Ostabar 01, 2012							67 450 040 75
				otal construction budget as of:	Monday, October 21, 2013						<u>\$5,098,504.58</u>	<u>\$7,452,249.75</u>
	\square			Cont Des Courses Frint (Mith Doning Continues	A						¢100.65	¢174 70
				Cost Per Square Foot (with Design Contingency)						\$133.03	\$174.70
			-+-+-	Construction Cost Esselation	C 000/						¢207 400 21	¢506 752 09
	\vdash	+		Construction Cost Escalation:	6.80%						\$507,490.31	\$7,050,002,72
	\vdash			Subiolai							\$0,000,002.09	\$1,959,002.15
				Occupied Eacility Eactor / Contingency -	0%						\$0.00	00.02
		+-+		Subtotal	0 /8						\$6 086 002 89	\$7 959 002 73
	\vdash	+-+	-+-+-								\$0,000,002.00	\$1,000,002.10
											** *** ***	
				TOTAL CONSTRUCTION BUDGET							<u>\$6,086,002.89</u>	<u>\$7,959,002.73</u>
	\square	+		as of Bid Day on:	<u>\$40,149.00</u>							
				Or at Day OF an of Did Day an	\$40,140,00						6140.74	6100.07
	┝┝-			Cost Per SF as of Bid Day on	\$40,149.00						\$142.74	\$180.07
						0%					\$0.00	<u> </u>
				Construction Contingency:	(NOT Included, By Owner!)	0 /8	NOTE: P	PM recommends 5% to	o 7% for renovation proje	ects	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>
				Diversity Participation Contingency:	(NOT Included, By Owner!)	0%	tbd ???				<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>
				TOTAL	CONSTRUCTION BUDGET:						\$6.086.003	\$7.959.003
					Brojected to Completion Date of	Monday Sontom	hor 1 - 20	11				
	┣──┠──	++			Fillected to completion bate of	wonday, Septenni						
											Total Lower C	Cost Range
											\$6.086.0	02.89
		+-+									<i><i><i>vc</i>,<i>ccc</i>,<i>c</i></i></i>	
			++								Assessed Deve	
											Average Ren	vation Cost
					Average Cost -						\$7.000	502
					Average 0031 =						φ1,022	.,505
									Gross Square Foot Area		42,63	7
		1-1						Tota	Average Cost per SE -		\$164	70
	\vdash	++						1014			ψ10 4 .	
	\vdash	++										
		+-+										
		+	-+-+-									
		+	-+-+-									
	\vdash											
		++										
		1										

CSI					(Fighais	u by and Froporty (11 NG- J				
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
	1	1										
	-											
	-	-										
		_										
	_	_										
				Deduct Alternate	e No. 1: Upper 2 Levels Re	main Unocc	upied	d - Windows (Openings Insu	lated		
		_		Add / Deduct Alternates: NOT Included in	Budget Estimate!!!							
								Lower Range	Upper Range	Lower Range	Upper Range	
		DE						Unit Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost	
			Ceilinge	Walls & Electring Painting Misc Finishes / Interior Bu	uld-Out				<u>onit oost</u>	0031	0031	
	-+-	+	Firet	Floor								
	-	+		ring Areas		12 294	ef	(\$15.00)	(\$20.00)	(\$184,410,00)	(\$245,880,00)	
			Seco	nd Floor		,_0 .		(\$13.00)	(\$20.00)	(\$104,410.00)	(\\$2+3,000.00)	
	-+-	+		ring Aroos		12 327	of	(\$15.00)	(\$20,00)	(\$184,905,00)	(\$246 540 00)	
	-			ling Aleas		12,027	31	(\$13.00)	(\$20.00)	(\$104,303.00)	(\$240,040.00)	
		+	Comple	he Maahaniaali Air Sida and Wat Sida / Dlumbing								
	-+-	+	Comple	Le Mechanical: All-Side and Wet-Side / Plumbing								
			FIISU	ring Aroop		12 294	of	(\$25.00)	(\$40.00)	(\$420,200,00)	(\$401 760 00)	
	-+-					12,234	51	(\$33.00)	(\$40.00)	(\$430,290.00)	(\$491,700.00)	
			Seco			10 307		(\$05.00)	(\$40.00)	(\$404.445.00)	(\$ 400,000,00)	
				/ing Areas		12,527	SI	(\$35.00)	(\$40.00)	(\$431,445.00)	(\$493,080.00)	
	_	_	Sprinkle			24 621	- 4	(*0.50)	(\$0.00)		(\$70,000,00)	
			He	enovation Areas		24,021	SI	(\$2.50)	(\$3.00)	(\$01,552.50)	(\$73,863.00)	
			Tempera									
			First	Floor		12 204		(\$0.00)	(\$2.00)	(\$00,000,00)		
		-		/ing Areas		12,294	SI	(\$3.00)	(\$3.00)	(\$36,882.00)	(\$35,882.00)	
			Seco			10 307		(\$2.00)	(00.0%)	(00 1 00)	(\$26,091,00)	
		+				12,021	51	(\$3.00)	(\$3.00)	(00.188,986)	(00.188,966)	
		+	Comple	i Electrical (Main Service: 0.500 Amn. 077(400))								
			Comple	le Electrical (Main Service: 2,500 Amβ, 277/480V,	Three Phase, Four Wire Distribution)							
		+	rirst			12 294	<u></u>	¢10.00	¢16.00	¢147 500 00	¢100 704 00	
		+		ning Areas		12,234	51	\$12.00	\$10.00	φ147,528.00	ຈ ເອບ,704.00	
		+	Seco			12 327	of	¢10.00	¢16.00	¢147.024.00	¢107.000.00	
	+	+				12,027	51	\$12.00	\$10.0U	\$147,924.00	\$197,232.00	
	-+-	-										
		AL	Wind-	la fill								
		+	window	Iniii		4 800		¢0.00	¢E 00	¢0,600,00	¢04.000.00	
		+		moow Openings with Sneathing and insulation		4,000	51	φ2.00	φ ວ .00	\$9,000.00	φ∠4,000.00	
		-										
		+										
		+										
						1						

CEL					(Fioparo	u by and Fropony		11NG. J				
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Unner Cost Range
DIVISION		-			REAL AND AND A	Quantin	UIII	chill cost		Septeme	Lower Cost Range	opper cost Range
		_			Low Cost	High Cost				L		
			+	Subtotal Deduct Alternate No. 1 =	(\$1,061,413.50)	(\$1,207,050.00)						
			+ + +	General Conditions:								
		-		10.00%	(\$106,141,35)	(\$120.705.00)						
		-	+-+-+-	Subtotal	(\$1,167,554.85)	(\$1,327,755.00)						
				OH & Profit:								
		_		4%	<u>(\$46,702.19)</u> (\$1.014.057.04)	<u>(\$53,110.20)</u>						
				Subtotal (W/Out Contingencies)	(\$1,214,257.04)	(\$1,380,865.20)						
			+-+-+-	Desian Continaency:								
				10.00%	(\$121,425.70)	(\$138,086.52)						
				Total Construction Budget	(\$1,335,682,75)	(\$1 518 951 72)						
	-+-		+-+-+-		<u>101,000,002.107</u>	<u>(0,0,0,0,0,1,72)</u>						
				as of Bid Day on:	Tue, 12/03/13	Fri, 01/01/04						
			+	Ocert Freedotion								
			+	Cost Escalation:	(\$00,926,42)	(6102 200 72)						
	+		+ + + -	6.80%	(\$90,826.43)	(\$103,288.72)						
				Subtotal -	(\$1 426 509 18)	(\$1 622 240 44)						
	-+-		+		(\$1,420,000.10)	(\$1,022,240.44)						
	\mathbf{H}	-										
					Add Alternate No. 2: In	sulate Uppe	<u>r 2 le</u>	vels exterior				
				Add / Deduct Alternates: NOT Included in	Budget Estimate!!!							
								Lower Range	Higher Range	Lower Range	Higher Range	
								Unit Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost	
		A	DD:									
		_	Window	v Infill		1 000			AT 00		<u> </u>	
			Inill V	Vindow Openings with Sheathing and Insulation		4,800	st	\$2.00	\$5.00	\$9,600.00	\$24,000.00	
		_										
					Lower Bange Cost	Higher Bange Cost						
			+-+-+-	Subtotal Deduct Alternate No. 3 -	\$9 600 00	\$21 000 00						
	\vdash			Cubicial Deduct Alternate NO. 5 =	<i>ψ3,000.00</i>	ψ24,000.00						
	+-		+-+-+-	General Conditions								
			+-+-+-	10.00%	\$960.00	\$2,400,00						
	+	-	+ + +	Subtotal	\$10.560.00	\$26.400.00						
	+	-									· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				OH & Profit:								
				4%	\$422.40	\$1,056.00						1
				Subtotal (W/Out Contingencies)	\$10,982.40	\$27,456.00						
				Design Contingency:								
				10.00%	\$1,098.24	\$2,745.60						
				Total Construction Budget	\$12 080 64	\$30,201,60						
				Total Construction Dudget	<u>012,000.04</u>							
				as of Bid Day on:	Fri, 01/01/04	Fri, 01/01/04						
				as of Bid Day on:	Fri, 01/01/04	Fri, 01/01/04						
				as of Bid Day on: Cost Escalation:	Fri, 01/01/04	Fri, 01/01/04						

CSI				(Fighaig	u by and Froporty (nw.)				
CSI			DECONPTION	DEMADIZO					CI ID TO THE	T G (D	
DIVISION			DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
			Subtotal =	\$12 902 12	\$32 255 31						
				<i>\$12,002.112</i>	<i>voz,zoolo i</i>						
		-									
	++										
				Add Alternate No. 2.	Exterior Cite		revenente				
				Add Alternate No. 3:1	Exterior Site	: impi	rovements				
			Add / Deduct Alternates: NOT Included in	Budget Estimate!!!							
							Lower Range	Higher Range	Lower Range	Higher Range	
							Unit Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost	
		AL	D:				1				
		-	Site Demo:								
			Bemove existing top soil / landscaping at green spaces	30,966 sf x 6" /27	573	CV	\$4.00	<u>00 88</u>	\$2 203 78	\$4 587 56	
	+		Demove Existing top soil / landscaping at green spaces	31 576 cf x 8" / 27	794	 	ΦΩ.00	¢10.00	¢£,200.70	¢4,007.00	
	+	-+	Nine Operation Alle service		/04	Cy	φ <u>6.00</u>	φ12.00	<u></u>	₹¥,402.03	
	\vdash		IVIISC Grading Allowance			allow	\$5,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$10,000.00	
	$ \rightarrow $	_	New Sitework:								
			New Topsoil at green spaces	30,966 sf x 4" /27	378	су	\$12.00	\$15.00	\$4,541.68	\$5,677.10	
			New Sodding at Green Spaces (not complete replacing)	30,966 / 9	3,441	sy	\$1.50	\$2.50	\$5,161.00	\$8,601.67	
			Misc Landscaping Allowance at Parking area		1	allow	\$3,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$8,000.00	
			Sight Lighting Allowance		1	allow	\$5,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$8,000.00	
			New Concrete Walks		1,060	sf	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$3,180.00	\$4,240.00	
			New Uncovered Parking Area								
		+	New Base Course	23.029 sf x 6" / 27	426	CV	\$12.00	\$15.00	\$5 117 56	\$6 396 94	
			New Asphalt Paving	23.029 sf / 9	2 559	ev	\$12.00	\$14.00	\$30,705,33	\$35,822,80	
			New Curb & Cuttor		083	lf	¢12.00	¢15.00	¢11 706 00	¢03,022.03	
	+		New Culb & Guiler		40		\$12.00	\$15.00	\$11,790.00	\$14,745.00 \$645.00	
			INew Painted Stalls		43	ea	\$10.00	\$15.00	φ430.00	Φ04 3.00	
			New Covered Parking Area		0.710						
			Unheated Parking Garage - 18 stalls		3,748	sf	\$110.00	\$140.00	\$412,280.00	\$524,720.00	
				Lower Range Cost	Higher Range Cost	•					
			Subtotal Deduct Alternate No. 3 =	\$494,773.77	\$640,838.79						
			General Conditions:								
			10.00%	\$49 477 38	\$64 083 88						
	-+		Subtotal	\$544,251,14	\$704,922,67						
	-+	-+									
	\vdash		OU & Drofit:								
	\vdash			\$21 770 05	\$28 106 01						
	+	-+	4%	φ <u>21,110.00</u> ΦΕCC 021 10	\$700 110 57						
	\vdash		Subiolal (W/Out Contingencies)	\$300,UZ1.19	ə133,119.51						
	\vdash										
		_	Design Contingency:								
			10.00%	<u>\$56,602.12</u>	<u>\$73,311.96</u>						
			<u>Total Construction Budget</u>	<u>\$622,623.31</u>	<u>\$806,431.53</u>						
			as of Bid Day on:	Fri, 01/01/04	Fri, 01/01/04						
			Cost Escalation:								
			6.80%	\$42,338.39	\$54,837.34						
			Subtotal =	\$664.961.69	\$861.268.87						
				······							
	\vdash	-									
	$\left \cdot \right $										
	\vdash	-									
	1				1						1

CSI						(Fiopaio	a by and Froporty		m.,				
DIVISION					DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	OUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
	1			+									-118-
				_									
	+		++-										
	+		+-+										
	+		+										
	-	\vdash		-									
	+		++-										
	+	┝┝	+-+										
	+	$\left \cdot \right $	+										
	+		+	+									
	+	++-	+-+										
					TOTAL DIRECT COST SUMMAR	v .							
	1	\vdash	+			<u>1.</u>							
	4				(Quantity Take-Off)								
					Gross Areas:								
						PPM							
	1		↓ ↓			<u>Mon, 10/21/13</u>							
	1		+	_									,
	1					Renovation Areas							
	+		+-+	Ba	isement Level	(Square Feet)							
	1				Boiler Room	1,260							
	1				Gym	4,431							
	1			1	School Area	12,325							
	1			Fir	rst Floor								
	1				Living Areas	12,294							
				Se	cond Floor								
	Τ				Living Spaces	12,327							
				Su	ubtotal Renovation Areas =		42,637						
	1	\square		_									
	4												
					Total Gross Area	42,637							
	1												
	T										Renov	vation	
02000	C	ITE)	NO	DV					Lower Dongo	Unner Denge			
02000	5								Lower Hange	Opper Hange	Lower Hange	Opper Hange	
									Unit Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost	
	De	moliti	ion &	Clea	aring								
		SITE	DEM	10		TBD	0	allow	\$10,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	1		₊.										
	1-		+			Low Cost	High Cost						
					Subtotal Site Demolition & Clearing =	\$0.00	\$0.00						
	+												
	+		++-+										
	+		++		NUTE: The Following Costs ARE NOT Included				<u> </u>		60.00		
	+	+	++		1. Contaminated Soil Abatement / Remediation 2. Hazardous Material Abatement / Remediation	<u>l</u>		ea ea	\$0.00 ¢0.00		ου.00 \$0.00		
	+	++-	++	+	2. nazaruous material Abatement / nemediatio	<u>"</u>		<i>ea</i>	\$0.00 \$0.00		\$0.00 \$0.00		
	+	+	+					Ja	φ0.00		<i>40.00</i>		
	1		+										
	Bu	ilding	Den	noliti	on / Prep								
	1	Exter	ior D	emol	iition								
	1	E)	kterio	r Mas	sonry Repair	Allowance	1	sf	\$30,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$40,000.00	
		De	emoli	sh Ex	kisting Boiler Building	1,045 sf x 13'	13,585	cf	\$0.30	\$0.50	\$4,075.50	\$6,792.50	

CEL						(Fiopaio	u by and Fropenty	1	mc.)				
CSI					DESCRIPTION						CLID TO THE	T G (D	T G (D
DIVISION					DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
		В	Remov	e Ext	erior Windows		7.000	sf	\$7.00	\$9.00	\$49,000,00	\$63.000.00	
							1		+		+,	+	
		Poot	fing D										
					ing realing outom								
			ternov	exil	ing rooning system		1 445	- 6		.	#0.000.00	<u> </u>	
			Boile	er Bu	liding		1,115	SI	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$2,230.00	\$4,460.00	
			Gym				4,583	St	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$9,166.00	\$13,749.00	
			Mair	I Buil	ding		12,327	sf	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$24,654.00	\$36,981.00	
		D	emo E	xitin	g Roof Hatch	Allowance	. 1	sf	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	
		Inter	ior De	molit	ion								
		Н	lazard	ous N	Naterial Abatement	Allowance by A/E	´1	sf	\$166.000.00	\$166.000.00	\$166.000.00	\$166.000.00	
)emo I	nterio	r Finishes Mechanical and Electrical Systems		1		+,	+,	,	+ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			Roik	TRONG	ilding		1 260	ef	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$12,600,00	\$18,000,00	
	-	\vdash	DUII				1,200		¢10.00	φ10.00 ¢15.00	¢12,000.00	¢66 465 00	
			Gym		- P		4,431	SI	\$10.00	\$15.00	ə44,310.00	add,405.00	
			Mair	I Buil	aing		10	L					
			E	aser	nent		12,325	sf	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$123,250.00	\$184,875.00	
			F	irst F	loor		12,294	sf	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$122,940.00	\$184,410.00	
			S	ecor	d Floor		12,327	sf	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$123,270.00	\$184,905.00	
				-									
						Low Cost	High Cost						
					Subtotal Building Demo / Pren =	\$711.995.50	\$971.537.50						
			+++	+		+							
				+									
	Site	e Wo	<u>ork</u>			722)	ļ					
		New	Site V	Vork		IBD	0	st	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
		New	Acces	s En	try - excavation and partial floor replacement neede	Allowance	. 1	allow	\$20.00	\$30,000.00	\$20.00	\$30,000.00	
				-									
			+ +	+								Renova	ation
			+-+	+	Subtatal Sitewark & Domalitian							\$712.015.50	¢1 001 527 50
				+	Sublotal Sitework & Demontion							\$712,015.50	\$1,001,557.50
03000	C	ON	CRF	TE									
30000	Ľ			1									
			++										L <u></u>
												Renova	tion
					Subtotal Concrete							\$0.00	\$0.00
		IT											
04000		~~	~										
04000	IVI.	AS		١Y									
	Ext	terio	r Mas	onry	Walls								
		Infill	East \	Vall v	vith CMU & Brick Veneer								
		B	lasem	ent I	ave	43 lf x 13'	559	sf	\$30.00	\$40.00	\$16 770 00	\$22,360,00	
		H		T			1		1	1	<i><i><i>ϕ</i>10,770.00</i></i>	<u>\$22,000.00</u>	
			+-+	+									
			++	+									
								 					
			+-+-	+				·				Henova	uon
					Subtotal Masonry							\$16,770.00	\$22,360.00
	11		11						1				

CSI					(Flapara	u by and Fropenty		n				
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	OUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
			11									-11 - 0
	\vdash											
	l											
05000	ME	TAI	S									
		Nev	v Raise	l Floor Area		600	sf	\$28.00	\$35.00	\$16.800.00	\$21.000.00	
										, ,,	, ,	
	\vdash											
											Renova	tion
				Subtotal Metals							\$16.800.00	\$21.000.00
00000	wo											
06000	WU		V & P	LASTICS								
											Renova	tion
				Subtotal Wood & Plastic							\$0.00	\$0.00
07000	тн	FRI	ΙΔΙ									
07000												
	\vdash											
	-											
				I								
	Built	Upl	loofing									
			dhered	Roofing System w/ sheathing and Insulation		1 445			.	<u> </u>	* 11 1 50 00	
		Boil	er Build	ing I		1,115	ST	\$8.00	\$10.00	\$8,920.00	\$11,150.00	
		Gyr		I		4,583	SI	\$8.00	\$10.00	\$30,004.00	\$45,830.00	
		Mai	n Buildii	ng T		12,327	ST	\$8.00	\$10.00	\$98,616.00	\$123,270.00	
								¢1 500 00	¢0,000,00	¢1 500 00	¢0,000,00	
		ew R	oor Hate	n 1		1	SI	\$1,500.00	\$3,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$3,000.00	
		<u> </u>										
	151	kyligr	IT Hepla	rement - TBD								
		++										
	\vdash	++									Bonova	tion
				Outstated Thermal							6145 700 00	¢102.0E0.00
		++		Subtotal Thermal							\$145,700.00	\$165,250.00
		┿╍┿										
				1								
08000	Doo	ors	, Win	dows & Glass								
	Door	s		Refinish Existing doors, replace entry doors - incude	ed with renovation costs below							
		††										
		$\uparrow \uparrow$										
		$\uparrow \uparrow$										
???	Wood	d Wir	ndows		Allowance???							
	w	ood	Storefr	ont								
		Exte	erior Wi	ndows	New exterior windows	7,000	sf	\$88.00	\$94.00	\$616,000.00	\$658,000.00	
		T	TT								·····	
		TT										

CEL						(Fiopaio	u by and Froporty		n.c.,					
DIVISION					DESCRIPTION	DEMADKS	OUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SUPTOTAL	Lower Cost Dange	Upper Cest Per	
DIVISION	1			+	DESCRIPTION	KEWIAKKS	QUANTITI	UNII	UNITCOST		SUBIUIAL	Lower Cost Kange	Opper Cost Kar	ige
	1												·····	
				_										
	+	Щ							\$0.00					
	IVIIS		ors.	win	dows & Glass Allowance			ea	\$0.00		\$0.00	Bonov	tion	
	-			-	Subtatal Dears Windows & Class							00 00 1632	\$659 000 (00
	+				Subiotal Doors, windows & Glass							\$010,000.00	\$050,000.	<u>,,,</u>
	+													
	1		l											
09000	FI	nist	nes											
	1													
	+	Ceilin	gs, V	Valls	& Flooring, Painting, Misc Finishes / Interior Build-Ou	Jt								
	1	Ba	seme	ent L	evel		1.060			\$0.00	* 0.000.00	* 10,000,00		
	+		Boile	er Ro	oom T		1,200	ST	\$5.00	\$8.00	\$6,300.00	\$10,080.00		
	+		Gyn				12 325	of	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$44,310.00	\$246 500 00		
	+	Fir	st Flo	or or			12,025	31	φ13.00	φ20.00	\$104,073.00	φ240,300.00		
	+		Livin	na Ar	l eas		12.294	sf	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$184,410.00	\$245.880.00		-
	1	Se	cond	I Flo	Dr.		,	<u>.</u>	\$.0.00	\$20.00	\$10.,10.00	42.10,000.00		
	+		Livin	ng Sr	aces		12,327	sf	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$184,905.00	\$246,540.00		
	1			Ť.										
	T													
	1			_										
	+											Renova	ation	
	-				Subtotal Finishes							\$604,800.00	\$815,465.0	10
	+													-
	+	ll			l									
10000	S	PEC	IAL	.TI	ES									
												Renova	ation	
	1			_	Subtotal Specialties							\$0.00	\$0.0)0
	1													
	-													
11000	E	QUII	PM	EN	т									
	1											Renova	ation	
					Subtotal Equipment							\$0.00	\$0.0)0
	1													
12000	F	JRN	IS	IIN	GS									
	1													-
	+			1										
	Mis	sc. Allo	wan	ce		Allowance		ea	\$0.00		\$0.00			
												Renova	ation	
					Subtotal Furnishings							\$0.00	\$0.0)0
	1													
13000	S	PEC	IAL	_ C	ONSTRUCTION									
	1			T										
	+		-											
	1											Renova	ation	-
	1				Subtotal Special Construction							\$0.00	\$0.0	00

CSI					(i-iopaio	u by and Froperty (l í	1110.J				
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	OUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST		SURTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Unner Cost Range
DIVISION			+	DESCRIPTION	KEWARKS	QUANIIII	UNII	UNITCOST		SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Kange	Opper Cost Kange
14000	CO	NV	ΕY	ING SYSTEMS								
	Eleva	ators										
	Н	vdra	ulic.	Front & Rear Entry								
		Pa	ssen	ger - 5-Stop								
	\vdash	1	5 01	an Recompant (Difficult Construction		5	ston	00 000 022	\$35,000,00	\$150,000,00	\$175,000,00	
		oictu	0-01			5	stop	\$10,000,00	\$15,000,00	\$50,000,00	\$75,000.00	
		UISIW	ay			J	Siop	φ10,000.00	\$13,000.00	φ30,000.00	\$75,000.00 Bonovo	tion
	\vdash	HOI	stwa	y								
				Subtotal Conveying Systems							\$200,000.00	\$250,000.00
		_										
15000	ME	СН										
13000			i All									
	Com	plete	Me	chanical: Air-Side and Wet-Side / Plumbing								
	A	ir Sic	le									
	T	Ba	seme	ent Level								
			Boile	er Room		1,260	sf	\$35.00	\$45.00	\$44,100.00	\$56,700.00	
			Gym			4,431	sf	\$30.00	\$35.00	\$132,930.00	\$155,085.00	
		-	Scho	pol Area		12.325	sf	\$35.00	\$40.00	\$431,375.00	\$493,000,00	
	\vdash	Fire	at Flo	oor		,					,	
		1	Livin	a Areas		12 294	ef	\$35.00	\$40.00	\$430 290 00	\$491 760 00	
			ond	Eleer		,_0 .		φ03.00	φ+0.00	φ+00,230.00	φ+01,700.00	
		00		- 1001 		10 307	of	¢25.00	\$40.00	\$421 445 00	00 000 0019	
	\vdash			g Spaces		12,321	SI	\$35.00	\$40.00	\$431,445.00	\$495,060.00	
				Subtotal Complete Mechanical =	\$1,470,140.00							
				Cost / SF = ⁱ	#REF!							
	Plum	bina		Include Above								
		T		Subtotal Plumbing =	\$0.00							
		-		Plumbing Cost / SE - 1	#BEF!							
				+ +								
				+								
		+		+								
	Hydr	onics	(inc	luded in HVAC "Wet Side")	Included Above!		ea	\$0.00		\$0.00		
	Sprin	ıkler										
		Re	nova	tion Areas		42,637	sf	\$2.50	\$3.00	\$106,592.50	\$127,911.00	
				Subtotal Sprinkler =	\$106,592.50							
		+										
	Tem	nerat	ure	Control	DDC Control System		sf	\$3.00		\$0.00		
		Ba	sema	ant Level				<i>4</i> 0.00		\$3.00		
			Roile	ar Boom		1 260	ef	¢3 UU	00 63	¢3 780 00	¢3 780 00	
	\vdash	+	DUIE			1,200	01	φο.00 Φο.00	φ <u></u> σ.00	¢3,700.00	¢10,700.00	
		+	Gym			4,431	SI	\$3.00 \$0.00	\$3.00	\$13,293.00	\$13,293.00	
	\vdash	+	SCNO	JULATEA		12,323	51	\$3.00	\$3.00	JO.518,926	a30,975.00	
	├	Fire	st Flo	oor		10.001	L					
			Livin	g Areas		12,294	sf	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$36,882.00	\$36,882.00	

CSI					(Fiopaio	Dy and Froperty		nno.)				
CSI				DESCRIPTION	DEMADIZO					CLIDTOTA I	T C (D	T C (D
DIVISION				DESCRIPTION	REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNITCOST		SUBIUIAL	Lower Cost Kange	Upper Cost Range
		S	Second Flo)Or								
		-	Livina S	paces		12.327	sf	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$36,981,00	\$36,981,00	
	++					7-						
	++	-										
	+	-										
	+											
	++											
	Mise	c. M	lechanical	Allowance								
		Ren	novation Ar	ea							Renova	ation
				Subtotal Mechanical							\$1,704,643.50	\$1,945,447.00
	П				Total Mechanical Cost/sf =							
					% of Total Construction Budget =							
	++	-										
		L		-I								
16000	EL	_E(CTRIC	AL								
	I I											
	Con	mple	ete Electr	i ical (Main Service: 2,500 Amp, 277/480V, Three Ph	ase Four Wire Distribution)							
			Bacamort									
	$\left \right $		Boilor D			1 260	of	¢10.00	¢10.00	¢15 100 00	¢00 600 00	
	$\left \cdot \right $		Duller H			4.421	- SI	\$12.00	\$10.00 \$10.00	φ13,1∠0.00 ¢50,170,00	¢Z2,000.00	
	\vdash		Gym			4,431	SI	\$12.00	\$18.00	\$53,172.00	\$79,758.00	
	++		School	Area		12,325	St	\$12.00	\$18.00	\$147,900.00	\$221,850.00	
		F	First Floor									
			Living A	reas		12,294	sf	\$12.00	\$18.00	\$147,528.00	\$221,292.00	
		S	Second Flo	or								
			Living S	paces		12,327	sf	\$12.00	\$18.00	\$147,924.00	\$221,886.00	
											Renova	ation
		-		Subtotal Electrical							\$511.644.00	\$767,466.00
					Total Electrical Cost/sf =						\$12.00	
	++				% of Total Construction Budget =						8 08%	
	+				, or retail conclusion 244get =						0.30 /8	
	+											
	++											
	$\left \right $											
	$\left \right $	-	+++									
	+	+		1 Items specifically not listed above but not	limited to the following:							
	\vdash	-+	-+-+-+-	2 Design Contingency to be determined by A	Architect & Owner							
	++	-+		2. Design contingency to be determined by Architect & Owner								
	++	-+-	-+-+-+-	4 Design Fees								
	++	-+-		5. Consultant Reimbursables								
		-		6. Owner Provided Items								
	++	-+		7. Owner Soft Costs								
	++			8. Furniture								
	++	-+-										
	$\uparrow \uparrow$	-		NOTE:								
		-		Professional Project Management, Inc. car	nnot and does							
				not warrant or represent the accuracy of the	his budget							
	T^{\dagger}			estimate.								
	$\uparrow \uparrow$											
	$\uparrow\uparrow$			The above materials including budget esti	mate							
	TT			format and budget cost information have t	been							
				developed by Professional Project Manage	ement, Inc.							
	$ \top $			All rights are reserved and no part of this	document							

CSI DIVISION		DESCRIPTION	(Frepa) REMARKS	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	SUBTOTAL	Lower Cost Range	Upper Cost Range
		may be reproduced and/or distributed wit	hout						
		the express permission in writing of Profe	ssional						
		Project Management, Inc.							

UNIT SUMMARY

The following is a preliminary schedule of the windows and doors for this project.

All information shown is based on information supplied to Marvin and unverified by Marvin.

The information supplied is for preliminary project budget and feasibility purposes.

Information contained within these pages is not final order ready information.

Field verification for conditions and sizes are required for accurate project pricing, sizing and ordering.

Pricing is for manufactured supplied product only and does not include installation or products generally supplied by others for installation.

Additional charges, tax or Terms and Conditions may apply. All prices are subject to change at anytime.

NUME	BER OF LINES: 7		TOTAL UNIT QTY: 107			
LINE	MARK UNIT	BRAND	ITEM	QTY		
1	1,2 & 3rd Flr 4wide	Marvin	Clad Marvin Assembly	16		
	Assembly					
2	1,2 &3rd Flr 2W	Marvin	Clad Marvin Assembly	55		
	Assemblies					
3	Rear Bmt 2W 6ft Hgh	Marvin	Clad Marvin Assembly	6		
	Wdw Hgts					
4	3rd Flr 2W 11ft	Marvin	Clad Marvin Assembly	6		
	Assemblies					
5	2/3rd Flr Wds Over	Marvin	Clad Marvin Assembly	2		
	Entrances					
6	1 Wide Wdws Gym &	Marvin	Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum	16		
	Entries					
7	Rear Misc 1 Wide	Marvin	Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum	6		
_	Wds					

LINE ITEM QUOTES

The following is a schedule of the windows and doors for this project. For additional unit details, please see Line Item Quotes. Additional charges, tax or Terms and Conditions may apply. Detail pricing is per unit.

Line #1 Otv: 16	Mark Unit: 1,2 & 3rd	FIr 4wide Assembly		
As Viewed	From The Exterior	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option Nailing Fin		
Line #2 Qty: 55	Mark Unit: 1,2 &3rd I	Flr 2W Assemblies		
		Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs		

As Viewed From The Exterior

4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option

Nailing Fin

Line #3 Mark Unit: Rear		2W 6ft Hgh Wdw Hgts		
As Viewed F	Tom The Exterior	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option Nailing Fin		
Line #4 Qty: 6	Mark Unit: 3rd Flr 2W	11ft Assemblies		
As Viewed Exte	△ From The prior	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option Nailing Fin		
Line #5 Qty: 2	Mark Unit: 2/3rd Flr V	Vds Over Entrances		
As Viewed From The Exterior	n	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 2W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option		

Line #6 Otv: 16	Mark Unit: 1 Wide Wo	dws Gym & Entries		
As Viewed From The Exterior	<u></u>	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option Nailing Fin		
Line #7 Qty: 6	Mark Unit: Rear Misc	1 Wide Wds		
As Viewed Fro	m	Stone White Clad Exterior Stained Interior Finish Pine Interior Clad Ultimate Single Hung Magnum IG - 1 Lite Low E II w/Argon 5/8" SDL - With Spacer Bar Rectangular - Special Cut 3W1H 2 /Unit Bronze Custodial Sash Lock 2 /Unit Bronze Sash Lift Bottom Sash Full Travel Magnum Half Screen Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh Vertical Structural Mull 1" Factory Mull Charge 4 9/16" Jambs 1 5/16" Clad BMC A217 Simulated Thick Subsill Applied End Cap Option Nailing Fin		

The estimated "contractor cost" for Marvin manufacturer supplied materials only, shown on these 4 pages, purchased through a Marvin dealer is: \$440,000.00 not including tax or other fees.

The estimated "contractor cost" for Marvin manufacturer supplied materials only, shown on these 4 pages but with Triple Pane Glazing and without spacer bars for the SDL, purchased through a Marvin dealer is: \$510,000.00 not including tax or other fees.

Contractor cost will vary by contractor, by dealer and with contractor dealer relationships.

Please contact Ken Modeen for further information or with questions concerning this budget information. <u>kenmod@marvin.com</u> 612-720-8118




ULTIMATE DOUBLE HUNG MAGNUM WINDOWS



BEAUTY GOES BIG.

The Ultimate Double Hung Magnum can be designed as large as 5 ¹/₂' wide x 10 ¹/₂' tall so commercial buildings, historic renovations and new construction have no size barriers when it comes to beauty and protection. The high quality and performance of the spiral balance system make even the largest window a breeze to open. The sight lines and profiles match our Ultimate Double Hung family of products so your design options are greatly expanded. When you want magnum sizes with exceptional, real-wood construction, architectural appeal and commercial-grade performance, this is the ultimate window for you.

STANDARD FEATURES

- One-lite Lo $\bar{E}^2\text{-}272^\circledast$ with Argon insulating glass
- Satin Taupe sash lock
- Bare wood interior
- All wood brick mould casing (wood units)
- Extruded aluminum clad exterior (clad units)
- 4 ⁹/16" (116 mm) jambs
- Installation hardware

HARDWARE

SASH LOCK	DETAILS
	A
SASH LIFT	
(optional)	The Ultimate Double Hung Magnum Round Top provides options for large, high performance elliptical, eyebrow, and true radius shapes in double hung, single hung and picture unit styles.
	29

GLASS, HARDWARE FINISHES AND CLAD COLORS

GLASS OPTIONS

Marvin® offers a broad array of specialty glass options. Choose clear, patterned or decorative glazing or have our artisans create a special glass just for you. Contact a Marvin representative for availability.

BRONZE TINT	GREEN TINT	GRAY TINT	OBSCURE	RAIN	RENOVA	THIN REED	CLEAR BEVELED
HARDWARE	FINISHES						
SATIN TAUPE	BRONZE	SATIN NICKEL	SATIN CHROME	ANTIQUE BRASS	OIL RUBBED BRONZE	BRASS	WHITE
CLAD COLO	ORS						
PEBBLE GR	AY	BAHAMA BROWN	EVERC	FREEN	BRONZE	SI	ONE WHITE
EBONY		COBALT BLUE	WINE	BERRY	COCONUT CREA	IAH MA	1PTON SAGE
CASHMER	E	ARCTIC WHITE	CUMULL	JS GRAY	DESERT BEIGE	SHER	WOOD GREEN
Printed color may n accurate representa your local Marvin re color chips.	ot be an ation. Ask etailer for						
56		SIERRA WHITE	CADET	GRAY	CASCADE BLUE	FREI	NCH VANILLA

CLAD ULTIMATE DOUBLE HUNG MAGNUM

	1 1/10/10	, i i , 511 (OLLIN		
ENERGY DATA	U-Factor	SHGC	VT	CR	ENERGY STAR
11/16" Insulating Glass Air	0.46	0.55	0.58	42	
11/16" Insulating Glass Air LoĒ-180™	0.35	0.50	0.56	51	
11/16" Insulating Glass Argon LoĒ-180™	0.32	0.50	0.56	54	Ν
11/16" Insulating Glass Lo $\bar{E}^2\text{-}272^{\circledast}$ Air	0.34	0.30	0.51	52	SC
11/16" Insulating Glass LoE ² -272® Air w/Combination	0.26	0.30	0.47	69	N, NC, SC
11/16" Insulating Glass LoĒ ² -272® Argon	0.30	0.30	0.51	56	N, NC, SC
11/16" Insulating Glass LoĒ ² -272® Argon w/Combinat	ion 0.24	0.29	0.47	71	N, NC, SC
11/16" Insulating Glass Lo $\bar{E^3}366^{\circledast}$ Air	0.33	0.20	0.46	53	SC, S
11/16" Insulating Glass Lo $\bar{E}^3366^{\circledast}$ Air w/Combination	0.26	0.22	0.42	70	N, NC, SC, S
11/16" Insulating Glass LoĒ ³ 366® Argon	0.30	0.20	0.46	56	N, NC, SC, S
7/8" Tri-Pane LoĒ-180™ Argon LoĒ-180™	0.27	O.41	0.49	62	Ν
7/8" Tri-Pane LoĒ-180™ Krypton-Argon LoĒ-180™	0.24	O.41	0.49	65	Ν
7/8" Tri-Pane LoDz-272® Argon LoDz-272®	0.26	0.25	0.41	63	N, NC, SC, S
7/8" Tri-Pane LoDz-272® Krypton-Argon LoDz-272®	0.23	0.25	0.41	66	N, NC, SC, S
7/8" Tri-Pane Lodz 366® Argon LoĒ-180™	0.26	0.18	0.40	63	N, NC, SC, S
7/8" Tri-Pane Lodz 366® Krypton-Argon LoĒ-180™	0.23	0.18	0.40	66	N, NC, SC, S

CLAD ULTIMATE DOUBLE HUNG MAGNUM / SINGLE HUNG MAGNUM

CLAD ULTIMATE DOUBLE HUNG MAGNUM PICTURE

ENERGY DATA	U-Factor	SHGC	VT	CR	ENERGY STAR
1" Insulating Glass Air	0.44	0.56	0.60	45	
1" Insulating Glass Air LoĒ-180™	0.33	0.50	0.58	55	
1" Insulating Glass Argon LoĒ-180™	0.30	0.50	0.58	59	Ν
1" Insulating Glass LoĒ ² -272® Air	0.32	0.31	0.53	57	NC
1" Insulating Glass LoĒ ² -272® Argon	0.28	0.30	0.53	60	N, NC, SC
1" Insulating Glass LoĒ ³ 366 [®] Air	0.31	0.21	0.47	57	NC, SC, S
1" Insulating Glass LoĒ ³ 366® Argon	0.28	0.20	0.47	60	N, NC, SC, S
1" Tri-Pane LoĒ-180™ Argon LoĒ-180™	0.22	0.43	0.52	69	Ν
1" Tri-Pane LoĒ-180™ Krypton-Argon LoĒ-180™	0.20	0.43	0.52	69	Ν
1" Tri-Pane Lo $\bar{E}^2272^{\circledast}$ Argon Lo $\bar{E}^2272^{\circledast}$	0.21	0.27	0.43	69	N, NC, SC, S
1" Tri-Pane Lo \bar{E}^2 -272 $^{\otimes}$ Krypton-Argon Lo \bar{E}^2 -272 $^{\otimes}$	0.19	0.26	0.43	70	N, NC, SC, S
1" Tri-Pane Lodz 366® Argon LoĒ-180™	0.22	0.19	0.42	69	N, NC, SC, S
1" Tri-Pane Lodz 366® Krypton-Argon LoĒ-180™	0.19	0.19	0.42	70	N, NC, SC, S

WINDOW AND DOOR LIMITED WARRANTY



Built around you.

This Limited Warranty applies to Marvin® windows and patio doors purchased on or after the Effective Date from an authorized Marvin dealer, and extends to the owner of the structure in which the products are originally installed. This Limited Warranty is fully transferable. This Limited Warranty is applicable only to product installed in the U.S.A. and Canada. For information on warranties available in other countries, please contact Marvin at the address or phone number below.

GLASS COMPONENTS

Glass warranties apply to factory-installed glass or Marvin-supplied glass installed by Marvin-authorized service personnel. Clear insulating glass with stainless steel spacers is warranted against seal failure caused by manufacturing defects and resulting in visible obstruction through the glass for twenty (20) years from the original date of purchase. Non-tempered glass is warranted against stress cracks caused by manufacturing defects for ten (10) years from the original date of purchase. All other glass and glass features are provided with the same warranties, limitations, and exclusions Marvin receives from its supplier; contact Marvin for further details.

EXTERIOR CLADDING FINISH

Except as provided below, Marvin's standard exterior cladding finish is warranted against manufacturing defects resulting in chalk, fade, and loss of adhesion (peel), per the American Architectural Manufacturer's Association's (AAMA) Specification 2605-11 Sections 8.4 and 8.9, for twenty (20) years from the original date of purchase. Anodized finishes and other specialty exterior finishes are warranted to be free from manufacturing defects for five (5) years, from the original date of purchase.

Standard exterior cladding finish installed in coastal environments (within one (1) mile of a sea coast or other salt water source) is warranted against manufacturing defects resulting in abnormal deterioration caused by corrosion and/or loss of adhesion for ten (10) years from the original date of purchase. "Abnormal deterioration" means damage to the finish (such as peeling, flaking, or blistering) beyond what is normal for an ocean coastline environment. Anodized or other specialty finishes are not warranted in coastal environments.

NON-GLASS COMPONENTS

Hardware and other non-glass components are warranted to be free from manufacturing defects for ten (10) years from the original date of purchase. Stainless steel hardware, hardware with physical vapor deposition ("PVD"), and other specifically-designated "coastal" hardware finishes (collectively "Coastal Hardware") installed in coastal environments are warranted to be free from manufacturing defects that result in abnormal deterioration of the finish for a period of 10 years from the original date of purchase. Other hardware finishes are not warranted in coastal environments. Electric operators and other motorized accessories are provided with the same warranties, limitations, and exclusions Marvin receives from its supplier; contact Marvin for further details.

INTERIOR FINISH

Factory-applied interior finish is warranted to be free from Finish Defects for a period of five (5) years from the original date of purchase. Finish Defects include cracking, peeling, checking, delamination, blistering, flaking, excessive chalking and, in the case of painted interior finish, fading or change in color (per ASTM D2244), under normal interior environmental conditions. The color of wood changes, typically darkening over time, and is not a defect. The application of stains and/or clear finish does not prevent this natural process. Color change may be more noticeable in woods treated with a clear coat or light colored stain. The appearance of a raised grain or other natural variation in the wood grain may be enhanced by the interior finish and is not a defect. Interior finish is applied prior to assembly and is not intended to cover joinery seams. Products with factory-applied primer only are not covered under this provision. Factory-applied primer must be painted in accordance with Marvin's finishing instructions within 90 days of installation.

EXCLUSIVE REMEDY

This Limited Warranty is made as of the original date of product purchase and is not a warranty of future performance. If a covered defect is reported during the term of the applicable warranty notice period, and otherwise in accordance with the terms of the Limited Warranty, Marvin will, at its option, repair or replace the product or component, or refund the price paid for the defective product or component. Removal, installation, finishing, refinishing, and disposal costs and services are not included. Marvin will endeavor to supply original replacement parts; however, replacement parts may differ from the original parts. Replacement parts, including upgrades, are warranted for the remainder of the original product warranty.

EXCLUSIONS

Damage, defects, or problems resulting from causes outside Marvin's control are excluded from coverage under the Limited Warranty. Such causes include, without limitation:

Installation, Maintenance, and Acts of God

- installation not in conformance with Marvin's installation instructions and applicable building codes
- improper or non-standard field finishing
- non-standard installation, such as non-vertical or sloped glazing, upside down, or out-of square
- installation or use in applications exceeding design standards
- field mulls; field finishes
- insulating glass installed above 5000 feet without capillary tubes (except as specifically provided in the Marvin Limited Warranty High Altitude Supplement)
- installation or use near pools, saunas, hot tubs, or other high-humidity environments

19913555 Effective January 1, 2013 Marvin Window and Door Limited Warranty

APPENDIX F: Financial Analysis



Jon Commers, Principal

2288 University Avenue West Saint Paul, MN 55114 ph) 651.645.4644 www.donjek.com

ANNANDALE SCHOOL

Ownership and Operations October 10, 2013

Prospects for reuse of historic structures are influenced by availability of capital for their rehabilitation, as well as the viability of their next generation of uses. As a result, the listing and discussion of prospective funding sources is organized under three themes that relate to use as well as finance. Partnerships, taxability and phasing are three elements that will influence decision making about the Annandale School.

Partnerships

The scale of rehabilitation required for the school requires exploration of long-term, formalized partnerships to enable both construction and ongoing operations. The primary partnership that needs to be evaluated as it relates to the Annandale School, is between the Annandale School District and the City of Annandale. Current leadership is not predisposed to invest cash assets in the rehabilitation of the school building, but our team recommends focused discussion on whether members of the School Board and the City Council are willing to support the rehabilitation in other ways. For example, the City could exercise its powers to establish a tax increment financing (TIF) or tax abatement district. The School District could retain the land beneath the school and enter a long-term land lease on terms that facilitate the reuse of the building.

Depending on the uses introduced to the building, these municipalities, perhaps in tandem with other public partners, could form a joint powers agreement to formalize a shared initiative in the building. The School District, if partnering with Wright County, Wright County Community Action and a public health entity, could form an entity known as a family service collaborative, to co-provide services for local families and children in a portion of the school building. These are offered as examples only, to outline that an exchange between the School District and the City Council could help identify new ways of partnering toward reuse of the '22 building.

Larger sponsor organizations such as the YMCA may also be suited to a partnership in the Annandale School. While the YMCA does have multiple branches located north and west of the metropolitan area, the nearest is in St. Cloud, 22 miles away. The current strategy for expansion at the YMCA is for a nearby branch to explore a pilot investment in a relatively small space in a new community, such as a storefront. The YMCA uses this structure to test the efficacy of local programming and membership development. If these evaluations are positive, the YMCA may advance a capital campaign and membership drive, to develop a more permanent presence in a community. In the case of Annandale, YMCA representatives noted the relative lack of nearby facilities, but also expressed reservations about the ability of a small, somewhat seasonal community base to support a permanent YMCA branch.



Existing local organizations such as YouthFirst may also represent potential partners in the reuse of a rehabilitated school building. As an organization broadly supported by the community, YouthFirst could contribute by committing to a lease of multiple years, and offering programs complementary to other uses in the building. Other stable local organizations with a support base on which to draw, could participate similarly.

Given the size of the Annandale School and the intensity of rehabilitation required, successful partnerships for reuse will be critical. First and foremost, a shared strategy for the building's future by the City and the School District, will be important. Secondly, developing partnerships with interested users as early as possible will assist in procuring financing from tax credit investors and lenders.

Taxability

As school district property, the Annandale School is exempt from property taxes levied by the City, School District and County. The future ownership of the school will determine its treatment for property tax purposes. If the owner organization of the building, and all of the users housed within it, qualify as charitable or are public agencies, then under State law there will be no property tax liability. If either the owner organization or some of the users are individuals (as in the case of housing), or private enterprises, then the property will incur annual taxes to the City, School District and County.

The issue of taxability is a significant consideration for reuse, because it is based on use and influences the tool set available for financing. The nonprofit structure employed by the Detroit Lakes Community and Cultural Center (see inset), as a tax-exempt entity, reduces the annual cost burden on the facility, and facilitates membership contributions that are tax-deductible. A public ownership model provides property tax exemption and retains the possibility of State bond support or other sources. For tax-exemption to be granted, the Annandale School would be limited in its uses to public or charitable uses in the structure, which include a community center and (under certain conditions) affordable housing.

Incorporating market-rate housing, condominiums, or commercial uses necessitate the assumption of property tax liability. While this creates a cost to be managed through operations, the property's taxable status may also expand the financing tool kit to include tax increment financing (TIF) and tax abatement. These tools allow the capture of property tax revenues generated by a rehabilitated school building, and allow for repayment of the investment in the construction over time. Moving the school from the tax-exempt status it has always held as a public building, into taxable status, reflects one form of value of reusing the historic structure.

Phasing

The Annandale School, at roughly 40,000 square feet, represents a substantial inventory of space to deliver to the local real estate marketplace, whether for lease or for sale. A theme raised in interviews and community meetings has been the prospect for filling the building in a series of phases, with the first floor completed and reused first, and upper floors built out and occupied subsequently. As this strategy relates to supporting the downtown marketplace, this approach to phasing is recommended. The development of partnerships and securing of financing also may progress at different rates, making a phased approach advantageous. At the same time, completing some elements of the



rehabilitation (such as mechanical equipment) in the most cost-effective way will demand they are undertaken for the building as a whole, instead of in a phased way.

Phasing can impact financing strategies, as well. The development of affordable housing, for example, often relies on the federal low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC). The credit, which is awarded to projects by Minnesota Housing, allows the project to trade the credit in exchange for investors' substantial contribution toward construction. Attracting these investors is a competitive process, and phasing of a development introduces a risk element that will narrow the field of investors interested in the project.



		Scenario C	omments
		Community	Community
Funding Tool	Notes	Center/Affordable	Center/Luxury
		Housing	Condo
Project Finance Tools			
Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit	The Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit provides a mechanism to aggregate capital for the restoration of historic property. The credit is a vehicle for purchasers – typically banks or other larger investors – to contribute funds to a project in exchange for a tax credit on federal income. The federal program allows for projects to sell credits equal to up to 20% of the qualifying expenses of the project. Proceeds of the sale are then used for rehabilitation of the historic structure. Buyers of the federal credits are typically large banking organizations.	Eligible for rehabilitation costs	Eligible for rehabilitation costs
State Historic Tax Credit	Minnesota's Historic Structure Rehabilitation State Tax Credit reflects the general structure of the federal credit. Like the federal tool, the state credit allows for the sale of credits for up to 20% of qualifying expenses on a project, and buyers of this credit are also large entities, primarily banks.	Eligible for rehabilitation costs	Eligible for rehabilitation costs
Federal 10% Rehabilitation Tax Credit	An additional tax credit vehicle exists to support rehabilitation of pre-1936 buildings that are not designated on the National Register of Historic Places. The 10% credit provides a more flexible tool, but it does require that structures are depreciable (requiring private ownership of the building), and the credit proceeds are not permitted for residential rehabilitation. The 10% credit	Eligible for rehabilitation costs, provided property is in private ownership	Eligible for rehabilitation costs, provided property is in private ownership

		Scenario C	omments
		Community	Community
Funding Tool	Notes	Center/Affordable	Center/Luxury
		Housing	Condo
	cannot be used in tandem with the 20% federal		
	historic rehabilitation tax credit.		
Low-Income Housing	The federal LIHTC credit provides an annual tax	Eligible for portion of	Ineligible.
Tax Credit (LIHTC)	credit of 4% or 9%, for a period of ten years. Like	rehabilitation and	
	the historic tax credits, LIHTC allows for the	construction costs	
	pooling of capital up front for construction, in	used by attordable	
	exchange for a tax credit awarded through	housing.	
	Minnesota Housing. LIHIC requires a minimum		
	of 20% of the fented units be affordable for		
	nouseholds earling 50% of less of area median		
	affordable to households earning 60% of the		
	median family income or less		
	incutan family income of less.		
	Typical affordable housing projects using the 9%		
	credit are able to sell these credits to fund roughly		
	60% of the capital required. Often, a mortgage by a		
	private lender provides 10% of the funds required,		
	and an additional 30% is covered by equity, grants		
	and other contributions.		
HUD Section 202	The Section 202 program is designed to increase	Eligible.	Ineligible.
Advances	the inventory of affordable housing with		
	supportive services for very low-income elderly		
	residents. These projects provide an environment		
	for independent living, which also provides support		
	activities such as cleaning, cooking, and		
	transportation		

		Scenario C	omments
		Community	Community
Funding 1001	Notes	Center/Affordable	Center/Luxury
		Housing	Condo
	HUD provides interest-free capital advances to private, nonprofit sponsors to finance the projects, and the source does not require repayment if the project is in service for 40 years. HUD 202 funds can also be used as rental assistance resources for residents over time.		
Private Lending	Rehabilitation may also be funded by construction debt, subsequently consolidated into a long-term mortgage on the property. In cases where historic and LIHTC credits are utilized on the same project, a private lender may become a partner both by purchasing these tax credits and by lending funds for the rehabilitation.	Eligible.	Eligible.

Public Agency Tools			
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	Tax increment financing (TIF) is a mechanism used to dedicate a portion or all of the property tax revenue collected on property, in order to support outcomes such as redevelopment of difficult sites or structures, or affordable housing development. In Minnesota, the process for establishing a TIF district is initiated by the City, which may proceed to establish a redevelopment TIF district, or a housing TIF district to advance a project like the Annandale School. In each case, the maximum term of a district is 25 years from the date the first "captured" property tax revenue is received. TIF districts do not eliminate the collection of property tax by the City, County and School District; they trap those revenues generated beyond a base level, and authorize their use as repayment of construction costs.	Eligible if building is held by private, taxable party. Could operate as redevelopment TIF district or housing TIF district.	Eligible if building is held by private, taxable party. Could operate as redevelopment TIF district.
Tax Abatement	Tax abatement provides for the capturing of property tax revenue payable to the City only, on property. The term of an abatement is typically limited to 15 years, and the amount is restricted to the larger of 10% of net tax capacity or \$200,000. For Annandale, this tool would allow for abatement of up to roughly \$225,000.	Eligible if building is held by private, taxable party.	Eligible if building is held by private, taxable party.
School District Lessor	The Annandale School District could elect to retain the land under the school and structure a long term lease to the party advancing the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the Annandale School. At an estimated land value of \$8.00 per foot, the Annandale School District could retain roughly	Eligible.	Eligible.

ST DONJEK

\$630,000 of land value on its balance sheet, reducing the overall cost of acquisition and	
rehabilitation by this amount for an end user. * Presumes land area of 75,000 square feet in total.	
<i>J i J j</i>	

Supplemental Data



S DONJEK

Annandale School Reuse Study Ownership and Operations Issues October 10, 2013

Wright County Census Tracts	1004	1005	Combined
Total population	5,053	4,560	9,613
Age Groups			
Under 5 years	6.00%	6.90%	
5 to 9 years	5.00%	5.70%	
10 to 14 years	7.20%	8.40%	
15 to 19 years	6.50%	5.90%	
20 to 24 years	2.90%	3.40%	
25 to 29 years	4.30%	5.30%	
30 to 34 years	7.30%	4.10%	
35 to 39 years	4.30%	7.50%	
40 to 44 years	6.20%	6.10%	
45 to 49 years	9.10%	9.50%	
50 to 54 years	7.40%	7.90%	
55 to 59 years	7.30%	7.10%	
60 to 64 years	7.50%	7.20%	
65 to 69 years	5.00%	6.50%	
70 to 74 years	4.10%	3.80%	
75 to 79 years	3.10%	2.10%	
80 to 84 years	3.50%	1.40%	
85 years and over	3.30%	1.20%	
Also Available with Male / Fen	nale Breakd	lown.	

American Community Survey 2011 Estimates.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	1004	1005
Population 16 years and over	4,044	3,554
In labor force	2,566	2,391
Civilian labor force	2,566	2,391
Employed	2,414	2,194
Unemployed	152	197
Armed Forces	0	0
Not in labor force	1,478	1,163
INCOME AND BENEFITS (IN 2011		
Total households	2,183	1,774
Less than \$10,000	102	78
\$10,000 to \$14,999	144	80
\$15,000 to \$24,999	130	166
\$25,000 to \$34,999	290	124
\$35,000 to \$49,999	373	233
\$50,000 to \$74,999	468	424
\$75,000 to \$99,999	290	311
\$100,000 to \$149,999	244	260
\$150,000 to \$199,999	55	53
\$200,000 or more	87	45
Median household income (dollars)	53,576	60,074
Mean household income (dollars)	67,858	71,680
With earnings	1,672	1,422
Mean earnings (dollars)	68,806	70,209
With Social Security	813	516
Mean Social Security income	16,372	20,107
With retirement income	431	307
Mean retirement income (dollars)	16,602	22,082
With Supplemental Security Income	15	36
Mean Supplemental Security Income	5,680	7,103
With cash public assistance income	67	34
Mean cash public assistance income	7,051	3,050
With Food Stamp/SNAP benefits in the	118	58
		1

American Community Survey 2011 Estimates



Feasibility Proforma

Annandale School: Affordable Housing and Community Center Fall 2013



S DONJEK

OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS: AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMU	NITY CENTER						
		Initial Monthly	Leased Starting in				
Building Program	SF	Rent ¹	Year	•			
Second Floor							
Apt 2BR	1,222	888.80	2				
Apt 2BR	1,209	888.80	2				
Apt 2BR	1,189	888.80	2				
Apt 2BR	1,176	888.80	2				
Apt 1.5BR	1,065	741.60	2				
Apt 1.5BR	950	741.60	2				
Apt 1BR	1,050	741.60	2				
Apt 1BR	713	741.60	2			Phasing:	
First Floor						Square Feet Leased in Year 1	11,812
Apt 2BR	1,223	888.80	3			Square Feet Leased in Year 2	8,574
Apt 2BR	1,200	888.80	3			Square Feet Leased in Year 3	9,962
Apt 2BR	1,189	888.80	3			Square Feet Leased in Year 4	-
Apt 2BR	1,182	888.80	3			Square Feet Leased in Year 5+	-
Apt 1BR	1,062	741.60	3			Total	30,348
Apt 1BR	997	741.60	3				
Community Room	970	-	3				
Apt Studio	713	692.00	3				
Apt 1BR	713	741.60	3				
Apt 1BR	713	741.60	3				
Basement							
Studio/Classroom	1,620	810.00	1				
Studio/Classroom	1,611	805.50	1				
Studio/Classroom	1,423	711.50	1				
Studio/Classroom	1,269	634.50	1				
Studio/Classroom	1,090	545.00	1				
Gymnasium	4,190	1,500.00	1				
Air Handling Equipment	609	-	1				
Unused/Mothballed GSF	-						
Total	30,348	18,742					
Financial Terms							
Capital Structure							
Developer Rehab Cost of Capital (20-Year Amortization)	5.50%						
<u>Cash Flow</u>							
Annual Expense Per GSF	5.00	2					
Annual Rent Escalation	2.00%						
Annual Expense Increase	2.00%						
Long-Term Vacancy Rate	6.00%						
Notes							
(1) Lease rates for housing are 80% of limits based on \$83,900 a	reawide median incon	ne for 2013; \$6.00/fo	ot for studio/classro	om space; \$1,500/mc	onth for gymna	sium uses.	
(2) Includes operating expenses and property taxes.							

PROFORM	1A: AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMU	UNITY CENTER													
	S DONJEK	Sq Ft	Year												
Program			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Second Flo)ť														
	Apt 2BR	1,222	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,001	13,20
	Apt 2BR	1,209	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,001	13,20
	Apt 2BR	1,189	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,001	13,20
	Apt 2BR	1,176	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,001	13,20
	Apt 1.5BR	1,065	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,848	11,0
	Apt 1.5BR	950	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,848	11,0
	Apt 1BR	1,050	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,848	11,00
	Apt 1BR	713	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,848	11,00
First Floor			-	-	-										
	Apt 2BR	1,223	-	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,00
	Apt 2BR	1,200	-	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,00
	Apt 2BR	1,189	-	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,00
	Apt 2BR	1,182	-	-	10,666	10,879	11,096	11,318	11,545	11,776	12,011	12,251	12,496	12,746	13,00
	Apt 1BR	1,062	-	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,84
	Apt 1BR	997	-	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,84
	Community Room	970	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt Studio	713	-	-	8,304	8,470	8,639	8,812	8,989	9,168	9,352	9,539	9,729	9,924	10,12
	Apt 1BR	713	-	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,84
	Apt 1BR	713	-	-	8,899	9,077	9,259	9,444	9,633	9,825	10,022	10,222	10,427	10,635	10,84
Basement			-	-	-										
	Studio/Classroom	1,620	9,720	9,914	10,113	10,315	10,521	10,732	10,946	11,165	11,389	11,616	11,849	12,086	12,32
	Studio/Classroom	1,611	9,666	9,859	10,057	10,258	10,463	10,672	10,885	11,103	11,325	11,552	11,783	12,018	12,25
	Studio/Classroom	1,423	8,538	8,709	8,883	9,061	9,242	9,427	9,615	9,807	10,004	10,204	10,408	10,616	10,82
	Studio/Classroom	1,269	7,614	7,766	7,922	8,080	8,242	8,406	8,575	8,746	8,921	9,099	9,281	9,467	9,65
	Studio/Classroom	1,090	6,540	6,671	6,804	6,940	7,079	7,221	7,365	7,512	7,663	7,816	7,972	8,132	8,29
	Gymnasium	4,190	18,000	18,360	18,727	19,102	19,484	19,873	20,271	20,676	21,090	21,512	21,942	22,381	22,82
	Air Handling Equipment	609	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unused/Me	othballed GSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		30,348	60,078	139,539	228,893	233,471	238,140	242,903	247,761	252,716	257,770	262,926	268,184	273,548	279,01
Expenses															
Vacancy Al	owance		(3,605)	(8,372)	(13,734)	(14,008)	(14,288)	(14,574)	(14,866)	(15,163)	(15,466)	(15,776)	(16,091)	(16,413)	(16,74
Aggregate I	xpense for Active Uses (incl. operating, taxes)		(154,775)	(157,870)	(161,028)	(164,248)	(167,533)	(170,884)	(174,302)	(177,788)	(181,343)	(184,970)	(188,670)	(192,443)	(196,29
Total Expe	incl. operating, taxes)		(158,379)	(166,243)	(174,761)	(178,256)	(181,822)	(185,458)	(189,167)	(192,951)	(196,810)	(200,746)	(204,761)	(208,856)	(213,03
Operating	Income		(98,301)	(26,704)	54,131	55,214	56,318	57,445	58,594	59,766	60,961	62,180	63,424	64,692	65,9
				. /	10.010	50.405	P4 400	F0.000	52.0.5		PP 410			50.041	
Operating	Income / 1.1x coverage		-	-	49,210	50,195	51,199	52,222	53,267	54,332	55,419	56,527	57,658	58,811	59,9
Present Va	lue of NOI for Borrowing Capacity		-	-	44,213	42,746	41,328	39,957	38,632	37,350	36,111	34,913	33,755	32,635	31.5

	S DONIEK	Sq Ft								
Program			14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
Second Floor							-			
	Apt 2BR	1,222	13,527	13,797	14,073	14,354	14,642	14,934	15,233	243,608
	Apt 2BR	1.209	13.527	13,797	14.073	14,354	14.642	14,934	15,233	243.608
	Apt 2BR	1.189	13.527	13,797	14.073	14,354	14.642	14,934	15,233	243.608
	Apt 2BR	1.176	13.527	13,797	14.073	14,354	14.642	14,934	15,233	243.608
	Apt 1.5BR	1,065	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	12,710	203,263
	Apt 1.5BR	950	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	12,710	203,263
	Apt 1BR	1,050	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	12,710	203,263
	Apt 1BR	713	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	12,710	203,263
First Floor			,	,	,	,	,		,	-
	Apt 2BR	1,223	13,261	13,527	13,797	14,073	14,354	14,642	14,934	228,375
	Apt 2BR	1,200	13,261	13,527	13,797	14,073	14,354	14,642	14,934	228,375
	Apt 2BR	1,189	13,261	13,527	13,797	14,073	14,354	14,642	14,934	228,375
	Apt 2BR	1,182	13,261	13,527	13,797	14,073	14,354	14,642	14,934	228,375
	Apt 1BR	1,062	11,065	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	190,552
	Apt 1BR	997	11,065	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	190,552
	Community Room	970	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt Studio	713	10,325	10,531	10,742	10,957	11,176	11,400	11,628	177,808
	Apt 1BR	713	11,065	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	190,552
	Apt 1BR	713	11,065	11,286	11,512	11,742	11,977	12,217	12,461	190,552
Basement										-
	Studio/Classroom	1,620	12,574	12,825	13,082	13,343	13,610	13,883	14,160	236,170
	Studio/Classroom	1,611	12,504	12,754	13,009	13,269	13,535	13,805	14,082	234,858
	Studio/Classroom	1,423	11,045	11,266	11,491	11,721	11,955	12,194	12,438	207,451
	Studio/Classroom	1,269	9,850	10,047	10,247	10,452	10,661	10,875	11,092	185,000
	Studio/Classroom	1,090	8,460	8,629	8,802	8,978	9,158	9,341	9,528	158,905
	Gymnasium	4,190	23,285	23,751	24,226	24,710	25,204	25,708	26,223	437,353
	Air Handling Equipment	609	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unused/Mothl	balled GSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		30,348	284,599	290,291	296,097	302,019	308,059	314,221	320,505	5,100,740
Expenses										
Vacancy Allow	ance		(17,076)	(17,417)	(17,766)	(18,121)	(18,484)	(18,853)	(19,230)	(306,044
Aggregate Exp	ense for Active Uses (incl. operating, taxes)		(200,218)	(204,222)	(208,307)	(212,473)	(216,722)	(221,057)	(225,478)	(3,760,621
Total Expenses	s (incl. operating, taxes)		(217,294)	(221,640)	(226,072)	(230,594)	(235,206)	(239,910)	(244,708)	(4,066,665
							, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
Operating Inc	come		67,306	68,652	70,025	71,425	72,854	74,311	75,797	1,034,075
Operating Inc	come / 1.1x coverage		61,187	62,411	63,659	64,932	66,231	67,555	68,906	1,053,709
			,	,						1 1 1
Present Value	of NOI for Borrowing Canacity		30.505	29.493	28.515	27.569	26.654	25.770	24.915	606,615

Feasibility Proforma

Annandale School: Condo Housing and Community Center Fall 2013



SDONJEK

Building Program	n						
Second Floor		SF	Total Sale Price	Sold in Year			
	Apt 2BR	1,222	91,650	2			
	Apt 2BR	1,209	90,675	2			
	Apt 2BR	1,189	89,175	2			
	Apt 2BR	1,176	88,200	2			
	Apt 1.5BR	1,065	79,875	2			
	Apt 1.5BR	950	71,250	2			
	Apt 1BR	1,050	78,750	2			
	Apt 1BR	713	53,475	2		Phasing:	
First Floor	r ·		,			Square Feet Occupied in Year 1	11.812
	Apt 2BR	1.223	91,725	3		Square Feet Occupied in Year 2	8,574
	Apt 2BR	1.200	90.000	3		Square Feet Occupied in Year 3	9.962
	Apt 2BR	1,189	89,175	3		Square Feet Occupied in Year 4	-
	Apt 2BR	1,182	88.650	3		Square Feet Occupied in Year 5+	-
	Apt 1BR	1.062	79,650	3		Total	30 348
	Apt 1BR	997	74 775	3		1000	50,510
	Community Room	970	-	3			
	Apt Studio	713	53 475	3			
	Apt 1BR	713	53,475	3			
	Apt 1BR	713	53,475	3			
	npt ibit	18 536	1 317 450				
		10,550	1,517,450				
			Initial Monthly	Tarrad Charting in			
Pasamont			Pont ¹	Leased Starting in			
Dasement	Studio /Classes om	1.620	810.00	1 cai			
	Studio/Classroom	1,020	805.50	1			
	Studio/Classroom	1,011	711 50	1			
	Studio/Classroom	1,423	634.50	1			
	Studio/Classroom	1,209	545.00	1			
	Studio/ Classroom	1,090	1 500.00	1			
	Air Handling Engineerat	4,190	1,500.00	1			
1/36 -11 11	Air Handling Equipment	609	-	1			
Unused/Mothballe	ed GSF	-					
Total		50,548					
T 1/T							
Conital Street							
Capital Structure	Cast of Casital (20 Mars Association)	5 5004					
Developer Kehab (Lost of Capital (20-Year Amortization)	5.50%					
Cash Flow		5.00	T 1 1	1			
Annual Expense P	GSF (Used Space)	5.00	Includes operating e	expenses and property	y taxes		
Annual Expense Per GSF (Unused Space) 2.		2.00	Includes operating e	expenses and property	y taxes		
Annual Kent Escal	ation	2.00%					
Annual Expense Ir	ncrease	2.00%					
Long-Term Vacano	cy Kate	6.00%					

PROF	ORMA: CONDO HOUSING AND (COMMUNITY CENTER													
	S DONJEK	Sq Ft										Ye	ear		
Progra	um l		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Second	l Floor														
	Apt 2BR	1,222	-	91,650	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,209	-	90,675	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,189	-	89,175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,176	-	88,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1.5BR	1,065	-	79,875	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1.5BR	950	-	71,250	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	1,050	-	78,750	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	713	-	53,475	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First Fle	loor		-	-	-										
	Apt 2BR	1,223	-	-	91,725	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,200	-	-	90,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,189	-	-	89,175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 2BR	1,182	-	-	88,650	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	1,062	-	-	79,650	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	997	-	-	74,775	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Community Room	970	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt Studio	713	-	-	53,475	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	713	-	-	53,475	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Apt 1BR	713	-	-	53,475	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baseme	ent		-	-	-										
	Studio/Classroom	1,620	9,720	9,914	10,113	10,315	10,521	10,732	10,946	11,165	11,389	11,616	11,849	12,086	12,327
	Studio/Classroom	1,611	9,666	9,859	10,057	10,258	10,463	10,672	10,885	11,103	11,325	11,552	11,783	12,018	12,259
-	Studio/Classroom	1,423	8,538	8,709	8,883	9,061	9,242	9,427	9,615	9,807	10,004	10,204	10,408	10,616	10,828
	Studio/Classroom	1,269	7,614	7,766	7,922	8,080	8,242	8,406	8,575	8,746	8,921	9,099	9,281	9,467	9,656
	Studio/Classroom	1,090	6,540	6,671	6,804	6,940	7,079	7,221	7,365	7,512	7,663	7,816	7,972	8,132	8,294
	Gymnasium	4,190	18,000	18,360	18,727	19,102	19,484	19,873	20,271	20,676	21,090	21,512	21,942	22,381	22,828
	Air Handling Equipment	609	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unused	1/Mothballed GSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		30,348	60,078	704,330	736,905	63,755	65,030	66,331	67,658	69,011	70,391	71,799	73,235	74,699	76,193
D 1		11.010	11.012	11.010	44.042	11.010	11.012	11.010	11.010	11.012	11.012	11.010	11.010	11.012	44.040
Rented	Space (Excludes Condos)	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812
D	(Ell Cl)														
Expens	ses (Excludes Condos)		(2 (05)	(42.260)	(11.01.4)	(2.025)	(2.002)	(2.000)	(4.050)	(4.1.41)	(4.222)	(4.200)	(4.20.4)	(4.400)	(1.572)
Vacancy Allowance		tion town)	(3,605)	(42,260)	(44,214)	(3,825)	(5,902)	(5,980)	(4,059)	(4,141)	(4,223)	(4,508)	(4,594)	(4,482)	(4,5/2)
Aggreg: Total E	Aggregate Expense for Active Uses (incl. operating, taxes)		(62.841)	(01,440)	(02,075)	(03,928)	(05,207)	(00,511)	(07,041)	(09,198)	(74,900)	(76 202)	(77,929)	(70.294)	(20.072)
1 Otal E	Expenses (incl. operating, taxes)		(03,646)	(105,706)	(100,089)	(07,754)	(09,109)	(70,491)	(71,901)	(73,339)	(74,000)	(70,502)	(77,628)	(79,384)	(00,972)
Operat	ting Income		(3760)	600.624	630.016	(3 000)	(4.079)	(4.160)	(1 2/2)	(1 370)	(4.415)	(4 502)	(4 502)	(1 695)	(4 770)
Operat			(3,/06)	000,024	050,010	(3,999)	(4,076)	(4,100)	(4,243)	(4,326)	(4,415)	(4,505)	(4,393)	(4,065)	(4,779)
												1			

PROF	ORMA:	CONDO HOUSING AND COMMUNITY	CENTER								
		🛠 DONJEK	Sq Ft								
Progra	m			14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
Second	Floor										
		Apt 2BR	1,222	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91,650
		Apt 2BR	1,209	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,675
		Apt 2BR	1,189	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89,175
		Apt 2BR	1,176	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,200
		Apt 1.5BR	1,065	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79,875
		Apt 1.5BR	950	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71,250
		Apt 1BR	1,050	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78,750
		Apt 1BR	713	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53,475
First Fl	oor										-
		Apt 2BR	1,223	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91,725
		Apt 2BR	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,000
		Apt 2BR	1,189	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89,175
		Apt 2BR	1,182	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,650
		Apt 1BR	1,062	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79,650
		Apt 1BR	997	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74,775
		Community Room	970	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Apt Studio	713	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53,475
		Apt 1BR	713	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53,475
		Apt 1BR	713	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53,475
Baseme	nt										-
		Studio/Classroom	1,620	12,574	12,825	13,082	13,343	13,610	13,883	14,160	236,170
		Studio/Classroom	1,611	12,504	12,754	13,009	13,269	13,535	13,805	14,082	234,858
		Studio/Classroom	1,423	11,045	11,266	11,491	11,721	11,955	12,194	12,438	207,451
		Studio/Classroom	1,269	9,850	10,047	10,247	10,452	10,661	10,875	11,092	185,000
		Studio/Classroom	1,090	8,460	8,629	8,802	8,978	9,158	9,341	9,528	158,905
		Gymnasium	4,190	23,285	23,751	24,226	24,710	25,204	25,708	26,223	437,353
		Air Handling Equipment	609	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unused	/Mothba	alled GSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total			30,348	77,717	79,272	80,857	82,474	84,124	85,806	87,522	2,777,187
Rented	Space (E	Excludes Condos)	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	11,812	
							-				
Expen	ses (Exc	ludes Condos)									
Vacancy Allowance			(4,663)	(4,756)	(4,851)	(4,948)	(5,047)	(5,148)	(5,251)	(166,631)	
Aggregate Expense for Active Uses (incl. operating, taxes)			(77,928)	(79,487)	(81,077)	(82,698)	(84,352)	(86,039)	(87,760)	(1,463,703)	
Total Expenses (incl. operating, taxes)			(82,591)	(84,243)	(85,928)	(87,647)	(89,400)	(91,188)	(93,011)	(1,630,334)	
Operat	ing Inco	ome		(4,874)	(4,972)	(5,071)	(5,172)	(5,276)	(5,381)	(5,489)	1,146,853

ANNANDALE SCHOOL REUSE STUDY: IF CONDO SALES COVER FUNDING GAP

Analysis **Cost Estimate Calculation** Estimated Sale Proceeds from Condos at Market Price of \$75/foot 1,317,450 Plus: Estimated Gap for Condo Scenario 1,362,726 Total Amount to Be Covered by Condo Sales 2,680,176 **Square Footage of Total Condo Area** 17,566 Capital Rehab Cost + Acquisition Cost Per Square Foot of Condo 153 **Required Sale Price of Condo Units by Square Footage:** Price Ant Studio 713 cauaro foot 110,000

Apt Studio	/13	square reet
Apt 1BR	713	square feet
Apt 1.5BR	950	square feet
Apt 1BR	997	square feet
Apt 1BR	1050	square feet
Apt 1BR	1062	square feet
Apt 1.5BR	1065	square feet
Apt 2BR	1176	square feet
Apt 2BR	1182	square feet
Apt 2BR	1189	square feet
Apt 2BR	1200	square feet
Apt 2BR	1209	square feet
Apt 2BR	1222	square feet
Apt 2BR	1223	square feet



110,000 110,000 145,000 152,500 160,000 162,500 180,000 180,000 182,500 182,500 185,000 187,500

ANNANDALE SCHOOL REUSE STUDY: COMPARISON OF SCENARIOS

SDONJEK

Scenario	Community Center/	Affordable Housing	Community Center/Condos			
Building Program	Square Feet	Percentage	Square Feet	Percentage		
Community Center	11,812	39%	11,812	39%		
Private Ownership	-	0%	18,536	61%		
Affordable Housing	18,536	61%	-	0%		
Total	30,348	100%	30,348	100%		
Cost Estimate Calculation						
Estimated Capital Rehab Cost	7,000,000	100%	7,000,000	100%		
Plus: Acquisition of Land and Building	1	0%	1	0%		
Total	7,000,001	100%	7,000,001	100%		
Illustrative Combination of Funding Sources						
Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit	1,260,000	18%	1,260,000	18%		
Low Income Housing Tax Credit	2,565,283	37%	-	0%		
Private Contribution	500,000	7%	500,000	7%		
Private Lending	600,000	9%	1,030,000	15%		
Proceeds of Resident Purchases	-	0%	1,317,450	19%		
State Historic Tax Credit	1,260,000	18%	1,260,000	18%		
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	269,825	4%	269,825	4%		
Gap	544,893	8%	1,362,726	19%		
Total	7,000,001	100%	7,000,001	100%		

Notes

All figures are prospective estimates, for illustrative purposes only. No funding commitments are in place.

Low income housing tax credit estimate projects awarding of 9% credits, funding 60% of the rehab attributable to affordable housing.

For purposes of historic tax credits, assumes 90% of rehabilitation costs are eligible for historic tax credit.

Philanthropic gift of \$500,000 is assumed for either scenario.

Prospective land and building acquisition value of \$1 is not confirmed by Annandale School District.

APPENDIX G: Other School Reuse Projects



Glencoe City Center 1107 11th Street East Glencoe, MN 55366 320-864-5586

City and county offices, public library, senior center, events center.

Contact: Mark Larson, City Administrator 320-864-6500 mlarson@ci.glencoe.mn.us

http://www.glencoemn.org/landing-page/city-center-home/



Orono Discovery Center 5050 Independence Street Maple Plain, MN 55459

Community education, early childhood, dance studio, clay studio, glass studio, fitness.

Contact: Mitzi Overland, Manager 763-479-1530, ext. 216

http://www.orono.k12.mn.us/page/2676



Central Park Bluff View Suites 523 East Avenue Red Wing, MN 651 840-1392

Luxury condominiums and apartments. Historic properties reuse study completed 1998.

Contact:

George Sutton 651-840-1392 George@gfsutton.com

http://www.redwingcondos.com/index.html



Central Square Cultural and Civic Center 105 2nd Avenue Northeast Glenwood, MN, 56334

Performance venue, conference center, gymnasium, art gallery and classrooms

Contact: Cheryl Larson, Executive Director 320-634-0400 office@centralsquare.org

http://centralsquare.org



Detroit Lakes Community and Cultural Center 826 Summit Avenue Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 218-844-7469

Theater, fitness and aquatic center, senior center, childcare center, alternative learning

http://www.dl-online.com/marketplace/dlccc



Chatfield Center for the Arts 405 Main Street South Chatfield, MN 55923 507-867-2927

Performance venue, conference and meeting rooms, gallery space, event center

Contact: Joel Young jyoung@ci.catfield.mn.us 507-867-3810

http://www.chatfieldcfa.com/index.html

APPENDIX H: List of Interviewees

People Interviewed

Intensive personal interviews with local officials, business owners, financial and realestate professionals, civic leaders, members of the arts community and ordinary citizens were a primary source of information for the Annandale School Reuse Study. Team members conducted on-site interviews with forty-one people over the course of the study.

Betty Anderson Arts community

Blaine Barkley Longtime Annandale Resident

Mary Barkley Brown Youth First staff Former School Board member

Jill Bishop Citizens Committee to Save the '22

John Bishop Retired telecommunications executive

David Burd State Farm Insurance agent Annandale City Council

Megan Czycalla

Events Center Past president Annandale Chamber of Commerce

Will Damann

Recent graduate, Annandale High School

Mike Dougherty Financial planner Former School Board Member

David Ferrell Semi-retired business owner

Judy Grabham Judy's Cottage Act Community Center Committee

Vicki and Larry Greene Faith community

Annandale School Reuse Study Interviewees
Sam Harmoning Former Mayor

Kelly Hinnenkamp Annandale City Administrator

Laura Hood Beckman Citizens Committee to Save the '22

Keith Jerpseth Annandale State Bank

Katie Jones School Board member

Tasha Laudenbach Recent graduate, Annandale High School

Amy Miller Miller's Jewelry

Roger and Karen Millner M&M Bus Company Faith Community

Vicki Morgan Morgan Family Foundation

Kris Nelson Business Owner President, Annandale Chamber of Commerce

Rose Mary Nelson Citizens Committee to Save the '22

Steve Niklaus Superintendent of Schools

Steve and Sharon Prinsen Publishers, *Annandale Advocate*

Zane Schaefer Retired teacher Youth First Board member

Annandale School Reuse Study Interviewees **Ed and Jean Skomoroh** Food shelf

Dawn Schaefer Stumpf Teacher ACT Arts Committee

Patti Van Dorp In Hot Water Coffee and Tea

Harry Wahlquist Star Bank

Kathy Wenngatz Arts community

Tom and Barb Westman *Annandale Advocate* writer Cottage Gourmets

Nicole Wilke Community Education Director

Pam Wurm Youth First staff

Marlene Young Mayor Youth First Chair, ACT

Paul Zabinski School Board member **APPENDIX I: Results of Public Meeting**

Years in the Community Represented by Attendee

About 64 people attended-plus local committee and reuse team members Attendees represented a total of 1888 years within the community, averaging=29.5 years per person

The tallies for the questions will be higher than the number of attendees, because many of the responses recorded at the meeting fell into multiple categories.

Question 1—What Are Your Memories of the 1922 Building?

-Many school and community functions took place in the Gym (12)

-Climbing rope
-Gymnastics
-Had youth group there because was no room at church
-Adult education classes
-Went to first dance/prom there
-Place card scoreboard
-Kids "raised heck" there on Halloween
-Dance recitals
-Easy to break in
-Sliding down the fire escape tubes (9)
-Second and third floors were "off limits" (4)

-The tunnel to the lunchroom in City Hall (2)

-Getting lost on the first day

-A bronze plaque on the second floor

-The third floor was haunted

-Elementary school honors banquet was held in the "dingy" lunchroom

-Three kids attended school in the building—became very familiar with the principal's office

-Cloak rooms

-High ceilings

-Heard about the assassination of JFK while attending classes in that building

-Had first exposure to computers there-remembers noisy dot-matrix printers

-Took children to early childhood classes there

-Craft show where they had Brown's ice cream

-It was very cold near the windows

Question 2—How Do You Envision Annandale in 20 Years?

-It will basically be the same as now, although perhaps with additional residential development (3)

-It will retain its small town feel (8)

Annandale School Reuse Study Results of Public Meeting -There will continue to be a strong focus on families and children

-The new elementary school will be paid for

-There will be a new middle school

-Residents will be voting on another school bond referendum

-Highway 55 will be a three- or four-lane highway (4)

-There will be passenger rail service to the Twin Cities (2)

-It will be a commuter/bedroom community (5)

-It will be an extension of the Metro area (6)

-There will be a variety of local employment opportunities (2)

-There will be a much greater use of technology for employment and education (2)

-It will be a vibrant, prosperous community with a much larger population (14)

-There will be a solid core of successful businesses downtown (8)

-There will be fewer local businesses, more chain stores (4)

-There will be a concentration of new business along Highway 55 (2)

-The lakes will continue to be lovely and appealing, and the area will still be a desirable resort destination (15)

-There will be many more opportunities for outdoor recreation—bike trails, walking paths, sports fields, the lakes (7)

-There will be a multi-generational community center (6)

-Young people/the next generation will want to remain here

-Residents will be younger and wealthier

-The average of the population will be older, and it will be a popular community for retirees (7)

-Taxes will be lower -It will continue to be surrounded by rich farmland

Question 3A—If Money Were No Object, What Should Happen with the Building and Site?

-Community Center using 1922 Building and Site (31)
-Indoor skating/hockey
-Roller rink
-Swimming pool
-Athletic fields
-Tennis courts
-Athletic center (gym, racquetball, weights, exercise machines, etc.)
-Venue for events
-Arts and entertainment center
-Offices for social service agencies
-Senior dining/Senior center

Annandale School Reuse Study Results of Public Meeting -Demolish 1922 Building and develop a Community Center (2)

-Remain a school

-New middle school (not clear if this would incorporate existing building or not) -Move middle school to new school campus and redevelop building and site into community center

-Post-secondary education center (3)

-Rehabilitated for other continued educational use (3)

-Medical clinic for school employees

-Upscale apartments or condominiums (perhaps with a swimming pool) (5)
-Senior housing (2)
-Luxury housing for seniors
-Housing (unspecified) (3)

-Mixed use (19)

-Condominiums/community center
-Commercial on lower level/condominiums on upper levels
-Retail, business and senior housing
-Retail, day care center, senior housing
-Microbrewery, luxury apartments, microbrewery
-Low-income housing/light manufacturing
-Teen center/senior housing
-Community center/senior housing
-Multi-generational housing/community center

-Small business mall

-Business incubator

-Maintain exterior structure

-Sell the building to lower taxes

Question 3B—If Money Were the Only Object, What Should Happen with the Building and Site?

-Continue to use the building as a school (2)

-Retain the middle school and renovate the 1922 building for post-secondary education -Post-secondary education center

-Low-income housing -Luxury condominiums -Condominiums (2) -Housing (unspecified) (2)

Annandale School Reuse Study Results of Public Meeting -Athletic center

-Clear site to make way for a new community center

-Use the building for youth activities, preserve and operate with volunteers

-Mixed use redevelopment (14)

-Community center with emphasis on performance events/space for local businesses, condominiums -Senior center/theater/business space/condominiums -Art studios/convert gym to pool/condominiums

-Use the 1922 building as a community center (3) -Use the building as a teen center

-Stabilize and retain the building until a new use presents itself (5)

-Seek state and federal grants

-Appeal to the whole town for support

-Seek a private developer for the building (7) -Redevelop as a microbrewery -Redevelop for offices

-Individual retail stores

-Offer the 1922 building for private redevelopment—if no developer is forthcoming, demolish the building (2) -Demolish the building (6) -Demolish the building and sell components for salvage value -Demolish the building and use the site as green space/park land

-Convert to a Wal-Mart -Use site for fracking -Don't know