MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors, Massachusetts School Building Authority
FROM: Maureen G. Valente, Chief Executive Officer
             John K. McCarthy, Executive Director/Deputy CEO
DATE: January 20, 2016
RE: Statement of Interest for Core Program – 2015
             Recommendations for Invitations to Eligibility Period

---

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") opened the 2015 Statement of Interest ("SOI") filing period on January 9, 2015. The filing deadline for the Core Program was April 10, 2015, with 97 SOIs submitted for consideration.[1] Of the 97 SOIs submitted, 53 were designated as the priority school by the District. Beginning April 2015, the MSBA conducted its due diligence on the SOIs that were submitted for the Core Program as outlined in Attachment A, SOI Process Overview for Core Program, and as noted below.

- Review SOI submission for completeness – votes, signatures and support documentation;
- Review SOI submissions and accompanying documents for content; and
- Conduct senior study visits, if required.

As discussed with the Board during the process and most recently at the December 16, 2015 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee meeting, the MSBA has now concluded its due diligence for the 2015 SOIs, and is recommending that the Board vote to invite the 26 Districts and schools into the Eligibility Period, as listed in Attachment B.

In addition to this initial invitation to the Eligibility Period, each District and school will be submitted separately for Board approval to commence its Eligibility Period phase. These votes will take place at Board meetings to be held in January, March, May, and July 2016. The Eligibility Period for each such approved District and school will commence two weeks from the date of the District and school-specific Board vote.

At today's Board meeting, MSBA staff is recommending that the Eligibility Period commence as of the date of this Board meeting for the eight Districts and schools listed below and in Attachment C.

Attachment D of this memorandum lists the names of the remaining 47 Districts and 71 schools that submitted an SOI in 2015 but are not being considered for an invitation into the MSBA's grant program.

---

[1] The filing deadline for the Accelerated Repair Program ("ARP") was February 14, 2015 with 61 SOIs submitted. Invitations into the ARP were concluded at the June 3, 2015 Board of Directors Meeting and 24 districts, representing 44 projects were invited into the ARP.

Recommended Invitations to Eligibility Period – January 27, 2016

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration
Belmont	Belmont High School	1970	9–12
Harvard	Hildreth Elementary School	1955	PK–5
Lexington	Maria Hastings Elementary School	1955	PK–5
Ludlow	Chapin Street Elementary School	1959	2–3
Manchester Essex RSD	Memorial Elementary School	1950	PK–5
Marlborough	Richer Elementary School	1965	K–4
Tisbury	Tisbury Elementary School	1929	PK–8
Triton RSD	Pine Grove Elementary School	1954	PK–6

Recommended Invitations to Eligibility Period – Proposed March 2016

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration
Blue Hills RSD	Blue Hills Regional Technical High School	1966 (2000 R)	9–12
Danvers	Ivan G. Smith Elementary School	1975 (1998 R)	K–4
Dennis-Yarmouth RSD	Mattacheese Middle School	1969	6–7
Foxborough	Mabelle M. Burrell Elementary School	1967	PK–4
Marblehead	Elbridge Gerry Elementary School	1906	K–1
Northbridge	W. Edward Balmer Elementary School	1968 (2008 R)	2–4
Shrewsbury	Beal Early Childhood Center	1922 (1987 R)	K–1
Wareham	Minot Forest Elementary School	1966	PK, 3–4

Recommended Invitations to Eligibility Period – Proposed May 2016

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration
Arlington	Arlington High School	1913	9–12
Framingham	Fuller Middle School	1958	6–8
Natick	J. F. Kennedy Middle School	1965	K–4
Pentucket RSD	Pentucket Regional High School	1958 (2001 R)	9–12
Tewksbury	Louise Davy Trahan Elementary School	1952	3–4
Weymouth	Maria Weston Chapman Middle School	1961	7–8

Recommended Invitations to Eligibility Period – Proposed July 2016

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration
Amesbury	Amesbury Elementary School	1968	PK–4
Central Berkshire RSD	Wahconah Regional High School	1961 (2009 R)	9–12
Springfield	Brightwood Elementary School	1898	K–5
West Springfield	Philip G. Coburn Elementary School	1926	K–5

Please note, "R" denotes the year of a renovation

<center>

Attachment A

Core Program SOI Process Overview

</center>

Introduction

The Massachusetts School Building Authority's (the "MSBA") grant program is a non-entitlement, competitive program, and its grants are distributed by the MSBA Board of Directors based on need and urgency, as expressed by the district and validated by the MSBA. The MSBA completes an exhaustive review of available information regarding all districts that submit an SOI for the Core Program each year. The goals of this review include:

- To determine those schools that are the most urgent and needy relative to the pool of SOI submittals filed in that year. The MSBA considers many factors when looking at the totality of the SOIs including, but not limited to, the age of the building, the amount of space per student, the current and projected enrollment, the condition of the major systems of the school, the general environment of the building and the appropriateness of the building to the educational mission;
- To collaborate with districts on the potential project that they have identified as the priority school if they are filing more than one SOI for that given year;
- To understand if the MSBA is currently partnering with the district on another core project already underway; and
- To understand the range of options each district faces when planning for district wide educational facilities.

The following information provides an overview of the SOI process from initial opening of the SOI period each January until the Board of Directors votes to authorize invitations to the MSBA's grant program at a subsequent winter Board meeting.

The SOI Filing Period

The MSBA opens its Statement of Interest system annually for districts to file one or more SOIs for either the Core Program or the Accelerated Repair Program. The SOI is the tool districts use to identify the deficiencies and/or programmatic issues that exist in their facilities. Districts should submit one SOI per school for each school that they believe requires a project. An SOI should only be filed for a facility where a district has the ability to fund a project in the next two years. Over the last several years, the SOI system has opened in early January. SOIs are typically due for the Accelerated Repair Program in early February and for the Core Program in early April.

The MSBA has received approximately 100 to 125 SOIs for the Core Program annually. The number of invitations that the Board is allowed to authorize each year varies, and is contingent on a number of factors. The MSBA has to operate within its annual statutory budget cap. The number of invitations varies based on the characteristics of the pool of applicants, including the number of elementary, middle or high schools that file, total square footage of the schools and the reimbursement rates of the districts that are invited to participate in the MSBA's grant

program. Thus, applying for competition for an MSBA grant is competitive, and not every SOI can be invited into the grant program.

The Funding Cap

The Commonwealth irrevocably dedicated a 1% statewide sales tax, known as the School Modernization Trust fund ('SMART Fund'), to the MSBA's capital program. The state sales tax collections inform the amount of annual funding cap the MSBA can commit for projects. The MSBA's enabling legislation limits increases or decreases annually thereafter by the lesser of four and one half percent (4.5%) of the limit for the prior fiscal year or the percentage increase or decrease of the dedicated sales tax revenue amount over the prior fiscal year.

The SOI Due Diligence Process

The SOI process involves the district filing an electronic and print version of an SOI with the MSBA by the dates established. MSBA staff is readily available to address concerns, questions and issues during the filing period. Once the filing period has closed, MSBA staff commence the due diligence process for all SOIs. This is a 4-phase process, which includes:

1. Review SOI submissions for completeness;
2. Review SOI submissions and accompanying documents for content;
3. Conduct senior study visits, if required; and
4. Recommend SOIs for invitation into Eligibility Period

During this process, the MSBA may seek to obtain additional or clarifying information from districts. As the MSBA reviews the entire cohort of SOIs received, it will determine the appropriate level of due diligence that will be required for each SOI and will notify districts of next steps accordingly.

1. Review SOI submission for completeness:

Once the SOI system has closed, MSBA staff review each submission to check that all of the required materials have been received. The MSBA works with districts throughout the filing period to ensure that the SOI is complete. For all SOI submissions, the district needs to provide:

- A hard copy of the SOI with the required signatures; there are two separate certifications in each SOI where district officials need to sign;
- A hard copy of the closed schools certification with the required signatures;
- Hard copies of the required local vote documentation that is detailed in the SOI; and
- Any supporting materials required to be submitted with the SOI.

Districts are expected to submit the hard copies of the materials and have them post-marked on or before the due date for the Program submission deadline. The district and the MSBA should discuss in advance of the filing date any extenuating circumstances or requests for exceptions to receipt of the hard copy material.

Attachment A

2. **Review each SOI submission and accompanying documents for content:**

Once an SOI is determined to be complete, MSBA staff review the information and any additional documents submitted by the district. MSBA staff then compile the data necessary to assess which SOIs filed in that calendar year may be categorized as the most urgent and needy. Determining the most urgent and needy SOIs relies on many different data sources. MSBA staff use over 50 data points that include the SOI, the MSBA project management system, the MSBA's enrollment tool, the MSBA's 2010 Needs Survey, and information from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ("DESE"). There are many factors that can impact the assessment of urgency and need in an SOI, such as increasing enrollment, overcrowding, building condition, general environment and program deficiencies. As such, it is important to assemble as much data as possible so that staff may gain as complete of a picture of the submitted SOI as possible.

Due to the volume of SOIs submitted for the Core Program, the MSBA requests that each district identify a priority SOI for consideration. This enables the district and the MSBA to focus financial and staff resources on completing a project and ensures that an opportunity for a grant is possible for as many districts as possible. This narrows down the pool of potential projects if districts have submitted multiple schools within the district for consideration.

With its focus on the district identified SOI priority, MSBA staff then look at this smaller pool of submitted SOIs to assess urgency and need focusing on:

- Needs Survey rating of building condition;
- Needs Survey rating of general environment;
- Previous or ongoing project activity with the MSBA; and
- Section 8 of the MSBA's statute.

Consideration of these factors produces a smaller subset of the priority SOIs that appear to be more urgent and needy than the other SOIs submitted that year. With this assessment, a group of SOIs are identified for further consideration. This further review may or may not require a senior study visit. If the MSBA is familiar with the school facility identified in the SOI or if the SOI has already received a senior study visit within the previous two years, a senior study visit may not be needed for that SOI. The MSBA may choose to re-visit a school within this two-year window if the SOI contains new information since the last visit.

3. **Conduct Senior Study Visits, if required:**

If MSBA staff determines that a senior study visit is needed to complete the due diligence process, MSBA staff, accompanied by its technical consultant, will visit the SOI facility. The senior study visit lasts approximately two hours and is an opportunity for the MSBA to further understand the issues identified in the district's SOI. MSBA staff request that the district have someone familiar with the facilities and systems present, as well as someone who is familiar with the curriculum as it relates to the program offered. The district is requested to provide a copy of the school's floor plans (emergency/evacuation plans are sufficient) ahead of the MSBA's visit.

The senior study visit starts with a meeting to review the SOI, the MSBA process and to hear district concerns. The discussion is followed by a tour of the main areas of the school, as well as typical general classrooms and specialty spaces.

Dependent upon the number of senior study visits that are required, this phase can take approximately 8 to 10 weeks, with visits typically scheduled from September through November.

4. Recommend SOIs for Invitation into Eligibility Period:

Once the content review and senior study visits have been completed, MSBA staff once again review the factors, noted above, that can impact the assessment of urgency and need in an SOI (increasing enrollment, evidence of overcrowding, building condition, general environment and program deficiencies), to understand the total impact of all of the factors on the overall need of the SOI.   As the number of invitations that the MSBA can issue varies each year, and the number of SOIs received each year exceeds the MSBA's annual cap expenditure, MSBA staff compares the SOIs that were selected for further review to each other to determine a degree of urgency and need, ranging from minor to major, for each of the SOIs. MSBA staff then provide their findings to the Chief Executive Officer, Executive Director/Deputy Chief Executive Officer, the MSBA's Facilities Assessment Subcommittee and the Board of Directors.   Once the recommendations have been accepted, MSBA staff works with the districts to determine the optimum board meeting for the district to receive an invitation into Eligibility Period from the Board of Directors.

District Name	School Name	Year Built/ Year(s) of Reno(R)/ Add(A)	Grades Served	School Type	Current Enroll	Building Gross SF	MSBA Section 8 Statutory Priorities Check
Amesbury	Amesbury ES	1968	PK-4	ES	433	48,000	2, 4, 5, 7,
Arlington	Arlington HS	1913	9-12	HS	1,217	378,620	3, 4, 5, 7,
Belmont	Belmont HS	1970	9-12	HS	1,236	257,120	2, 3, 4, 5, 7,
Blue Hills RSD	Blue Hills RTHS	1966	9-12	HS	859	342,000	5,
Central Berkshire RSD	Wahconah RHS	1961	9-12	HS	543	116,000	5, 7,
Danvers	Ivan G Smith ES	1975	K-4	ES	296	44,021	7,
Dennis-Yarmouth RSD	Mattacheese MS	1969	6-7	MS	461	156,600	5,
Foxborough	Mabelle M Burrell ES	1967	PK-4	ES	339	40,000	5, 7,
Framingham	Fuller MS	1958	6-8	MS	441	196,000	1, 5, 7,
Harvard	Hildreth ES	1955	PK-5	ES	433	68,700	5, 7,
Lexington	Maria Hastings ES	1955	PK-5	ES	427	59,853	2, 5, 7,
Ludlow	Chapin Street ES	1959	2-3	ES	342	43,000	2, 5, 7,
Manchester Essex	Memorial ES	1950	PK-5	ES	421	62,000	2, 5, 7,
Marblehead	Elbridge Gerry ES	1906	K-1	ES	144	17,000	5, 7,
Marlborough	Richer ES	1965	K-4	ES	598	66,000	2, 5, 7,
Natick	J F Kennedy MS	1965	5-8	MS	483	106,000	2, 4, 5, 7,
Northbridge	W Edward Balmer ES	1968	2-4	ES	469	70,857	5, 7,
Pentucket RSD	Pentucket RHS	1958	9-12	HS	765	213,400	5, 7,
Shrewsbury	Beal ECC	1922	K-1	ES	309	32,100	5, 7,
Springfield	Brightwood ES	1898	K-5	ES	375	55,473	5, 7,
Tewksbury	Louise Davy Trahan ES	1952	3-4	ES	242	40,000	7,
Tisbury	Tisbury ES	1929	PK-8	ES	331	60,000	4, 5, 7,
Triton	Pine Grove ES	1954	PK-6	ES	514	90,852	5,
Wareham	Minot Forest ES	1966	PK,3-4	ES	494	64,600	5, 7,
West Springfield	Philip G Coburn ES	1926	K-5	ES	502	73,200	7,
Weymouth	Maria Weston Chapman MS	1961	7-8	MS	966	233,226	5, 7,

Attachment C - 2015 Statement of Interest Board Memo

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration
Belmont	Belmont High School	1970	9–12
Harvard	Hildreth Elementary School	1955	PK–5
Lexington	Maria Hastings Elementary School	1955	PK–5
Ludlow	Chapin Street Elementary School	1959	2–3
Manchester Essex RSD	Memorial Elementary School	1950	PK–5
Marlborough	Richer Elementary School	1965	K–4
Tisbury	Tisbury Elementary School	1929	PK–8
Triton RSD	Pine Grove Elementary School	1954	PK–6

District Name	School Name	MSBA Section 8 Statutory Priorities Check	MSBA Due Diligence Findings
Amherst	Fort River Elementary	5, 7	Not district priority, couple with active CORE Project
Athol-Royalston	Athol High	5,7	Not district priority, active CORE project, Low NS Rank
Bedford	John Glenn MS	4, 7	Not district priority, alternative exists
Bedford	Lt Elezer Davis ES	2, 4, 7	Alternative exists, Low NS Rank
Bedford	Lt Job Lane ES	4, 7	Not district priority, alternative exists, Low NS Rank
Boston	Carter Develop Day Care	5, 7	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Braintree	Liberty	2, 4, 5	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Bristol-Plymouth	Bristol-Plymouth VTHS	5	Low NS Rank
Brookline	Brookline High	2, 4	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Burlington	Burlington High	5	Low NS Rank
Dennis-Yarmouth	Wixon Middle Sch	5	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Dracut	Brookside Elementary	5, 7	Low NS Rank
Dracut	George H. Englesby IS	5	Not district priority, Low NS Rank
Dracut	Joseph A Campbell Elem	5, 7	Not district priority, Low NS Rank
Dudley-Charlton	Shepherd Hill RHS	5, 7,	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
East Longmeadow	East Longmeadow High	5, 7	Low NS Rank
Easton	Center School	7	Active district ARPs, Low NS Rank
Easton	Moreau Hall	7	Not district priority, active district ARPs, Low NS Rank
Easton	Parkview Elementary	7	Not district priority, active district ARPs, Low NS Rank
Everett	Everett HS	4,	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Fitchburg	Goodrich Kindergarten	3, 5, 7	District not ready to proceed
Fitchburg	Crocker Elementary	5, 7	District not ready to proceed
Fitchburg	Arthur M Longsjo MS	5	District not ready to proceed
Fitchburg	South Street Elementary	5	District not ready to proceed
Gardner	Elm Street School	7	Active ARP underway at facility
Gr Fall River	Diman RVTHS	5, 7	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Halifax	Halifax Elementary	5	Refiling under ARP for roof replacement
Leicester	Leicester Middle	7	Active ARP, Low NS Rank
Leicester	Leicester Memorial Elem	7	Not district priority, active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Leicester	Leicester Primary School	7	Not district priority, active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Lincoln	Lincoln School	5, 7	Low NS Rank
Ludlow	Veterans Park ES	2, 5, 7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Manchester Essex	Essex Elementary/Middle	5, 7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Marblehead	Coffin ES	5, 7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Marthas Vineyard	Marthas Vineyard Reg HS	5, 7	Low NS Rank
Middleborough	Henry Burkland	5	Not district priority, active district CORE project, Low NS Rank
Nantucket	Nantucket Elementary	2, 4	Proceeding independent of MSBA
Nauset	Nauset Regional High	5, 7	Active ARP, Low NS Rank
Needham	William Mitchell	2, 7	Not district priority, active district CORE project

District Name	School Name	MSBA Section 8 Statutory Priorities Check	MSBA Due Diligence Findings
Needham	Pollard Middle	2, 7	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Norfolk County	Norfolk County Agr	5	CORE project just completed at facility
Northbridge	Northbridge Middle	5	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Northbridge	Northbridge Elementary	5	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Norwood	Dr. Philip O. Coakley MS	5	Active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Orange	Dexter Park	5, 7	District not ready to proceed
Peabody	William A Welch Sr	5	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Peabody	John E Burke	5	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Peabody	Center	7	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Quincy	Squantum	7	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Salem	Salem High	5, 7	Active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Springfield	Gerena ES	5, 7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Springfield	Homer Street ES	5, 7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
South Shore	So Shore Voc Tech High	5, 7	Active ARP underway at facility
Stoneham	Stoneham HS	5, 7	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Stoughton	South Elementary	7	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Tewksbury	Heath-Brook ES	7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Tewksbury	North Street	7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Tewksbury	Heath-Brook	7	Not district priority, recommending priority SOI
Tyngsborough	Tyngsborough MS	5,	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Watertown	Watertown High	7	Active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Webster	Bartlett Jr Sr HS	5,	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Wellesley	John D Hardy	5, 7	Active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Wellesley	Ernest F Upham	5, 7	Not district priority, active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Wellesley	Hunnewell	5, 7	Not district priority, active district ARP, Low NS Rank
Westfield	Westfield High	3, 7	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Westfield	Westfield Voc Tech High	7	Not district priority, active district CORE project
Whitman-Hanson	Maquan Elementary	5, 7	Failed vote - district reconsidering priority
Whittier	Whittier RVTHS	5, 7	Deficiencies not among highest most needy - urgent
Worcester	Doherty Memorial HS	3, 5, 7	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Worcester	Burncoat Senior High	3, 5, 7	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects
Worcester	Worcester East Middle	5	Not district priority, active ARP & CORE projects

Exhibit A

2015 SOI Invitations to Eligibility Period

District	School	Age of Existing Building	Grade Configuration	2015-2016 Enrollment	Existing Square Footage
Town of Amesbury	Amesbury Elementary School	1968	PK-4	433	48,000
Town of Arlington	Arlington High School	1913	9-12	1,217	378,620
Town of Belmont	Belmont High School	1970	9-12	1,236	257,120
Blue Hills Regional School District	Blue Hills Regional Technical High School	1966	9-12	859	342,000
Central Berkshire Regional School District	Wahconah Regional High School	1961	9-12	543	116,000
Town of Danvers	Ivan G. Smith Elementary School	1975	K-4	296	44,021
Dennis-Yarmouth Regional School District	Mattacheese Middle School	1969	6-7	461	156,600
Town of Foxborough	Mabelle M. Burrell Elementary School	1967	PK-4	339	40,000
Town of Framingham	Fuller Middle School	1958	6-8	441	196,000
Town of Harvard	Hildreth Elementary School	1955	PK-5	433	68,700
Town of Lexington	Maria Hastings Elementary School	1955	K-5	427	59,853
Town of Ludlow	Chapin Street Elementary School	1959	2-3	342	43,000
Manchester Essex Regional School District	Memorial Elementary School	1950	PK-5	421	62,000
Town of Marblehead	Elbridge Gerry School	1906	K-1	144	17,000
City of Marlborough	Richer Elementary School	1965	K-4	598	66,000
Town of Natick	J.F. Kennedy Middle School	1965	5-8	483	106,000
Town of Northbridge	W. Edward Balmer Elementary School	1968	2-4	469	70,857
Pentucket Regional School District	Pentucket Regional High School	1958	9-12	765	213,400
Town of Shrewsbury	Beal Early Childhood Center	1922	K-1	309	32,100
City of Springfield	Brightwood Elementary School	1898	K-5	375	55,473
Town of Tewksbury	Louise Davy Trahan Elementary School	1952	3-4	242	40,000
Town of Tisbury	Tisbury Elementary School	1929	PK-8	331	60,000
Triton Regional School District	Pine Grove Elementary School	1954	PK-6	514	90,852
Town of Wareham	Minot Forest Elementary School	1966	PK, 3-4	494	64,600
City of West Springfield	Philip G. Coburn Elementary School	1926	K-5	502	73,200
Town of Weymouth	Maria Weston Chapman Middle School	1961	7-8	966	233,226