District: City of Brockton
School Name: Brockton High School
Recommended Category: Preferred Schematic
Date: June 17, 2026

Recommendation

That the Executive Director be authorized to approve the City of Brockton (the "District"), as part of its Invitation to Feasibility Study, to proceed into Schematic Design for an addition and renovation project at the existing Brockton High School that will continue to serve students in grades 9 through 12. MSBA staff has reviewed the Feasibility Study and accept the District's Preferred Schematic.

District Information	
District Name	City of Brockton
Elementary Schools	Brookfield Elementary School (K-5) Downey Elementary School (K-5) Dr. W. Arnone Community School (K-5) Gilmore Elementary School (K-5) Hancock Elementary School (K-5) John F. Kennedy Elementary School (K-5) Louis F. Angelo Elementary School (K-5) Mary E. Baker Elementary School (K-5) Oscar F. Raymond Elementary School (K-5)
Middle Schools	Ashfield Middle School (6-8) Frederick Douglas Academy (6-12) Huntington Therapeutic Day School (6-12) Joseph F. Plouffe Academy (6-8) East Junior High School (6-8) North Junior High School (6-8) South Junior High School (6-8) West Junior High School (6-8)
High Schools	Brockton Champion High School (9-12) Brockton High School (9-12) Frederick Douglas Academy (6-12) Huntington Therapeutic Day School (6-12)
Priority School Name	Brockton High School
Type of School	High School
Grades Served	9-12
Year Opened	1970
Existing Square Footage	545,000
Additions/Renovations	2012 – Renovation to ceilings and floors in one of the buildings due to burst pipe. 2012 – Roof and windows were partially replaced as part of MSBA's Green Repair Program. 2014 – Biotech Lab was renovated to have running water and gas.

Acreage of Site	67 acres
Building Issues	The District identified deficiencies in the following areas: – Mechanical systems – Electrical systems – Plumbing systems – Building envelope – Interior materials – Roofing – Accessibility In addition to the physical plant issues, the District reported that the existing facility does not support the delivery of its educational program.
Original Design Capacity	Unknown
2025-2026 Enrollment	3,305 students
Agreed Upon Enrollment	3,640 students
Enrollment Specifics	The District and MSBA have mutually agreed upon a design enrollment of 3,640 students serving grades 9-12.
Total Project Budget – Debt Exclusion Anticipated	To be determined.

MSBA Board Votes	
Invitation to Eligibility Period	December 21, 2022
Invitation to Feasibility Study	June 26, 2024
Preferred Schematic Authorization	On June 24, 2026 Board agenda
Project Scope & Budget Authorization	District is targeting Board authorization on December 9, 2026.
Feasibility Study Reimbursement Rate (Incentive points are not applicable)	79.58%

Consultants	
Owner's Project Manager (the "OPM")	Leftfield, LLC
Designer	Kaestle Boos Associates, Inc.

Discussion

The existing Brockton High School is a 545,000 square foot facility located on a 67-acre site, currently serving students in grades 9-12. The original school building was constructed in 1970, with renovations to ceilings and floors in one of the buildings due to a burst pipe in 2012, and a Biotech Lab was renovated to include running water and gas in 2014. Additionally, the roof and windows were partially replaced in 2012 as part of MSBA's Green Repair Program.

The District identified numerous deficiencies in the Statement of Interest in the following areas: mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, building envelope, and accessibility. In addition to the physical plant issues, the District reported that the existing facility does not support the delivery of its educational program.

In conjunction with its consultants, the District performed a comprehensive assessment of the existing conditions and the educational program and received input from educators, administrators, and facilities personnel. Based on the findings of this effort, the District and its consultants initially studied eight (8) preliminary options that included one (1) code upgrade option, three (3) addition/renovation options, and four (4) new construction options. The following is a detailed list of the preliminary options considered.

Option	**Description of Preliminary Options**
Option 1	Code upgrade at the existing Brockton High School facility with 548,000 sf designed for 3,640 students in grades 9-12; with an estimated total project cost range of $460-$500 million.
Option 2A	Addition/renovation that retains the Gym and Auditorium and a similar building footprint, where 532,000 sf is proposed to be renovated and 92,000 sf is proposed new construction for a total of 624,000 sf, for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School; with an estimated total project cost range of $735-$765 million.
Option 2B	Addition/renovation that retains only the Gym and Auditorium with newly constructed academic components, where 153,000 sf is proposed to be renovated and 544,000 sf is proposed new construction for a total of 697,000 sf, for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School; with an estimated total project cost range of $780-$800 million.
Option 3A	New construction that proposes 651,029 sf (north of existing with east-to-west central spine) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School site; with an estimated total project cost range of $725-$750 million.
Option 3B	New construction that proposes 651,029 sf (north of existing with north-to-south central spine) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School site; with an estimated total project cost range of $722-$748 million.
Option 3C	New construction that proposes 651,029 sf (north of existing with east-to-west central spine, house location variation) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School site; with an estimated total project cost range of $728-$758 million.
Option 3D	New construction that proposes 675,629 sf (north of existing with east-to-west central spine and expanded gym and auditorium) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School site; with an estimated total project cost range of $737-$763 million.
Option 4	Addition/renovation (multi-phased funding and construction) for grades 9-12 with an enrollment of 3,640 students at the existing Brockton High School; with an estimated total project cost range of $1.4-$1.5 billion

As a result of this analysis, the District determined that “Option 1” would not be considered for further evaluation because this option would not fully address the needs of the District’s educational program. However, please note that subsequent to the evaluation of preliminary options, the MSBA worked with the District and the consultant team to ensure that this option would be included as part of the final evaluation of options to be considered for cost comparison purposes only.

The District determined that "Option 2A" would not be considered for further evaluation based on the estimated duration of construction. This duration results in a majority of the work being phased/ occupied construction. The duration of construction would have a significant impact on the day-to-day learning of the students as well as an increase cost of construction for work occurring during "2nd shift" and happening over a longer period of time. It was determined that this option is not educationally appropriate or fiscally responsible when compared to "Option 2B".

The District determined "Option 3A" and "Option 3B" would not be considered for further evaluation as these options would require early demolition of the existing pool. In comparison to "Option 3C", which maintains the existing pool during construction, it was decided that "Option 3A" and "Option 3B" would not be explored further.

Although "Option 4" results in a similar addition/renovation building project when compared to "Option 2B", the District determined that this option would not be considered for further evaluation based on several reasons. The primary concern for the District is the added cost of escalation over a proposed 10-year phased approach. Phase 1 scope would include code upgrade work that would be required ahead of the full renovation of the same building sections in Phase 2. Based on analysis, the cost for Phase 2 would occur approximately 10 years after Phase 1. Planning and constructing a multi-phase project would also incur additional fees for "re-design" ahead of the Phase 2 work based on anticipated changes in the building code, building technology, and available building materials. The District expressed no interest in an extended phasing of the project due to the major cost drivers and estimated cost.

Following the evaluation of preliminary options, "Options 2C and 2D" were developed as variations to the addition/renovation scenarios and were included in the final evaluation and development of the preliminary design pricing as presented below.

Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing for Final Evaluation of Options

Option (Description)	**Total Gross Square Feet**	**Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sq. ft.)**	**Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sq. ft.)**	**Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost***	**Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sq. ft.)**	**Estimated Total Project Costs**
Option 1: (Code Upgrade)	537,781	531,781 $761/sq. ft.	N/A	$52,002,309	$456,852,502 $859/ sq. ft.	$511,624,965
Option 2B: (Addition/ Renovation) (4) Section Building Addition with reno to Perf Arts (expanded Aud capacity) and Athletic sections***	***669,072***	***138,672 $904/sq. ft.***	***530,400 $844/sq. ft.***	***$80,382,271***	***$653,434,218 $977/sq. ft.***	***$801,392,377***
Option 2C: (Addition/ Renovation) (2) Section Building Addition with reno to Perf Arts (expanded Aud capacity) and Athletic sections	669,072	138,672 $908/sq. ft.	530,400 $847/sq. ft.	$83,005,328	$657,909,238 $932/sq. ft.	$806,692,896

Option (Description)	Total Gross Square Feet	Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sq. ft.)	Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sq. ft.)	Site, Building Takedown, Haz Mat. Cost*	Estimated Total Construction ** (cost*/sq. ft.)	Estimated Total Project Costs
Option 2D: (Addition/ Renovation) Single Building Addition with reno to Perf Arts (w/o expanded Aud capacity) and Athletic sections	654,448	66,613 $863/sq. ft.	587,835 $850/sq. ft.	$77,322,766	$634,152,969 $969/sq. ft.	$777,063,931
Option 3C: (New Construction) Aud for 750 seats without Pool	648,711	N/A	648,711 $824/sq. ft.	$79,162,448	$613,590,031 $946/sq. ft.	$753,544,393
Option 3D: (New Construction) Aud for 950 seats without Pool	651,711	N/A	651,711 $832/sq. ft.	$76,468,486	$618,848,449 $950/sq. ft.	$759,756,908

** Marked up construction costs*
*** Does not include construction contingency*
******District's Preferred Schematic***

The District has selected "Option 2B" as its Preferred Schematic to proceed into Schematic Design, as the District determined this option to be the most fiscally responsible and educationally appropriate long-term solution for the District. "Option 2B" is anticipated to allow for occupied phased construction minimizing disruption to ongoing school operations, maintain the existing pool and 1,572-seat auditorium, re-create four distinct academic houses, and accommodate desired expansion of Career and Technical Education ("CTE") programs.

"Option 1" was not selected as the District determined that this option does not meet its educational program and undersized educational spaces remain the same size. Furthermore, construction activity would be disruptive to occupied school operations and phased construction would require a longer construction duration.

Although there are many advantages and similarities associated with "Option 2C" when compared to "Option 2B", "Option 2C" was not selected by the District primarily because this option results in a compact footprint proposing to blend two distinct academic houses, compared to the District's preference to continue to deliver their program across four distinct academic houses.

Although there are many advantages and similarities associated with "Option 2D" when compared to "Option 2B", including four distinct academic houses, "Option 2D" was not selected by the District primarily because this option results in the new construction of an Auditorium that aligns with MSBA guidelines but is smaller than the existing larger Auditorium. In addition, it is anticipated that "Option 2D" would result in significant site circulation impacts during construction and anticipated disruption to athletic fields.

Although there are many advantages associated with the all new construction scenarios in "Option 3C" and "Option 3D", these options were not selected by the District primarily because these options result

in a scenario with two distinct academic houses, no pool, and smaller than existing Auditorium. In addition, it is anticipated that "Option 3C" and "Option 3D" would result in significant site circulation impacts during construction and anticipated disruption to athletic fields. There are also no provisions for parking at Campanelli Stadium within "Option 3D".

The District presented its proposed Preferred Schematic to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee ("FAS") on May 20, 2026. At that meeting, members discussed the following items: appreciation of the Educational Program and the updates made since the original submission; distribution of Special Education spaces, clarification of substantially separate programs, and the DESE review process following Schematic Design; current and proposed Chapter 74/CTE programs and anticipated updates to the viability documentation previously reviewed by DESE; appreciation for the expansion of CTE programs; the proposed planetarium and associated learning opportunities; suggestion to collaborate with museums and other local organizations to develop additional non-CTE program offerings and potential career opportunities for students; continued consideration of user needs in making design decisions as the project progresses; appreciation for the overall building design, organization, and architectural elements that serve to break down scale; building massing, clarification of double-height spaces and sectional connections as well as appreciation for the recognition of outdoor spaces; the student experience and opportunities to incorporate transparency and visibility into a variety of program areas; considerations for site development and construction logistics, including coordinating with adjacent community uses and proximity to the existing building; considerations associated with sustainable design and the energy profile of the proposed project; appreciation for the participation of the Director of Operations and Facilities at the meeting and early involvement in the proposed project; and, suggestion to seek insight from MSBA's Post Occupancy Evaluation team as well as other districts regarding design choices and long-term maintenance considerations.

MSBA staff reviewed the conclusions of the Feasibility Study and all other subsequent submittals with the District and found:

1) The options investigated were sufficiently comprehensive in scope, the approach undertaken in this study was appropriate, and the District's Preferred Schematic is reasonable and cost-effective and meets the needs identified by the District.

2) The District has submitted an operational budget for educational objectives and a capital budget statement for MSBA review.

3) The District's Special Education submission will be subject to final review and approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as part of the Schematic Design submittal, which is prior to executing a Project Scope and Budget Agreement.

4) Subject to Board approval, the MSBA will participate in a project that includes spaces that meet MSBA guidelines, except for variations previously agreed to by the MSBA. All proposed spaces will be reviewed during the Schematic Design phase.

5) As part of the Schematic Design phase, the District will work with the MSBA to determine a mutually agreeable methodology to differentiate eligible costs from ineligible costs.

Based on the review outlined above, staff recommend that the City of Brockton be approved to proceed into Schematic Design for an addition and renovation project at the existing Brockton High School that will continue to serve students in grades 9-12.