

**ENROLLMENT PROJECTION  
AND  
EDUCATIONAL SPACE ANALYSIS  
THE MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL  
AUGUST, 2004**



**ENROLLMENT PROJECTION  
AND  
EDUCATIONAL SPACE ANALYSIS  
THE MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL  
AUGUST, 2004**

**LONG RANGE  
ENROLLMENT PROJECTION**

**AND**

**EDUCATIONAL SPACE ANALYSIS**

**FOR**

**THE MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL**

**PREPARED BY**

**THE MERRIMACK EDUCATION CENTER**

**Revised August 16, 2004**

# MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL

## SPACE ANALYSIS

Members of the Merrimack Education Center team visited the Mt. Greylock Regional School on two occasions in the process of developing a long-range student enrollment projection and space analysis of the facility.

David Backlin, MEC Associate and former administrator with the State Department of Education School Building Assistance Bureau, carried out the first visit. Mr. Backlin did a physical survey of the entire building noting the adequacy of existing classroom and educational space. A summary of physical space can be found in Table I School Space Inventory Guide.

Dr. Arthur Wagman, MEC Director of School Planning, carried out the second visit. Dr. Wagman met with school and district administrators and teachers to determine how well the existing facilities met their current educational needs and to determine what changes would be required to address future educational requirements.

We have not examined the physical structure of the building and have limited our analysis strictly to its ability to support current and future educational programs.

### BUILDING OBSERVATIONS

The Mt. Greylock Regional School was constructed in 1960 with an addition added in 1968. This is a sprawling 44 year old building of brick construction, configured around several courtyards of different sizes housing a Middle School and High School under one roof. Since the addition and relocation in 1968 of the library, cafeteria and some classrooms little of a structural nature has been done to improve or update school facilities. As a result many of the current facilities were not designed to accommodate the

Table I  
**Merrimack Education Center**  
*School Building Assistance Services*

**School Space Inventory Guide**

**School**  
 Mt. Greylock Jr/Sr  
 High School

**Age**      **# of Students**      **Grades**      **Acreage**

<b>Educational Spaces</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comments</b>
General Classroom	33 Available	1 classroom used as A.D. office
Art	2	+ Art Display area, No Ceramic Program, No Kiln, Limited Natural Light
Music	4	Orchestra, Chorus, Piano Lab, Band - all in different areas of the school
Computer Lab	4	Including Computer Lab in Library
Science	9	1 Physics, 2 Biology, 2 Chemistry, 4 General Science, 2 Prep rooms
Gym	1	+ Exercise room and Wrestling room
Special Needs	7	6 are regular size, 1 is 300 SF
Library/Media Center	1	Includes Computer lab
Remedial	1	
Cafeteria/Kitchen	1	+ Faculty Dining area
Auditorium	1	Poor Condition, Limited Facilities. No Handi. Access
Guidance Suite	✓	
Health Room	1	
Admin Suite 7 - 12	✓	
Conference Room	2	
Planning Room	✓	
Teacher's Room	1	
Yearbook	1	
Greenhouses	2	Used for Storage
Middle School Tech	1	
Stained Glass Shop	1	Former Wood Shop
Drafting	1	
District Wide Admin Offices	✓	Superintendent, Business Manager

**Space Concerns:**

- Need Conference Room
- Need Additional Teacher Planning Space

curriculum demanded of today's schools. Although the overall footprint of the building is quite substantial, interior space is diminished by the incorporation of 5 courtyards that, although attractive, do not significantly contribute to the educational facilities.

**Middle School:** The current concept in Middle School education incorporates a system of clusters or pods representing each grade. Within these clusters, classrooms for basic subjects such as math, science, English, foreign language and social studies are grouped around a central core, which is utilized for class meetings, large group instruction, team teaching etc. Common facilities for other subjects like art, music, drama are also available. The present configuration of the Mt. Greylock Regional School does not lend itself to this concept. The present Middle School is housed in a single corridor with classrooms running the length of the corridor on both sides. This configuration dictates a traditional, rigid instructional program that precludes the effective utilization of team teaching or grade grouping and eliminates flexibility of instruction that is so important in a contemporary Middle School program. Without major structural modifications the Mt. Greylock Regional School is not able to adapt to the new Middle School model and will deprive its Middle School students of the educational benefits accruing from this more progressive method of instruction.

### **PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS**

**Foreign Language:** There are no dedicated language facilities. Computer technology for language instruction is limited.

**Computer Technology:** There are no centralized stations in the computer labs. Computer technology, equipment and programs are not standardized.

**Physical Education:** Locker and shower facilities are in poor condition. No space to expand program offerings. Rhythm class is held in the auditorium. Gymnasium and physical education facilities are not handicapped accessible.

**Gymnasium:** Weight and exercise rooms, excellent equipment. Facilities very shabby.

**Science:** Science labs tend to be smaller than new standards require (1200 sq. ft.). There are not enough lab stations for all students and some facilities must be shared. Safety facilities such as hoods, emergency showers, fountains do not meet current requirements. AP experiments are carried out at Williams College because of superior facilities, and because some of the equipment necessary for these experiments does not exist in the Regional School. Science prep areas are small, cluttered and used primarily as storage rooms. All science facilities need to be updated to support a comprehensive science program.

**Mathematics:** Computer projection equipment is limited

**SPED:** OT/PPT held in classroom space not designed for this purpose.

**Art:** Art rooms have limited natural light because of eastern exposure into courtyard. No ceramics program because of lack of kiln.

**Music:** Music facilities are not grouped together for student or faculty convenience. The band room and related facilities are across from the auditorium. The orchestra and the chorus rooms are next to the cafeteria and kitchen while the room used for the piano lab is at the opposite end of the school.

**Auditorium:** Original seating is in very poor condition and should be replaced. General lighting very poor and needs updating. No dedicated dressing space. No dedicated rehearsal space. Lobby area in front of auditorium small, cannot adequately accommodate large crowds. No facilities for handicapped students.

Teachers also commented on the lack of small group rooms, limited workspace and satisfactory storage area.

## SPACE UTILIZATION

We did a complete analysis of room requirements as indicated by the current curriculum. This included course offerings, number of sections, sessions and periods available. The number of periods is based upon a seven period day in a seven day rotating cycle.

Based upon our analysis (Table II Major Programs and Room Requirements), there does not appear to be a shortage of classroom space for the programs being offered. Secondary schools are traditionally scheduled to achieve 80% utilization of design capacity. Based upon class scheduling and space utilization our analysis shows an **additional 14 spaces available for educational use**. It is possible better utilization of classroom space can be obtained through revised scheduling and we recommend the scheduling process be reviewed.

We also noted that some areas could be modified for more efficient use. The Director of Athletics' office for example (E49) is a 920 square foot classroom that could be subdivided to provide needed office space for other departments. Also the piano lab occupies 885 square feet although the equipment in that space, at the present time, occupies only a portion of the space. Greenhouses space is also not effectively utilized. If programs in biology and /or horticulture are not going to utilize that space for educational purposes, it could be used for general storage thus opening up areas presently used for storage for other uses. Some issues relating to equipment, technology, and general maintenance could possibly be addressed through the operating budget on a scheduled basis. However, as noted earlier, this is no longer a new school and many of the facilities have outlived their usefulness and /or are not up to current standards.

Despite the fact enrollments from member Towns are projected to fall, it is necessary to update the existing facilities to prevent further deterioration and to assure the facilities are capable of supporting the additional educational programs and requirements imposed by new, more stringent curriculum guidelines as established under the Education Reform Act.

**GREYLOCK**

Table II

**MT. GREYLOCK MAJOR PROGRAMS & ROOM REQUIREMENTS**

Subject	Sections	Sessions	Total	Periods	Rooms Req'd.	Rooms Avail.	Diff.
<b>English</b>							
Eng 9	4	7	28	49	0.6		
H.Eng 9	2	7	14	49	0.3		
Eng 10	3	7	21	49	0.4		
H.Eng 10	3	7	21	49	0.4		
Eng 11	4	7	28	49	0.6		
H. Eng 11	2	7	14	49	0.3		
Eng 12	3	7	21	49	0.4		
H.Eng 12	2	7	14	49	0.3		
Eng 7	6	7	42	49	0.9		
Eng 8	7	7	49	49	1.0		
IntroDrama	2	7	14	49	0.3		
CreativeWriting	2	7	14	49	0.3		
CreativeWriting II	1	7	7	49	0.1		
APEng11	1	7	7	49	0.1		
APEngLit	1	7	7	49	0.1		
<b>Total English</b>					<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SPED - OTHER</b>							
Peer Resource	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Sports Medicine	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Child Dev.	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Acad. Supp.9	4	7	28	49	0.6		
Acad. Supp10	4	7	28	49	0.6		
Acad. Supp. 11/12	5	7	35	49	0.7		
Dev. Eng.	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Dev. Read. MS	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Dev. Math9/10	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Dev. Math 11/12	3	7	21	49	0.4		
Acad. Supp. 7	3	7	21	49	0.4		
Dev. Eng. MS	2	7	14	49	0.3		
Dev. Math	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Acad. Supp. 8	3	7	21	49	0.4		
Speech/Lang 6	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Speech/ Lang.7	1	7	7	49	0.1		
MS Reading MS	2	7	14	49	0.3		
Dev. Math 8	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Lang. Comm.	1	7	7	49	0.1		
Pre Voc. Life Skills	2	7	14	49	0.3		
					<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>							
Algebra	4	7	28	49	0.57		
H. Algebra	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Geom.	3	7	21	49	0.43		
H. Geom	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Alg. II	3	7	21	49	0.43		

**GREYLOCK**

Table II cont'd.

Subject	Sections	Sessions	Total	Periods	Rooms Req'd.	Rooms Avail.	Diff.
<b>Mathematics cont'd.</b>							
H. Alg. II	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Pre-Cal	2	7	14	49	0.29		
H. Pre-Cal	1	7	7	49	0.14		
H. Calculus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Topics in Math	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Statistics	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Math 7	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Adv. Math 7	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Math 8	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Adv. Math 8	3	7	21	49	0.43		
AP Cal	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Mathematics</b>					<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Science</b>							
Integrated Sc.	5	7	35	49	0.71		
Biology	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Applied Bio	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Chem.	3	7	21	49	0.43		
H.Chem	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Applied Chem	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Physics	1	7	7	49	0.14		
H. Physics	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Enviro Sc	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Ant. & Phy.	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Science 7	6	7	42	49	0.86		
Science 8	7	7	49	49	1.00		
AP Chem	2	7	14	49	0.29		
APChem Lab	2	7	14	49	0.29		
AP Physics	1	7	7	49	0.14		
AP Physics Lab	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Science</b>					<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Foreign Languages</b>							
Latin II	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Latin III	2	7	14	49	0.29		
French II	1	7	7	49	0.14		
French III	1	7	7	49	0.14		
H. French IV	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Adv. French	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Spanish I	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Spanish II	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Spanish III	3	7	21	49	0.43		
H. Spanish IV	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Latin 7	2	7	14	49	0.29		
French 7	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Spanish 7	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Latin 8	2	7	14	49	0.29		
French 8	1	7	7	49	0.14		

**GREYLOCK**

Table II cont'd.

Subject	Sections	Sessions	Total	Periods	Rooms Req'd.	Rooms Avail.	Diff.
<b>Foreign Languages cont'd.</b>							
Spanish 8	2	7	14	49	0.29		
AP Latin Lit	1	7	7	49	0.14		
AP Spanish	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Foreign Languages</b>					<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Business/Technical</b>							
Acct I	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Acct II	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Basic Keyboard	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Intro Business	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Pers. Fin/Invest	1	7	7	49	0.14		
BCC Careers	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Comp. Graphics	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Comp. Graphics II	2	7	14	49	0.29		
WEB Design	2	7	14	49	0.29		
WEB Design II	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Tech.Draw	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Tech.Draw II	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Business/Tech.</b>					<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Social Studies</b>							
World Hist & Geo I	7	7	49	49	1.00		
World Hist & Geo II	7	7	49	49	1.00		
U.S. Hist	5	7	35	49	0.71		
Psychology	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Holocaust	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Vietnam Conflict	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Soc Studies 7	6	7	42	49	0.86		
Soc Studies 8	7	7	49	49	1.00		
AP US Hist	1	7	7	49	0.14		
AP Euro Hist	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Social Studies</b>					<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Art</b>							
Intro Studio Art I	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Intro Studio Art Alt	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Intro Studio Art II	3	7	21	49	0.43		
Adv Studio Art I	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Adv Studio Art II	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Printmaking	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Painting	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Art theory	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Stained Glass	5	7	35	49	0.71		
Adv Stained Glass	3	7	21	49	0.43		
<b>Total Art</b>					<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

**GREYLOCK**

Table II cont'd.

Subject	Sections	Sessions	Total	Periods	Rooms Req'd.	Rooms Avail.	Diff.
<b>Health</b>							
Tech/Art 7	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Art/Tech 7	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Art/Health 8	4	7	28	49	0.57		
Health/Art 8	4	7	28	49	0.57		
<b>Total Health</b>					<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Music</b>							
MusicComp 7	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Comp/Music 7	2	7	14	49	0.29		
Comp I/Comp II 8	4	7	28	49	0.57		
PA Band	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PA Chorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PA Orchestra	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PA Orchestra/Chor	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PABandOrchChorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PABandChorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
PAOrchBand	1	7	7	49	0.14		
AmerPopMusic	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Piano I	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Piano II	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Guitar I	1	7	7	49	0.14		
Guitar II	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MS Band	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MS Chorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MS Orchestra	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MS Orch Chorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MSBandOrchChorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MS Band Chorus	1	7	7	49	0.14		
MSOrchBand	1	7	7	49	0.14		
<b>Total Music</b>					<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Rooms</b>					<b>46</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>14</b>

**Note:**

Fractions of spaces have been rounded off to represent whole spaces

# MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SHOOOL ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

## INTRODUCTION

Enrollment forecasting and demographic analysis are two of the basic components utilized in school planning and construction. Forecasting is the projection of specified future events within a certain time frame based upon available, if sometimes incomplete, information.

Demographic analysis is the process used to examine the environmental context of the school district that may affect student enrollment. Birth data, in-out migration, rate of building, available building lots and future development are all instrumental in establishing the demographics of a community.

The cohort survival method is the basic method utilized in this projection to analyze enrollment trends and subsequent results. It is the most frequently utilized method of enrollment forecasting. The cohort survival method uses historical enrollment data to calculate the survival rates of students as they move from one grade to the next and is upgraded each subsequent year as actual enrollment data becomes available. The result is a linear forecast projected from the last data point. The cohort survival technique of forecasting provides a limited assessment of future enrollments assuming that what has happened in the past will continue to happen in the future and at the same rate. This can often be misleading and must be combined with other demographic data as noted above, to provide a balanced and accurate projection of anticipated enrollments.

Merrimack Education Center was commissioned to do a ten-year enrollment projection along with a facility and space analysis for the Mt. Greylock Regional School. To accomplish this we reviewed data and spoke to Town and School officials who have provided data that enables us to draw significant conclusions relative to future enrollments at the Mt. Greylock Regional School District.

For the purpose of this report the following information was reviewed:

- 1) October 1 Enrollment Reports for each of the school districts in the region from 1993 through 2003, supplied by each of the school departments and from October 1 data compiled by the Department of Education.
- 2) Birth data: i.e. births to residents of Williamstown and Lanesborough, supplied by the Town Clerks and by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Dept. of Public Health, Registry of Vital Statistics.
- 3) Number of housing unit starts annually from 1990 through 2002, supplied by the regional towns.
- 4) Each town supplied information relative to current and potential housing development.
- 5) Information on the senior populations of the member towns was supplied by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs.
- 6) Real estate information and relevant market data was gleaned from the web sites of both the Warren Group & Banker & Tradesman.

### BIRTH DATA

The Town Clerks of Lanesborough and Williamstown and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Health, Registry of Vital Statistics supplied birth data. It is complete through December 31, 2002 and then incorporates 2003 data as available to September 2003, which is extrapolated for the full year. It reflects births to residents of each town whose children might be expected to attend the Mt. Greylock Regional School District (Table III).

**Table III**  
**BIRTHS TO RESIDENTS**


<u>Year</u>	<u>Actual</u>	
	<u>Lanesborough</u>	<u>Williamstown</u>
1993	39	48
1994	27	45
1995	32	52
1996	32	33
1997	27	49
1998	15	45
1999	25	24
2000	32	46
2001	26	41
2002	14	28
2003	12	39
	(8 through Sept.)	(29 through Sept.)
<b>Avg. 1993-2003</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>41</b>
	<u>Projected</u>	
2004	21	35
2005	20	35
2006	19	33
2007	19	32
2008	19	33
2009	18	32
2010	17	31
2011	17	31
2012	17	30
<b>Proj. Avg. 2004-2012</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32</b>

- Note:** 1) 2003 numbers are from January through September extrapolated into a twelve mo. total (Monthly average x 12)
- 2) Birth data 1993 through 2001 from Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Registry of Vital Statistics. Birth data from 2002-03 from birth records of the respective town clerks
- 3) Births 2004 through 2012 are projected using a 10 yr. rolling average

From January 1993 through December 31, 2003 (extrapolated) births to residents of both towns were totaled to determine an actual birth rate in each town over that 11-year period. Williamstown had an average of 41 births per year and Lanesborough had an average of 26 births per year. For the purpose of estimating future enrollments, births from 2004 through 2012 we estimated future birth rates for each town by using the average of each of the previous ten years of birth data. (Rolling 10 yr. average). Based on these projected birth averages we anticipate the birth rate in Williamstown will shrink from 41 to an average of 32 births per year and births in Lanesborough will fall from an average of 26 births per year to 19 births per year. We factored the projected births into our enrollment projections.

#### HOUSING PERMITS & NEW DEVELOPMENT

The Building Inspector in Williamstown and the Town Administrator in Lanesborough provided information relative to permits issued for new housing units since 1998. (Table IV) With the exception of 2000 when only 4 permits for new home construction were issued, Williamstown has averaged fewer than 12 new homes per year. Data for Lanesborough was available for the years 1998 through 2001. During this period the town averaged 10 new home starts per year.

Based upon information supplied by the towns there are no substantive plans for new housing development in the pipeline for either town at this time. We anticipate new development will proceed slowly reflecting the limited growth in the economy, rising interest rates and the overall effect of manufacturers such as General Electric and Sprague Electric reducing their presence in the area. 

**We anticipate that the future growth of the region as a vacation and resort area, reflecting the cultural and recreational attributes of the Berkshires, will not be sufficient to sustain or grow the overall enrollment at the regional school.**

Table IV

NEW HOME CONSTRUCTION

<u>Year</u>	<u>Lanesborough</u>	<u>Williamstown</u>
1998	8	16
1999	9	11
2000	14	4
2001	9	13
2002	n/a	11
2003	n/a	14 (extrapolated for 12 months) (12 through 10/30/03)
Total (of years available)	40	69
Avg./yr.	10	12

## POPULATION DATA

Figures from the U.S. Census Bureau for the 2000 census show a slight increase in population in Williamstown, from 8,220 to 8,424, an increase of 204 or 2.5%. (Table V) Since 1980, however, the population has shrunk from 8,741 to 8,424, a decrease of 317 or 3.6%. According to data supplied by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs, residents over 60 years of age now comprise 20.2 % of the total population down from 22.3% in 1980. Also the number of residents under 19 years of age has grown from 17.4% of the total population in 1990 to 25.9% in 2000, indicating that the overall population of Williamstown is becoming younger. The population in Lanesborough, however, has dropped from 3,131 in 1980 to 2,990 in 2000, a decrease of 141 residents or 4.5%. During this period the number of residents over 60 has grown by 61 or 12.4%. From 1990 to 2000 the number of Lanesborough residents under 19 years of age has grown by 224 or 39.3%.

Mid-level projection data for 2010 from MISER, the Massachusetts Institute for Social and Economic Research, projects a population decrease in Lanesborough to 2,714 or 9.2% and in Williamstown the decrease for 2010 is projected to be from 8,424 to 7,923 or 501 persons, a decrease of 5.9%.

A substantial portion of seniors in the two towns are homeowners. It can be argued that within the ten years covered by this study, a portion of these residents will alter their living arrangements and many who live in single residences will have sold or moved out of their current homes. These homes will normally be older, smaller and somewhat less expensive and well suited to younger families who are more likely to have school age children. While it is not possible to quantify this number, it is possible the turnover of "senior-owned" homes will have an impact on school enrollments. However, declining birth rates and limited new housing development will not produce a large enough influx of new students to offset students graduating from the regional high school.

Table V

MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

Town	Year	Total	Incr./Decr.	% Diff.	Residents over 60	% of pop. over 60	Residents under 19	% of pop. under 19
Lanesborough	1980	3131			490	15.6%		
	1990	3032	-99	-3.2%	541	17.8%	570	18.8%
	2000	2990	-42	-1.4%	551	18.4%	794	26.6%
	2010	2714	-276	-9.2%	674	24.8%		
Willimansown	1980	8741			1624	18.6%		
	1990	8220	-521	-6.0%	1831	22.3%	1432	17.4%
	2000	8424	204	2.5%	1701	20.2%	2179	25.9%
	2010	7923	-501	-5.9%	1720	21.7%		

Note: All demographic data from US census 1980-2000 & Mass. Executive Office of Elder Affairs 2010 projected data from MISER; Massachusetts Institute for Social & Economic Research, Amherst, Mass. and Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs

**REAL ESTATE MARKET**  
**MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Towns in the Mt. Greylock Region have traditionally been considered an ideal market for first time homebuyers because it has been possible to get a "lot for your money" and in Lanesborough there was an inventory of lower priced homes. Despite low mortgage rates, sales, particularly of higher priced homes, have slowed in line with the economic slowdown and homes in all price ranges are staying on the market longer.

Information from The Warren Group and Banker & Tradesman (Table VI) allows us to compare the growth of home sales as well as the median sale prices of homes within each Town. From 2001 – to 2003 the median price of homes in Lanesborough have increased 4.2 % while the median price of homes in Williamstown has dropped 2.6 % from \$190,000 to \$185,000. However, the median price of condos in Williamstown, have more than doubled during this period from \$85,000 to \$197,000.

Both towns offer unique attributes for their residents. Williamstown is a typical college community with its upscale shops and cultural facilities. Both communities provide easy proximity to cultural and recreational amenities in the area but the loss of manufacturing plants in the Pittsfield area has slowed real estate growth and development in the region generally. As of the time of this study there are no significant housing developments in the planning stage for either community. Much new development has centered around seasonal and recreational homes that do not have a significant effect on the school system.

Table VI  
REAL ESTATE DATA

Lanesborough

Year	Period	Single Family	Condos
2003	Jan.-Aug.	\$123,000	\$60,500
2002	Jan.-Dec.	\$108,000	\$90,000
2001	Jan.-Dec.	\$118,000	n/a

Median Sale Prices

Year	Period	Single Family	Condos
2003	Jan.-Aug.	\$185,000	\$197,000
2002	Jan.-Dec.	\$247,500	\$170,000
2001	Jan.-Dec.	\$190,000	\$85,000

Williamstown

Number of Sales

Year	Period	Single Family	Condos
2003	Jan.-Aug.	29	3
2002	Jan.-Dec.	49	4
2001	Jan.-Dec.	38	1

Note: Projected for a full year these number would be 44 single family homes and 5 condos

Year	Period	Single Family	Condos
2003	Jan.-Aug.	48	6
2002	Jan.-Dec.	78	7
2001	Jan.-Dec.	31	13

Note: Projected for a full year these number would be 72 single family homes and 9 condos

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

The method of analysis utilized by the Merrimack Education Center to project enrollments consists of birth data, housing starts, future development, analysis of general population projections and historic enrollments as reported by the Regional Towns to the Department of Education as of October 1 of each school year.

We have utilized the following methodology to develop these projections:

- 1) Birth rates for Lanesborough and Williamstown have been projected based upon birth statistics back to 1993 supplied by the Town Clerks of each community. Information for 2003 has been extrapolated for a full year. From 2003 forward we have used an average birth rate based on a rolling average of each of the previous ten years.
- 2) Historic student enrollments for Lanesborough, Williamstown and each town currently a part of the Mt. Greylock Regional School District from 1993-94 through 2003 as reported on October 1 of each school year have been used and a cohort survival projection was developed for a ten-year period extending to 2013.
- 3) Reductions in the enrollments of town schools are reflected in a reduction of enrollment from the member towns in the Mt. Greylock Regional School.
- 4) To achieve the most comprehensive projections we made the following assumptions:
  - a) there will not be substantial new housing development in the member Towns
  - b) populations of the member Towns will slowly decrease
  - c) future birth rates in each of the communities will fall as the populations of each town retract

Using the cohort survival analysis of historical data, based upon known birth rates, enrollments, in-out migration, grade retention and the projected survival of children from grade to grade plus new growth and development we estimate enrollments will slowly decrease in the member towns. We project that enrollments in Lanesborough will fall from a current enrollment in 2003-04 of 307 to 298 in 2013-14 a reduction of 9 students

or 2.9%. (see Table VII) In Williamstown we also project a decline in enrollment from a present enrollment of 541 students to a projected enrollment of 510 for 2013-14, down 31 students or 5.7%. (see Table VIII) Lower enrollments in the member towns will result in lesser demand for services from the Mt. Greylock Regional School.

We assume that to offset lower enrollments from Lanesborough and Williamstown and to sustain level enrollment at the regional school, Mt. Greylock Regional School District will proportionately increase the number of out of district students.

**Factoring in this assumption, we project overall enrollments will remain basically stable. We anticipate an overall increase of 2 students in the next ten years or .3%. (Table IX) Although a stable enrollment will not put further strain on current facilities, it does not address the fact that these facilities are no longer new and cannot effectively support a progressive educational curriculum.**

Another assumption we have been asked to consider is a scenario in which the Town of Hancock sends its students (37 as of 10/1/03 or 4.8%) to New York and the Mt. Greylock Regional School district withdraws from "School Choice", leaving only Lanesborough and Williamstown sending students to the regional school. This would remove 132 students or 17.1% from the school as well as removing a substantial financial infusion from these communities to the Regional School District, leaving Lanesborough and Williamstown to shoulder 100% of the financial commitment.

In Table X we have broken down the existing school population showing the percent each Town contributes to each grade level. Table XI shows enrollment projections through 2013-14, if only Lanesborough and Williamstown remained in the region and the overall reduction in school population.



Table VIII

WILLIAMSTOWN ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

School Yr.	Pre-K	Kind	Gr. 1	Gr. 2	Gr. 3	Gr. 4	Gr. 5	Gr. 6	Total	% Diff.	
1993-94	23	94	85	69	86	85	79	90	611		
1994-95	32	61	93	77	70	79	85	78	575	-5.9%	
1995-96	37	71	66	91	87	71	78	80	581	1.0%	
1996-97	40	64	78	69	87	89	78	84	589	1.4%	
1997-98	34	72	65	73	71	89	83	80	567	-3.7%	
1998-99	35	66	73	69	74	76	87	82	562	-0.9%	
1999-00	35	74	68	70	72	71	80	97	567	0.9%	
2000-01	36	69	80	74	69	74	72	81	555	-2.1%	
2001-02	35	56	65	82	71	70	76	84	539	-2.9%	
2002-03	35	65	58	77	88	66	83	76	548	1.7%	
2003-04	30	74	67	64	79	80	67	80	541	-1.3%	
<b>Projected</b>											
2004-05	41	58	76	72	65	78	84	70	544	0.6%	
2005-06	36	79	59	81	73	64	82	87	561	3.1%	
2006-07	25	69	81	63	82	72	67	85	544	-3.0%	
2007-08	34	48	71	87	64	81	75	70	530	-2.6%	
2008-09	35	65	49	76	88	63	85	78	539	-3.9%	
2009-10	35	67	66	52	77	87	66	88	538	-1.1%	
2010-11	33	67	68	71	53	76	91	69	528	-0.4%	
2011-12	34	64	68	73	72	52	79	95	537	-0.4%	
2012-13	33	65	65	73	74	71	54	82	517	-3.9%	
2013-14	33	64	66	70	74	73	74	56	510	-3.4%	
Overall change 2003-04 to 2013-14										-31	-5.7%



MT. GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Students by Town a/o October 1, 2003

Table X

Town	Gr. 7	Gr. 8	Gr. 9	Gr. 10	Gr. 11	Gr. 12	Town Total
Adams	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	1
Bennington	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.7%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.7%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	2
Clarksburg	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	1
Dalton	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.9%	2
Florida	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	3
Hancock	No. 8 % Class 6.3%	No. 9 % Class 6.6%	No. 8 % Class 6.1%	No. 8 % Class 5.8%	No. 3 % Class 2.4%	No. 1 % Class 0.9%	37
Lanesboro	No. 28 % Class 21.9%	No. 46 % Class 33.8%	No. 38 % Class 29.0%	No. 34 % Class 24.8%	No. 43 % Class 34.1%	No. 34 % Class 30.4%	223
New Ashford	No. 2 % Class 1.6%	No. 4 % Class 2.9%	No. 5 % Class 3.8%	No. 3 % Class 2.2%	No. 2 % Class 1.6%	No. 1 % Class 0.9%	17
North Adams	No. 6 % Class 4.7%	No. 9 % Class 6.6%	No. 2 % Class 1.5%	No. 3 % Class 2.2%	No. 5 % Class 4.0%	No. 4 % Class 3.6%	29
Pittsfield	No. 8 % Class 6.3%	No. 1 % Class 0.7%	No. 5 % Class 3.8%	No. 5 % Class 3.6%	No. 3 % Class 2.4%	No. 2 % Class 1.8%	24
Pownal	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	2
Readsboro	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.9%	1
Stamford	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 2 % Class 1.5%	No. 2 % Class 1.5%	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 6 % Class 5.4%	11
Williamstown	No. 71 % Class 55.5%	No. 66 % Class 48.5%	No. 69 % Class 52.7%	No. 81 % Class 59.1%	No. 67 % Class 53.2%	No. 61 % Class 54.5%	415
Windsor	No. 1 % Class 0.8%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 0 % Class 0.0%	No. 1 % Class 0.9%	2
<b>Total All</b>	128 100.0%	136 100.0%	131 100.0%	137 100.0%	126 100.0%	112 100.0%	770
Will. & Lanes Stur	99	112	107	115	110	95	638
Will. & Lanes %	77.3%	82.4%	81.7%	83.9%	87.3%	84.8%	82.9%

**Table XI**  
**Enrollment Projections - Mt. Greylock Regional High School**  
**Lanesborough & Williamstown Only**

<u>School Yr.</u>	<u>Projected</u>												<u>Total</u>	<u>% Diff.</u>
	<u>Gr. 7</u>	<u>Gr. 8</u>	<u>Gr. 9</u>	<u>Gr. 10</u>	<u>Gr. 11</u>	<u>Gr. 12</u>	<u>Gr. 7</u>	<u>Gr. 8</u>	<u>Gr. 9</u>	<u>Gr. 10</u>	<u>Gr. 11</u>	<u>Gr. 12</u>		
2004-05	101	116	113	105	117	101	652	-15.3%						
2005-06	98	112	114	112	107	109	651	-0.2%						
2006-07	104	102	105	112	112	104	639	-1.9%						
2007-08	105	109	100	103	112	103	632	-1.1%						
2008-09	100	113	107	104	106	102	632	-0.1%						
2009-10	100	109	110	107	107	98	631	-0.1%						
2010-11	100	104	109	111	113	101	637	1.0%						
2011-12	103	109	102	110	113	108	645	1.2%						
2012-13	101	110	105	107	112	107	641	-0.5%						
2013-14	104	109	103	108	109	105	638	-0.5%						
<b>Overall change 2003-04 to 2013-14</b>							<b>-132</b>	<b>-17.1%</b>						

## SUMMARY

Our projections, based upon a variety of data, are open to interpretation, as are all such projections. The enrollment projection is intended to put into perspective the space needs of the Mt. Greylock Regional School based upon historic enrollments, birth rates, new development, in-migration, etc. In any analysis of space needs questions such as the condition of existing space, whether such space meets state standards and how space quality and constrictions impact the quality of education and the ability of the school to support a diversified comprehensive educational program.

With a present school population of 770 students and a very small projected increase, a projected downturn in populations, birth rates and limited new housing starts for year round residents, we believe the region, to maintain a stable enrollment, will need to **proportionately increase the number of tuitioned in students.** In these circumstances **we believe the number of classrooms is adequate.**

If lack of classroom space was an issue the idea of possibly leaving the "School Choice" program might be a reasonable option rather than adding new facilities. However, with no shortage of educational space and a pressing need to renovate and refurbish the existing school under any circumstance, it is hard to imagine the justification for such a proposal.

As noted earlier, the facilities are more than forty years old and were not designed or built to meet the educational and technological needs of the twenty-first century. Current science facilities do not meet state standards for educational adequacy. There are insufficient lab stations for students and a lack of safety and emergency equipment. The lack of handicapped accessibility in many areas of the school puts the Regional School District in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In our estimation Mt. Greylock Regional High School is in need of substantial renovation to enable the school to fulfill its educational mission, particularly at the Middle School

where the current building configuration does not allow for curriculum flexibility and the establishment of a more dynamic educational program.

The Mt. Greylock Regional School District is wise to assess its school facilities in relation to its educational program and the fitness of those facilities to support the educational program. To do less will ultimately limit the ability of the Mt. Greylock Regional School to maintain the quality of the educational program and its ability to meet the needs of the students of its member communities.