



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PO Box 500
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

DAVID C. HESPE
Commissioner

June 28, 2016

Dr. Larrie Reynolds, Superintendent
Mount Olive Township School District
227 US Highway 206, Suite 10
Flanders, NJ 07836

Re: Approval of Long-Range Facilities Plan Major Amendment

Dear Dr. Reynolds:

The Department of Education (Department) has completed its review of the proposed amendment to the approved Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) submitted by the Mount Olive Township School District (District) pursuant to the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act, P.L. 2000, c. 72 (N.J.S.A. 18A: 7G-1 *et seq.*), as amended by P.L. 2007, c. 137 (Act), N.J.A.C. 6A:26 -1 *et seq.* (Educational Facilities Code), and the Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES). The amendment, which updates the LRFP previously approved on October 30, 2009, includes updates to the Department's LRFP reporting system and the submission of required supporting documentation.

The Department has approved the District's LRFP amendment submission, which is reflected in the attached "Summary of the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as Amended June 29, 2016." **The approved LRFP amendment fulfills LRFP reporting requirements for a period of five years from the date of this letter per N.J.S.A. 18A: 7G-4 (a) unless the LRFP needs to be further amended to address a proposed school facilities project that is inconsistent with the approved Plan.** The approval of the LRFP amendment, and thus the approved amended LRFP, supersedes all former LRFP approvals and replaces all prior versions of the LRFP. Unless and until a new amendment is submitted to and approved by the Department pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-4(c), this approved LRFP shall remain in effect.

Approval of the LRFP, and any projects and costs listed therein, does not imply approval of an individual school facilities project or its corresponding costs and eligibility for State support under the Act. Similarly, approval of the LRFP does not imply approval of portions of the Plan that are inconsistent with the Department's FES and proposed building demolition or replacement. Determination of preliminary eligible costs and final eligible costs will be made at the time of the approval of a particular school facilities project pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-5. The District must submit a feasibility study as part of the school facilities project approval process, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-7b, to support proposed building demolition or replacement. The feasibility study should demonstrate that a building might pose a risk to the safety of the occupants after rehabilitation or that rehabilitation is not cost-effective.

We trust that this document will adequately explain the Final Determination and allow the District to move forward with the implementation of projects within its LRFP. Should you have questions pertaining to the LRFP, contact me at (609) 943-5681 or susan.kutner@doe.state.nj.us. Contact Cathy Bravo from the Office of School Facilities and Finance at (609) 943-5887 or cathy.bravo@doe.state.nj.us with any questions pertaining to project status or advancement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Susan Kutner" followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Susan Kutner
Deputy Executive Director, Office of School Facilities and Finance

Enclosure

c: Bernie Piaia, Department of Education, Office of School Facilities and Finance
Cathy Bravo, Department of Education, Office of School Facilities and Finance
Margaret Conroy, Mount Olive Township School District
David Corso, Mount Olive Township School District

Mount Olive Township School District
Summary of the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as Amended June 28, 2016

The Department of Education (Department) has completed its review of the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) amendment submitted by the Mount Olive Township School District (District) pursuant to the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act, P.L. 2000, c. 72 (N.J.S.A. 18A: 7G-1 *et seq.*), as amended by P.L. 2007, c. 137 (Act), N.J.A.C. 6A:26-1 *et seq.* (Educational Facilities Code), and the Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES).

This is the Department’s summary of the District’s LRFP, as amended June 29, 2016. The summary is based on the standards set forth in the Act, the Educational Facilities Code, the FES, data in the Department’s LRFP reporting system, and District-supplied supporting documentation. The referenced reports in *italic* text are standard LRFP reports generated from the LRFP system.

1. Inventory Overview

The District provides services for students in grades K-12. Existing and proposed schools, sites, buildings, playgrounds, playfields, and parking lots were identified in the LRFP. The total number of existing and proposed district-owned or leased schools, sites, and buildings are listed in Table 1. A detailed description of each asset can be found in the LRFP website report titled “*Site Asset Inventory Report.*” Section 5 of this Summary lists work proposed for each school building.

Table 1: Inventory Summary

	Existing	Proposed
Sites:		
Total Number of Sites	8	7
Number of Sites with no Buildings	0	0
Number of Sites with no (Active) Instructional Buildings	2	1
Schools and Instructional Buildings:		
Total Number of Schools (assigned DOE school code)	6	6
Total Number of Instructional Buildings (incl. leased buildings)	6	6
Total Number of Administrative and Utility Buildings (standalone)	6	4

As directed by the Department, incomplete school facilities projects that are funded and/or under construction are represented as “existing” in the LRFP. Applicable District projects that include new construction and/or the reconfiguration of existing program space are as follows: n/a

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District is proposing to decrease the existing number of District-owned or leased sites.
- The District is proposing to maintain the existing number of District-operated schools.
- The District is proposing to maintain the existing number of District-owned or leased instructional buildings. The District is proposing to decrease the existing number of District-owned or leased non-instructional buildings.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the proposed inventory is adequate for approval of the District’s LRFP amendment. However, the LRFP determination does not imply approval of an individual school facilities project listed within the LRFP. The District must submit individual project applications for project approval. If building demolition or replacement is proposed, the District must submit a feasibility study, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-7b, as part of the application for the specific school facilities project.

2. K-12 Enrollments

The number of students, or “proposed enrollments,” for five-year planning purposes was determined by the District on a district-wide and school level basis. Proposed district enrollments are based on a cohort-survival enrollment projection incorporating historic enrollments from 2009-14 and with minor adjustments for atypical survival ratios.

Existing and proposed enrollments are listed in Table 2. Detailed projection information can be found in the supporting document titled “*Mount Olive 2016 Amendment Projection.*”

Table 2: K-12 Enrollment Comparison

	2014-15 Enrollments	District Proposed Enrollments
Grades PK-5, including SE	1,997	2,109
Grades 6-8, including SE	1,209	1,109
Grades 9-12, including SE	1,467	1,484
District PK-12 Totals	4,673	4,702

“SE” = *Special Education*

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the District’s proposed enrollments are supportable for approval of the District’s LRFP amendment. The Department will require a current enrollment projection at the time an application for a school facilities project is submitted incorporating the District’s most recent enrollments in order to verify that the LRFP’s planned capacity continues to be appropriate.

3. FES and District Practices Capacity

The proposed room inventories for each school were analyzed to determine whether the LRFP provides adequate capacity for the proposed enrollments. Two capacity calculation methods, called “*FES Capacity*” and “*District Practices Capacity*,” were used to assess existing and proposed school capacity in accordance with the FES and District program delivery practices. A third capacity calculation, called “*Functional Capacity*,” determines Unhoused Students and potential State support for school facilities projects. Functional Capacity is analyzed in Section 4 of this Summary.

- *FES Capacity* only assigns capacity to pre-kindergarten (if district-owned or operated), kindergarten, general, and self-contained special education classrooms. No other room types are considered to be capacity-generating. Class size is based on the FES and is prorated for classrooms that are sized smaller than FES classrooms. FES Capacity is most accurate for elementary schools, or schools with non-departmentalized programs, in which instruction is “homeroom” based. This capacity calculation

may also be accurate for middle schools depending upon the program structure. However, this method usually significantly understates available high school capacity since specialized spaces that are typically provided in lieu of general classrooms are not included in the capacity calculations.

- *District Practices Capacity* allows the District to include specialized room types in the capacity calculations and adjust class size to reflect actual practices. This calculation is used to review capacity and enrollment coordination in middle and high schools.

A capacity utilization factor in accordance with the FES is included in both capacity calculations. A 90% capacity utilization rate is applied to classrooms serving grades K-8. An 85% capacity utilization rate is applied to classrooms serving grades 9-12. No capacity utilization factor is applied to preschool classrooms.

Table 3 provides a summary of proposed enrollments and District-wide capacities. Detailed information can be found in the LRFP website report titled “*FES and District Practices Capacity.*”

Table 3 Proposed Enrollments and Capacity Summary

	Proposed Enrollment	Proposed FES Capacity	Deviation*	Proposed District Practices Capacity	Deviation*
Elementary (PK-5)	2,109	2,351.79	242.79	2,200.88	91.88
Middle (6-8)	1,109	985.70	-123.30	1,153.20	44.20
High (9-12)	1,484	984.91	-499.09	1,533.40	49.40
District Totals	4,702	4,322.40	-379.60	4,887.48	185.48

** Positive numbers signify surplus capacity; negative numbers signify inadequate capacity. Negative values for District Practices capacity are acceptable if proposed enrollments do not exceed 100% capacity utilization.*

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District has adequately coordinated proposed school capacities and enrollments in the LRFP for grade groups with proposed new construction.
- Adequate justification has been provided by the District if capacity for a school with proposed work in the LRFP deviates from the proposed enrollments by more than 5% and if new construction is proposed for the grade group(s) served.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that proposed District capacity, in accordance with the proposed enrollments, is adequate for approval of the District’s LRFP amendment. The Department will require a current enrollment projection at the time an application for a school facilities project is submitted, incorporating the District’s most recent enrollments, in order to verify that the LRFP’s planned capacity meets the District’s updated enrollments.

4. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students Prior to Proposed Work

Functional Capacity was calculated and compared to proposed enrollments to provide a preliminary estimate of Unhoused Students and new construction funding eligibility. Functional Capacity is the adjusted gross square feet of a school building (*total gross square feet minus excluded space*) divided by the minimum area allowance per Full-time Equivalent student for the grade level contained therein. Unhoused Students is the number of students projected to be enrolled in the District that exceeds the Functional Capacity of the District’s schools pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:26-2.2(c).

“*Excluded Square Feet*” in the LRFP Functional Capacity calculation includes (1) square footage exceeding the FES for any pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, general education, or self-contained special education classroom; (2) grossing factor square footage (*corridors, stairs, mechanical rooms, etc.*) that exceeds the FES allowance, and (3) square feet proposed to be demolished or discontinued from use. Excluded square feet may be revised during the review process for individual school facilities projects.

Table 4 provides a preliminary assessment of Functional Capacity, Unhoused Students, and Estimated Maximum Approved Area for the various grade groups in accordance with the FES. Detailed information concerning the calculation and preliminary excluded square feet can be found in the LRFP website reports titled “*Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students*” and “*Functional Capacity Excluded Square Feet.*”

Table 4: Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students Prior to Proposed Work

	A Proposed Enrollment	B Estimated Existing Functional Capacity	C = A-B Unhoused Students	D Area Allowance (gsf/students)	E = C x D Estimated Maximum Approved Area for Unhoused Students
Elementary (PK-5)	2,109	2,232.10	0.00	125.00	0.00
Middle (6-8)	1,109	1,288.73	0.00	134.00	0.00
High (9-12)	1,484	1,789.34	0.00	151.00	0.00
District Totals	4,702	5,310.17			

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The calculations for “Estimated Existing Functional Capacity” do not include incomplete school facilities project(s) that are under construction..
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, has Unhoused Students for the following FES grade groups: n/a.
- The District is not proposing to demolish or discontinue the use of existing district-owned instructional space that is currently in use. The Functional Capacity calculation excludes square feet proposed to be demolished or discontinued for the following FES grade groups: n/a.

FINDINGS Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students calculated in the LRFP are preliminary estimates. Justification for square footage in excess of the FES and the determination of additional excluded square feet, Preliminary Eligible Costs (PEC), and Final Eligible Costs (FEC) will be included in the review process for

specific school facilities projects. A feasibility study undertaken by the District is required if building demolition or replacement is proposed per N.J.A.C. 6A:26-2.3(b)(10).

5. Proposed Work

The District was instructed to review the condition of its facilities and sites and to propose corrective “*system*” and “*inventory*” actions in its LRFP. “*System*” actions upgrade existing conditions without changing spatial configuration or size. Examples of system actions include new windows, finishes, and mechanical systems. “*Inventory*” actions address space problems by removing, adding, or altering sites, schools, buildings and rooms. Examples of inventory actions include building additions, the reconfiguration of existing walls, or changing room use.

Table 5 summarizes the type of work proposed in the District’s LRFP for district-operated instructional buildings proposed to be maintained, acquired, or constructed new. “*Renovation*” includes inventory and system actions. Detailed information can be found in the LRFP system reports titled “*School Asset Inventory Report*” and “*LRFP Inventory Actions Summary Report*.”

Table 5: Proposed Schools and Scope of Work

School Name	Proposed Grades	Proposed Scope of Work
Chester M. Stephens	PKSE/K-5	Systems
Mountain View	PKSE/K-5	Systems
Sandshore	K-5	Systems, addition
Tinc Road	K-5	Systems
Mount Olive Middle School	6-8	Systems
Mount Olive High School	9-12	Renovation, addition

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District has proposed systems work in one or more instructional buildings.
- The District has proposed inventory changes, including new construction, in one or more instructional buildings.
- The District has not proposed new construction in lieu of rehabilitation in one or more instructional building.

Please note that costs represented in the LRFP are for capital planning purposes only. Estimated costs are not intended to represent preliminary eligible costs or final eligible costs of approved school facilities projects.

The Act (N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-7b) provides that all school facilities shall be deemed suitable for rehabilitation unless a pre-construction evaluation undertaken by the District demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the structure might pose a risk to the safety of the occupants even after rehabilitation or that rehabilitation is not cost-effective. Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:26-2.3(b)(10), the Commissioner may identify school facilities for which new construction is proposed in lieu of rehabilitation for which it appears from the

information presented that new construction is justified, provided, however, that for such school facilities so identified, the District must submit a feasibility study as part of the application for the specific school facilities project. The cost of each proposed building replacement is compared to the cost of additions or rehabilitation required to eliminate health and safety deficiencies and to achieve the District’s programmatic model.

Facilities used for non-instructional or non-educational purposes are ineligible for State support under the Act. However, projects for such facilities shall be reviewed by the Department to determine whether they are consistent with the District’s LRFP and whether the facility, if it is to house students (full or part time) conforms to educational adequacy requirements. These projects shall conform to all applicable statutes and regulations.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the proposed work is adequate for approval of the District’s LRFP amendment. However, Department approval of proposed work in the LRFP does not imply that the District may proceed with a school facilities project. The District must submit individual project applications with cost estimates for Department project approval. Both school facilities project approval and other capital project review require consistency with the District’s approved LRFP.

6. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students After Completion of Proposed Work

The *Functional Capacity* of the District’s schools *after* completion of the scope of work proposed in the LRFP was calculated to highlight any remaining Unhoused Students. Table 6 provides a preliminary assessment. Detailed information concerning the calculation can be found in the website report titled “*Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students.*”

Table 6: Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students After Completion of Proposed Work

	Estimated Maximum Approved Area for Unhoused Students	Total Proposed New GSF	Proposed Functional Capacity after Construction	Unhoused Students after Construction	Estimated Maximum Area for Unhoused Students Remaining
Elementary (PK-5)	0.00	19,243	2,386.04	0.00	0.00
Middle (6-8)	0.00	0.00	1,288.73	0.00	0.00
High (9-12)	0.00	3,730	1,814.04	0.00	0.00
District Totals		22,973	5,488.82		

Major conclusions are as follows:

- New construction is proposed for the following grade groups: K-5, 9-12.
- Proposed new construction exceeds the estimated maximum area allowance for Unhoused Students prior to the completion of the proposed work for the following grade groups: K-5, 9-12.
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, will not have Unhoused Students after completion of the proposed work.

FINDINGS The Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students calculated in the LRFPP are preliminary estimates. Justification for square footage in excess of the FES and the determination of additional excluded square feet, Preliminary Eligible Costs (PEC), and Final Eligible Costs (FEC) will be included in the review process for specific school facilities projects.

7. Proposed Room Inventories and the Facilities Efficiency Standards

The District's proposed room inventories for instructional buildings, or programmatic models, were evaluated to assess general educational adequacy and compliance with the FES area allowance pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:26-2.2 and 2.3.

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District is not proposing school building(s) that will provide less square feet per student than the FES allowance.
- The District is proposing school building(s) that exceed the FES square foot per student allowance.

FINDINGS The Department has reviewed the District's proposed room inventories and has determined that each is educationally adequate. If schools are proposed to provide less square feet per student than the FES, the District has provided a written justification indicating that the educational adequacy of the facility will not be adversely affected and has been granted an FES waiver by the Department. This determination does not include an assessment of eligible square feet for State support. State support eligibility will be determined at the time an application for a specific school facilities project is submitted to the Department. The Department will also confirm that a proposed school facilities project conforms with the proposed room inventory represented in the LRFPP when an application for a specific school facilities project is submitted to the Department for review and approval.