



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

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Lt. Governor

LAMONT O. REPOLLET, ED.D.
Commissioner

July 12, 2019

Ms. Olga Hugelmeyer, Chief School Administrator
Elizabeth Public Schools
500 North Broad Street
Elizabeth, NJ 07208

Re: **Long-Range Facilities Plan, Major Amendment Approval**
Elizabeth Public Schools (1320), Union County

Dear Ms. Hugelmeyer:

The Department of Education (Department) has approved the major amendment to the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) submitted by the Elizabeth Public Schools (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). Findings are summarized in the attached "Summary of the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as Amended July 12, 2019."

The approved amendment fulfills LRFP reporting requirements for a period of five years from the date of this letter pursuant to 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 approved LRFP amendment supersedes all prior LRFP approvals. 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. The approval of the LRFP does not imply approval of an individual school facilities project listed therein or its corresponding costs and eligibility for State support. Determination of preliminary eligible costs will be made at the time of the approval of a school facilities project pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-5. Similarly, approval of the LRFP does not imply approval of portions of the Plan that are inconsistent with the FES or proposed building demolition or replacement.

Please contact Jeanne Dunn , your Educational Facilities Specialist from the Office of School Facilities, at telephone number (609) 376-3675 or email at Jeanne.Dunn @doe.nj.gov, with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Susan Kutner
Director, Office of School Facilities Planning

SK: sk

Encl. Summary of the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as Amended July 12, 2019

c: Bernard E. Piaia, Jr., Department of Education, Office of School Facilities Projects
Jeanne Dunn, Department of Education, Office of School Facilities
Harold Kennedy, Elizabeth Public Schools, Business Administrator
Luis Couto, Elizabeth Public Schools, Director of Plant, Property, and Equipment

Elizabeth Public Schools (1320)
Summary of the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as Amended July 12, 2019

The Department of Education (Department) has completed its review of the major amendment to the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) submitted by the Elizabeth Public Schools (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 following provides a summary of the District’s approved amended LRFP. The summary is based on the standards set forth in the Act, the Educational Facilities Code, the FES, District-reported information in the Department’s LRFP reporting system, and supporting documentation. The referenced reports in *italic* text are standard reports available on the Department’s LRFP website.

1. Inventory Overview

The District is classified as a SDA District for funding purposes. It provides services for students in grades PK-12.

The District identified existing and proposed schools, sites, buildings, rooms, and site amenities in its LRFP. Table 1 lists the number of existing and proposed district schools, sites, and buildings. Detailed information can be found in the *School Asset Inventory Report* and the *Site Asset Inventory Report*.

As directed by the Department, school facilities projects that have received initial approval by the Department and have been approved by the voters, if applicable, are represented as “existing” in the LRFP. Approved projects that include new construction and/or the reconfiguration/reassignment of existing program space are as follows: n/a.

Table 1: Number of Schools, School Buildings, and Sites

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Schools (assigned DOE school code)	36	42
Number of School Buildings ¹	43	49
Number of Non-School Buildings ²	5	8
Number of Vacant Buildings	0	0
Number of Sites	44	51

¹*Includes district-owned buildings and long-term leases serving students in district-operated programs*

²*Includes occupied district-owned buildings not associated with a school, such as administrative or utility buildings*

Based on the existing facilities inventory submitted by the District:

- Schools using leased buildings (short or long-term): School 14 Lincoln (170), School 16 Madison Monroe (190), School 5 Mabel G. Holmes (300), iPrep Academy (301), School 9 Jerome Dunn (302), School 80 Alexander Hamilton (405)
- Schools using temporary classroom units (TCUs), excluding TCUs supporting construction: School 1 Washington (090), School 2 Winfield Scott (100), School 6 Louverture - de Lafayette (120), School 12 Elmora (150), School 15 Columbus (180), School 16 Madison-Monroe (190),

School 22 Halloran (250), School 23 Butler (260), School 25 Hudson (280), School 5 Holmes (300), School 9 Jerome Dunn (302), School 90 Bollwage Finance Academy (303), School 80 Alexander Hamilton (405)

- Vacant/unassigned school buildings: n/a

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the proposed inventory is adequate for approval of the District’s LRFPA amendment. However, the LRFPA determination does not imply approval of an individual school facilities project listed within the LRFPA; the District must submit individual project applications for project approval.

2. District Enrollments

The District determined the number of students, or “proposed enrollments,” to be accommodated for LRFPA planning purposes on a district-wide basis and in each school.

The Department minimally requires the submission of a standard cohort-survival projection. The cohort-survival method projection method forecasts future students based upon the survival of the existing student population as it moves from grade to grade. A survival ratio of less than 1.00 indicates a loss of students, while a survival ratio of more than 1.00 indicates the class size is increasing. For example, if a survival ratio tracking first to second grade is computed to be 1.05, the grade size is increasing by 5% from one year to the next. The cohort-survival projection methodology works well for communities with stable demographic conditions. Atypical events impacting housing or enrollments, such as an economic downturn that halts new housing construction or the opening of a charter or private school, typically makes a cohort-survival projection less reliable.

Proposed enrollments are based on a standard cohort-survival enrollment projection.

Adequate supporting documentation was submitted to the Department to justify the proposed enrollments. Table 2 provides a comparison of existing and projected enrollments. All totals include special education students.

Table 2: Enrollments

Grades	Existing Enrollments 2018-19	District Proposed Enrollments 2023-24
PK (excl. private providers)	2,813	3,672
Grades K-5	12,274	11,295
Grades 6-8	6,862	5,617
Grades 9-12	7,030	7,711
Totals K-12	27,979	28,295

FINDINGS The Department has determined the District’s proposed enrollments to be acceptable for approval of the District’s LRFPA 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 LRFPA’s planned capacity is appropriate for the updated enrollments.

3. District Practices Capacity

Based on information provided in the room inventories, *District Practices Capacity* was calculated for each school building to determine whether adequate capacity is proposed for the projected enrollments based on district scheduling and class size practices. The capacity totals assume instructional buildings can be fully utilized regardless of school sending areas, transportation, and other operational issues. The calculations only consider district-owned buildings and long-term leases; short term leases and temporary buildings are excluded. A capacity utilization factor of 90% for classrooms serving grades K-8 and 85% for classrooms serving grades 9-12 is applied in accordance with the FES. No capacity utilization factor is applied to preschool classrooms.

In certain cases, districts may achieve adequate District Practices Capacity to accommodate enrollments but provide inadequate square feet per student in accordance with the FES, resulting in educational adequacy issues and “Unhoused Students.” Unhoused students are considered in the “Functional Capacity” calculations used to determine potential State support for school facilities projects and are analyzed in Section 4.

Table 3 provides a summary of proposed enrollments and existing and proposed District-wide capacities. Detailed information can be found in the LRFP website reports titled *FES and District Practices Capacity Report*, *Existing Rooms Inventory Report*, and *Proposed Rooms Inventory Report*.

Table 3: District Practices Capacity Analysis

Grades	Proposed Enrollments	Existing District Practices Capacity	Existing Deviation*	Proposed District Practices Capacity	Proposed Deviation*
Elementary (PK-5)	14,967	11,287.05	-3,679.95	15,303.80	336.80
Middle (6-8)	5,617	4,011.37	-1,605.63	5,749.54	132.54
High (9-12)	7,711	6,100.20	-1,610.80	8,084.30	373.30
District Totals	28,295	21,398.63	-6,896.37	29,137.63	842.63

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

Considerations:

- Based on the proposed enrollments and existing room inventories, the District is projected to have inadequate capacity for the following grade groups, assuming all school buildings can be fully utilized: PK, K-5, 6-8, 9-12
- Adequate justification has been provided by the District if the proposed capacity for a school significantly deviates from the proposed enrollments. Generally, surplus capacity is acceptable for LRFP approval if additional capacity is not proposed through new construction.

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 Fall Enrollment Report, in order to verify that the LRFP’s planned capacity meets the District’s updated enrollments.

4. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students

Functional Capacity was calculated and compared to the proposed enrollments to provide a preliminary estimate of Unhoused Students and new construction funding eligibility.

Functional Capacity is the adjusted gross square footage 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* 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 the Functional Capacity, Unhoused Students, and Estimated Maximum Approved Area for each FES grade group. The calculations exclude temporary facilities and short-term leased buildings. School buildings proposed for whole or partial demolition or reassignment to a non-school use are excluded from the calculations pending project application review. If a building is proposed to be reassigned to a different school, the square footage is applied to the proposed grades after reassignment. Buildings that are not assigned to a school are excluded from the calculations. Detailed information concerning the calculations can be found in the *Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students Report* and the *Excluded Square Footage Report*.

Table 4: Estimated Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students

	PK/K-5	6-8	9-12	Total
Proposed Enrollments	14,967	5,617	7,711	28,295
FES Area Allowance (SF/student)	125.00	134.00	151.00	
Prior to Completion of Proposed Work:				
Existing Gross Square Feet	1,794,242	667,065	989,606	3,451,664
Adjusted Gross Square Feet	1,524,336	564,927	901,245	2,990,876
Adjusted Functional Capacity	12,194.69	4,423.10	5,968.51	
Unhoused Students	2,772.31	1,193.90	1,742.49	
Est. Max. Area for Unhoused Students	346,538.75	159,983.26	263,115.60	
After Completion of Proposed Work:				
Gross Square Feet	2,263,438	844,208	1,436,190	4,543,836
New Gross Square Feet	471,050	177,162	453,489	1,101,701
Adjusted Gross Square Feet	1,995,754	742,089	1,354,734	4,092,577
Functional Capacity	15,966.03	5,811.32	8,971.75	
Unhoused Students after Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Est. Max. Area Remaining	0.00	0.00	0.00	

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.

Estimated costs represented in the LRFP by the District are for capital planning purposes only. The estimates are not intended to represent preliminary eligible costs or final eligible costs of approved school facilities projects.

Considerations:

- The District does not have approved projects pending completion, as noted in Section 1, that impact the Functional Capacity calculations.
- The Functional Capacity calculations *exclude* square feet proposed for demolition or discontinuation for the following FES grade groups and school buildings pending a feasibility study and project review: n/a.
- Based on the preliminary assessment, the District has Unhoused Students prior to the completion of proposed work for the following FES grade groups: PK-5, 6-8, 9-12.
- New construction is proposed for the following FES grade groups: PK-5, 6-8, 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: PK-5, 6-8, 9-12.
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, will not have Unhoused Students after completion of the proposed LRFP work. If the District is projected to have Unhoused Students, adequate justification has been provided to confirm educational adequacy in accordance with Section 6 of this determination.

FINDINGS Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students calculated in the LRFP are preliminary estimates. 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 assessed program space, capacity, and physical plant deficiencies to determine corrective actions. Capital maintenance, or "*system actions*," address physical plant deficiencies due to operational, building code, and /or life cycle issues. Inventory changes, or "*inventory actions*," add, alter, or eliminate sites, site amenities, buildings, and/or rooms.

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.

Table 5 lists the scope of work proposed for each school based on the building(s) serving their student population. Detailed information can be found in the LRFPP website reports titled “*School Asset Inventory*,” “*LRFPP Systems Actions Summary*,” and “*LRFPP Inventory Actions Summary*.”

With the completion of the proposed work, the following schools are proposed to be eliminated: n/a; the following schools are proposed to be added: (4) new PK-8 schools, Visual and Performing Arts High School, Vocational High School, Alternative High School.

Table 5. School Building Scope of Work

Proposed Scope of Work	Applicable Schools
Renovation only (no new construction)	
System actions only (no inventory actions)	School 13 Benjamin Franklin (160); School 21 Victor Mravlag (240); School 22 William Halloran (250); School 23 Butler Academy (260); School 26 Dr. Orlando Edreira Academy (290); School 27 Dr. Antonia Pantoja (310); School 28 Duarte-Marti (315); School 29 Albert Einstein; School 30 Ronald Reagan (305); School 50 Francis Smith (350); School 51 Donald Stewart (355); School 52 Martin Luther King (360); School 80 Alexander Hamilton (405); School 84 Thomas Jefferson (403); School 89 Elizabeth High School (025); School 90 Christian Bollwage (303)
Inventory actions only (no systems actions)	n/a
Systems and inventory changes	Schools 1 George Washington (090); School 9 Jerome Dunn (302); School 3 Lacorte-Peterson (110); School 5 Mabel G. Holmes (300); School 7 Terrence Reilly (030); School 83 Admiral William Halsey (402);
New construction	
Building addition only (no systems or existing inventory actions)	n/a
Renovation and building addition (system, existing inventory, and new construction actions)	School 2 Winfield Scott (100); School 4 Joseph Battin (035); School 6 Loverture-Lafayette (120); School 12 Elmora (150); School 14 Abraham Lincoln (170); School 15 Christopher Columbus (180); School 16 Madison Monroe (190); School 18 Robert Morris (210); School 19 Wildrow Wilson (220); School 20 John Marshall (230); School 25 Charles Hudson (280); School 82 John Dwyer (401)
New building on existing site	n/a
New building on new or expanded site	School 32 New PK-8 (P01); School 36 New PK-8 (P02); School 38 New PK-8 (P03); School 40 New PK-8 (P05); Visual and Performing Arts High School (P09); Vocational High School (P10)
Site and building disposal (in addition to above scopes)	

Proposed Scope of Work	Applicable Schools
Partial building demolition	n/a
Whole building demolition	n/a
Site and building disposal or discontinuation of use	n/a

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 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. Proposed Room Inventories and the Facilities Efficiency Standards

The District’s proposed school buildings were evaluated to assess general educational adequacy in terms of compliance with the FES area allowance pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:26-2.2 and 2.3.

District schools are not proposed to provide less square feet per student than the FES after the completion of proposed work as indicated in Table 5.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the District’s proposed room inventories are adequate for LRFP approval. If school(s) are proposed to provide less square feet per student than the FES area allowance, the District has provided justification indicating that the educational adequacy of the facility will not be adversely affected and has been granted an FES waiver by the Department pending project submission and review. This determination does not include an assessment of eligible square feet for State support, which 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 LRFP when an application for a specific school facilities project is submitted to the Department for review and approval.

7. Other LRFP Amendment Considerations: The standard cohort-survival enrollment projection likely underestimates future enrollments since survival rates have increased during the last few years. Therefore, the district anticipates more significant enrollment growth than projected by a standard projection at this time.