

DATA CHECK EXPLANATION LETTER

April 24, 2020

Mr. Richard Altringer

Educational Program Development Specialist
New Jersey Department of Education
Office of School Facilities
Division of Facilities & Transportation
P.O. Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500
Richard.Altringer@doe.nj.gov

Dear Mr. Altringer:

The East Windsor Regional School District Board of Education recently submitted a comprehensive update to their Long Range Facilities Plan, to comply with the five-year reporting requirement. As part of this submission, there were several items that appear with “yes” responses in the Data Check Report. Please accept this letter as an explanation of those items.

			Statement True for Proposed LRFP?		
Ref No.	Reporting Area	Issue	YES	NO	Comments
1	Enrollment	Proposed District-wide Enrollments deviate from the website Baseline Cohort-Survival Projection for the cited grades. <i>(Supporting documentation must be submitted to the DOE.)</i>	X		G4; G8; G11; SCSEK5; G3; G7; G12; SCSE68; G2; G9; SCSE912; PK4; G6; G1; G10; G5; K
Explanation No. 1		Items #1 and 2 on the Data Check report stem from a lack of functionality of the LRFP system, resulting in no appropriate Baseline within the system. Enrollment projections have been provided based on historical data and known birth rates. Refer to the attached submitted Cohort Survival Spreadsheet.			
2	Enrollment	Proposed District-wide Enrollments deviate from the website Baseline Cohort-Survival Projection by more than 10% for the cited grades.	X		G4; G8; G11; SCSEK5; G3; G7; G12; SCSE68; G2; G9; SCSE912; PK4; G6; G1; G10; G5; K
Explanation No. 2		Response to this data check message is the same as described in Explanation No. 1.			

			Statement True for Proposed LRF?		
Ref. No.	Reporting Area	Issue	YES	NO	Comments
3	Enrollment	Proposed District-wide Enrollments deviate from Current School Year Enrollments by more than 10% for the cited grades.	X		G4; G8; G11; G3; G12; G2; SCSE912; G1; G10; K
Explanation No. 3		Enrollment projections have been provided based on historical data and known birth rates. Refer to the attached submitted Cohort Survival Spreadsheet, which was populated from data provided from the NJDOE. As is the case with many suburban New Jersey school districts, there is a decreasing enrollment wave spreading through the district. As the schools were designed to accommodate a higher capacity, as was the case in the late 2000's and early 2010's, there is a confirmed gap between the current enrollment numbers and the school's capacity.			
4	Enrollment; LRF/School Grade Alignment	Proposed District-wide Enrollments do not equal the Proposed School Grade Alignment totals for the cited grades. (This must be adjusted to equal for LRF approval.)		X	
Explanation No. 4		No response is required.			
5	LRF/School Grade Alignment	No students are assigned to a Proposed School.		X	
Explanation No. 5		No response is required.			
6	Inventory/ Assets	No Assets are assigned to a Site.		X	
Explanation No. 6		No response is required.			
7	Inventory /Assets	No Instructional Buildings are assigned to a School.		X	
Explanation No. 7		No response is required.			
8	Inventory /Assets	A preschool community provider-owned building is included in the district's Inventory. (Please confirm that the district plans to request, or has already received, state facilities funding for the center. If this is not true, the center should be included in the ECCP Survey section of the website and not in the Inventory section)		X	
Explanation No. 8		No response is required.			
9	Inventory /Rooms; LRF/School Grade Alignment	A Proposed School's capacity, based on district practices, is not within 5% of the Proposed School Enrollment.	X		Ethel Mcknight; Melvin H Kreps School; Grace Norton Rogers School; Walter C Black; Perry L. Drew
Explanation No. 9		Please refer to Explanation #3 above.			
10	Inventory /Rooms; LRF/School Grade Alignment	Proposed FES Capacity Generating Rooms in Instructional Building(s) assigned to a Proposed School do not match the Proposed School Grade Alignments.		X	
Explanation No. 10		No response is required.			

			Statement True for Proposed LRFP?		
Ref. No.	Reporting Area	Issue	YES	NO	Comments
11	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Schools are missing Specialized or Administrative / Support FES Room Types from the Room Inventory.		X	
Explanation No. 11		No response is required.			
12	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings do not have "Grossing Factor Spaces" included in the Room Inventory.		X	
Explanation No. 12		No response is required.			
13	Inventory/ Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings have a Grossing Factor, based on the Room Inventory that is not within a 1.30-1.70 range. <i>(Please confirm that the Room Inventory is accurately represented.)</i>		X	
Explanation No. 13		No response is required.			
14	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings have Proposed Room(s) assigned a District Class Size Practice of 25 or greater.	X		Hightstown High School
Explanation No. 14		The school district operates its PE classes with greater than 25 students per class.			
15	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings contain FES Capacity Generating Rooms with no District Class Size Practices assigned. <i>(Capacity will be automatically assigned in the reports.)</i>		X	
Explanation No. 15		No response is required.			
16	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings do not contain Rooms.		X	
Explanation No. 16		No response is required.			
17	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings contain Net Program Spaces sized greater than 10,000 square feet.	X		Hightstown High School – Instructional(600 – Library / Media Center); Hightstown High School – Instructional(715 – Annex Gym); Hightstown High School – Instructional(District BOE Offices)
Explanation No. 17		The district confirms that each of the three spaces indicated is greater than 10,000 square feet.			

			Statement True for Proposed LRFP?		
Ref. No.	Reporting Area	Issue	YES	NO	Comments
18	Inventory /Rooms	Proposed Instructional Buildings contain FES Capacity Generating or Specialized Space room types sized less than 100 square feet.		X	
Explanation No. 18		No response is required.			
19	Inventory / Rooms; LRFP	Proposed Buildings contain Reconfiguration Actions in which the total square feet of Existing Room Reconfiguration Actions, including Support Spaces, is not within 3% of the total square feet of the Potential Room Reconfiguration Actions.		X	
Explanation No. 19		No response is required.			
20	LRFP	Proposed School(s) provide less gross square feet per student than prescribed in the Facilities Efficiency Standards.		X	
Explanation No. 20		No response is required.			
21	LRFP	Building(s) proposed to be demolished are assigned work.		X	
Explanation No. 21		No response is required.			
22	LRFP	Leased Buildings are assigned work.		X	
Explanation No. 22		No response is required.			

We trust that the above explanation of each of the Data Check Report items is sufficient to further explain the conditions at the East Windsor Regional School District. The Board and Administration are confident that their proposed long range plans will satisfy the needs of their students for the next five year period.

Respectfully submitted,

SSP Architects


 Scott E. Mihalick, AIA
 Chief Operating Officer

East Windsor Regional School District


 Paul Todd
 School Business Administrator

Enclosures: Data Check Report dated April 24, 2020