



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

JON S. CORZINE
Governor

LUCILLE E. DAVY
Commissioner

September 12, 2007

Mr. Richard Kaplan, Superintendent
MIDDLESEX COUNTY
New Brunswick School District
P.O. Box 2683
New Brunswick, NJ 08903-2683

Re: Long-Range Facilities Plan Final Determination

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

The Department of Education (Department) has completed its preliminary review of the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) submitted by the New Brunswick 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.*) (Act), N.J.A.C. 6A:26 -1 *et seq.* (Educational Facilities Code), and the Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES). The Department has found the District's LRFP submittal to be complete and is now presenting the LRFP Final Determination (Final Determination).

The Final Determination of the District's LRFP includes a Summary with the following sections:

1. Inventory Overview
2. K-12 Enrollments
3. Preschool Enrollments
4. FES and District Practices Capacity
5. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students Prior to Proposed Work
6. Proposed Work
7. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students After Completion of Proposed Work
8. Proposed Room Inventories and the Facilities Efficiency Standards
9. Preliminary Project Prioritization

Major LRFP approval issues include the adequacy of the LRFP's proposed enrollments, school capacities, and educational spaces. 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

www.nj.gov/education

New Jersey Is An Equal Opportunity Employer • Printed on Recycled and Recyclable Paper

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.

Following the approval of the LRFP, the District may submit an amendment to the approved LRFP for Department review. Unless and until an amendment to the LRFP is submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of the Department pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7G-4(c), the approved LRFP shall remain in effect. The District may proceed with the implementation of school facilities projects that are consistent with the approved LRFP whether or not the school facilities project contains square footage that may be ineligible for State support.

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. Please contact Susan Kutner at the Office of School Facilities at (609) 943-5681 or email susan.kutner@doe.state.nj.us with any questions you may have pertaining to the District's LRFP. Contact Ron Tofel, County Manager at the Office of School Facilities, at telephone number (609) 943-5881 or email at ron.tofel@doe.state.nj.us with any questions pertaining to project advancement.

Sincerely,



Lucille E. Davy
Commissioner

Enclosure

c: Willa Spicer, Deputy Commissioner
John Hart, Chief of Staff
Assistant Commissioner, Division of District and School Improvement
William King, Assistant Commissioner
Kathryn Forsyth, Director of Public Information
Dr. Patrick Piegari, Middlesex County Superintendent of Schools
Bernard E. Piaia, Director, School Facilities, Office of the Chief of Staff
Susan Kutner, Director, Policy and Planning, School Facilities, Office of the Chief of Staff
H. Lyle Jones, Regional Director, School Facilities, Office of the Chief of Staff
Ron Tofel, County Manager, School Facilities, Office of the Chief of Staff

LONG-RANGE FACILITIES PLAN
Final Determination Summary
New Brunswick School District

The Department of Education (Department) has completed its review of the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP or Plan) submitted by the New Brunswick 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.*) (Act), N.J.A.C. 6A:26-1 *et seq.* (Educational Facilities Code), and the Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES).

This is the Department's Final Determination Summary (Summary) of the LRFP. The Summary is based on the standards set forth in the Act, the Educational Facilities Code, the FES, District entered data in the LRFP and Project Application and Tracking System (LRFP website), and District supplied supporting documentation. The Summary consists of nine sections. The referenced reports in *italic* text are standard LRFP reports available on the Department's LRFP website.

1. Inventory Overview

The District provides services for students in grades PK-12. The predominant existing school grade configuration is K-8 / 6-12. The predominant proposed school grade configuration is K / PK, 1-5 / 6-8 / 9-12. The District is classified as an Abbott District for funding purposes.

The District identified existing and proposed schools, sites, buildings, playgrounds, playfields, and parking lots in its 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 9 of this Summary lists work proposed at each school.

Table 1: Inventory Summary

	Existing	Proposed
Sites:		
Total Number of Sites	17	17
Number of Sites with no Buildings	1	2
Number of Sites with no Instructional Buildings	2	5
Schools and Buildings:		
Total Number of Schools with Enrollment	10	13
Total Number of Instructional Buildings	16	13
Total Number of Administrative and Utility Buildings	2	4
Total Number of Athletic Facilities	0	0
Total Number of Parking Structures	0	0
Total Number of Temporary Facilities	0	0

As directed by the Department, incomplete school facilities projects that have project approval from the Department and are (1) under construction or (2) included in the New Jersey School Development Authority's April 2007 Capital Plan are represented as "existing" in the LRFP website. District projects in

in either of these two categories that include new construction and/or the reconfiguration of existing program space are as follows: Kindergarten Center #3, Paul Robeson Community Center, Redshaw Elementary School, and New High School (Demonstration Project).

Major conclusions are as follows:

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

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the proposed inventory is adequate for review of the District's LRFP. 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. The District did not accept the LRFP website cohort-survival enrollment projection due to the misrepresentation of historic enrollments. In lieu of the LRFP website projection, the District submitted a cohort-survival enrollment projection based on historic data from the 2000-01 school year to the 2005-06 school year.

The District's existing and proposed enrollments and the "baseline" cohort-survival projection provided on the Department's LRFP website are listed in Table 2. Detailed information can be found in the LRFP website report titled "*Enrollment Projection Detail*." Existing and proposed school enrollments and grade alignments can be found in the report titled "*Enrollment and School Grade Alignment*." An analysis of preschool enrollments is provided in Section 3.

Table 2: K-12 Enrollment Comparison

	Actual Enrollments 2005-06	District Proposed Enrollments	Department's LRFP Website Projection
Grades K-5, including SCSE	3,904	4,421	4,061
Grades 6-8, including SCSE	1,571	1,820	1,703
Grades 9-12, including SCSE	1,508	1,981	1,901
District K-12 Totals	6,983	8,222	7,665

"SCSE" = Self-Contained Special Education

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District did not elect to use the Department's LRFP website projection. Supporting documentation was submitted to the Department as required to justify the proposed enrollments.
- The District is planning for a 1,239 (17.74%) student increase. The enrollment growth is projected in all grade levels.
- As of December 2006, the District places 175 students, ages 6-21, in private day schools or public separate schools. 19 students, ages 3-5, are placed in private day schools or public separate schools. The District-proposed enrollments include accommodations for the return of a portion of these students to District-operated schools.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the District's proposed enrollments are supportable for review of the District's LRFP. 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 is appropriate for the updated enrollments.

3. Preschool Enrollments

The District identified the preschool universe for five-year planning purposes and the anticipated future use of community provider and Head Start programs to accommodate capacity needs. The preschool universe includes accommodations for three year old, four year old, and self-contained special education students.

Table 3 summarizes existing and proposed preschool enrollments in District, community provider, and Head Start facilities. Ninety percent (90%) of District births three or four years prior to the projection year and the average birth to kindergarten survival ratio are also listed for comparative purposes.

Table 3: Preschool Enrollments

	Total Preschool	District	Community Provider	Head Start
Actual (2005-06)	1,219	105	1,097	17
District Proposed Universe	1,372	217	1,110	45
90% of Births 3-4 Years Earlier	1,704			
Historic Average Birth to Kindergarten Survival Rate Percentage	60%			

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The majority of the District's preschool enrollments are currently served by private providers. No significant change is proposed.
- District, community provider, and Head Start facilities are proposed to accommodate approximately 72% of the preschool universe based on births three or four years earlier.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that the District-proposed preschool enrollments are adequate for review of the District's LRFP. 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 and an update on community provider and Head Start enrollments in order to verify that the LRFP's planned capacity continues to meet District enrollments.

4. 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 5 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 4 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 4 Proposed Enrollments and Capacity Summary

	Proposed Enrollment	FES Capacity	Deviation*	District Practices Capacity	Deviation*
Preschool (PK)	217	237.89	20.89	222.23	5.23
Elementary (K-5)	4,421	4,296.27	-124.73	4,457.85	36.85
Middle (6-8)	1,820	1,617.17	-202.83	1,813.63	-6.37
High (9-12)	1,981	826.20	-1,154.80	1,947.35	-33.65
District Totals	8,439	6,977.53	-1,461.47	8,441.05	2.05

* 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.
- Adequate justification has been provided by the District if capacity for a school deviates from the proposed enrollments by more than 5%.

FINDINGS The Department has determined that proposed District capacity, in accordance with the proposed enrollments, is adequate for review of the District's LRFP. 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.

5. 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 5 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 5: 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
Preschool (PK)	217	208.49	8.51	125.00	1,064.05
Elementary (K-5)	4,421	3,135.63	1,285.37	125.00	160,671.06
Middle (6-8)	1,820	319.70	1,500.30	134.00	201,039.54
High (9-12)	1,981	2,203.28	0.00	151.00	0.00
District Totals	8,439	5,867.10			

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The calculations for “Estimated Existing Functional Capacity” include four incomplete school facilities projects that have project approval from the Department and are under construction or part of the New Jersey School Development Authority’s April 2007 Capital Plan.
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, does not have Unhoused Students for the following grade groups: 9-12.
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, has Unhoused Students for the following grade groups: PK, K-5, 6-8.
- The District is an ECPA (Early Childhood Program Aid) District. Therefore, general education pre-kindergarten students are included in the calculations.
- The District is proposing to demolish or discontinue the use of existing instructional space. The Functional Capacity calculation excludes square feet proposed to be demolished or discontinued for the following FES grade groups: K-5, 6-8, 9-12.

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).

6. 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 6 summarizes the type of work proposed in the District’s LRFP for instructional buildings. Detailed information can be found in the LRFP website reports titled “*Site Asset Inventory*,” “*LRFP Systems Actions Summary*,” and “*LRFP Inventory Actions Summary*.” The proposed scope of work for instructional buildings includes two new buildings on new sites, two new buildings on existing sites, the renovation and expansion of three buildings, and systems upgrades at two buildings. System upgrades are also proposed for two buildings that are to be demolished.

Table 6: Proposed Work for Instructional Building

Type of Work	Work Included in LRFP
System Upgrades	Yes
Inventory Changes	
Room Reassignment or Reconfiguration	Yes
Building Addition	Yes
New Building	Yes
Partial or Whole Building Demolition or Discontinuation of Use	Yes
New Site	Yes

Major conclusions are as follows:

- The District has proposed system upgrades in one or more instructional buildings.
- The District has proposed inventory changes, including new construction, in one or more instructional buildings.
- The District has proposed new construction in lieu of rehabilitation in one or more instructional buildings.

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 review of the District's LRFP. 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.

7. 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 7 provides a preliminary assessment. Detailed information concerning the calculation can be found in the website report titled "*Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students.*"

Table 7: Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students After Completion of Proposed Work

	Estimated Maximum Approved Area for Unhoused Students	Total New GSF	Proposed Functional Capacity after Construction	Unhoused Students after Construction	Estimated Maximum Area for Unhoused Students Remaining
Pre-Kindergarten	1,064.05	4,672	245.86	0.00	0.00
Elementary (K-5)	160,671.06	322,301	5,707.04	0.00	0.00
Middle (6-8)	201,039.54	195,914	1,788.28	31.72	4,250.62
High (9-12)	0.00	0	2,203.28	0.00	0.00
District Totals		522,887	9,944.46		

Major conclusions are as follows:

- New construction is proposed for the following grade groups: PK, K-5, 6-8.
- 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, K-5.
- The District, based on the preliminary LRFP assessment, will have Unhoused Students after completion of the proposed LRFP work for the following grade groups: 6-8.

FINDINGS The 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.

8. 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(s) that will provide less square feet per student than the FES allowance.

- The District is proposing school(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 LRFP when an application for a specific school facilities project is submitted to the Department for review and approval.

9. Preliminary Project Prioritization

The Department of Education and the New Jersey School Development Authority convened a “Project Prioritization Task Force” to create a system that objectively and transparently applies the priorities of the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act and logistical considerations to the sequencing of future school facilities projects. The goal of the prioritization criteria is to allocate available funding to the highest and best purpose by addressing issues consistent with the criteria of the Act. District feedback concerning logistical or other considerations particular to each project will be a critical part of the process.

Projects will be organized in the following descending criteria:

1. Physical Plant / Health and safety
2. Early childhood center (*pre-kindergarten and/or kindergarten*)
3. Overcrowding; Preschool capacity
4. Overcrowding; No preschool capacity
5. All other projects
 - a. No overcrowding; Preschool capacity
 - b. No overcrowding; No preschool capacity or overcrowding
 - c. Non-instructional projects

Logistical considerations will influence the sequencing of school facilities projects within each category. Considerations will include land status, project timeline, construction phasing, and district priorities.

Table 9 organizes the work proposed in the District’s LRFP by the prioritization categories. The prioritization analysis assumes that all proposed work associated with a school will be advanced at the same time, with physical plant work included within the larger renovation and expansion project as applicable. Overcrowding is based on existing enrollments and capacity on a district-wide grade group basis. **Incomplete projects currently represented as “existing” inventory in the LRFP website are calculated as existing capacity in the overcrowding analysis.** This includes Kindergarten Center #3, Paul Robeson Community Center, Redshaw Elementary School, and New High School (Demonstration Project). Operational issues that impact overcrowding, such as school sending areas, are not considered pending District input. Physical plant and educational adequacy issues other than overcrowding are also not examined at this time.

Table 9: Proposed LRFP Work and Preliminary Prioritization

School/Building Name	Proposed Grades	LRFP Scope of Work	Land Needed	Project Status
1. Physical Plant				
Lincoln (existing)	--	Systems prior to demolition	N	
McKinley	PK-8	Systems	N	
Paul Robeson	1-5	Systems	N	
Roosevelt (existing)	--	Systems prior to demolition	N	
2. Early Childhood Center				
<i>Gr. K-5: 2005-06 enrollment = 3,904; Existing FES Capacity = 3,120.83</i>				
Sanford K Center 1	K	New building on new site		Pending schematic approval
Lord Stirling K Center 2	K	New building on new site	Y	Pending schematic approval
3. Overcrowding; Preschool Capacity				
<i>District PK Planning Universe = 217; Existing FES Capacity = 189.02</i>				
<i>Gr. K-5: 2005-06 enrollment = 3,904; Existing FES Capacity = 3,120.83</i>				
Livingston	PK / 1-5	Renovation and addition; Land transfer	Y	
4. Overcrowding; No Preschool Capacity				
<i>Gr. K-5: 2005-06 enrollment = 3,904; Existing FES Capacity = 3,120.83</i>				
<i>Gr. 6-8: 2005-06 enrollment = 1,571; Existing FES Capacity = 593.98</i>				
Lincoln	1-5	New building on existing site; Demolition of existing	N	
Roosevelt	1-5	New building on existing site; Demolition of existing	N	Pre-development approval
New Middle School	6-8	Conversion of HS building; Partial demolition; Renovation and addition	N	
Wilson	K-8	Partial demolition; Renovation and addition	N	Pre-development approval
5. All Other Projects				
5A. No Overcrowding; Preschool Capacity				
<i>No applicable projects.</i>				
5B. No Overcrowding or Preschool Capacity				
<i>No applicable projects.</i>				
5C. Non-instructional Projects				
Adult Learning Center/BOE Offices	--	Systems	N	
Health Science Technology High (proposed Administrative)	--	Conversion to administrative offices	N	

FINDINGS District-wide overcrowding has been identified in grades PK-8. The District currently has 1,350 students from Redshaw and Robeson located in swing space for construction and another 264 students located in leased annex buildings for Lincoln and Robeson. The Department will meet with the District to discuss project prioritization, logistical considerations, and District objectives for the proposed projects.