

Greater Egg Harbor Regional School District Board of Education
Task Force Committee Meeting Minutes
July 31, 2006
7:00 PM

Present: Dr. Pfeffer, Dr. Ciccariello, Mr. Grossi, Task Force Committee (list attached), Community Members (list attached).

1. Welcome and Introductions Dr. Pfeffer opened the meeting with introductions of the members of the Task Force Committee, Architects, SCC members, and Greater Egg Harbor Regional High School District Board of Education members. Mr. Houck, GEHRHSD Board President, followed with a welcome for the members of the Task Force and audience. Dr. Pfeffer reviewed the agenda for the meeting and the role of the Task Force Committee to choose a conceptual floor plan for the proposed high school.

2. History of the District Dr. Pfeffer provided the history of the district from its creation in 1957 to the present. He explained the extensive steps that the district has undertaken since 2000 to secure the information necessary to begin the process of adding an additional high school. While displaying a picture of the various sites that were considered for the new high school and directing the attention of the audience to a side table holding up binders of documentation and blueprints, he outlined the preliminary steps the district has accomplished thus far which included: identifying land, seeking funding, numerous animal and plant studies, and securing various permits. In 2006 the architectural firm, Faridy Veisz Fraytak, P.C. was selected and funding assistance was pursued under the direction of the Department of Education and the School Construction Corporation (SCC).

3. Facilities Needs – Student Enrollment Dr. Ciccariello informed the Task Force that district enrollment has increased steadily with an increase of 1,439 students over the last eleven years. The 2006/2007 total student enrollment for Absegami is 2232; Oakcrest, 1752; District, 3984. Presently, district student enrollment is 1033 over the functional capacity or maximum fit for students. The number of unhoused students is projected to rise to 1148 by the 2007-2008 school year exclusive of housing growth. Approximately 1514 single family dwelling units are presently under construction in constituent districts.

4. Facilities Needs – Educational Specifications Dr. Ciccariello explained that the educational specifications of the proposed high school must follow standards for general and specialized instructional space to support the achievement of the core curriculum content standards. The educational specifications must also include non-instructional spaces such as administrative offices, department offices, health and food services, etc. The educational specifications being considered for the proposed high school include the two Schools-Within-a-School Concept. One school will be for Grades 9 and 10 and one for Grades 11 and 12. Benefits of a school-within-a school concept include: academic, social, attendance and graduation, safety and discipline. At least one magnet school program will also be included in the proposed high school with programs being considered such as: International Baccalaureate, Animation and Graphic Arts,

Technology, Creative and Performing Arts, Environmental Sciences, University Connections, Gifted & Talented, International Studies, Broadcast Arts, Computer Studies, Education to Careers, and Marine Technology.

5. Facilities Needs – Financial Mr. Grossi announced that the maximum estimated cost of the new high school is \$70 million dollars with the state responsible for 66.69% or \$46,683,000 and the remaining 33.31% or \$23,317,000 being the cost to the regional district. While these figures are preliminary, an analysis of the tax allocations illustrates the following share of the regional district's constituent costs: EHC, 4.9184% or \$1,146,824; Galloway, 52.3916% or \$12,216,149; Hamilton, 34.7270% or \$8,097,295; Mullica, 7.9630% or 1,856,732. Mr. Ianoale, Bond Attorney, emphasized four points regarding the \$23 million dollar expense to the constituent districts: (1) the district cost would be spread over 25 to 30 years (2) the SCC will fund two thirds or 66.67% of the cost of the new high school (3) if the referendum is defeated in March 2007, it is not known if the SCC can continue to fund the 66.67% cost of the new high school beyond March 2007 (4) interest rates as of last week are still relatively low at 4.5%. An SCC representative further explained that if there is any overage beyond the cost at referendum time to the voters, the overage would be completely funded by the SCC.

6. Communications Dr. Pfeffer introduced Terry-Ann Zander, public relations expert who will be working on behalf of the new high school. Ms. Zander explained consensus decision making and summarized the role of the Task Force: (1) feel comfortable to express opinions and ideas (2) the meeting is being filmed to document decisions and consensus of the committee (3) decide which building plan best meets the needs of the community (4) a summary of all decisions will be made at the end so all will feel comfortable going back to the public and helping explain and promote the new high school.

7. Construction Model and Issues Mr. Fraytak provided an overview for architectural planning that were included in all three conceptual plans being presented: (1) all plans maximized space for functional capacity (2) each met the educational specifications for a school-within-a-school concept but with different nuances (3) each design contained the magnet school concept.

Mr. Hopkins presented pros and cons for each of the three Conceptual Floor Plans referring to large scale drawings and hand-outs. According to Mr. Hopkins, the key points of the First Conceptual Floor Plan are:

- (1) best design for the small school-within-a-school concept
- (2) Vice Principal and Guidance Offices located in each of the two academic wings
- (3) one central point of access at main entrance, good for safety, not many key entrances
- (4) ease of expansion
- (5) can close off cafeteria, gym, performing arts and auditorium from the rest of the building when in use for school and community use
- (6) good for natural lighting
- (7) wide main hallway for student flow

(8) takes up more area so not as efficient

The key points of the Second Conceptual Floor Plan are:

- (1) more effective because of rectilinear design
- (2) core spaces provide easy access
- (3) best student circulation pattern of all three schemes
- (4) main events lobby has multiple entry points rather than one main entrance so not as well contained
- (5) while the gym, library and auditorium can be separated from the academic areas, the cafeteria is on the other end of the building

The key points of the Third Conceptual Floor Plan are:

- (1) baseball design
- (2) CST, Guidance and Administration are located in the main entrance
- (3) while the first and second plan fits under 70 million, the third does not
- (4) the gym, library, auditorium and cafeterias are all separated from each other

Questions are attached.

Dr. Pfeffer adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM. Next Task Force meeting will be held at 7:00 PM on Monday, August 7, 2006.

Minutes submitted by Margaret M. Doran