

**BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING**  
Borough of Manasquan

*The Special Meeting on the Warrior Athletic Field was held in the Manasquan Elementary School Cafetorium, 168 Broad Street, Manasquan, New Jersey, on Tuesday, October 29, 2013.*

*Mr. Bauer called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and read the Opening Statement.*

**1. Call to Order**

Opening Statement: Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-10, notice of this meeting has been provided by publication in the Asbury Park Press, the Coast Star and posted in the Borough Hall of Manasquan and in the schools within the time limits prescribed by law.

Call to Order

*Mr. Bauer requested that everyone stand and join in the Pledge of Allegiance.*

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

Pledge of Allegiance

**3. Roll Call**

<i>Julia Barnes (Brielle) - absent</i>	<i>Linda DiPalma</i>	<i>Michael Shelton</i>
<i>Thomas Bauer</i>	<i>Mark Furey (Belmar) – arrived 7:35 p.m.</i>	
<i>Jack Campbell</i>	<i>Michael Forrester (SLH)</i>	<i>Katherine Verdi</i>
<i>Kenneth Clayton</i>	<i>Thomas Pellegrino</i>	<i>James Walsh - absent</i>
		<i>Patricia Walsh</i>

Roll Call

*Also Present: Renae LaPrete, Interim Superintendent of Schools, Dominic V. Carrea, Interim Business Administrator/Board Secretary, Michael Gross, Board Attorney and Sandi Freeman, Recording Secretary.*

*Mr. Bauer read the Mission Statement and Statement to the Public.*

**4. Mission Statement**

Manasquan School District's mission is to empower students to reach their potential and become life-long learners. We strive to ensure that students play an active role in their education, are guided by rigorous academic standards aligned with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, and function within the community that regards student, educators, and parents as full participants in the educational process. We dedicate ourselves to the realization of a supportive learning environment that nurtures growth, personal integrity and mutual respect.

Mission Statement

**5. Statement to the Public**

Often times it may appear to members of our audience that the Board of Education takes action with very little comment and in many cases by unanimous vote. Before a matter is placed on the agenda at a public meeting, the administration has thoroughly reviewed the matter with the Superintendent of Schools. If the Superintendent of Schools is satisfied that the matter is ready to be presented to the Board of Education, it is then referred to the appropriate Board committee. The members of the Board committee work with the administration and the Superintendent of Schools to assure that the members fully understand the matter. When the committee is satisfied with the matter, it is presented to the Board of Education for discussion before any final action is taken. Only then is it placed on the agenda for action at a public meeting. In rare instances, matters are presented to the Board of Education for discussion at the same meeting that final action may be taken.

Statement to The Public

*At this time Mr. Bauer began the presentation on the Warrior Athletic Complex. He said that tonight's special meeting was to discuss specifically the improvements to the school district for the Warrior Athletic Complex. He introduced the Board Members, Administrators, Ms. LaPrete and Mr. Carrea and the following consultants: Mr. David Eareckson, civil engineer, Mr. Bob Allison, financial consultant and Mr. Michael Gross, the Board Attorney.*

Warrior Athletic Complex Presentation

*Mr. Bauer provided a bit of history on the project that was first kicked off around 2004-2005 and the numerous options that have been presented to date relating to the project. He also spoke on the \$5 million proposal in 2006 that was brought to referendum and failed. He spoke on the efforts made for private funding that were not successful due to economic situations. He said there is a new proposal that has received positive interest and community spirit but also contentious disputes from the public. He hopes that the hurdle can be met head on and move the project forward as a community.*

*Mr. Bauer presented a photo essay of the district's facilities, past proposals and options, the new proposal and a photo tour of some of the Shore Conference facilities. He provided details on the phases of the project and the costs related to each of the phases. He reported that the district plans on starting Phase I of the project once approval is received at the state level.*

*Mr. Shelton thanked Mr. Bauer and introduced Mr. Bob Allison, who presented the financial component and following options that can apply to financing of the project: Current budget and transfers; future budgeting, grant possibilities, permanent financing (going to bond); leasing (equipment – i.e. turf); temporary financing – one-year note; donations; participation fees (pay a fee to play).*

*(A copy of the presentation will be posted on the school website and be included in the formal minutes.)*

*A video narrated by Jack Ford on the athletic field complex was shown at this time.*

*Mr. Bauer, Mr. Shelton and Mr. Pellegrino addressed a list of Frequently Asked Questions on the project.*

*(A copy of the FAQ will be posted on the school website and be included in the formal minutes.)*

## **6. Presentations**

- **Warrior Athletic Complex**

*At this time Mr. Bauer began the presentation on the Warrior Athletic Complex.*

*At the conclusion of the presentation Mr. Bauer opened the Public Comment on Agenda items.*

## **7. Public Comment on Agenda**

Time may be allocated for public comment at this meeting. Each speaker may be allotted a limited time when recognized by the presiding officer. Individuals wishing to address the Board shall be recognized by the presiding officer and shall give their names, addresses and the group, if any, that they represent. Although the Board encourages public participation, it reserves the right, through its presiding officer, to terminate remarks to and/or by any individual not keeping with the conduct of a proper and efficient meeting. During the public participation portions of this meeting, the Board will not respond to questions from the public involving employment, appointment, termination of employment, negotiations, terms and conditions of employment, evaluation of the performance of, promotion or disciplining of any specific or prospective or current employee. This public forum is limited to comment on items included in this agenda only.

Public  
Comment on  
Agenda

*Andrew Tuit, 96 Broad Street, Manasquan, thanked the Board for their efforts and asked the Board to look at the financing and bonding. He said he supports the project and asked how the Board would move forward with bonding.*

*Mr. Shelton explained the referendum process, its advantages and drawbacks. He said that this project has to be started and it has to be done in compliance with state statutes. He commented that he believes a lot of people want to see this project happen.*

*Marilyn Jackson, 59 McLean Avenue, Manasquan, stated she is a member of the Concerned Taxpayers group but was speaking on behalf of herself. She complimented the Board on the presentation and said she was concerned with the lack of maintenance of the existing facilities. She asked how they were going to build the complex and how they were going to pay for the project. She said that the financial plan is vague and does not exist on paper. She commented on the questionable support from the sending districts. She said that the Board must be accountable to the taxpayers and provide a clear plan and estimates for each phase, gain support from the sending district, get firm donations from alumni, businesses and groups.*

*Michelle LaSala, 44 Parker Avenue, Manasquan, complimented the Board on the presentation. She informed the public and the Board that Mr. Bauer graciously extended an invitation to her and the group to meet with him and Mr. Pellegrino to discuss their concerns. She thanked them for this opportunity. She asked if the questions read tonight were all submitted by the public or by members of the Board. Mr. Bauer said a great majority were from the public. She referred to a question that pertained to her group and explained the formation of the group and their purpose. She continued with budgetary questions that were addressed by Mr. Allison. She also questioned budgetary transfers that took place at the June 25<sup>th</sup> meeting and asked in the future that a clear explanation be given to the public when the Board addresses budgetary transactions. Mr. Allison addressed her question on how funds could be used to fund a high school baseball field on the elementary school property. She feels that this is a capital project and the voters should have a say on this project. Mr. Shelton provided clarity to the transfer of funds that took place at the June 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

*Dick Meincke, 36 N. McClellan, Manasquan, stated he is a member of the Manasquan Concerned Taxpayers Association but was speaking on behalf of himself. Mr. Eareckson addressed his question on the expiration dates of the permits and provided details on the multi-permit application approval from the Department of Education and the nature of the permits relating to expiration dates and possible extensions. Mr. Meincke feels that there is ample time to work out the details of the project and no need to start now. He also asked for cost details on the project and alluded to cost estimates received from Astroturf. Mr. Shelton provided an explanation on the receipt of the Astroturf proposal and said that this document was made part of the Buildings & Grounds minutes in February 2013 and reported by Mr. Bauer in his committee report.*

*Mrs. Verdi said that she first saw this document on June 25<sup>th</sup>.*

*Mr. Meincke also questioned the participation fees and how this relates to a capital project. He said that he is in favor of improving the football field but not in favor of this project. He said that he believes that a referendum is not being called for because the complete plan and financing is not laid out and the public would vote it down.*

*Tim McMahon, 70 Minerva Avenue, Manasquan, said he was not a member of the concerned taxpayers association and commended the Board for their transparency. He said his family is in favor of the project. He said he is embarrassed by the substandard facilities and spoke on the liability having athletes play off campus. He asked that people stop taking shots against Mr. Bauer because he has done nothing underhanded. He said people are not moving into the district because of the disadvantage to the athletes.*

*Kevin Roddy, Holly Hill Drive, Brielle, alluded to a letter he wrote to the editor of The Coast Star in support of the project and comments he made this evening were in essence embodied in his letter. He wholeheartedly supports this project and has urged the Brielle Board of Education to support and make a financial commitment to support the project. He said as a coach of teams that have played on the fields and a father of a high school athlete in comparison to other Shore conference fields these are the worse.*

*Jeanne Walsh, 356 Cedar Avenue, Manasquan, disagreed with Mr. McMahon and said that there has not been transparency on the Board. She said that bids have to be put out and we need answers on the money and where the money is coming from.*

*Mr. Bauer said the Board would love to go to bid but this cannot be done until the Board gets approval from the state. He said it would be helpful if the public would write to the state and ask them to approve the project. He said that the project will be built in phases that can stand alone.*

*George Murvine, 84 Club Road, Brielle, said he wanted to echo Mr. Roddy's comments and he would also talk to the Brielle Board of Education to convince them to support the project. He is happy that so many people support the project and once you have the support finding the financing is secondary. He suggested the Board look at the funds, look at options and come up with a plan.*

*Bob Ferrante, 80 Ocean Avenue, Manasquan, complimented the plan presented this evening and asked if the numbers reported by sport could be separated by sending district. He believes this is important when asking the sending districts to support the plan. Mr. Bauer said this chart would be modified to include this information.*

*George McLaughlin, 10 James Place, Manasquan, asked why the Elizabeth Avenue/Osborn Avenue gate was closed for the football game. Mr. Pellegrino addressed this question and said that as a result of budget cuts there was a reduction in the number of ticket takers. He said that cost savings versus the inconvenience was analyzed and it was decided to re-open the gate. Mr. Bauer addressed his question on the use of Mallard Park by the varsity baseball team and clarified that this was not received well by the residents of that area. Mr. Bauer addressed his question on the capacity for seating in the new project and how the high school and elementary school baseball program would work schedule wise.*

*Jane Richardson, Willow Way, Manasquan, a member of the Concerned Taxpayers group, said she did not think the people of Manasquan were against the project. She said that of all the possible funding sources the only one that is a sure thing is the budget. She said to get the financing in place and then you will get support from the town. She commented on the deplorable state of the facilities and asked how they planned on maintaining this new facility if they cannot maintain what they have now.*

*Heather Garrett Muly, 28 Elizabeth Avenue, Manasquan, commented that the reason things are not being done is because of budget cuts. She then referred to monies coming into the budget due to breakage and CDL monies. She said the plan is beautiful but she has personal issues with parking and the walking track literally being up to a neighbor's property and bleachers being two feet off a resident's property. She commented on the length of time spent on presenting the plan and the short amount of time on how the plan would be financed. She asked to work with the people of the town and not move forward with the wall until a plan is in place. She suggested exploring sharing cost with the army camp to put fields at that location. She also suggested that since you have Astroturf estimates why not get more estimates from companies and put this information on the website.*

*Mr. Bauer commented that the need to build the retaining wall is so a track can be built on the campus.*

*Mr. Shelton spoke on the irrelevance of the Astroturf proposal.*

*George Murvine commented on the \$2.75 million and suggested that since that detail is known you should be able to put a financial package together.*

*Tim McMahon, explained the initial substance and composition of Astroturf being toxic and the new composition being improved and that has reduced costs.*

*Julia Barnes, speaking as a member of the audience, commented that the \$23 million dollar budget is not from Manasquan taxpayer revenue and over 40% is from sending district revenue. She said that the 24% of the population sent from Brielle deserve safe facilities. She said millions of dollars is paid in tuition. She realizes that teams will still practice at the army camp. She mentioned new regulations imposed by the NJSIAA and the deficiencies that are present for both the spectators and athletes at the army camp. She pointed out the benefits of having a track and the athletes being able to practice on campus instead of running through the town. She spoke through her experience of the educational value of track, the facility here and the safety of the athletes. She said that she is communicating with Brielle and has urged them to contribute towards this project. She spoke on the negative effect the efforts of the Manasquan Taxpayers have had on the project. She said that if this project fails and goes down the taxpayer should blame the people of the Manasquan Concerned Taxpayers Association.*

*Heather Garrett-Muly alluded to an e-mail sent to Mr. Bauer after the last meeting. She said it is not the intention to stop the project and rules need to be followed and if it does go down she feels it is very convenient for Mrs. Barnes to put down the group.*

*Mrs. Verdi commented that she takes offense of the behavior of Mrs. Barnes, a representative of the sending district. She also stated that she takes offense that if this plan goes down the Board is not prepared with an Option B. She said it cannot be this plan or nothing because that is unfair to the children of Manasquan. She hopes that the Board will come up with another plan. She thanked Mr. Bauer for all he has done but said there better be a Plan B.*

#### **8. Public Forum**

*Mr. Bauer asked for a motion to adjourn.*

#### **9. Adjournment**

*Motion was made by Mr. Shelton, seconded by Mr. Campbell, and **carried** by voice vote in favor to adjourn the meeting.*

*Ayes (10), Nays (0), Absent: (2) – Mrs. Barnes and Mr. Walsh*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Dominic V. Carrea  
Interim Business Administrator/Board Secretary*

Adjournment

# **Warrior Athletic Complex Frequently Asked Questions**

## **Section 1. General Plan & Design**

**What is the scope of the project as approved by the Board and what items are included in the \$2.75M?**

The main components of the project are first, a retaining wall and drainage improvements, followed by a synthetic turf, multi-purpose field, a 6-lane, 400 meter regulation track, bleachers, sports lighting, a baseball renovation including lighting and associated site improvements and ADA accommodations.

**Is there an existing conceptual plan of the Warrior Athletic Complex and how many phases does it include?**

Yes, a conceptual plan exists for the Master Plan. The project as anticipated will be constructed in multiple phases; the number of which will be based upon the least disruption to our student athletes and consideration for the time of year, including inclement weather.

**Numerous plans have been presented over the years. Why did the Board select this plan?**

This plan is the only one that includes a regulation track and baseball on campus, thus allowing for many teams, both boys and girls to participate more regularly on campus.

**Manasquan High School has never had a regulation track. Why is it being proposed now? What are the benefits?**

There are numerous benefits to having a track on campus, including the most obvious of being able to practice and hold track meets at home on our own regulation, 6-lane 400-meter track. A track benefits every student in the District for physical education classes on a year round basis and, the community at large could utilize the track for fitness and recreation purposes during certain non-school event hours.

**Is the Administration and staff in favor of a track on campus?**

Absolutely. The track coaches and Athletic Director have expressed their strong desire to construct a regulation track on site.

**What are the options for the relocation of the varsity baseball field?**

Numerous options have been considered and discussed. It is preferable to keep as many teams at home for competition purposes as possible. Greater attendance and participation would be expected, in addition to reduced transportation costs and the availability for more spectators to attend.

**Is a 6-lane regulation track adequate for high school competitions?**

Yes it is. Very few high schools in the shore conference have an 8-lane oval track. Several schools do have a 6-lane oval with an 8-lane straightaway. The great majority of schools have a 6-lane oval and a 6-lane straightaway.

**Why do we need a turf field? Is it a necessity?**

In Manasquan, it is a necessity due to the lack of fields and minimal land area. And, the kids deserve one – all teams, boys and girls. Many of the Shore Conference schools have turf fields, or at a minimum, practice fields. We have a shortage of space. Our field takes tremendous abuse and there is little way to maintain it for high impact usage and traffic. Turf surfaces greatly reduce the number of contests that are postponed due to weather-related conditions.

**Why are the bleachers being removed? Can't they be reused?**

The bleachers are being removed in order to construct the retaining wall and maximize usable land surface area. They cannot be reused, however they can and will be recycled.

**What type of new stands / bleachers can we expect? When?**

There are numerous options as to the type of stands available. While we anticipate permanent, ADA compliant stands, we have not finalized the type or design. This is contingent upon price and financing alternatives. Other districts have acquired permanent bleachers through lease-purchase financing and we are exploring that option. We have also been asked to look at donations, fund-raising and the possibility of selling reserved season tickets. There are many possibilities.

**What is the ultimate disposition of the "Plaza" and what kind of tables and umbrella's will we be looking at?**

At this stage, that question cannot be answered. We would like to have a nicely designed and landscaped area that includes seating and provides spectators a place to sit, eat, relax and enjoy conversation. It is too early to determine that, nor is the plan itself contingent in any way upon that.

**Has the Board discussed scheduling issues with the athletic director and administrators?**

Yes. All scheduling for activities is a function of the administration.

**Will the track have a finished surface? What type?**

The track will have a permanent, competition ready surface. Pricing varies and is being obtained.

**What are we doing about concessions? Is there a new concessions area planned in this project?**

See following question and response.

**The Pop Warner donated the current "snack shack." What happens to it with this plan?**

While Pop Warner did begin the initial construction of the current "snack shack," the BOE completed the majority of the project at their (taxpayer) cost.

In this plan, the present non-compliant building is removed. Last year, the District was cited for the structure's inadequacy from the Fire Department. Any new concession stand contemplated will be compliant with all code and setback requirements. Several parties have expressed their interest in donating a new concessions area at the new complex and conversations are ongoing. We'd love to have the concessions be located on the "home side" of the stadium as it would provide greater access to more people and be easier to stock supplies without taking vehicles across the property.

**Why not turf the present football field and baseball field where they currently exist? Many say this can be done for a much lesser cost.**

The Board doesn't believe this to be the case. It would forever eliminate a track. Lighting concerns would exist and usage would be severely restricted. The Board has no substantiated evidence that the plan would be any more economical as the initial installation of a synthetic field still exists. Drainage improvements would still be required at the initial installation. Some fields, even natural grass ones, have elaborate drainage systems underneath. Ours has none.

From a more practical standpoint, having one field overlap another not only limits use, but also creates additional unnecessary wear and tear as spectators, their pets, bicycles and numerous vehicles that are often present during our football games would regularly be on top of a new synthetic surface.

**What is the estimated lifespan of a synthetic turf field and polyurethane track? When will they need to be replaced?**

The estimated lifespan of a turf field is 10-12 years; according to those we've spoken with, including other schools. Traffic and weather as well as the fiber quality are all considerations. Track surfaces are estimated to be 12-15 years, again dependent upon the usage and care given to them.

## **Section 2. Engineering & Permits**

**Please explain what permits were obtained for the project and their expiration dates? Can they be renewed or extended?**

The District received three (3) permits to proceed with the project as well as a (LOI) Letter of Interpretation.

Only the LOI and Wetlands Buffer Modification Permit have been extended until June 2015. Extensions for the other two permits are not permissible and will expire in December 2014.

*(Copies of NJDEP Permitting Information are attached hereto as Exhibit A)*

**There are claims made that adjacent neighbors were not "properly notified" as to the construction. Is this true?**

No. All neighbors were properly notified in 2009 as per requirements necessary by the NJDEP as identified by taxpayer rolls provided by the Borough. Should any additional notifications be necessary regarding the project, they will be properly made.

**What are the differences in the 2009 plan submitted to the NJDEP to obtain the permit(s) and what you are contemplating today?**

The plan as proposed today is based upon the 2009 permits obtained. While not all components of the permitted plan are contemplated for construction at this time, approval to do so has been obtained.

**Are visitor side bleachers contemplated for the other side of the field?**

Many options exist for visitor seating; none part of the plan as submitted today. The Master Plan was designed to allow for these, based on need, in the future.

**There have been references made to the Wetlands having protected species there. Has this been looked at and do you believe there is any negative impact on any wildlife living in that area?**

A review was done by the NJDEP when the permits were applied for and it was determined that no protected species would be negatively affected by the project.

**Based on all the delays thus far, when do you expect construction to begin? Are the bleachers coming down?**

Once State approval is obtained, bids will be collected. The actual awarding of a contract will determine the start date.

To construct the wall and make the drainage improvements, the current bleachers must be removed. As stated at the onset, that timing will be conscious of the bid award as well as the scheduled football games and weather determinations, where appropriate.



**There has been discussion of blocking, "slatting" or protecting the perimeter fencing by addressing privacy concerns for the existing neighbors. What is the BOE thinking in this regard?**

Measurements have been taken and no final decisions have been made in this regard.

**Neighbors bordering the school property, specifically the Wetlands area along Willow Way in the Squan Village neighborhood, have expressed concerns about flooding. What, if anything, are you doing to address this?**

The flooding events that occur along Willow Way are fluvial, i.e. non-tidal events. Those properties have been part of a flood hazard zone for years. They do not flood because of water discharged from the school property, rather the rate of flow of water being released from Mac's Pond, across Broad St., under Hwy. 71 and into Stockton Lake.

There is a 36" diameter pipe under the driveway from the BOE Office to the High School. We believe if that pipe was larger, or completely removed that water would flow faster and help to reduce their flooding concerns. However, that is not a BOE issue, rather one for the Borough, County and NJDEP to agree to resolve. Conversations are taking place but that is not part of this project, nor the responsibility of the BOE to resolve in this budget.

The plans as submitted provide for all drainage from the synthetic field surface to discharge downstream of those residents and connect to the 36" diameter pipe in place. While this will not completely eliminate their flooding issues it could improve them and will help to minimize impact.

**What are the differences between this plan and the 2006 plan?**

See below.

**Some have said the Board must go to Referendum because this same plan was defeated prior. Is that correct?**

No, we don't believe so. There are numerous differences in the approved plan from that which was defeated in 2006. The project cost is less than half of that plan, and the current plan compensates for baseball to remain on campus. The defeated plan, had it been approved, would have been entirely funded by Manasquan residents. The 2006 plan never received NJDEP approval.

**There is conflicting information about what components of the project were included in the recent applications to the State and Planning Board. Please advise.**

Submissions were only made for those portions of the project to be constructed at this time. No further submissions were required.

**Are we planting trees and shrubs to prevent noise?**

Not necessarily. Foliage is not a sound barrier. Whether it is students, the whistles of the officials or the Warrior Band, there won't be any more noise pollution than currently exists. If anything, the band seating moves further from the neighbors on Willow Way than they presently are today once the new stands are constructed.

**What is the plan for adding new restroom facilities? Are they included?**

There are no plans at the present time to add additional facilities, nor were any included in the original plan at the time the permits were obtained. With the proper approvals and funding, anything could be added later.

However, this plan greatly improves the ADA access to the current restrooms, which are located on the lower level of the high school below the locker rooms, by adding greatly improved access-ways and an ADA compliant ramp.

### **Section 3. Sports Lighting**

#### **Is lighting necessary in the plan?**

Yes. A synthetic, multi-use, multi-team, mixed-gender field is only as practical as its accessibility. Lights are a necessity to maximize usage and provide a ROI on the installation. Lighting will expand useable hours for more teams and increase the opportunity for community use. For nighttime events, it has been proven that spectator attendance increases which is positive for revenue.

#### **Is it possible to use portable lighting for sports fields?**

Anything is possible. Portable lights are unreliable, noisy, expensive and hard to store. Most do not provide the height necessary to adequately light the playing surface with minimal spillage.

#### **What hours do you anticipate the lights at each complex to be on until? Have you looked into the cost of running these?**

While the BOE doesn't set the schedules for sports, we don't anticipate the reason for lights in most circumstances to be on later than 9 or 10 p.m. That would be more a function of coaches and the Athletic Director than the Board.

Costs have been looked at and we don't anticipate a significant increase. Sports lighting is more efficient than it used to be. The cost of running lights is significantly less than the transportation costs for teams to travel to other locations.

#### **The high school property currently has ten (10) light posts that are often used at night for practices. Will those lighting structures remain in place after the installation of the new field and lights?**

Those light poles on the Atlantic and Osborne side of the property were installed absent of Planning Board and BOE approval

There has been no discussion of removing the existing light poles. Those are used regularly for practices. We cannot comment at this time as to whether they will remain or be removed, or relocated as the project commences.

### **Section 4. Finances**

#### **How will the project be funded?**

There are multiple possibilities for the funding of the project. Once bids are received on actual costs, the financing components will be analyzed and bid also.

#### **Why a "lease purchase? Please explain what that is.**

Leasing, be it equipment or facilities, is very common in school financing on any items with a lifespan greater than one year that can be afforded for a District via inclusion in their regular operating budget. No decisions have been finalized at this time as to what components of the plan may or may not be obtained through lease purchase. In school finance, the maximum lease term is five (5) years.

#### **Are there alternatives to lease purchase financing?**

There are many.

**Did you apply for a ROD grant for this project? If not, why not? What did you apply for?**

ROD, or Regular Operating Grants are not available for any sports facilities such as track and fields. The Board did discuss the possibility of whether or not a Grant could be obtained for the retaining wall and drainage portions of the project, as well as any possible reimbursements should the work commence. Discussions are ongoing.

The District is actively pursuing numerous grants to improve facilities in other areas at both MHS and MES, including re-doing classrooms, science labs, HVAC and other mechanical upgrades and security enhancements, among other things.

*(An itemization of the September 2013 ROD Grants submissions is attached hereto as Exhibit B)*

**If you cannot lease purchase all or any portion of this project, would you be required to go to Referendum?**

Not necessarily. Referendums are always a possibility.

**What other programs are suffering due to the approval of this project and the expenses estimated to complete it?**

None. The Board has reallocated an annual expenditure from one general budget line to another. No programs, staff or other items were removed from the adopted budget when contemplating this project approval, nor was the budget or tax levy increased.

**A Referendum has been mentioned as a possible funding alternative? What would that look like?**

First, it's important to realize that a local Referendum would mean that only Manasquan taxpayers would foot the entire cost of any Referendum projects, field or otherwise. For that reason, we have initially opted not to consider that approach.

A Referendum guarantees an increase in property taxes in addition to the regular school tax levy. Referendum funds are carried outside of the District's regular operating budget. Therefore, the amount you pay in taxes now would increase by whatever the Referendum amount is, based on property valuations at the time.

**The District should soon have expiring debt obligations that will further reduce the taxes for residents. Does that have any impact on the funding for this project?**

The current bonds in place have no direct bearing on this project.

The district has several bonds expiring, one in 2015 for approximately \$375k per year (MHS), the other in 2024 for almost \$700k per year (MES). Those amounts and terms are always subject to change due to refinancing during their term.

Upon expiration, each would reduce the additional amount raised through taxation. Currently, they have no impact on this project, but their expirations are accounted for in long-term draft models for the replacement of synthetic turf and other items.

**Has the Board discussed budgeting for maintenance, replacement costs when the synthetic turf needs replacement, for the increased utility costs if any for items such as lighting, and, what is going to be "dedicated" in budgets for these expenses?**

Absolutely. We have drafted a 15 year financial model showing not only turf replacement, track resurfacing and estimated utility costs – but also included the expiration of other debt issues in place now (which will result in even lower Manasquan taxes than currently collected).

**Will a Referendum be necessary to complete any phases of this project?**

No. Under the currently adopted plan and the Board's position of dedicating a very small portion of our

overall budget towards improving the facilities for students, we don't believe that is necessary.

However, dependent upon the financing vehicles selected, the desires of the District going forward, the Administration, the sending districts and the other capital needs of the District, combined with the needs of the students - it could be more advantageous for the Board at a future date to refinance any portion of expenditures over a longer period of time, or combine them with other new debt issues, or replace expiring ones.

**What is the status of the conversations with our sending districts regarding their financial participation in this project?**

We have met with our sending districts several times, more in generality of the overall needs of the District than this specific project. They were unable to attend the last meeting as scheduled.

It is premature to define the scope of their participation when final pricing and finance vehicles haven't been agreed upon. The Board has no reason to believe that our sending districts aren't interested in upgrading our athletic facilities, among other things.

How we get the sending districts to ultimately participate is independent of doing the project itself.

**The District raised the budget several times over the years to acquire adjacent properties to enhance the school's athletic facilities. What happened?**

The Board is looking into these transactions. We cannot confirm to date what properties were acquired nor were they done so with any specific purpose.

**Is this project accounted for in the current year budget? Was a line item created and when did the board approve the transfer for any capital outlay associated with this project?**

The Board transferred funds to Capital Reserve on June 25 at their public meeting. A portion of that money is dedicated to the retaining wall and drainage improvement projects that were approved on July 10. A line item was created for the field project with a placeholder of \$1 until such time as a subsequent funds transfer approval, if necessary is obtained by the ECS. The ECS is aware of these modifications of current year expenditures.

**Does the Board believe they can financially finish what they are starting here?**

Yes. The Board would not proceed otherwise.

**Has there been any proposal to close the Manasquan High School?**

There has been no formal proposal to close our schools. Conversations on fair funding and realignment of expenditures have been held. Meetings as high up as the DOE and local legislators have included topics related to possible administrative or legislative changes being made which could benefit the taxpayers and students of the area. Any discussions were informal, at best and occurred in committee with the sole purpose of generating additional revenue for the District.

**It was discussed in 2006 and since to sell land along Sea Girt Avenue. Those anticipated funds were going to be used to help fund the project. Has this been further discussed? Isn't there a better use for that seemingly unoccupied land?**

The Board has discussed space utilization and the disposition of underperforming assets for some time. That particular parcel has been discussed for development purposes. It is currently being used for training of our track team, sports camps and storage of athletic equipment.

**What about the old Agriculture Building on Elizabeth Avenue? Some have discussed selling that property to neighbors to raise funds for the District. What is the long term plans for that building and property? Is it necessary for the day-to-day operation of the school district?**

This property currently houses out-of-date computer equipment, among other items. We believe it is currently an underutilized asset for which we pay utilities and expenses on that provides no educational value. Options are being considered.

Any sale of public property, were that to be pursued, would require Board approval, possibly voter approval and a sale through an advertised Public bid process.

**Why are sending districts allowed to vote on the project?**

By statute, sending districts can vote on capital projects that affect their students, just like they can vote regarding the staff that instructs them. Currently, over 40% of the entire budget is funded through sending district tuition

**There have been rumors that FEMA money is being used to construct the field. Is this true?**

Absolutely not.

The District, by Executive Order issued by Governor Christie, applied for and received approval for FEMA CDL (Community Disaster Loan) funds.

This year, approximately \$650,000 is being applied to the local tax levy to reduce the impact of the loss of ratables from Hurricane Sandy. Additionally, approximately \$450,000 was used to reinstate District jobs that were being eliminated at the time of the original budget adoption.

**What is the tax increase to me, a Manasquan resident, if you go forward with this plan?**

The budget as adopted was a no increase budget. This project has no additional impact on your tax bill.

**It is said you obtained significant savings on health care benefits for staff. Please explain how much and do you anticipate that to be an annual occurrence?**

The District saved approximately \$500,000 by changing the health care plan. In addition, the District realized additional savings through retirements and staff departures, among other things.

A prudent and financially responsible BOE will evaluate all costs regularly to ensure the District is receiving the highest value for the best economics available. Health care is just one place where a potential annual savings was realized. Next to employee salaries, it is the largest cost item in the District budget.

**What has been the history or District health care expenditures? Could a savings have been realized sooner?**

It would be speculative to say what could have happened in the past. However, a preliminary 10-year review of health benefit expenditures shows an increase of approximately \$3 million over that time.

**Some residents have mentioned updating our science labs in the high school. Is this a lesser priority to this Board than renovating the athletic fields?**

Absolutely not. We've had discussions with our sending district counterparts about their needs as well as our District administration and Supervisors. If a change in curriculum warrants expansion of the science program for the benefit of the students, it will be evaluated.

**What is the cost to redo our science rooms and how would you pay for it?**

We've been given very preliminary prices from \$1.2MM to \$2.0MM. The Science Supervisor and the needs of the students would determine the scope of the project. Grants were applied for to offset the cost of the project.

**With a budget cap of 2%, how can you assure that new projects can be done to improve the facilities and infrastructure within our schools on a regular basis?**

It will take careful planning to not exceed the State mandated cap. Salaries and benefits are a large part of the budget and contractual increases must be accounted for in building the budget. The same considerations should be given to facilities improvements.

**What does the Board anticipate in regards to revenue from rentals, advertising and sponsorships at the Complex?**

It is too early to make these determinations at this time. It has been discussed and, once project approvals are obtained to begin the actual construction, these conversations are more appropriate to resume.

**What are the participation rates by sport?**

See attached chart as part of the accompanying presentation.

**There has been discussion about the renting of the facility. Please elaborate.**

It is premature to discuss any rental or outside usage of the facility. District teams and students would have first priority to usage.

**Has Mr. Passiment, the Executive County Superintendent been involved in this plan? Has he been asked to come and speak with the Board, or at a public meeting about this project?**

Mr. Passiment has been in contact with the Administration, Counsel and Board since approval. He has been out several times as well as invited to attend meetings, as necessary. He has assured the Board to date that the project is in compliance and no deficiencies exist in the application or approval process.

Mr. Passiment also stated, recently, that any specific discussions regarding financing are premature at this time. And, he did tell us as a former instructor and track coach at this District, the project has his full support and he would help us do everything the proper way.

**What is the estimated cost of the entire complex at completion including permanent bleachers, permanent track surface, handicap ramps, stairs, lighting, and concession stand and landscaping?**

Included in the \$2.75M overall budget, all items are accounted for in the estimates except for the concession stand. It may or may not be included. It is not part of one of the approved phases nor was it represented as such.

**Does the \$2.5M plan include lights and bleachers? If so, why doesn't the plan submitted to the State and planning board show it?**

The \$2.5M estimated plan does include lights and permanent bleachers. The plans submitted to the planning board did not include permanent bleachers, albeit a flat space is there to accommodate any type of bleachers. This was due to waiting for the final costs for other components of the project prior to determining the type and style of bleachers. The same is true for lighting; there are many options available and a wide array of costs. The plans submitted do include the necessary conduits under the field.

The intent of the Board is to accommodate the majority of athletes first and foremost.

**What's been spent on engineering / architectural so far?**

The District prior spent approximately \$400k in designing the original 2006 Maser Plans and the 2009 Birdsall plans after the prior didn't receive NJDEP approval. That amount includes associated permit fees.

## **Section 5. Elementary School Considerations**

**There seems to be resistance to placing varsity baseball at the Elementary school. Have you considered other alternatives?**

An existing baseball field of the proper size and dimensions for both elementary and high school baseball exists at MES today. It is in need of improvements. Over the years many alternatives have been looked at for baseball, including relocation to various parks and other municipalities. The Board prefers to keep baseball on campus.

**Will our elementary school students be disrupted by the relocation of high school baseball to the proposed location?**

No. There will be no disruption whatsoever to the elementary school activities.

**What happens to baseball if the elementary parents are successful in stopping it from being behind MES? Will it remain off campus?**

Under the current plan, that would be the case. However, we don't believe the MES parents will oppose much needed improvements to their children's playing space. Further, at some point those kids will be in high school and most contend that a majority of parents would rather see events at their local school when possible.

For the present time being, varsity baseball will be played at Wall Township Municipal Complex. It is a beautiful, well-maintained facility, with lights.

**How much does playing baseball at Wall cost?**

The cost for the current year is \$2,000.

**If baseball isn't moved, what will the Board do with the funds anticipated to improve MES?**

That will be up to the Board to decide. Further enhancements could be made at the high school, athletic or otherwise.

**Why can't baseball be played at the MBLL fields instead?**

The dimensions of a junior baseball field are not the same as the elementary and high school students use. The baselines, pitching mound and outfield lines are much less for little league than they are for older ages.

**What about the existing playground and swing sets and play areas at MES? Would they be impacted?**

First, the playground by the elementary rooms bordering Broad Street remains untouched with this plan.

The existing swings (14) currently in the outfield of the existing baseball field could be re-located to the out of bounds line along the northern fence line.

Regarding swing sets – they are very unpopular with insurance companies and many schools and parks are removing them. This is an ongoing discussion with Administration as to their views on the safety of these on the school property.

**What are the “green boxes” all over the MES playing fields? They seem like a safety hazard, can they be moved?**

Those boxes contain old well pumps from systems that are no longer in place. We have discussed having them removed for both aesthetic and safety reasons.

**The Elementary PTO wants to donate a new scoreboard for their fields. Does your plan to renovate the baseball field at MES prevent this?**

Absolutely not. Those discussions have been held. A new scoreboard can be installed exactly where the existing, non-operable one is and, if need, be relocated later. The proposal calls for a “wireless” scoreboard being donated. It would be a wonderful addition for the students.

**If you re-do the baseball field behind MES, how much of the existing blacktop area would be lost?**

Little to no disturbance in the proposed plan is necessary to the blacktop area. We understand it is an important aspect of recess time for basketball, foursquare and other activities. The plan as proposed enhances the entire area.

**Would soccer remain at MES?**

Yes. There is no loss of fields at MES. A baseball, softball and soccer field will still remain.

**I'm worried about the MHS baseball team taking over the Elementary school and playground. Are my concerns validated?**

This is not a concern. These are often the big brother's of existing MES students. MHS boys and girls basketball teams practice and compete currently at the MES gymnasium. Additionally, many MHS students are in the Elementary school daily for peer group, as well as provide child-care and assistance during elementary events. In turn, elementary students will have access to the campus track for physical education or other events.

Additionally, the whole premise of our summer recreation program is predicated upon the upper and lower school kids working together.

**Is baseball going to remain on campus? Some are saying that it will “not work” behind MES.**

The intent of this plan is to renovate the existing baseball field at the Elementary School with significant improvements including turf, lighting, dugouts and spectator seating. It would provide a wonderful enhancement to the existing dilapidated facilities that exist there today.

**What about recess at the Elementary School, will it be impacted by that plan?**

The schedule calls for the baseball improvements to be made during the summer of 2014, which would not affect the student body.

Recess would not be impacted in any way; in fact it may be improved dependent upon the amount of turf surfacing installed.

The MHS baseball team would not be using the field during the school day. They do not use the current baseball field during the day now; the students are in class.

**In inclement weather, as a parent I used to be able to stay in my vehicle with other children and watch my MES kids participate. The growth and vegetation along the creek now prevents that. What can be done?**

The Administration has directed the Facilities department to clear that area as appropriate. Removing the unsightly and evasive brush has also been suggested by the local Police Department as part of security protocols.



## **Section 6. Miscellaneous / Other**

**I notice the name / logo of Melillo & Bauer has been “covered up” by tape on the complex banner hanging at the high school next to the gymnasium entrance. Why?**

Two reasons. An Ethics Complaint was filed (by Mrs. Verdi) with the State Department of Education alleging that it was inappropriate for the logo of Bauer’s firm to be on the banner, despite it having been there for years.

Secondly, a resident (Mrs. LaSala) also alleges it was inappropriate for the firm name to be listed.

To clarify, the Manasquan High School Endowment donated the banner. They used a rendering provided donated by Mr. Bauer to create a banner to promote the project when they attempted to fundraise for it.

Mr. Bauer has never received nor requested any funds from the District for his many years of design services and assistance provided to the School District.

**Some believe that the best video footage for games would be taken from the visitor side of the field due to direct sunlight at certain times of the day. Does this plan allow for that?**

The current plan includes no structure to house a video booth on the opposite side of the field, but many options exist. Games recorded at night could be taped from either side. With Board approval, an alternate side structure could be considered.

**Is the district concerned about Title IX issues?**

TBD

**There was no baseball field contemplated in the 2006 plan. What was the feeling then regarding baseball? Was it going to remain off campus forever?**

The accommodation for varsity baseball being able to remain on campus has always been a concern for the District. That is why this Board felt it important to include an alternative in the current plan design. There have been numerous options presented in the past, from a re-design of Mallard Park, or inclusion at the Sea Girt campsite, Brielle Green Acres, Spring Lake Heights or Orchard Park.

**What about the current scoreboard?**

In the proposed plan, the existing scoreboard can remain exactly where it is. However, there are options to relocate it or replace it. Several parties have expressed interest in possibly donating a new scoreboard. However, a new one is not necessary in this plan design.

**New regulations require storm shelters for participants and spectators at athletic events and practices. Defibrillators are also mandatory. Is the District compliant now with the multiple locations utilized?**

TBD

**Have you considered putting the new field at the Sea Girt Army Camp? Is that a viable option?**

That idea has been reviewed and discussed in the past. Nothing was ever finalized in this regard.

**Who is the Concerned Manasquan Taxpayer Group and what are their other causes and motives?**

The CMT claims to be a “grass roots, non-political” group, which obviously opposes this project.

The Board cannot speak to what other causes if any they represent, or their motives.

**Is the Board concerned about the temperature of synthetic turf during extremely warm weather?**

No. Having consulted with several turf professionals, we do not anticipate this to be a health or safety concern. Only in extremely hot climates are water cannons or compensations made for turf temperatures. The types of turf available today are designed accordingly and numerous improvements have been made in the fibers.

**What about the maintenance costs associated with a synthetic surface?**

Synthetic surfaces require much less maintenance than natural grass fields, and have an obviously longer lifespan. A turf "fluffer" is typically included in the installation pricing.

*(A summary maintenance cost analysis of artificial turf vs natural grass is attached hereto as Exhibit C)*

**Will the new complex require any changes or additions to gate staffing?**

The staffing levels for those that sell tickets, collect tickets or provide security are set by the Administration and AD.

**What effects if any does proceeding with the plan have on the current district staff?**

None.

**I have a hard time attending my child's activities now. It would be easier to attend events later in the day or evening if they could play under lights. How late will the complex be open?**

The scheduling of the facilities and hours available for participation, as well as to the public has yet to be determined. That is solely a function of the Administration and Athletic Director.

**How will scheduling be handled? Who has first priority on the new field?**

The Administration and the Office of the Athletic Director will handle all scheduling for the use of the facilities.

Keep in mind; it is not uncommon to see multiple teams participating on a field, or even boys and girls lacrosse as an example, practicing on opposite ends, when necessary.

**Did the Board unanimously approve the 2009 plan design and expenditures? Who was on the BOE then and how did they vote? Assuming it is the same, why are there members on the current board not supporting the plan, as it exists today?**

We cannot speak for the individual actions of any one Board member in their present or prior capacity.

The Board of Education as populated at the time of the 2009 approval included:

Patricia Walsh, President, John McLaughlin, Vice President, Christopher Brennan, Christine Haley, Christine Muly, Cynthia O'Connell, Linda DiPalma, Claudia DePasquale, Cherie Adams, Gary Abadrabo and James Hackett.

**What type of enhanced security is needed at this facility? Are you projecting increased costs in this regard?**

We are not anticipating any increased costs in regards to security. The District's Security Director and the Manasquan Police Department will coordinate all security needs with Administration to ensure the proper safeguards are in place.

**A neighbor complained that the Board irrationally took action against their adjacent property last year. What details are available?**

The Board's directive that the matter was closed from our end has been on file since December 2012. We cannot speak as to that neighbor's motives.

*(A Copy of the Violation Notice on file in the Board Office is attached as Exhibit D)*

## **Section 7. Community Concerns**

**Some state that we have an undesirable parking situation. Does this plan further complicate that?**

The District has always had limited parking, a function of a shortage of space. The problem is not unique to the school in a town of our size that is almost entirely developed. There are numerous parking challenges throughout the Borough, particularly for those residents who are faced with beachgoer traffic.

**Can't we turf the current football field in its present location, leaving baseball where it is, and still accommodate the same teams as the proposed plan, with the exception of the track team?**

No. Due to the overlap of the fields there would be limited usage. No other sport could utilize the multi-purpose turf field when the baseball field was being utilized, or visa versa.

**What involvement does the Manasquan Planning Board have in the project approval? Where does that process stand?**

The Planning Board has reviewed the project and prepared a Resolution that was submitted to the State. The BOE believes the Planning Board has overstepped their boundaries, which is solely limited to review and recommendation.

*(The Planning Board Resolution, Planning Board T&M Engineering Summary, Board of Education's Engineer (Matrix) Response and Board of Education's Counsel Response to the Commissioner of Education regarding the Planning Board Resolution and review process are attached hereto as Exhibit's E, F, G and H).*

**The Coast Star has reported numerous times that a "complaint" was lodged against the District in regards to the project. What does this mean?**

The complaint we received from the DOE was an email from a local resident with a list of their stated concerns.

*(A copy of the document as provided by the DOE is attached as Exhibit I)*

**The Mayor of Manasquan is quoted as not being in support of this plan. Why?**

The Board cannot speak for the Mayor, who for years claimed neutrality in regards to this project. The Board was denied repeated requests to discuss the plan with our Mayor. It is upsetting that a project with so many positives for our youth and no additional spending for our residents has been made part of a political agenda.

**Recently, a resident provided the Board with petitions opposing the project. What is the Board's position on the project having now received these?**

The subject matter of various petitions received was varied in nature. The Board has no formal response.

*(Copies of the petitions as received are attached hereto as Exhibit J)*

**Is the MEA supporting this plan? What if any impact does it have on teaching staff?**

We believe the MEA should support this plan, as a majority of them are our paid coaches. Many of them have children who will benefit from these improvements. There is no impact to the teaching staff by completing this project other than they will have access to vastly improved facilities for instructional, participation and spectator purposes.

**Did the Board reach out to neighbors of adjacent properties with their intent to proceed with this plan?**

Yes. The Board conducted a walk through and overview of the project in August, as well as has answered numerous questions regarding the project in public meetings. The district engineer has been very accessible to neighbors and answered many questions and correspondences with those neighbors for a number of years.

**Will the Manasquan Marching Band have access to the new field as they do now?**

Absolutely. Not only will a better surface allow for more team participation, but also it should make band practices much easier in inclement weather.

**There appears to be a certain level of controversy surrounding this project, just as there was with the 2006 plan. Can you provide a response as to what opposition existed then versus today?**

As with any project involving taxpayer dollars, there was certainly opposition to the plan in 2006; we cannot judge whether more or less. Certain properties have changed hands since that time and some new owner's are more vocal for different reasons. Taxes and the cost of living have also increased, as have municipal budgets since that time.

It is important to realize, the overall district budget today is almost identical to the budget then. There was no increase this year.

*(Copies of articles and letters appearing in the 2006 Coast Star regarding that plan are attached as Exhibit K)*

**Does the Board intend to partner with Manasquan Recreation in sharing the new facilities?**

The Board has a great relationship with Manasquan Recreation presently. We expect that to continue.

**Are the names of the fields changing in this plan?**

Regardless of slightly modified locations, we anticipate the Vic Kubu and Jake Landfried Memorial field's always being part of the Warrior Athletic Complex, and our heritage.

We are aware of the false and misleading rumors in this regard.