

**2006
Annual Report to the
Governor and Legislature**

**Project Labor Agreement (PLA) Act
P.L. 2002, Chapter 44
(C.52:38-et seq.)**

**New Jersey Department of Labor
And Workforce Development
January 2008**

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Presentation of Available Data	6
Use of Project Labor Agreements in Public Projects	6
Project Awards	7
Employment Work Hours for Minorities, Females and Apprentices	10
Employment Work Hours for Minorities and Apprentices by Construction Trade	13
Employment Utilization Rates for Minorities by Race/Ethnicity	16
Construction Duration	17
LWD Apprenticeship Training Efforts and Results	17
PLA Improvement Recommendations	18
Appendix I : Data Sources and Methodology	20
Appendix II: Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Communities with Completed New School Projects	24
Appendix III : Information on Cost, Size, Student Capacity for Completed New Schools	30
Appendix IV : Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation Rates for All Projects	35
Appendix V: Minority Employment Participation Based on County Goal Obligations for New Construction Projects	43
Appendix VI: Project Duration and Completion Timeliness Includes All Projects	45
Appendix VII: Project Completion Timeliness, Non-PLA Projects	50

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes 2006 data on the impact of the Project Labor Agreement (PLA) Act (P.L. 2002, Chapter 44) on public works projects in New Jersey. The PLA Act, which was signed into law on July 25, 2002, specifies that beginning December 31, 2003, an annual report evaluating the effectiveness of projects utilizing Project Labor Agreements is to be prepared by the Commissioner of Labor and Workforce Development. PLA public works projects are to be compared with non-PLA projects related to performance indicators, such as: cost; shares of employment for minorities, females and apprentices; construction duration and timeliness. Because to date, only school construction projects have been completed with a PLA, the comparative analysis in this report focuses on completed school projects. The following are the major findings of this year's report:

1. There is no measurable or statistically significant increase in construction costs associated with PLA projects. When taking into account differences that may influence costs, such as type and location of the school construction projects, there was no statistical evidence of cost differentials due to the existence of a PLA. While square foot costs for PLA projects are on average higher, this may be due to regional differences in labor cost. A formal linear regression statistical model capable of controlling for these and other factors confirms this hypothesis.
2. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the 220 projects completed between July 2002 and June 2006 did not involve the use of a project labor agreement.
3. The average adjusted cost per square foot for new elementary schools implemented without a PLA was \$195.60, compared with \$215.55 for PLA projects, a 10.2% difference. For new middle schools, the cost per square foot for non-PLA projects was \$169.61, versus \$204.38 for PLA projects, a 20.5% differential. However, the average represents a generalization of the data and therefore, interpretation of its value must be done with care or else the value can be misleading; as noted above, factors other than the presence or absence of a PLA explain these differentials.
4. Projects completed in Northern New Jersey cost more than projects completed in other parts of the state. Holding the effects of PLA and type of construction constant, the difference due to location is statistically significant.
5. PLA projects exceeded their goals for minority employment, and these goals entailed higher percentages of minority employment than those for non-PLA projects. The actual employment work hours (participation rate) attained for minorities on PLA projects was above the county goal obligation (26.0% achieved vs. 24.1% goal). The actual participation rate achieved on non-PLA projects was slightly above the county target (15.6% achieved vs. 14.4% goal). The actual apprentice participation rate on PLA projects was slightly higher than on non-PLA projects.
6. Among PLA/Schools Development Authority (SDA) projects, only 6 out of 20 trades (asbestos workers, bricklayers/masons, laborers, painters, primers, and roofers) achieved a higher participation rate than the county goal. Among the non-PLA projects, only five construction occupations were above the county goal.
7. The use of apprentices varied from less than 6% for truck drivers, asbestos workers, iron workers, laborers, bricklayers/masons, operating engineers and primers to a high of 26.7% and 22.0% for electricians on PLA and non-PLA projects, respectively.

8. The overall minority utilization rates (persons employed for each month on a construction project) declined between 2004 and 2006 on PLA and non-PLA projects, despite efforts to attract and use more minorities on construction projects. The same trend is evident for the participation rates (hours worked) for minorities.
9. The differences in types of construction may have contributed to variances in the length of construction time. The average duration for new school projections was 95.1 weeks for PLA/SDA projects, and 89.6 weeks for non-PLA projects. Given the limitations of the available data, these differences cannot be explained.
10. Since its inception in March 2002 through August 2006, the Construction Trades Training Program for Women and Minorities (CTTP-WM) had enrolled a total of 1,465 participants in training with 1,079 completions (73.7%). Of the individuals that completed the program, 362 (33.5%) obtained a union apprenticeship and 234 (21.7%) obtained non-union apprenticeships or other construction placements. So far, the program achieved a successful 55.2% placement rate.

INTRODUCTION

On July 25, 2002, the “Project Labor Agreement Act” (P.L. 2002, Chapter 44) was signed into law. The law authorizes all public agencies (state, county, municipal, others) in New Jersey to include project labor agreements (PLAs) in all public works projects for the construction, reconstruction, demolition or renovation of buildings (other than pumping stations and water/sewage treatment plants) at public expense, for which the total cost of the project, exclusive of land acquisition cost, will equal or exceed \$5 million.

Project labor agreements (PLAs) are a form of pre-hire collective bargaining agreements permitted under federal law between contractors, or owners on behalf of contractors, and labor unions in the construction industry. PLAs cover project terms and conditions of employment for construction trade workers, and are often used for major, multi-year construction projects. PLAs typically require contractors to hire employees through the union hall referral systems. In return for this advantage, the unions agree to a no strike and no work stoppage provision. The use of project labor agreements in general, and the use of a statewide project labor agreement for the original \$8.6 billion school construction program in particular, is a recent occurrence in New Jersey.

A standard public works project labor agreement between the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA), formerly the Schools Construction Corporation (SCC), the New Jersey Building and Construction Trades Council and several construction trade unions was completed on February 28, 2003.

The PLA Act spells out New Jersey’s compelling interest in carrying out public works projects to meet certain beneficial business and public policy performance objectives. PLA projects are expected to: advance public interests with respect to costs; efficiency; quality; timeliness of completion; the use of skilled labor; guarantees against strikes, work stoppages, or similar actions; and the effective resolution of jurisdictional and labor disputes. These projects also require contractors to have an apprenticeship program and to implement set-aside goals for women and minority owned businesses. The PLA Act also requires each agreement to achieve employment and apprenticeship shares for minorities and women in conformance with applicable requirements, as well as to allow the contracting agency or another State agency to monitor the amount and share of work performed by minorities and women and their progression into apprentice and journey worker positions.

The PLA Act requires the Commissioner of Labor and Workforce Development (LWD) to annually provide an analysis and comparison of the effectiveness of PLA and non-PLA projects. The 2006 PLA Report shall include an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the implementation of the PLA Act and recommendations deemed necessary to better effectuate its purpose. To date, only school projects were completed with a PLA; therefore, the comparative analysis focuses on completed school projects. The data sources and methodology for this report are presented in Appendix I.

PRESENTATION OF AVAILABLE DATA

Use of Project Labor Agreements in Public Projects

Since the enactment of the PLA Act to June 30, 2006¹, statewide a total of 220 identifiable construction projects have been completed, of all the types covered by the Act. A comparison of construction projects with a PLA agreement and those without a PLA is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Projects Type and PLA/Non-PLA Designation

<u>School Projects (152)</u>	<u>PLA Projects</u>	<u>Non-PLA Projects</u>
New School Construction	15	28
New School Addition	4	7
School Renovation and Addition	9 ⁽¹⁾	84
School Renovation	3	2
Total Number of School Projects	31	121
 <u>Non-School Projects (68)</u>		
University/College/Tech. Institute Research & Education	-	21
County/Municipal/Police/Public Works/Social Services	-	9
Student Housing (College/University)	-	6
Library	-	6
Parking Garage/Deck	-	6
Sports/Recreation/Community/Youth Center	-	6
Railroad/Ferry Terminal	-	4
Other ⁽²⁾	-	10
Total Non-School Projects	0	68
Total School, Non-School & Other Projects	31	189
Grand Total of Projects	220	

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by New Jersey Department of the Treasury, Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts (DCC); and New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA).

Note: The above construction projects were started and completed for the period from July 25, 2002 to June 30, 2006.

(1) Includes two non-Abbott schools implemented by the SDA with a PLA.

¹A June 30 cut-off date allows for the receipt and inclusion of all field reports, information entry and transfer, data analysis, report writing and report issuance.

- (2) “Other” includes: 2 Veterans Affairs/Long Term Care Facilities; 2 Court House/Justice Centers; and 1 each Theater, Children Center, Armory, Cemetery Building, River Boathouse, and Health Care Center.

As shown in Table 1, 189 (85.9%) of the 220 projects were completed without a PLA agreement. The majority (64%) of the non-PLA construction projects were school construction projects. All the PLA construction projects were school construction projects completed in Abbott² districts, except for the Manchester School District in Ocean County.

Table 2 shows the completion timeline for the 152 school construction projects completed during the reference period. There were 31 PLA projects compared to 121 non-PLA projects and of the 43 completed new schools, 15 were PLAs compared to 28 non-PLAs.

Table 2. Completed Schools Projects by Time Period

Time Period	All School Projects			New Schools Only		Total New Schools Only
	PLA/SDA	Non-PLA	Total All Schools	PLA/SDA	Non-PLA	
7/02 to 9/04	12	40	52	6	6	12
10/04 to 9/05	5	29	34	3	16	19
10/05 to 6/06	14	52	66	6	6	12
Total Projects	31	121	152	15	28	43

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by New Jersey Department of the Treasury, Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts (DCC); and, New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA).

In Appendix II, the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the communities in which the 43 new school projects were completed, are presented.

Project Awards

The award amount (the term used in the DCC database³) and the construction award (the term used in the SDA database) are essentially synonymous, and can be defined as the dollar amount originally approved by the awarding agency or project owner (e.g., Board of Education, Township, College/University, SDA) at the beginning of a construction project. It is the originally anticipated costs for a particular construction project and the dollar amount awarded to the prime contractor. The award amount does not include: the costs of land acquisition; architectural design; engineering; project management; change orders, deviations and upgrades from the original design and construction plan; or cost-overruns. The award amount is not the final, total or complete actual costs of a construction project.

²Abbott refers to the 1998 New Jersey Supreme Court decision finding the State responsible for funding school facilities in special needs districts. Today there are 31 special needs districts in New Jersey. All Abbott schools are built by the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA) with a PLA in effect.

³ Much of the data used in this report is derived from administrative records maintained by the Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts, New Jersey Department of the Treasury (DCC), the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA), and the New Jersey State Department of Education (DOE). For further information, please consult Appendix I: Primary Data Sources.

A truly valid and fair “apple to apple” cost comparison between different school projects is not easy. For instance, projects vary in terms of type and size (early childhood center versus high school), location (inner city in the North versus rural area in the South), construction design (one-story versus multi-level), materials used, and year of construction. Labor costs also vary by geographical location. To illustrate, Table 3 presents the hourly prevailing wage rates (wages and benefits) for certain construction occupations in Hudson County (northern county) and Burlington County (southern county).

Table 3. Hourly Prevailing Wage/Benefit Rates for Selected Trades in Burlington and Hudson Counties, 2006/2007

Trades	Burlington County	Hudson County	Dollar	Percent
			(Difference)	
Electrician	\$68.22 North/\$65.06 South	\$68.21	\$3.15	4.8%
Plumber	\$62.88 North/\$60.11 South	\$64.25	\$4.14	6.9%
Sheet Metal Worker	\$64.30	\$68.78	\$4.48	7.0%
Structural Iron Worker	\$61.53	\$64.04	\$2.51	4.1%
Roofer	\$46.10	\$57.80	\$11.70	25.4%
Sprinkler Fitter	\$53.65	\$61.11	\$7.46	13.9%
Tiler	\$54.35	\$63.11	\$8.76	16.1%

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Prevailing Wage Rate Determination. The contract durations vary among trades, they range from January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007.

The following analysis consists of 43 new schools, of which 15 or 35% were built using PLAs, and includes school construction projects that were started and completed between July 2002 and June 2006. We excluded all non-school construction projects from the analysis because PLAs were not used in other construction projects. Due to the limited availability of data, we further excluded all projects that were not considered new construction.

LWD obtained the building size (square footage) and student capacity for all 43 completed new schools from the State of New Jersey Department of Education (DOE). This information, which for previous reports was not available, was used to calculate the cost per square foot and the cost per student for each project. In order to compare the school construction costs of PLAs with non-PLAs, it was first necessary to adjust for the rising construction costs during the reference period, so that all costs could be expressed in 2006 prices. Specifically, we constructed a cost index that included both the trend in construction labor costs and the trend in materials costs between 2002 and 2006. The indexed cost per square foot was calculated using the Building Cost Index History (1915-2007) from McGraw Hill Construction. The Building Cost Index is based on a monthly 20-city average of four components: the cost of cement, the cost of 2 x 4 lumber, the cost of structural steel, and the cost of skilled labor. The indexed cost per square foot for each project is calculated by applying the monthly changes in the building cost index from each project’s completion date to June 2006. Information on cost, size and student capacity for the 43 completed new schools is listed in Appendix III.

It would be technically incorrect to measure the effects of a PLA agreement on project costs by comparing the average cost per square foot or cost per student of PLA projects versus the costs of non-PLA projects. The average is a mathematically computed value which represents a central value of a given data set. The average represents a generalization of the data and therefore, interpretation of its value must be done with care or else the value can be misleading. Also note that the average is influenced by extremes in the data. In other words, in a data set having extremely high or low data values, the average

tends to be “pulled” in the direction of those outliers and therefore can misrepresent the data's central tendency. To demonstrate why this would be inappropriate, consider the data in Table 4: the index-adjusted cost per square foot for the new elementary schools PLA projects was \$215.55 or 10.2 percent more expensive than the \$195.60 for non-PLA projects. For the new middle schools, the cost per square foot for non-PLA projects was \$169.61 versus \$204.38 or 20.5 percent more expensive than for PLA projects. In an analysis of the 43 new school construction projects undertaken in New Jersey since 2002, our initial findings suggest that on average PLA projects cost more than non-PLA projects. PLA projects are systematically different as evidenced by the varying labor and material costs for different areas. Given the differences between PLA and non-PLA projects, sorting out the effects of differences in school characteristics between PLA and non-PLA projects from pure PLA cost effects is central to understanding the cost impact of PLAs.

Table 4. New School Project Construction Cost per Square Foot and per Student

	Indexed Cost Per Square Foot		Indexed Cost Per Student	
	PLA	Non-PLA	PLA	Non-PLA
Early Childhood Centers (5 PLA Projects)	\$229.62	N/A	\$33,551	N/A
Primary Schools (4 Non-PLA Projects)	N/A	\$181.81	N/A	\$24,547
Elementary Schools (11 Non-PLA / 6 PLA Projects)	\$215.55	\$195.60	\$43,308	\$33,100
Middle Schools (7 Non-PLA / 3 PLA Projects)	\$204.38	\$169.61	\$42,350	\$25,327
High Schools (6 Non-PLA / 1 PLA Project)	\$343.16	\$150.21	\$61,414	\$40,597

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by the New Jersey State Department of Education (DOE).

N/A: Not Applicable

In economics, one way to determine if differences in PLA projects versus non-PLA projects are robust is by using a statistical technique called regression analysis; a standard method for measuring the effect one factor has upon another controlling for other things such location, the project size and project type.

A regression analysis will control for the effects of such influences as the size of the project, the type of school, and the geographical location. Generally we would expect elementary schools (including early childhood centers and primary schools) to be cheaper (per square foot) and projects in the northern region of the state to be more expensive⁴. Only after controlling for these effects can one hope to isolate the true costs of the project and whether those costs were affected by the existence or absence of a PLA arrangement. A more complete model would control for other factors such as the number of stories and whether the projects are new constructions or renovations. (At the time of this report, that data was not available.)

In our regression analysis, the dependent variable is the indexed cost per square foot of construction (in 2006 prices). The independent variable of most interest to us is a dummy variable that is set equal to 1 for PLA projects and to 0 otherwise. We control for whether the project is constructed in a high labor cost

⁴ Schools for the lower grades tend to be single story buildings and consist of basic classrooms (rather than science labs, athletic facilities, etc.), which are less expensive to construct.

area by including a dummy variable set equal to 1 for northern counties⁵ and to 0 otherwise. To capture the effect of the project size we include a measure of whether the project is an elementary school. The ordinary least squares regression results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression Estimates

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
Constant	150.88	14.00	0.00
PLA	15.34	17.74	0.39
Location	48.02	16.46	0.01
Elementary	21.91	15.19	0.16

Adjusted R² is .25 and sample size is 43.

Source: Author's calculations.

Our regression results show that PLA projects add an estimated \$15.34 per square foot, controlling for whether or not the project is located in the north or is a smaller project like an elementary school. However, the coefficient is not statistically significant at any conventional significance level⁶. The equation also shows that projects completed in the north add an estimated \$48.02 per square foot. Given the p-value of .001, this means that there is a 99.9 percent probability that we have not accidentally found that projects completed in the north are more expensive. After considering other factors, the difference in construction costs, on average, appears to be associated with location in the higher cost areas of the state, rather than the existence of a PLA. Surprisingly, the equation shows that projects involving the construction of elementary schools cost \$21.91 more per square foot. With an adjusted R² of .25, the equation explains 25 percent of the variation in the cost per square foot.

Employment Work Hours for Minorities, Females, and Apprentices

This section discusses the total cumulative work hours and the share of the total work hours for minorities, females, and apprentices for all of the 220 completed projects. Appendix IV provides the details of the information for all projects. As with the other data, this information is also self-reported by the various contractors based on payroll records and other records.

The State of New Jersey has established minority⁷ and female employment goal obligations for construction contractors and subcontractors for each county. Both the Office of Diversity and Emerging Business Markets of the SDA and the Department of Treasury's Division of Contract Compliance & Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts (DCC) use these goal obligations as guidelines.

The minority and female goals for each county are determined by the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, Affirmative Action Office. The methodology takes into account the actual availability of

⁵ For the purpose of the regression analysis, Mercer, Monmouth and all counties north of them (for a total 13) are considered "northern".

⁶ When regression analysis was used to take into account the type of project and the fact that more PLA projects were in high-cost areas, the difference in costs between PLA and non-PLA projects become smaller and statistically insignificant. That is, there is a high probability that the difference in the average costs due to a PLA occurred by chance.

⁷ The term "minority" includes all minority males and all minority females. The category female is defined as both minority females as well as non-minority females. In other words, minority females are counted twice in the cumulative total employment statistics: once under females and a second time under minorities. The double count of minority females is inconsequential since their participation rate in the construction trades at the present time is extremely low.

qualified minorities and females utilizing decennial Census data for affirmative action programs. It should be noted that these are goals, and not quotas. Therefore these goals do not have to be strictly satisfied if the contractor attempted in good faith to reach the applicable targets. Table 6 shows the established minority goal obligation rates for each county based on the 1990 and 2000 Census figures. The female employment goal obligation for all counties in New Jersey is 6.9%.

While there are some limitations in comparing project costs, this is not the case for evaluating the participation rates for minorities, females and apprentices. Minority employment does not depend on the type and size of the construction projects.

The participation rate of minorities, females and apprentices in the construction industry is of interest to many policy makers. To evaluate the extent to which minority, female and apprentice workers are included in these construction projects, the analysis uses two different measurements. The first is the actually-achieved participation rate on a project. The second measurement considers the established minority employment goal obligation for the county in which the project is located. This is done because of the substantial differences in the racial composition of the counties.

Table 6. Minority Goal Obligation Percentage by County Based on 1990 and 2000 Census

County	Minority Goal		County	Minority Goal	
	1990 Census	2000 Census		1990 Census	2000 Census
Atlantic	20%	18%	Mercer	19%	30%
Bergen	10%	22%	Middlesex	16%	24%
Burlington	16%	15%	Monmouth	11%	15%
Camden	16%	19%	Morris	7%	16%
Cape May	8%	5%	Ocean	6%	7%
Cumberland	21%	27%	Passaic	24%	36%
Essex	42%	53%	Salem	15%	10%
Gloucester	10%	9%	Somerset	8%	20%
Hudson	38%	60%	Sussex	5%	4%
Hunterdon	5%	3%	Union	24%	45%
			Warren	5%	5%

Source: New Jersey State Department of the Treasury, Division of Contract Compliance & EEO in Public Contracts, Affirmative Action Office, Goals for construction contractors and subcontractors, Revised 02/05.

Depending on the construction start date, the 2006 report uses the minority county goals based on either the 1990 or the 2000 Census. The year 2000 Census-based minority targets, which in some counties changed significantly, did not become available to Treasury's DCC until December 2004. The updated targets were revised in February 2005 and applied to new projects, which began in and after March 2005. Projects already underway prior to March 2005 continue to be subject to the 1990 Census-based minority targets. All but 6 of the 220 completed projects took place prior to the issuance of the 2000 Census-based guidelines.

Table 7 shows that both the actual PLA and non-PLA minority participation rates exceeded the weighted county goals. The female participation rates actually achieved on school construction projects are low for

both PLA and non-PLA projects; however, the hours worked by females on PLA projects (1.5%) was more than double that on non-PLA projects (0.6%). Overall, completed PLA projects demonstrated better minority, female and apprentice participation rates compared to completed non-PLA projects.

Table 7. Participation Rate for Minorities, Females, Apprentices

	PLA Projects (31)		Non-PLA Projects (121)	
	Achieved	Goal⁽¹⁾	Achieved	Goal⁽¹⁾
Minority	26.0%	24.1%	15.6%	14.4%
Female	1.5%	6.9%	0.6%	6.9%
Apprentice	11.3%	-	11.0%	-

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of Treasury. The sample includes 152 school projects of which 31 are PLA and 121 are non-PLA.

(1) Weighted State Average Minority Goal is determined by multiplying each county’s total work hours by the respective county minority goal percentage divided by the total statewide work hours.

Table 8 shows the minority participation rate (total hours worked by minorities) in the years 2004, 2005 and 2006. The work hours data (participation) collected by Treasury only provide an aggregate number for all minorities (Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian). The purpose is to determine the fluctuation of the minority work hours (participation rate) over time. Despite the efforts made to attract more minority workers into the construction trades, the participation results are lacking.

Table 8. Annual Minority Participation Rates

PLA Projects			
Fiscal Year	Total Hours	Total Minority Hours	Minority Percent
2005	1,381,827	361,172	26.14%
2006	1,940,321	504,912	26.02%

Note: 2004 data are not shown because only one project was completed.

Non-PLA Projects			
Fiscal Year	Total Hours	Total Minority Hours	Minority Percent
2004	919,177	143,569	15.62%
2005	4,359,829	745,341	17.10%
2006	5,204,454	878,468	16.88%

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of Treasury, DCC

Note: Minority percentages may not add up due to rounding.

2004 = July 1, 2003 to June, 30 2004;
 2005 = July 1, 2004 to June, 30 2005;
 2006 = July, 1 2005 to June 30, 2006.

Appendix V provides the actual weighted minority participation rates for the 43 new schools (15 PLAs and 28 non-PLAs) and compares them with the established county goals. Ten out of 15 PLA projects and 14 out of 28 non-PLA projects were above the relevant minority county goal.

Employment Work Hours for Minorities and Apprentices by Construction Trade

This section of the report presents the participation rates for minorities and apprentices for the different construction trades or occupations. There are no set trade-specific minority county goal obligations, but the minority work hours for all trades combined should reach or exceed the established minority county goal obligation percentage. Table 9 shows the achieved minority participation rate for each construction trade and compares it with the work-hour-based weighted eleven county-wide goal obligations.

The data are based on 107 school construction projects (new, addition, renovation, or addition and renovation) both for PLA (29) and non-PLA (78) school projects in the 11 counties with at least one PLA and one non-PLA project.⁸ The analysis is limited to school projects because they have a greater similarity in the occupational mix used than with non-school type projects, such as a parking deck (no roofers), a railroad terminal, or a theater.

The non-PLA analysis includes the following 19 trades or crafts: Asbestos Worker, Bricklayer or Mason, Carpenter, Electrician, Glazier, HVAC Mechanic, Ironworker, Laborer, Operating Engineer, Painter, Plumber, Primer, Roofer, Sheet Metal Worker, Sprinkler Fitter, Steamfitter, Surveyor, Tiler, and Truck Driver. Residual trades are reported as “Other”.

⁸The 11 counties with at least one PLA and one non-PLA project are: Bergen (1 PLA/14 non-PLA projects); Camden (1 PLA/4 non-PLA); Essex (1 PLA/6 non-PLA); Hudson (5 PLA/3 non-PLA); Mercer (2 PLA/11 non - PLA); Middlesex (1 PLA/9 non-PLA); Monmouth (6 PLA/13 non-PLA); Ocean (2 PLA/11 non-PLA); Passaic (4 PLA/4 non-PLA); Union (5 PLA/1 non-PLA); and Warren (1 PLA/2 non-PLA). Cumberland County has only PLA school projects; while the other 9 counties have no PLA school projects.

Of the 20 trades that worked on PLA projects, only six occupations (asbestos worker, bricklayer/mason, laborer, painter, primer, and roofer) achieved a minority participation rate above the goal obligation. For non-PLA projects, five trades (asbestos worker, bricklayer/mason, laborer, painter, and roofer) out of 19 scored above the county goal obligations. Overall, all trades combined exceeded the goal.

Table 9. Minority Participation in School Projects by Construction Trade

PLA/SDA School Projects				Non-PLA School Projects		
Actual Minority Participation	Weighted Minority County Goal Obligation	Above/Below County Goal Obligation	Construction Trade	Above/Below County Goal Obligation	Weighted Minority County Goal Obligation	Actual Minority Participation
74.5%	19.0%	Above	Asbestos Worker	Above	13.0%	65.1%
30.8%	22.7%	Above	Bricklayer/Mason	Above	16.6%	22.9%
16.5%	23.2%	Below	Carpenter	Below	17.7%	11.4%
15.8%	24.2%	Below	Electrician	Below	16.8%	8.1%
14.5%	28.1%	Below	Glazier	Below	19.8%	9.6%
18.9%	22.2%	Below	HVAC	Below	18.3%	4.9%
17.4%	25.4%	Below	Iron Worker	Below	19.3%	10.5%
48.2%	25.0%	Above	Laborer	Above	19.4%	36.9%
11.8%	22.1%	Below	Operating Engineer	Below	15.4%	13.2%
24.9%	28.2%	Below	Other	Below	16.2%	11.2%
47.9%	26.7%	Above	Painter	Above	17.3%	20.9%
22.2%	23.1%	Below	Plumber	Below	16.2%	8.5%
50.5%	24.0%	Above	Primer	INA	INA	INA
29.3%	21.8%	Above	Roofer	Above	17.5%	22.0%
20.1%	22.5%	Below	Sheet Metal	Below	20.0%	10.1%
14.0%	25.3%	Below	Sprinkler	Below	17.4%	9.3%
4.9%	35.6%	Below	Steam Fitter	Below	36.5%	4.3%
0.4%	25.1%	Below	Surveyor	Below	14.8%	5.9%
10.9%	27.5%	Below	Tiler	Below	16.2%	8.8%
11.9%	20.3%	Below	Truck Driver	Below	12.6%	6.3%
26.3%	24.1%	6 Above 14 Below	11 counties	5 Above 14 Below	17.7%	17.8%

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of Treasury, DCC.

Note: The sample includes 29 PLA and 78 non-PLA School Projects in 11 Counties with at least 1 PLA and 1 non-PLA Project)

INA: Information Not Available

Overall, for the eleven counties, the actual minority work hour participation rate for all trades exceeded the weighted minority county goal for both PLA project (26.3% compared to 24.1%) and non-PLA (17.8% compared to 17.7%) projects. The PLA projects showed a greater positive percentage difference: 9.1% for PLAs compared to 0.6% for non-PLAs.

Table 10 presents data on the extent to which the different trades use apprentices on PLA and non-PLA projects. The apprentice participation by trade is expressed as a percentage of the actual total work hours for all workers of the same trade. As mentioned, there are no specific trade goals set for the use of apprentices in New Jersey.

**Table 10. Apprentice Participation by Construction Trade
(includes all 220 Projects)**

PLA-SDA		Construction Trade	Non-PLA	
Actual Apprentice Participation	Ranking		Ranking	Actual Apprentice Participation
3.0%	14	Asbestos Worker	19	0.0%
5.9%	13	Bricklayer	14	5.0%
8.8%	11	Carpenter	10	11.1%
26.7%	1	Electrician	1	22.0%
10.5%	9	Glazier	12	8.6%
17.1%	5	HVAC	2	21.4%
2.3%	16	Iron Worker	16	2.1%
3.0%	15	Laborer	15	2.7%
0.4%	17	Operating Engineer	17	1.5%
7.7%	12	Other	11	9.2%
9.6%	10	Painter	13	7.2%
15.5%	8	Plumber	6	16.5%
0.0%	18	Primer	INA	INA
16.8%	6	Roofer	8	14.4%
17.4%	4	Sheet Metal	7	15.9%
20.4%	3	Sprinkler	5	18.6%
15.9%	7	Steam Fitter	3	19.4%
0.0%	18	Surveyor	4	18.8%
22.3%	2	Tiler	9	14.1%
0.0%	18	Truck Driver	18	0.5%
11.2%	-	Statewide	-	10.6%

Source: Author's calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, DCC.

The ranking of 1 represents the highest proportion of work hours by apprentices in a trade. Electricians had the largest percentage of apprentices.

INA: Information Not Available

Surprisingly, the rankings in the use of apprentices by the same trades are very similar for PLA and non-PLA projects. This is also true for the statewide weighted averages (11.2% for PLAs and 10.6% for non-PLAs). The work-hour based use of apprentices for a particular trade varies only slightly between PLA and non-PLA designated projects, other than surveyors.

However, there are substantial differences of how extensive the different trades use apprentices; this ranges from a high of 26.7% (PLA) and 22.0% (non-PLA) for electricians to a low of 6% or less for asbestos workers, truck drivers, laborers, primers, operating engineers, bricklayers, and iron workers.

Employment Utilization Rate of Minorities by Race/Ethnicity

The term employment utilization is different than the term employment participation. The minority employment participation rate refers to the total hours worked by a minority group or sub-group as a percent of the total work hours for all employees on construction projects. Employment minority utilization rate refers to the number of minority persons, such as Blacks or Hispanics, expressed as a percent of the number of all workers employed for each month on the monitored construction projects. For instance, a minority painter employed on a construction project for 10 months is counted 10 times, regardless of the total hours worked each month.

There are no established county or state utilization goals for minorities, females, or apprentices. The minority utilization data provides an overall employment profile over an extended period. The information can form the basis for determining the existence of possible systemic discrimination or minority underutilization. Underutilization can be defined as having fewer minorities on particular projects than would reasonably be expected by their availability.

Table 11 presents the total number of all workers counted monthly during selected construction periods and the minority utilization percentage for Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and Asians. The statistics include all construction projects identified with a firm completion date. PLA projects are located in the urban centers with large minority populations, while non-PLA projects are implemented in the suburbs with fewer minorities.

Table 11. Employment Utilization Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Selected Periods
PLA Projects

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Workers*</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>American Indian</u>	<u>Asian</u>
2005	27,663	29.8%	11.4%	17.5%	0.3%	0.7%
2006	32,776	26.4%	12.2%	13.8%	0.2%	0.2%

Year 2004 data are not shown since there was only one completed project

Non-PLA Projects

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Workers*</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>American Indian</u>	<u>Asian</u>
2004	14,553	18.3%	6.9%	10.6%	0.6%	0.2%
2005	60,509	18.2%	7.0%	10.6%	0.3%	0.2%
2006	78,176	16.4%	6.4%	9.1%	0.4%	0.6%

Source: Author's calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, DCC.

*Sum of workers employed in each month by the year indicated. Minority percentages may not add up due to rounding.

2004= July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004
 2005= July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005
 2006= July, 1 2005 to June 30, 2006

The data in Table 11 reveal that during the reference periods, the total utilization rates for minorities (actual number of minorities employed per month) declined from 29.8% in 2005 to 26.4% in 2006 for PLA projects, and from 18.3% in 2004 to 16.4% in 2006 for non-PLA projects.

Construction Duration

The final performance factor measured is the construction duration for all PLA and non-PLA projects. Construction duration information was not available for 4 non-PLA projects.

The SDA and DCC databases define construction start and construction completion slightly differently. The SDA's construction start is called "Construction Notice to Proceed" (NTP) and the completion date is called "Substantial Completion." It is understood that it may take a contractor several weeks after receiving the NTP certificate before actually starting the work on the construction site. Substantial completion means that the project essentially is completed, but finishing and clean-up activities may still be ongoing. For the DCC, the "Award Date" is used as the official construction start date, even though the contractor may take several more weeks before actually beginning the work. The "Closed Date" is the official construction end date, which usually is recorded at approximately 90 percent of the actual construction completion. Thus, construction duration is the time difference in weeks between the notice to proceed and the substantial completion dates for SDA projects, and the difference between award date and closed date for DCC monitored non-PLA projects.

There are a myriad of factors that influence the construction duration. Variables, such as project size and complexity, permitting, financing, material availability and delivery, change order requests, staffing and available resources, weather, unanticipated circumstances and more, play a crucial role in determining the projected and actual start and completion times of a construction project. Further, authorities with several school projects under construction may shift the priority from one construction site to another to accommodate the school calendar.

The length of time indicated for the construction duration is an approximation based on how the start and completion dates are recorded. There are disparities and variations in how projects are recorded. As a consequence, the findings should not be rigidly interpreted.

The average construction duration for all 152 projects, for which data were available, was 82.9 weeks. The average construction duration for the PLA school projects was an average of 95.1 weeks, versus an average of 89.6 weeks for the non-PLA school projects based on available data.

Timeliness data for the non-PLA projects are shown in Appendix VII. These data are not available for PLA projects.

THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT (LWD) APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING EFFORTS AND RESULTS

LWD, together with its partner agencies, is actively engaged in promoting and expanding registered apprenticeships and other work-based learning initiatives. In addition, through the schools construction initiative, LWD is strongly committed to orientation and outreach activities to promote apprenticeship training for female and minority residents primarily in the Abbott districts.

The goal of the Construction Trades Training Program for Women and Minorities (CTTP-WM) is to place program graduates into full-time registered apprenticeship programs in the building and

construction trades. The program is considered a success if there is a 50 percent placement rate, among program graduates, into registered apprenticeship programs.

Since its inception in March 2002 through August 31, 2006, the CTTTP-WM program has enrolled a total of 1,465 participants in training with 1,079 completions (73.7%) and 386 dropouts (26.3%). Of the 1,079 students who successfully completed the academic training, one-third (362) obtained a union apprenticeship, and 234 (21.7%) obtained non-union construction placements. This 55.2 percent rate of new personnel entering construction occupations surpasses the 50 percent goal and can be considered a success.

**Table 12. Construction Trades Training Program for Women and Minorities (CTTP-WM)
March 2002 to August 2006
Summary Statistics**

Participants	Completers	Drop Outs
1,465 (100%)	1,079 (73.7%)	386 (26.3%)

Outcomes for the 1079 Completers

- 362 (33.5%) - Obtained Union Apprenticeship
- 234 (21.7%) - Obtained Non-Union Apprenticeship or
Other Construction Placements
- 483 (44.8%) - Awaiting Apprenticeship Testing, Other Career Options, or
Unknown Outcome

Source: Author’s calculations using data provided by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Office of the CTTTP-WM.

LWD continues to meet with all construction trades unions and program operators to encourage their participation and commitment in the recruitment of apprentices and in the preparation of the individuals currently in the training programs.

PLA IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The PLA Act of July 25, 2002 stipulates that the PLA report issued for the year 2006 “...shall include an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the implementation of the act from the time of its enactment and any recommendations regarding legislation to make changes in the act deemed necessary by the commissioner to better effectuate those purposes.”

The Act does not mandate but authorizes and encourages the use of PLAs for certain public works projects. The overall goals addressed in the legislation are reasonable, worthy, and satisfy economic, social, business, and public policy objectives. Many of the goals are universal and sensible for any construction business. The overriding goal and benefit are the preservation of labor harmony on complex and multi-year projects.

Overall, the impact of the PLA Act is rather mixed, both in terms of the frequency of use, as well as the effect on the performance indicators measured. Most construction project owners in New Jersey do not use PLAs. Only the SDA uses PLAs on their school construction projects. So far, the SDA completed 29

school projects in Abbott districts, and two school projects in Manchester Township, Ocean County, a non-Abbott district. Of the 220 qualifying projects, only 31 or 14.1% used a PLA.

The following recommendations are offered to improve the PLA Act:

- Establish incentives for the achievement of certain goals. Currently, there are no incentives or penalties for non-performance.
- Strengthen oversight and inspections of contractors and workers to ensure that the data provided are accurate. Self-reporting is problematic.
- Designate a unit or person to initiate appropriate follow-up actions when the report findings are below expected standards, such as the minority hiring by some construction trades/crafts, and the declines in the minority utilization rates from 2004 to 2006.
- Modify the annual reporting requirement to every two years.
- Stipulate that the SDA, Treasury and DOE provide LWD with their data within three months of a June 30 cut-off date. This will allow LWD to conduct the necessary validations, formatting, analysis, report writing, review and report issuance by the next year.
- Clearly identify and code all construction contracts. Treasury should also track the race/ethnicity for the relevant employment work hours. The present data coding by Treasury of construction contracts makes it challenging and time-consuming for LWD to merge contracts into the appropriate projects.
- Request that the SDA keep timeliness data on PLA projects.

APPENDIX I DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

DATA SOURCES

The obligation to evaluate and report on the effectiveness of the PLA Act entails, first and foremost, a considerable data collection effort and a comprehensive retrospective analysis of the many different public construction projects in New Jersey. When LWD research staff began to plan ways to compile the information needed for the annual reports, it was reasoned that it would not be in the best interest of New Jersey to create a new, costly, unfunded, computerized database if LWD could get access to appropriate existing data collection systems at other State agencies. Consequently, various State agencies were contacted to identify the availability and accessibility of suitable operational data collection systems, which could serve the needs of LWD. After careful consideration, it was concluded that the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts (DCC) and the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA), previously called the Schools Construction Corporation (SCC), and the New Jersey Department of Education (DOE) could be of valuable assistance as primary data sources. LWD believes that the use of these primary data providers is the best way to systematically, routinely, comprehensively and cost-effectively collect PLA and non-PLA project information.

Neither the DCC nor the SDA tracking system was originally designed with the objective to monitor the implementation of the PLA Act. The DCC database primarily functions as a workforce compliance and equal employment opportunity in public contracts monitoring system. The SDA tracking system mainly serves as a school construction planning and management tool. Therefore, project-specific information on: safety; strikes, lockouts or other similar actions; specific contractor and subcontractor apprenticeship programs; set-aside goals for contracts which should be issued to minority- and women-owned businesses; and other project performance indicators, such as final construction costs, efficiency, quality and in, some instances, timeliness will not be available.

Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts, New Jersey Department of the Treasury

The Division of Contract Compliance and Equal Employment Opportunity in Public Contracts (DCC) tracks certain information on all State construction contracts and has become a significant contributor of raw data. To formalize this critical relationship, a Memorandum of Understanding was negotiated and signed on February 11, 2004 between the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, the Office of Information Technology, and the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development. DCC agreed to modify its tracking forms to include the designation of all projects as PLA or non-PLA. Of great benefit is their information on the use of minority, female and apprentice employees in public works contracts. If the private construction contractors correctly and responsibly fill out the required reports, it should be possible to analyze this important public policy issue. Appropriate access to the DCC database has been established which gives LWD the capabilities to review the monitored non-PLA projects.

LWD received electronically the most recent updated database from DCC covering all public works projects in New Jersey through June 2006, which became the cut-off date for the analysis. Several screens and hundreds of individual examinations, validations and queries were subsequently applied to obtain relevant information for the 189 Treasury-monitored non-PLA projects included in this analysis.

New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA) (Previously named: Schools Construction Corporation (SCC))

On July 29, 2002, Governor James E. McGreevey signed Executive Order No. 24, creating the New Jersey Schools Construction Corporation, as a subsidiary corporation of the New Jersey Economic Development Authority. Executive Order No. 24 spelled out several objectives, with the essential purpose to ensure that the State's \$8.6 billion schools construction program, required by the New Jersey Supreme Court's 1998 Abbott decision, is implemented in an efficient and timely manner. On February 7, 2006, Governor Jon S. Corzine signed Executive Order No. 3 creating a new working group to oversee a full review of the schools construction program. The group issued an initial written report on March 15, 2006, recommending various reforms.

On August 6, 2007, legislation creating the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA) was signed into law by Governor Jon S. Corzine. The SDA, an independent authority in but not of the Department of Treasury, is the successor to the New Jersey Schools Construction Corporation (SCC). The SDA is no longer a subsidiary of the EDA, though the EDA retains its role to provide financing for the SDA if new bonding authorization is approved by the legislature. After a short interim period until the Senate reconvenes in November 2007, the legislation mandates that the Governor appoint and the Senate confirm new SDA members with backgrounds directly relevant to the Authority's mission. These members collectively function as a board. Other reforms include creating a process that will allow Abbott districts to take on the responsibility to manage and construct their own projects, if they demonstrate the eligibility and capacity, with the SDA retaining ultimate responsibility for the project.

The SDA is responsible for financing, designing, and constructing all of the school facilities projects: in the 31 Abbott districts (special needs districts); in districts which receive 55 percent or more in State funding for education; and in the districts that are in level II State monitoring (districts that failed to show sufficient educational progress and are required to develop and implement a remedial plan). In the Abbott districts, the State provides 100 percent of the funding without the need for a voter referendum and without any financial, operational or management responsibility by local stakeholders. All school projects in these districts are constructed by the SDA under a PLA. In addition, the SDA is responsible for providing grants to fund the State share of school facilities projects approved by the Department of Education in districts with a district aid percentage of less than 55 percent (Section 15 districts⁹). Those districts, which receive less than 55 percent funding may elect to have the SDA undertake the financing and/or construction of their school facilities projects.

In the past, the DCC tracked all public works projects including schools. The monitoring of school projects was transferred to the SDA in November 2003, and the SDA elected to develop its own data monitoring system to track all school projects under its oversight. In response to a March 10, 2004 letter from the Commissioner of Labor and Workforce Development to the SCC Chief Executive Officer, the SDA agreed to provide LWD appropriate access to its computerized database. The SDA supplied LWD with updated data with a cut-off date of June 30, 2006. Following the application of various edits, a cumulative total of 31 SDA completed school projects remained for this LWD analysis and report.

The SDA is the only organization using PLAs. Twenty-nine (29) of the SDA's completed school projects were in Abbott districts. Two (2) school projects in Manchester Township, Ocean County, which selected the SDA as their construction oversight agency, were in a non-Abbott district.

New Jersey Department of Education (DOE)

⁹Stipulated in the New Jersey Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act which became law on July 18, 2000.

To enhance the 2006 report, LWD was interested in conducting a comparative cost analysis of PLA and non-PLA school projects. DOE was to determine the availability of information regarding the size (square footage) and student capacity from the identified completed new schools. After various interactions, LWD received the requested information together with explanations and definitions on August 22, 2007. The DOE data has assisted in elucidating the building cost aspects of PLA and non-PLA schools.

The definitions used by DOE for student capacity are as follows: “Student capacity” means the ideal number of full-time equivalent students for which the school is designed in order to have sufficient space for the building to be educationally adequate for the delivery of programs and services necessary for student achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. Student capacity is 100 percent of maximum capacity in the case of early childhood centers, 90 percent of maximum capacity in the case of elementary schools and middle schools, and 85 percent of maximum capacity in the case of high schools. The DOE also points out that the data are self-reported by the school districts and not necessarily validated.

METHODOLOGY

To complete the evaluation on the effectiveness of the PLA Act required the identification of the appropriate public works projects in New Jersey. Therefore, edits were applied to the DCC and SDA databases to eliminate all projects awarded prior to July 25, 2002, and all projects not completed by the cut-off date of June 30, 2006. Other screens eliminated all pumping stations and water/sewerage treatment plants, as well as all non-buildings, such as roads (improvements, re-surfacing, paving and drainage), tunnels, bridges, and golf courses. Following this, projects with less than \$5 million in estimated total costs were excluded. At the end of this process, there were a total of 220 projects which were organized by project type and by PLA and non-PLA designations.

In most cases, the analysis evaluated cumulative data. Some statistics have been examined on an annual basis. In order to inflation-adjust the cost of projects completed in different years, the analysis applied the 20-city building cost index purchased from McGraw Hill. All projects were indexed up to June 2006.

All information entered into the databases are self-reported and provided by the construction contractors themselves. The information was not audited. SDA and Treasury field representatives may occasionally catch an obvious error and question certain data, but in the end, the responsibility for and ownership of the information’s accuracy and quality rests with the reporting contractors. LWD checks the records and attempts to validate the information for reasonableness.

Comparing a sufficient number of PLA and non-PLA projects with similar characteristics, such as location, type of project (elementary school, municipal building), construction mode (new, renovation or addition) and building size, was challenging. Additional concerns include the fact that all PLA projects except two are in Abbott districts and all are implemented by only one agency, the SDA. The SDA does not execute any non-PLA projects. This makes it difficult to carve out the impact of PLAs on the many performance factors, such as cost, employment, construction duration, and timeliness. For instance, higher or lower award amount costs may not be due to the fact that a PLA is in place, but due to the operating practices of the construction oversight organization. It would be desirable to have several organizations implement comparable PLA and non-PLA projects. This would allow for a more meaningful PLA versus non-PLA comparison once there are sufficient numbers of projects.

All Abbott and “fifty-five (55) percent plus” school district projects must be covered by PLAs. Because districts differ with respect to population and occupational characteristics and workforce readiness, geographic location, cost (urban vs. suburban, North versus South Jersey) and construction work site

environment/logistics (congested inner city versus open suburban space), differences between projects with and without PLAs could certainly be due to factors other than the use of PLAs. The difficulty increases with non-school projects where there are even less similarities among projects.

APPENDIX II

Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Communities with Completed New School Projects

It is useful to provide some insights into the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the population in the communities in which the schools were built. While each location is obviously different, there are generally two distinct and acknowledged types of construction sites: locations in the economically disadvantaged inner cities called Abbott¹⁰ or PLA districts, and locations in the generally wealthier suburbs and rural areas which mostly complete their school projects without a PLA.

Table A presents highlights of selected socioeconomic and demographic differences between cities with completed PLA (Abbott) and non-PLA (non-Abbott) new school building projects. Variations between New Jersey's northern, central and southern regions are also shown. The analysis includes the 37 municipalities (some locations had more than one project) with completed new schools: 15 PLA projects (12 North, 3 Central, 0 South); and 28 non-PLA projects (7 North, 10 Central, 11 South). The percentage numbers for the minority population, individuals below the poverty line, home ownership and student enrollment, are calculated from the total population in the municipalities in the respective geographic areas. The median income ranges indicate the lowest and highest median income of only the municipalities with new school construction that are located in the respective region. As shown in Table A, the median income for all locations is identical with the one for the North region of New Jersey.

¹⁰According to the State of New Jersey Department of Education (DOE), "Abbott" is the shorthand description of a series of New Jersey Supreme Court decisions growing out of litigation filed in 1981 on behalf of children residing in New Jersey's most economically disadvantaged municipalities. "Abbott" is the first-named plaintiff, but the name is now used to distinguish the 31 school districts selected by the Court and the Legislature to benefit from state financial assistance and to implement specific remedies mandated by the Court. Under the Abbott decisions, Abbott districts receive state aid that is calculated to provide them with the same per-pupil operating budget as would be found in New Jersey's wealthiest school districts. Called "Abbott parity aid", this funding is adjusted annually to reflect spending and enrollment in wealthy districts.

Table A. Socioeconomic and Demographic Indicators of the Aggregated 43 New School Building Construction Locations

	PLA	Non-PLA	New Jersey
Total Population			
Locations with Projects	823,851	895,496	8,521,427
North	671,387	459,234	
Central	152,464	352,365	
South	-	83,897	
Minority Population			
Locations with Projects	55.1%	32.8%	29.0%
North	54.5%	50.7%	
Central	57.3%	14.2%	
South	-	13.2%	
Unemployment Rate			
Locations with Projects	10.1%	5.9%	6.3%
North	9.7%	7.9%	
Central	11.7%	4.0%	
South	-	3.5%	
Individuals Below Poverty			
Locations with Projects	18.6%	11.5%	8.2%
North	18.6%	18.3%	
Central	18.7%	4.4%	
South	-	4.0%	
Home Ownership			
Locations with Projects	32.6%	63.6%	65.6%
North	28.8%	44.9%	
Central	48.1%	84.0%	
South	-	79.1%	
Median Income Range			
Locations with Projects	\$32,345 - \$56,037	\$30,665 - \$135,649	\$61,672
North	\$32,345 - \$56,037	\$30,665 - \$135,649	
Central	\$34,356 - \$46,250	\$32,134 - \$118,850	
South	-	\$39,988 - \$83,790	
Nursery School Enrollment			
Locations with Projects	2.5%	2.4%	2.2%
North	2.6%	2.6%	
Central	2.1%	2.2%	
South	-	2.4%	

Table A. Socioeconomic and Demographic Indicators of the Aggregated 43 New School Building Construction Locations (Continued)

	PLA	Non-PLA	New Jersey
Kindergarten Enrollment			
Locations with Projects	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%
North	1.5%	1.7%	
Central	1.5%	1.3%	
South	-	1.8%	
Elementary Enrollment			
Locations with Projects	11.1%	11.6%	11.1%
North	10.6%	11.7%	
Central	12.8%	11.2%	
South	-	12.5%	
High School Enrollment			
Locations with Projects	6.7%	5.5%	6.0%
North	6.7%	6.0%	
Central	6.6%	4.8%	
South	-	5.5%	

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), and decennial Census. Numbers are based on the 2005 ACS for big cities, and based on 2000 Census for smaller cities. Student enrollments are self-reported by surveyed households, and may vary from the actual school district enrollments.

North, Central, South Regions include municipalities in the following counties:
 North: Sussex, Passaic, Bergen, Warren, Morris, Essex, Hudson, Hunterdon, Union.
 Central: Somerset, Middlesex, Mercer, Monmouth, Ocean.
 South: Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Salem, Atlantic, Cumberland, Cape May.

As expected, there are substantial differences between PLA (10) and non-PLA (27) locations with completed new school projects, in terms of minority population, unemployment rate, individuals below the poverty level, home ownership, and median income. PLA/Abbott municipalities compared with non-PLA locations, by definition, are poorer, with a much higher percentage of minorities (55.1% vs. 32.8%), a higher unemployment rate (10.1% vs. 5.9%), a higher number of people living below the poverty level (18.6% vs. 11.5%), and with a much lower rate of homeownership (32.6% vs. 63.6%). Furthermore, while the statewide New Jersey median income was \$61,672, the median income range in the poorer PLA/Abbott locations with completed new schools was between \$32,345 and \$56,037. The median income range in the more affluent non-PLA locations was between \$30,665 and \$135,649. This represents a 142.1% differential at the higher end of the median income range.

Table A also depicts the school enrollment percentages for the State of New Jersey and for the PLA and non-PLA areas. Despite the difficult socioeconomic circumstances for the people living in the PLA/Abbott locations, the percentage of students enrolled in nursery school, kindergarten, elementary

and high school are not substantially different from that in the more affluent suburban and rural areas. The numbers are also relatively consistent between the three regions.

In order to obtain a more specific and local view of the income and poverty situation, Table B provides an overview of the median income and the percentage of its population below the poverty line for counties and municipalities in which new schools were completed. Some municipalities had multiple projects.

Table B. Median Income and Percentage of Population Below the Poverty Line in Counties and Municipalities with New School Construction

County/District Board of Education	Project Type	2004 Median Income	Percent Below Poverty Level
Atlantic		\$44,782	10.0%
Hamilton	Non-PLA		6.6%
Bergen		\$66,637	5.7%
Garfield	PLA		7.8%
Burlington		\$63,354	5.5%
Bordentown Twp.	Non-PLA		2.8%
Burlington Twp.	Non-PLA		5.0%
Florence	Non-PLA		6.1%
Medford	Non-PLA		1.9%
North Hanover	Non-PLA		5.3%
Cape May		\$44,528	8.5%
Dennis	Non-PLA		5.5%
Essex		\$44,528	8.5%
Newark	Non-PLA		28.4%
West Orange	Non-PLA		5.6%
GLOUCESTER		\$59,516	6.2%
Kingsway	Non-PLA		INA
Woolwich	Non-PLA		2.9%
HUDSON		\$40,311	14.4%
Jersey City	PLA		18.6%
Union City	PLA		21.4%
West New York	PLA		18.9%
HUNTERDON		\$87,701	3.1%
Flemington	Non-PLA		6.9%
Tewksbury	Non-PLA		2.7%

**Table B. Median Income and Percentage of Population
Below the Poverty Line in Counties and Municipalities with New School
Construction
(Continued)**

County/District Board of Education	Project Type	2004 Median Income	Percent Below Poverty Level
MERCER		\$57,705	8.1%
W. Windsor/Mercer	Non-PLA		2.5%
Trenton	PLA		21.1%
Washington	Non-PLA		3.7%
MIDDLESEX		\$60,987	6.9%
Perth Amboy	PLA		17.6%
South River	Non-PLA		4.9%
MONMOUTH		\$71,464	5.9%
Freehold Twp.	Non-PLA		3.9%
Neptune	PLA		
MORRIS		\$82,173	4.1%
Washington	Non-PLA		2.3%
OCEAN		\$51,009	7.6%
Berkeley	Non-PLA		5.4%
Jackson	Non-PLA		3.7%
Plumsted	Non-PLA		5.0%
Stafford	Non-PLA		4.0%
Toms River	Non-PLA		INA
PASSAIC		\$47,861	12.0%
Clifton	Non-PLA		6.3%
Paterson	PLA		22.2%
Wayne	Non-PLA		2.8%
SOMERSET		\$79,567	4.3%
Franklin	Non-PLA		5.1%
Montgomery	Non-PLA		1.5%
UNION		\$55,247	9.1%
Elizabeth	PLA		17.8%
WARREN		\$61,281	5.4%
Phillipsburg	PLA		13.4%

Sources: Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates Program, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 12/06. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census of Population and Housing.

INA: Information Not Available

Table B clearly indicates that Abbott designated municipalities in which the new schools were completed with a PLA have a much higher percentage of individuals below the poverty line compared to the more affluent suburban townships. A case in point is the difference between three Passaic County municipalities: Paterson, an Abbott/PLA district has 22.2% of the population under the poverty line, compared to the non-PLA districts of Clifton and Wayne, which have only 6.3% and 2.8%, respectively, below the poverty level.

Appendix III. Cost Information for all 43 Completed New School Projects.

PLA	County	Location	Project Description	End Date	Square Footage	Student Capacity	Award Amount	Index Award Amount	Index Cost per Square Foot	Index Cost per Student
Early Childhood Centers										
Y	Union	Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #44	9/1/04	47,355	300	\$11,377,736	\$12,262,075	\$258.94	\$40,874
Y	Union	Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #45	9/28/05	46,675	300	\$11,064,000	\$11,319,604	\$242.52	\$37,732
Y	Bergen	Garfield	Early Childhood Center	7/15/04	37,057	316	\$8,875,000	\$9,598,181	\$259.01	\$30,374
Y	Middlesex	Perth Amboy	Ignacio Cruz Early Childhood Center	8/1/04	68,396	540	\$11,922,535	\$12,894,045	\$188.52	\$23,878
Y	Warren	Phillipsburg	Phillipsburg Early Childhood Center	12/23/05	89,829	524	\$19,340,000	\$20,357,895	\$226.63	\$38,851
					289,312	1,980		\$66,431,799	\$229.62	\$33,551
Primary Schools										
N	Cape May	Dennis	Primary School	9/28/05	45,321	340	\$7,513,814	\$7,687,400	\$169.62	\$22,610
N	Ocean	Plumstead	New Egypt Primary School	9/26/03	39,382	261	\$6,873,300	\$8,025,322	\$203.78	\$30,748
N	Middlesex	South River	South River Primary School	2/4/05	53,026	445	\$11,053,456	\$11,666,342	\$220.01	\$26,216
N	Ocean	Stafford	The Primary Learning Center	12/1/05	49,263	339	\$6,575,705	\$6,618,404	\$134.35	\$19,523

PLA	County	Location	Project Description	End Date	Square Footage	Student Capacity	Award Amount	Index Award Amount	Index Cost per Square Foot	Index Cost per Student
					186,992	1,385		\$33,997,469	\$181.81	\$24,547
Elementary Schools										
N	Ocean	Berkeley	5-6 Elementary School	10/7/04	75,300	567	\$15,443,753	\$16,339,807	\$217.00	\$28,818
N	Passaic	Clifton	K-5 Elementary School	6/7/04	82,010	420	\$12,139,881	\$13,318,272	\$162.40	\$31,710
N	Monmouth	Freehold	West Freehold Elementary School	7/27/04	82,025	622	\$15,506,203	\$16,769,729	\$204.45	\$26,961
N	Burlington	Medford	Kirby's Mill - North 70 Elementary School	12/30/04	57,963	423	\$11,584,956	\$12,194,691	\$210.39	\$28,829
N	Burlington	Medford	Chairville - South 70 Elementary School	7/30/04	59,766	451	\$10,443,037	\$11,293,990	\$188.97	\$25,042
N	Mercer	West Windsor C. Special Services	Elementary School	6/6/05	88,421	333	\$25,303,940	\$26,216,066	\$296.49	\$78,727
N	Essex	Newark	Belmont Runyon Elementary School	5/20/04	112,001	536	\$19,989,000	\$21,929,287	\$195.80	\$40,913
N	Burlington	North Hanover	Upper Elementary School	4/27/06	124,934	472	\$24,376,432	\$24,404,548	\$195.34	\$51,705
N	Hunterdon	Tewksbury	Tewksbury Elementary School	1/1/05	63,662	375	\$12,361,777	\$13,012,397	\$204.40	\$34,700
N	Morris	Washington	B. Cucinella Elementary School	9/19/05	86,640	683	\$18,427,557	\$18,853,276	\$217.60	\$27,604

PLA	County	Location	Project Description	End Date	Square Footage	Student Capacity	Award Amount	Index Award Amount	Index Cost per Square Foot	Index Cost per Student
N	Gloucester	Woolwich	Elementary School	9/25/03	98,000	618	\$6,609,675	\$7,717,511	\$78.75	\$12,488
					930,722	5,500		\$182,049,573	\$195.60	\$33,100
Y	Union	Elizabeth	Dr. Albert Einstein Academy, PreK-8	11/25/05	124,572	722	\$31,250,000	\$31,452,922	\$252.49	\$43,564
Y	Union	Elizabeth	Ronald Reagan Academy	6/15/06	125,380	722	\$27,987,000	\$27,987,000	\$223.22	\$38,763
Y	Hudson	Jersey City	PS3 Elementary School	12/30/05	117,939	490	\$25,100,000	\$25,163,779	\$213.36	\$51,355
Y	Monmouth	Neptune	Summerfield Elementary School	4/15/06	106,750	432	\$21,804,700	\$21,829,850	\$204.50	\$50,532
Y	Passaic	Paterson	Roberto Clemente School	4/6/05	117,820	591	\$26,598,000	\$27,970,758	\$237.40	\$47,328
Y	Mercer	Trenton	Mott Elementary School	6/14/05	64,944	315	\$7,056,000	\$7,299,890	\$112.40	\$23,174
					657,405	3,272		\$141,704,200	\$215.55	\$43,308
Middle Schools										
N	Burlington	Burlington	Burlington Middle School	4/27/06	181,700	1,293	\$16,342,850	\$16,361,700	\$90.05	\$12,654
N	Hunterdon	Flemington	Flemington - Raritan Middle School	8/16/05	155,165	848	\$30,028,912	\$32,362,920	\$208.57	\$38,164
N	Atlantic	Hamilton	William Davies Middle School	9/6/05	162,533	1,071	\$21,013,160	\$21,662,022	\$133.28	\$20,226
N	Gloucester	Kingsway	Kingsway Middle School	2/2/06	96,196	921	\$18,780,398	\$18,802,059	\$195.46	\$20,415

PLA	County	Location	Project Description	End Date	Square Footage	Student Capacity	Award Amount	Index Award Amount	Index Cost per Square Foot	Index Cost per Student
N	Ocean	Toms River	Intermediate School South	7/8/05	161,557	1,167	\$27,524,160	\$28,475,531	\$176.26	\$24,401
N	Passaic	Wayne	Anthony Wayne Middle School	9/15/05	95,808	588	\$22,015,300	\$22,523,904	\$235.09	\$38,306
N	Essex	West Orange	Liberty Middle School	9/13/05	106,880	540	\$21,935,000	\$22,612,328	\$211.57	\$41,875
					959,839	6,428		\$162,800,465	\$169.61	\$25,327
Y	Hudson	Jersey City	Middle School #4	12/30/05	169,678	810	\$37,644,000	\$37,739,653	\$222.42	\$46,592
Y	Hudson	Union City	Jose Marti Middle School	7/30/04	132,318	602	\$24,749,000	\$26,765,677	\$202.28	\$44,461
Y	Hudson	West New York	Middle School	7/30/04	171,281	872	\$29,794,000	\$32,221,769	\$188.12	\$36,952
					473,277	2,284		\$96,727,099	\$204.38	\$42,350
High Schools										
N	Burlington	Bordentown	Bordentown High School	4/27/06	175,619	714	\$31,170,900	\$34,616,608	\$197.11	\$48,483
N	Burlington	Florence	Florence High School	4/27/06	120,791	408	\$8,685,800	\$9,645,950	\$79.86	\$23,642
N	Somerset	Franklin	Franklin High School	3/8/05	319,083	1,316	\$50,585,800	\$53,338,769	\$167.16	\$40,531
N	Ocean	Jackson	Jackson High School	9/30/05	299,805	1,033	\$48,003,581	\$49,112,575	\$163.82	\$47,544
N	Somerset	Montgomery	Montgomery High School	6/10/05	321,932	796	\$57,464,805	\$59,536,227	\$184.93	\$74,794
N	Mercer	Washington	Washington High School	5/13/05	224,681	1,142	\$12,808,478	\$13,337,043	\$59.36	\$11,679

PLA	County	Location	Project Description	End Date	Square Footage	Student Capacity	Award Amount	Index Award Amount	Index Cost per Square Foot	Index Cost per Student
					1,461,911	5,409		\$219,587,171	\$150.21	\$40,597
Y	Passaic	Paterson	PANTHER Academy	8/1/04	26,666	149	\$8,461,200	\$9,150,662	\$343.16	\$61,414
					26,666	149		\$9,150,662	\$343.16	\$61,414

Y: Constructed with a PLA

N: Not constructed with a PLA

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(All 220 Projects)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
<i>Atlantic</i>						
Dept Of Veterans/Military Affairs	Atlantic City Armory	3,226	38.7%	20.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Hamilton	William Davies Middle School	131,465	14.6%	20.0%	1.0%	16.7%
Richard Stockton College	F-Wing (Academic)	50,062	19.3%	20.0%	0.0%	17.1%
Richard Stockton College	Student Housing / Academic	55,134	18.5%	20.0%	1.5%	13.8%
Ventnor City	Ventnor Library	34,473	4.7%	20.0%	1.8%	15.5%
<i>Bergen</i>						
Bergen County	Parking Deck	15,550	6.9%	10.0%	0.0%	5.4%
Demarest	Northern Valley Regional High School	38,335	7.8%	10.0%	0.0%	6.8%
Edgewater	Eleanor Van Gelder Elementary School	11,958	18.1%	10.0%	0.0%	14.9%
Fort Lee Borough	Community Center	47,708	6.2%	10.0%	1.1%	2.0%
Franklin Lakes	Colonial Road Elementary School	2,932	2.4%	10.0%	0.0%	4.7%
*Garfield	Early Childhood Center	56,530	18.0%	10.0%	0.3%	14.0%
Ho-Ho-Kus	Ho-Ho-Kus Elementary School	27,072	9.3%	10.0%	0.0%	10.3%
New Jersey Transit	Meadows Maintenance Complex	279,247	11.5%	10.0%	0.4%	3.7%
Northern Valley	Northern Valley Regional High School	23,807	15.5%	10.0%	0.4%	28.7%
Northern Valley	Old Tappan High School	19,159	23.9%	10.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Ramapo College	Sports & Recreation Center	114,418	13.9%	10.0%	0.5%	9.5%
Ramapo College	Student Housing	92,579	16.4%	10.0%	1.1%	10.5%
Ramapo Indian Hills	Indian Hills High School	70,115	16.8%	10.0%	0.0%	6.3%
Ramapo Indian Hills	Ramapo High School	93,692	17.3%	10.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Ramsey	John Y. Dater Elementary School	30,588	2.2%	10.0%	0.0%	10.1%
Rutherford	Lincoln Elementary School	108,838	7.8%	10.0%	0.1%	9.3%
Rutherford	Rutherford High School	28,594	8.9%	10.0%	1.3%	5.6%
Rutherford	Washington Elementary School	108,838	7.8%	10.0%	0.1%	9.3%
Saddle Brook	Saddle Brook Middle/High School	45,611	17.9%	10.0%	0.1%	13.0%
Woodcliff Lake	Woodcliff Middle School	38,094	37.5%	10.0%	0.2%	13.8%
<i>Burlington</i>						
Bordentown	Bordentown High School	86,861	15.7%	16.0%	0.7%	15.0%
Burlington County /Soc. Services	Westampton Complex	41,045	15.6%	16.0%	0.0%	14.3%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
Burlington County Institute of Tech	Westampton Campus	146,628	20.6%	16.0%	1.1%	9.8%
Burlington County Institute of Tech	Medford Campus	75,418	17.3%	16.0%	0.1%	8.7%
Burlington	Burlington Middle School	9,393	5.0%	15.0%	0.0%	15.5%
Dept Of Veterans/Military Affairs	Doyle Veterans Memorial Cemetery B.	9,464	16.5%	16.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Florence	Florence Township High School	24,488	8.5%	15.0%	0.0%	15.5%
Medford	North 70 Elementary School	58,786	9.8%	16.0%	0.3%	12.8%
Medford	South 70 Elementary School	41,382	10.7%	16.0%	2.3%	21.0%
Moorestown	Moorestown High School	84,594	9.2%	16.0%	1.1%	17.1%
North Hanover	Upper Elementary School	89,627	9.2%	16.0%	2.2%	13.1%
Riverside	Riverside Elementary School	43,769	10.4%	16.0%	0.2%	17.1%
Riverside	Riverside Middle / High School	49,214	12.4%	16.0%	2.0%	19.3%
<i>Camden</i>						
Audubon	Audubon Junior / Senior High School	55,032	9.6%	16.0%	1.2%	13.2%
Barrington	Avon Elementary School	38,159	14.1%	16.0%	0.1%	8.3%
Berlin Borough	Berlin Community Elementary School	42,211	14.7%	16.0%	0.0%	13.8%
Cherry Hill	Cherry Hill Library	82,627	12.9%	16.0%	0.5%	14.3%
County of Camden	Camden County Youth Center	23,552	8.9%	16.0%	0.0%	10.2%
County of Camden	Cooper River Boathouse	13,543	18.4%	16.0%	0.0%	18.1%
Eastern Camden	Eastern Regional High School	59,695	17.2%	16.0%	0.9%	14.5%
*Gloucester (Camden)	Cold Springs Elementary School	57,629	11.6%	16.0%	0.2%	13.1%
<i>Cape May</i>						
Cape May	Atlantic Cape Community College	69,154	12.9%	8.0%	0.0%	18.5%
Avalon Board	Avalon Community School	46,304	10.0%	8.0%	1.4%	14.2%
Dennis	Primary School	37,119	21.5%	8.0%	0.0%	15.2%
Lower Cape May	Lower Cape May Regional High School	79,168	10.6%	8.0%	0.0%	14.7%
Ocean City	Public Works / Engineering Center	24,259	3.0%	8.0%	0.0%	18.8%
<i>Cumberland</i>						
*Bridgeton	Buckshutem Road Elementary School	62,593	17.8%	21.0%	0.8%	19.3%
Cumberland	Cumberland County College Library	59,681	12.1%	21.0%	2.1%	14.2%
Vineland / Dept of Veterans Affairs	VA Memorial Home (Vineland)	304,701	10.1%	21.0%	1.3%	14.1%
*Millville District	Lakeside Middle School	118,066	22.8%	21.0%	1.6%	17.2%
<i>Essex</i>						
Bloomfield	Bloomfield High School	225,646	25.4%	42.0%	0.6%	11.1%
County Of Essex	Essex County Court House	66,014	29.0%	42.0%	5.7%	6.8%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
County Of Essex	Essex County Court House	66,014	29.0%	42.0%	5.7%	6.8%
County Of Essex	South Mountain Arena Parking	58,863	27.6%	42.0%	0.2%	8.4%
East Orange City	East Orange Police Facility	51,143	17.2%	42.0%	0.6%	10.2%
*East Orange	Campus 9 High School (Clifford Scott)	105,965	47.7%	42.0%	3.9%	16.0%
Glen Ridge	Glen Ridge High School	32,864	30.6%	42.0%	0.0%	10.7%
Livingston	Livingston Public Library	56,176	14.0%	42.0%	0.0%	10.7%
Montclair State University	Academic Building	262,798	14.8%	42.0%	1.7%	11.1%
Montclair State University	Alexander Kasser Theater	63,118	22.3%	42.0%	0.8%	10.7%
Montclair State University	Children's Center	26,659	27.8%	42.0%	0.7%	16.1%
Montclair State University	Student Resident Facility	160,994	17.5%	42.0%	1.3%	6.7%
Montclair Parking Authority	Crescent Parking Deck	24,521	29.4%	42.0%	11.0%	1.0%
New Jersey Transit	Bayhead Yard	22,049	19.0%	42.0%	0.3%	1.3%
Newark	Belmont Runyon Elementary School	77,037	25.0%	42.0%	1.2%	3.8%
North Caldwell	Grandview Elementary School	20,220	25.7%	42.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Rutgers University	Life Science Building / Olson Hall	40,213	29.9%	42.0%	1.0%	15.2%
Rutgers University	University Square Housing	46,759	42.4%	53.0%	1.3%	10.9%
UMDNJ	Ambulatory Care Center	225,179	29.0%	42.0%	0.1%	12.7%
UMDNJ	Cancer Research Center	361,749	24.7%	42.0%	0.5%	11.2%
UMDNJ	Science Center	41,572	10.5%	42.0%	4.0%	13.4%
West Essex Regional	West Essex High School	90,892	13.4%	42.0%	0.3%	13.8%
West Orange	Liberty Middle School	59,581	29.7%	42.0%	0.1%	9.8%
<i>Gloucester</i>						
Clearview Regional	Clearview Regional High School	111,563	10.5%	10.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Clearview Regional	Clearview Regional Middle	64,803	14.2%	10.0%	1.1%	19.2%
Gateway Regional	Gateway Regional High School	59,383	13.6%	10.0%	0.3%	14.5%
Glassboro	Glassboro Intermediate School	23,336	2.1%	10.0%	0.0%	23.0%
Gloucester County Vo-Tech/Depford	Gloucester County Inst. of Technology	65,391	7.7%	10.0%	0.8%	17.2%
Kingsway Regional	Kingsway Middle School	98,532	13.4%	10.0%	4.9%	9.3%
Monroe	Williamstown Middle School	151,814	13.5%	10.0%	0.9%	12.6%
Rowan College	College of Education Building	124,131	8.1%	10.0%	0.5%	10.9%
Rowan College	Student Modular / Townhome Housing	211,158	17.9%	10.0%	0.9%	12.1%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPEDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
Washington	Chestnut Ridge Middle School	27,474	5.2%	10.0%	0.1%	15.1%
Washington	Orchard Valley Middle School	29,916	8.7%	10.0%	0.2%	13.8%
Woolwich	Elementary School	31,660	13.5%	10.0%	0.0%	3.9%
<i>Hudson</i>						
Hudson County	Hudson County Community College	14,994	26.7%	38.0%	2.9%	19.8%
Hudson County Community College	Culinary Arts School	185,629	30.3%	38.0%	0.5%	9.0%
*Jersey City	Freshman Academy at Lincoln HS	101,080	41.0%	38.0%	3.2%	6.9%
*Jersey City	Middle School #4	570,053	28.0%	38.0%	1.9%	10.9%
*Jersey City	PS3 Elementary School	458	29.9%	38.0%	0.0%	3.5%
N.J. Division of Purchase & Property	Liberty State Park Railroad Terminal	44,531	29.1%	38.0%	0.0%	10.2%
New Jersey City University	University Academy Charter H. School	7,420	26.9%	38.0%	0.0%	0.0%
New Jersey City University	Arts & Science Building	94,556	29.5%	38.0%	0.4%	8.8%
New Jersey Transit	Hoboken Ferry Terminal	42,664	19.0%	38.0%	0.0%	2.3%
North Bergen	Lincoln School	13,590	31.1%	38.0%	1.2%	14.6%
Secaucus	Secaucus High / Middle School	53,442	26.2%	38.0%	0.0%	9.6%
*Union City	Jose Marti Middle School	111,629	20.4%	38.0%	0.9%	13.6%
*West New York	Middle School	182,082	24.9%	38.0%	0.9%	12.1%
<i>Hunterdon</i>						
Hunterdon County	Hunterdon County Main Library	19,750	7.9%	5.0%	0.1%	9.7%
Flemington - Raritan	Flemington - Raritan Middle School	183,769	11.8%	5.0%	0.3%	10.1%
North-Voorhees	North Hunterdon High School	50,258	6.1%	5.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Readington	Three Bridges Elementary School	28,565	13.0%	5.0%	1.1%	13.3%
Readington	Whitehouse Elementary School	38,677	18.2%	5.0%	0.0%	8.4%
Readington	Middle School	23,354	30.0%	5.0%	0.5%	2.4%
Tewksbury	Elementary School	73,882	5.5%	5.0%	0.2%	7.6%
<i>Mercer</i>						
East Windsor Regional	Hightstown High School	42,890	17.3%	19.0%	6.4%	5.2%
East Windsor Regional	Rogers Elementary School	30,228	14.7%	19.0%	0.0%	20.4%
Hamilton	Hamilton High School West	27,344	17.1%	19.0%	0.0%	17.3%
Hamilton	Steinert High School	19,408	8.6%	19.0%	0.0%	21.3%
Lawrence	Lawrence High School	87,013	22.6%	19.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Mercer County Special Services	Elementary School	164,970	13.7%	19.0%	0.6%	7.0%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
N.J. Division of Purchase & Property	Hughes Justice Complex	35,443	29.4%	19.0%	4.0%	12.4%
Princeton Borough	Spring Street Garage & Plaza	43,996	12.2%	19.0%	0.2%	4.4%
Princeton Regional	Community Park Elementary School	14,847	12.8%	19.0%	0.2%	8.9%
Princeton Regional	John Witherspoon Middle School	129,530	13.1%	19.0%	0.3%	15.1%
Princeton Regional	Johnson Park Elementary School	14,265	12.8%	19.0%	0.2%	8.9%
Princeton Regional	Princeton High School	94,928	18.4%	19.0%	0.3%	9.2%
Princeton	Princeton Library	21,618	14.1%	19.0%	0.0%	11.2%
The College of NJ	Athletic Field Complex	27,538	15.7%	19.0%	0.5%	7.0%
The College of NJ	Metzger Parking Deck	14,698	14.0%	19.0%	0.2%	5.8%
The College of NJ	Student Apartments	65,467	20.9%	19.0%	1.5%	7.4%
*Trenton	Mott Elementary School	47,974	23.7%	19.0%	1.4%	7.2%
*Trenton	P.J.Hill Elementary School	54,339	24.8%	19.0%	0.5%	10.3%
Washington	High School	72,636	5.9%	19.0%	0.0%	22.6%
<i>Middlesex</i>						
County of Middlesex	Long Term Care Facility (Roosevelt)	140,926	21.1%	16.0%	0.1%	7.3%
Cranbury	Cranbury Elementary / Middle School	27,336	16.9%	16.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Dunellen	Lincoln Middle School	13,198	23.5%	16.0%	0.0%	5.0%
North Brunswick	North Brunswick High School	70,163	26.6%	16.0%	0.1%	11.1%
Old Bridge	Old Bridge High School	89,263	17.2%	16.0%	0.2%	8.3%
Perth Amboy	Perth Amboy Public Safety Complex	65,488	19.5%	16.0%	1.3%	12.8%
*Perth Amboy	Ignacio Cruz Early Childhood Center	84,848	29.1%	16.0%	1.0%	13.1%
Rutgers University	Administration Service Building II	20,613	7.5%	16.0%	0.9%	12.8%
Rutgers University	Biomedical Engineering Building	61,059	8.4%	16.0%	0.0%	12.1%
Rutgers University	Hale Center (Athletic Center)	36,247	24.0%	16.0%	0.3%	8.4%
Rutgers University	Genetics & Biomaterial Life Sciences C.	4,041	1.1%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sayreville	Samsel Upper Elementary School	53,305	2.9%	16.0%	1.2%	18.7%
South Brunswick	Acres Elementary School	8,129	16.6%	16.0%	0.5%	11.1%
South Brunswick	Greenbrook Elementary School	8,632	16.6%	16.0%	0.5%	11.1%
South River	South River Primary School	21,464	34.7%	16.0%	0.0%	6.8%
Spotswood	Spotswood Elementary School	41,981	19.0%	16.0%	0.0%	7.6%
<i>Monmouth</i>						
Aberdeen	Matawan Regional High School	39,962	16.2%	11.0%	0.1%	7.1%
*Asbury Park	Bradley Primary School	52,086	19.1%	11.0%	2.9%	13.0%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
Freehold Regional	Freehold Borough High School	24,603	5.6%	11.0%	0.0%	12.0%
Freehold	West Freehold Elementary School	84,567	28.5%	11.0%	1.3%	9.8%
Henry Hudson Regional	H. Hudson Reg. Middle/High School	44,674	22.2%	11.0%	0.0%	8.4%
Holmdel	Holmdel High School	21,379	12.9%	11.0%	0.1%	17.7%
Holmdel	Village Elementary School	59,374	24.7%	11.0%	0.0%	10.3%
Little Silver	Markham Place Middle School	70,832	20.2%	11.0%	0.7%	1.0%
Matawan-Aberdeen Regional	Matawan Middle School	85,104	18.6%	11.0%	0.6%	10.0%
Monmouth County	Biotechnology High School	91,015	12.0%	11.0%	0.3%	7.7%
*Neptune	Green Grove Elementary School	93,700	28.6%	11.0%	0.7%	10.7%
*Neptune	Neptune Early Childhood Center	47,700	18.8%	11.0%	0.0%	13.2%
*Neptune	Neptune Middle School	122,467	22.3%	11.0%	3.4%	15.0%
*Neptune	Shark River Hills Elementary School	56,669	22.0%	11.0%	0.7%	9.4%
*Neptune	Summerfield Elementary School	155,344	23.4%	11.0%	1.4%	10.9%
Ocean	Ocean Township Intermediate School	33,235	24.5%	11.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Red Bank Regional	Red Bank Regional High School	23,846	8.0%	11.0%	2.0%	13.3%
Spring Lake	Spring Lake Heights Elementary School	19,163	21.3%	11.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Upper Freehold Regional	Allentown High School	56,551	16.2%	11.0%	0.0%	10.3%
West Long Branch	Frank Antonides Middle School	2,072	12.0%	11.0%	0.0%	8.0%
<i>Morris</i>						
Dover	East Dover Elementary School	14,145	13.7%	7.0%	1.6%	11.0%
Florham Park	Ridgedale Middle School	27,754	11.6%	7.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Jefferson	High School	77,617	21.0%	7.0%	0.0%	7.5%
Jefferson	Stanlick Elementary School	13,524	0.5%	7.0%	1.3%	7.0%
Kinnelon Borough	Stonybrook Elementary School	30,152	14.2%	7.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Mendham Borough	Mendham Middle School	23,804	21.0%	7.0%	0.0%	16.0%
Mendham	Mendham Elementary School	22,027	24.4%	7.0%	0.0%	7.5%
Morris	Morristown High School	49,906	15.6%	7.0%	0.0%	11.5%
Morris County College	Student Community Center	74,673	10.3%	7.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Morris County Vo-Tech.	Morris County Vocational School	29,492	6.8%	7.0%	0.1%	13.0%
Mountain Lakes	Mountain Lakes High School	28,722	14.8%	16.0%	0.1%	7.5%

***Indicates PLA Project**

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
New Jersey Transit	Madison Station / Morris & Essex Line	26,021	49.6%	7.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Parsippany-Troy Hills	Police Headquarters/Municipal Court B.	39,473	9.7%	7.0%	0.5%	10.8%
Washington	Benedict A. Cucinella Elem. School	44,273	10.2%	7.0%	0.2%	17.1%
<i>Ocean</i>						
Berkeley	5-6 Elementary School	72,063	19.1%	6.0%	0.2%	10.6%
Berkeley	Bayville Elementary School	6,890	4.7%	6.0%	1.6%	33.8%
Berkeley	Clara B. Worth Elementary School	5,802	4.7%	6.0%	1.6%	33.8%
Jackson	Jackson High School	292,613	13.8%	6.0%	1.1%	10.9%
Lakewood	John J. Franklin Public Works Complex	40,579	29.7%	7.0%	0.4%	9.8%
Little Egg Harbor	Municipal Complex	17,179	7.3%	6.0%	0.0%	13.6%
*Manchester	Manchester High School	96,120	17.2%	6.0%	2.3%	13.2%
*Manchester	Manchester Middle School	62,546	18.0%	6.0%	2.5%	10.5%
Ocean County	Ocean County Library	60,736	12.0%	6.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Ocean County	Technology Center	14,424	5.3%	6.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Plumsted	New Egypt Elementary School	16,590	4.5%	6.0%	0.0%	9.5%
Plumsted	New Egypt Primary School	42,669	20.6%	6.0%	0.7%	13.0%
Point Pleasant	Memorial Middle School	11,757	1.1%	6.0%	0.0%	29.4%
Point Pleasant	Point Pleasant High School	12,534	3.3%	6.0%	0.0%	31.1%
Stafford	Stafford Township Intermediate School	2,172	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stafford	The Primary Learning Center	11,283	9.4%	7.0%	0.0%	15.0%
Toms River Regional	Intermediate School South	19,055	41.9%	6.0%	2.4%	4.8%
<i>Passaic</i>						
Clifton	K-5 Elementary School	70,269	12.4%	24.0%	1.5%	5.9%
Passaic County	Passaic County Tech. Institute (Wayne)	116,536	17.4%	24.0%	0.9%	7.7%
*Passaic	Number 3, Mario J Drago Elem. School	55,154	21.8%	24.0%	0.7%	13.6%
*Passaic	Number 7, Grant Elementary School	36,028	13.7%	24.0%	0.0%	11.2%
*Passaic	Roberto Clemente School	180,062	30.2%	24.0%	0.2%	8.9%
*Paterson	PANTHER Academy High School	48,569	26.7%	24.0%	1.1%	8.6%
Wayne	Anthony Wayne Middle School	47,411	17.7%	24.0%	0.0%	6.8%

*Indicates PLA Project

APPENDIX IV
Minority, Female, Apprentice Construction Employment Participation by Project
(Continued)

District/Board of Education	Project Name	Total Project Work Hours	Minority Participation	Minority Obligation	Female Participation	Apprentice Participation
Wayne	Wayne Hills High School	45,232	8.6%	24.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Wayne	Wayne Valley High School	21,139	26.1%	24.0%	0.2%	5.9%
<i>Somerset</i>						
Franklin	Franklin High School	305,137	18.9%	8.0%	0.1%	8.3%
Montgomery	Montgomery High School	262,637	5.2%	8.0%	1.0%	12.8%
Watchung Borough	Bayberry Elementary School	55,502	27.7%	8.0%	0.0%	11.8%
Watchung Hills Regional	Valley View Middle School	26,498	14.2%	8.0%	0.0%	16.5%
<i>Sussex</i>						
Newton	Merriam Elementary School	5,874	0.9%	5.0%	3.4%	5.9%
Sparta	Municipal Building	31,839	118.4%	5.0%	2.7%	2.4%
<i>Union</i>						
*Elizabeth	Albert Einstein Academy/Pre K-8	236,320	28.4%	24.0%	0.8%	8.9%
*Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #44	116,411	20.6%	24.0%	1.5%	6.3%
*Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #45	75,473	31.5%	24.0%	1.7%	10.7%
*Elizabeth	Ronald Reagan Academy Elem. School	191,994	36.2%	24.0%	1.8%	11.5%
*Plainfield	Clinton Elementary School	67,297	20.0%	24.0%	0.2%	12.7%
Rahway Parking Authority	Rahway Transp. C. Parking Garage	27,175	24.6%	24.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Union	Union High School	44,293	16.9%	24.0%	0.0%	15.5%
<i>Warren</i>						
Hackettstown	Hackettstown High School	40,503	59.8%	5.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Oxford	Oxford Central Elementary/Middle S.	40,061	15.9%	5.0%	1.1%	16.1%
*Phillipsburg	Phillipsburg Early Childhood Center	122,662	15.4%	5.0%	1.8%	7.0%

*Indicates PLA Project

**Appendix V. Minority Employment Participation Based on County Goal Obligations for New School Construction Projects
(43 projects: 15 PLAs / 28 Non-PLAs)**

<u>County</u>	<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>PLA/SDA Projects (15)</u>	<u>Minority Percentage</u> ¹¹	<u>County Goal Obligation</u>	<u>Actual Participation</u>	<u>Percentage Point Difference</u>
Bergen	Garfield	Early Childhood Center	14.6%	10%	18.0%	8.0 Above Goal
Hudson	Jersey City	Middle School #4	63.6%	38%	28.0%	10.0 Below Goal
	Jersey City	PS3 Elementary School	63.6%	38%	29.9%	8.1 Below Goal
	Union City	Jose Marti Middle School	38.5%	38%	20.4%	17.6 Below Goal
	West New York	Middle School	33.3%	38%	24.9%	13.1 Below Goal
Mercer	Trenton	Mott Elementary School	67.6%	19%	23.7%	4.7 Above Goal
Middlesex	Perth Amboy	I. Cruz Early Childhood Center	49.1%	16%	29.1%	13.1 Above Goal
Monmouth	Neptune	Summerfield Elementary School	42.7%	11%	23.4%	12.4 Above Goal
Passaic	Paterson	R. Clemente Elementary School	69.0%	24%	30.2%	6.2 Above Goal
	Paterson	PANTHER Academy High School	69.0%	24%	26.7%	2.7 Above Goal
Union	Elizabeth	Albert Einstein Academy, PreK-8	51.0%	24%	28.4%	4.4 Above Goal
	Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #44	51.0%	24%	20.6%	3.4 Below Goal
	Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #45	51.0%	24%	31.5%	7.5 Above Goal
	Elizabeth	R. Reagan Elementary Academy	51.0%	24%	36.2%	12.2 Above Goal
Warren	Phillipsburg	Early Childhood Center	6.7%	5%	15.4%	10.4 Above Goal

<u>County</u>	<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Non-PLA Projects (28)</u>	<u>Minority Percentage</u>	<u>County Goal Obligation</u>	<u>Actual Participation</u>	<u>Percentage Point Difference</u>
Atlantic	Hamilton	Williams Davies Middle School	7.0%	20%	14.6%	5.4 Below Goal
Burlington	Bordentown	Bordentown High School	9.5%	16%	15.7%	0.3 Below Goal
	Burlington*	Burlington Middle School	30.6%	15%	5.0%	11.0 Below Goal
	Florence*	Florence Township High School	13.3%	15%	8.5%	7.5 Below Goal
	Medford	North 70 Elementary School	2.7%	16%	9.8%	6.2 Below Goal

¹¹The column labeled “minority percentage” presents data on the percentage of the population that is considered minority (non-white) in each of the named municipalities.

Appendix V. Minority Employment Participation Based on County Goal Obligations for New School Construction Projects
(43 projects: 15 PLAs / 28 Non-PLAs)
(Continued)

<u>County</u>	<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Non-PLA Projects (32)</u>	<u>Minority Percentage⁵</u>	<u>County Goal Obligation</u>	<u>Actual Participation</u>	<u>Percentage Point Difference</u>
	Medford	South 70 Elementary School	2.7%	16%	10.7%	5.3 Below Goal
	North Hanover	Upper Elementary School	16.6%	16%	9.2%	6.8 Below Goal
Cape May	Dennis	Primary School	2.1%	8%	21.5%	13.5 Above Goal
Essex	Newark	Belmont Runyon Elementary School	77.7%	42%	25.0%	17.0 Below Goal
	West Orange	Liberty Middle School	30.5%	42%	29.7%	12.3 Below Goal
Gloucester	Kingsway Regional	Kingsway Middle School	7.8%	10%	13.4%	3.4 Above Goal
	Woolwich	Elementary School	7.8%	10%	13.5%	3.5 Above Goal
Hunterdon	Flemington – Raritan	Flemington-Raritan Middle School	INA	5%	11.8%	6.8 Above Goal
	Tewksbury	Tewksbury Elementary School	2.7%	5%	5.5%	0.5 Above Goal
Mercer	Mercer Cnty Sp.Ser.	Elementary School	27%	19%	13.7%	5.3 Below Goal
	Washington	Washington High School	8.1%	19%	5.9%	13.1 Below Goal
Middlesex	South River	South River Primary School	13.8%	16%	34.7%	18.7 Above Goal
Monmouth	Freehold	West Freehold Elementary School	11.8%	11%	28.5%	17.5 Above Goal
Morris	Washington	B.A. Cucinella Elementary School	3.3%	7%	10.2%	3.2 Above Goal
Ocean	Berkeley	5-6 Elementary School	2.3%	6%	19.1%	13.1 Above Goal
	Jackson	Jackson High School	7.7%	6%	13.8%	7.8 Above Goal
	Plumsted	New Egypt Primary School	4.6%	6%	20.6%	14.6 Above Goal
	Stafford*	The Primary Learning Center	2.4%	7%	9.4%	2.4 Above Goal
	Toms River	Intermediate School South	INA	6%	41.9%	35.9 Above Goal
Passaic	Clifton	K-5 Elementary School	20.1%	24%	12.4%	7.6 Below Goal
	Wayne	Anthony Wayne Middle School	8.7%	24%	17.7%	6.3 Below Goal
Somerset	Franklin	Franklin High School	43.5%	8%	18.9%	10.9 Above Goal
	Montgomery	Montgomery High School	14.3%	8%	5.2%	2.8 Below Goal

Source: US Census 2000. Population by Race & Hispanic or Latino Origin for New Jersey Municipalities: 2000.

Appendix VI. Project Construction Durations and Completion Timeliness
Includes all 152 School Projects
PLA Projects are Marked with an Asterisk (*)

<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Construction Duration (Weeks)</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>
<i>Atlantic County</i>			
Hamilton	William Davies Middle School	83	1 week late
<i>Bergen County</i>			
Demarest	Northern Valley Regional High	75	31 weeks late
Edgewater	Eleanor Van Gelder Elementary	72	2 weeks late
Franklin Lakes	Colonial Road Elementary	81	17 weeks late
*Garfield	Early Childhood Center	50	INA
Ho-Ho-Kus	Ho-Ho-Kus Elementary School	47	18 weeks early
Northern Valley	Northern Valley Regional High	76	INA
Northern Valley	Old Tappan High School	72	3 weeks late
Ramapo Indian Hills	Indian Hills High School	187	8 weeks late
Ramapo Indian Hills	Ramapo High School	91	On Time
Ramsey	John Y. Dater Elementary	78	14 weeks early
Rutherford	Lincoln Elementary School	65	21 weeks early
Rutherford	Rutherford High School	133	3 weeks early
Rutherford	Washington Elementary School	65	21 weeks early
Saddle Brook	Saddle Brook Middle / High	73	3 weeks early
Woodcliff Lake	Woodcliff Middle School	60	20 weeks early
<i>Burlington County</i>			
Bordentown	Bordentown High School	108	6 weeks late
Burlington	Burlington Middle School	54	74 weeks early
Florence	Florence Township High School	57	14 weeks early
Medford	North 70 Elementary School	82	15 weeks late
Medford	South 70 Elementary School	64	On Time
Moorestown	Moorestown High School	107	35 weeks early
North Hanover	Upper Elementary School	108	30 weeks late
Riverside	Riverside Elementary School	48	10 weeks early
Riverside	Riverside Middle / High School	78	On Time
<i>Camden County</i>			
Audubon	Audubon Junior / Senior H.S.	89	20 weeks early
Barrington	Avon Elementary School	67	6 weeks late
Berlin Borough	Berlin Community Elementary	56	27 weeks early
Eastern Camden	Eastern Regional High School	133	41 weeks late
*Gloucester (Camden)	Cold Springs Elementary School	86	INA
<i>Cape May County</i>			
Avalon Board	Avalon Community School	64	1 week late
Dennis	Primary School	156	86 weeks late
Lower Cape May	Lower Cape May Regional H.S.	129	17 weeks late

Appendix VI. Project Construction Durations and Completion Timeliness
Includes all 152 School Projects
PLA Projects are Marked with an Asterisk (*)
(Continued)

<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Construction Duration (Weeks)</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>
<i>Cumberland County</i>			
*Bridgeton	Buckshutem Road Elem. School	92	INA
*Millville District	Lakeside Middle School	105	INA
<i>Essex County</i>			
Bloomfield	Bloomfield High School	111	41 weeks early
*East Orange	Campus 9 H.S. (Clifford Scott)	48	INA
Glen Ridge	Glen Ridge High School	63	2 weeks late
Newark	Belmont Runyon E.S.	82	6 weeks early
North Caldwell	Grandview Elementary School	60	4 weeks late
West Essex Regional	West Essex High School	88	INA
West Orange	Liberty Middle School	76	6 weeks late
<i>Gloucester County</i>			
Clearview Regional	Clearview Regional High School	66	33 weeks early
Clearview Regional	Clearview Regional Middle	67	2 weeks early
Gateway Regional	Gateway Regional High School	53	11 weeks early
Glassboro	Glassboro Intermediate School	68	26 weeks early
Kingsway Regional	Kingsway Middle School	131	5 weeks late
Monroe	Williamstown Middle School	120	21 weeks early
Washington	Chestnut Ridge Middle School	27	4 weeks early
Washington	Orchard Valley Middle School	27	4 weeks early
Woolwich	Elementary School	53	5 weeks early
<i>Hudson County</i>			
*Jersey City	Freshman Acad. at Lincoln H.S.	80	INA
*Jersey City	Middle School #4	147	INA
*Jersey City	PS3 Elementary School	168	INA
New Jersey City University	University Acad. Charter H.S.	60	10 weeks late
North Bergen	Lincoln School	61	INA
Secaucus	Secaucus High / Middle School	65	25 weeks early
*Union City	Jose Marti Middle School	99	INA
*West New York	Middle School	99	INA
<i>Hunterdon County</i>			
Flemington - Raritan	Flemington - Raritan M.S.	89	6 weeks early
North-Voorhees	North Hunterdon High School	45	9 weeks early
Readington	Three Bridges E.S.	47	26 weeks early
Readington	Whitehouse Elementary School	45	29 weeks early
Readington	Middle School	115	41 weeks late
Tewksbury	Elementary School	112	9 weeks late

Appendix VI. Project Construction Durations and Completion Timeliness
Includes all 152 School Projects
PLA Projects are Marked with an Asterisk (*)
(Continued)

<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Construction Duration (Weeks)</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>
<i>Mercer County</i>			
East Windsor Regional	Hightstown High School	77	8 weeks early
East Windsor Regional	Rogers Elementary School	90	36 weeks late
Hamilton	Hamilton High School West	54	11 weeks late
Hamilton	Steinert High School	96	48 weeks late
Lawrence	Lawrence High School	88	48 weeks early
Mercer County Special Services	Elementary School	60	8 weeks early
Princeton Regional	Community Park Elem. School	98	48 weeks late
Princeton Regional	J. Witherspoon Middle School	117	32 weeks late
Princeton Regional	Johnson Park Elementary School	98	48 weeks late
Princeton Regional	Princeton High School	123	8 weeks early
*Trenton	Mott Elementary School	80	INA
*Trenton	P.J.Hill Elementary School	116	INA
Washington	High School	110	17 weeks late
<i>Middlesex County</i>			
Cranbury	Cranbury Elem. / Middle School	81	30 weeks late
Dunellen	Lincoln Middle School	74	15 weeks late
North Brunswick	North Brunswick High School	159	37 weeks late
Old Bridge	Old Bridge High School	114	12 weeks early
*Perth Amboy	I. Cruz Early Childhood Center	85	INA
Sayreville	Samsel Upper E.S.	93	9 weeks early
South Brunswick	Acres Elementary School	46	58 weeks early
South Brunswick	Greenbrook Elementary School	46	58 weeks early
South River	South River Primary School	88	20 weeks early
Spotswood	Spotswood Elementary School	58	2 weeks early
<i>Monmouth County</i>			
Aberdeen	Matawan Regional High School	88	54 weeks late
*Asbury Park	Bradley Primary School	79	INA
Freehold Regional	Freehold Borough High School	36	6 weeks late
Freehold	West Freehold E.S.	80	17 weeks late
Henry Hudson Regional	H. Hudson Reg. Middle/H.S.	111	11 weeks early
Holmdel	Holmdel High School	80	24 weeks late
Holmdel	Village Elementary School	96	5 weeks late
Little Silver	Markham Place Middle School	73	14 weeks early
Matawan-Aberdeen Regional	Matawan Middle School	79	11 weeks early
*Neptune	Green Grove Elementary School	103	INA
*Neptune	Neptune Early Childhood Center	51	INA
*Neptune	Neptune Middle School	83	INA
*Neptune	Shark River Hills E.S.	72	INA

Appendix VI. Project Construction Durations and Completion Timeliness
Includes all 152 School Projects
PLA Projects are Marked with an Asterisk (*)
(Continued)

<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Construction Duration (Weeks)</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>
*Neptune	Summerfield Elementary School	91	INA
Ocean	Ocean Township Inter. School	90	4 weeks early
Red Bank Regional	Red Bank Regional High School	68	3 weeks late
Spring Lake	Spring Lake Heights E.S.	85	26 weeks early
Upper Freehold Regional	Allentown High School	119	17 weeks late
West Long Branch	Frank Antonides Middle School	66	2 weeks late
<i>Morris County</i>			
Dover	East Dover Elementary School	60	24 weeks early
Florham Park	Ridgedale Middle School	42	18 weeks early
Jefferson	High School	100	8 weeks late
Jefferson	Stanlick Elementary School	78	2 weeks early
Kinnelon Borough	Stonybrook Elementary School	56	8 weeks late
<i>Mendham Borough</i>			
Mendham	Mendham Middle School	71	4 weeks late
Mendham	Mendham Elementary School	71	4 weeks late
Morris	Morristown High School	159	7 weeks late
Mountain Lakes	Mountain Lakes High School	50	21 weeks early
Washington	Benedict A. Cucinella E.S.	73	8 weeks early
<i>Ocean County</i>			
Berkeley	5-6 Elementary School	67	5 weeks late
Berkeley	Bayville Elementary School	69	8 weeks late
Berkeley	Clara B. Worth Elem. School	69	8 weeks late
Jackson	Jackson High School	123	4 weeks late
*Manchester	Manchester High School	108	INA
*Manchester	Manchester Middle School	55	INA
Plumsted	New Egypt Elementary School	100	2 weeks late
Plumsted	New Egypt Primary School	55	9 weeks early
Point Pleasant	Memorial Middle School	93	15 weeks late
Point Pleasant	Point Pleasant High School	117	15 weeks late
Stafford	Stafford Township Inter. School	65	23 weeks early
Stafford	The Primary Learning Center	INA	INA
Toms River Regional	Intermediate School South	88	8 weeks early
<i>Passaic County</i>			
Clifton	K-5 Elementary School	90	12 weeks early
*Passaic	Number 3, Mario J Drago E.S.	81	INA
*Passaic	Number 7, Grant E.S.	118	INA
*Paterson	Roberto Clemente Elem. School	89	INA
*Paterson	PANTHER Academy H.S.	69	INA
Wayne	Anthony Wayne Middle School	85	11 weeks late
Wayne	Wayne Hills High School	49	5 weeks early
Wayne	Wayne Valley High School	50	9 weeks early

Appendix VI. Project Construction Durations and Completion Timeliness
Includes all 152 School Projects
PLA Projects are Marked with an Asterisk (*)
(Continued)

<u>District/Board of Education</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Construction Duration (Weeks)</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>
<i>Somerset County</i>			
Franklin	Franklin High School	97	12 weeks early
Montgomery	Montgomery High School	148	1 week late
Watchung Borough	Bayberry Elementary School	104	6 weeks early
Watchung Hills Regional	Valley View Middle School	65	32 weeks early
<i>Sussex County</i>			
Newton	Merriam Elementary School	63	4 weeks late
<i>Union County</i>			
*Elizabeth	Einstein Academy/Pre K-8	95	INA
*Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #44	69	INA
*Elizabeth	Early Childhood Center #45	101	INA
*Elizabeth	Reagan Academy Elem. School	104	INA
*Plainfield	Clinton Elementary School	85	INA
Union	Union High School	70	2 weeks late
<i>Warren County</i>			
Hackettstown	Hackettstown High School	102	4 weeks early
Oxford	Oxford Central Elem./Middle S.	60	3 weeks early
*Phillipsburg	Phillips. Early Childhood Center	80	INA

INA: Information Not Available

**Appendix VII. Project Completion Timeliness
Non-PLA Projects**

Timeliness data are only available for non-PLA projects. Timeliness data provide a measure of how accurate the planners were in projecting the actual construction completion date of a specific project.

For project completion timeliness, there are 179 non-PLA projects available for analysis. There were no data for any of the 31 PLA projects and for 10 of the non-PLA projects. As shown below, ninety-one projects or 50.8 percent were completed early or on time, and 88 projects were late, 21 of which were late by 4 weeks or less. For the 27 non-PLA new school construction projects, 14 were late (3 of which were late 4 weeks or less); 12 were early; and 1 was on time. No information was available for PLA projects.

**Construction Completion Timeliness
(179 Various Non-PLA Projects* including 27 Non-PLA New School Projects)**

	Early	On Time	Late
<u>All</u> Non-PLA Projects (179)	87	4	88 (21 by 4 weeks or less)
<u>All</u> Non-PLA <u>New Schools</u> (27)	12	1	14 (3 by 4 weeks or less)

Source: Raw data obtained from the New Jersey Department of the Treasury, DCC.

*No information was available for the SDA/PLA projects.