



Center for Innovative School Facilities of Oregon

Oregon School Facilities Briefing Book

June 4, 2009

Briefing Book Sponsors

**Glumac • National Trust for Historic Preservation
Lease Crutcher Lewis • Shiels Oblatz Johnsen**

CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE SCHOOL FACILITIES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CO-CHAIR, **CHRIS DUDLEY, RETIRED, OSBA**
 CO-CHAIR, **JUSTIN HURLEY, ASANTE HEALTH SYSTEM, MEDFORD**
 CO-CHAIR, **BOB PACKARD, ZIMMER GUNSUL FRASCA, PORTLAND**

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STEVE ANDERSON,
P&C CONSTRUCTION ▪ GORDON CHILDRESS,
SKANSKA ▪ JEFF CONDIT,
MILLER NASH LLP ▪ JEFF DeFRANCO,
SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS ▪ ISAAC DIXON,
PROVIDENCE ▪ NICK EHLEN,
MELVIN MARK PROPERTIES ▪ MARK FISHER,
STANCORP MORTGAGE INVESTORS ▪ VICKIE FLEMING
REDMOND SCHOOL DISTRICT ▪ LOUIS FONTENOT,
TRAMMEL CROW ▪ KAAREN HEIKES,
NORTHWEST CENTER FOR
EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SANDY HUSK
SALEM-KEIZER SCHOOL DISTRICT ▪ GIL KELLEY,
URBAN PLANNER ▪ NOLAN LIENHART,
ZIMMER GUNSUL FRASCA ▪ JIM MABBOTT,
NORTHWEST ESD ▪ KELLY MCINROY-EDWARDS,
WELLS FARGO ▪ DAVID MCKAY,
WILLAMETTE ESD ▪ BOB MCKEAN,
ALBINA COMMUNITY BANK ▪ BRUCE MURRAY,
RETIRED, CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS ▪ DAVID OH,
CORPORATE REAL ESTATE
PROFESSIONAL ▪ BART RICKETTS,
LEASE CRUTCHER LEWIS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BARBARA ROMMEL,
DAVID DOUGLAS SCHOOL DISTRICT ▪ SKIP ROTTICCI,
COSTA PACIFIC COMMUNITIES ▪ DIANE SHINER
MAHLUM ARCHITECTS ▪ JOSH SCHLESINGER,
SCHLESINGER COMPANIES ▪ KIRK SCHUELER,
BROOKS RESOURCES, BEND ▪ BILL SCOTT,
ZIPCAR ▪ CJ SYLVESTER,
PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

ADVISORY BOARD

- **MARK EDLEN, CHAIR**
GERDING EDLEN
- **JULIA BRIM-EDWARDS**
NIKE
- **SUSAN CASTILLO**
OREGON DEPT. OF EDUCATION
- **JAY COALSON**
GREEN BUILDING SERVICES
- **JOHN EMRICK**
NORM THOMPSON OUTFITTERS
- **JASON FRANKLIN**
21ST CENTURY SCHOOL FUND
- **SHEILA HOLDEN**
PACIFICORP
- **PAT LACROSSE**
OMSI, MASTERPLAN
- **ERIC PARSONS**
THE STANDARD
- **JOHN RUSSELL**
RUSSELL DEVELOPMENT
- **DENNIS WILDE**
GERDING EDLEN
- **ELISABETH ZINSER**
RETIRED, SOUTHERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

2008 – 2010 CENTER INVESTORS

- GERDING EDLEN
- LEASE CRUTCHER LEWIS
- MAHLUM ARCHITECTS
- MILSTEAD & ASSOCIATES
- SKANSKA
- THE STANDARD
- TODD CONSTRUCTION
- WELLS FARGO BANK



Oregon School Facilities Briefing Book

June 4, 2009

Prepared for the Center for Innovative School Facilities by:

Jeff Renfro, Innovation Partnership

Contributors and Editors:

Jeane DeLaney, Ph.D., St. Olaf College

Chris Dudley, retired, Oregon School Board Association

Mary Filardo, 21st Century School Fund

Bruce Murray, CASH Oregon

Fanasa Zhang, Portland State University Graduate School of Business

Innovation Partnership
610 SW Alder St., Suite 915
Portland, OR 97205
503-223-4475
www.innovationpartnership.org

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Emerging Statistics.....	5
III. Issue Statement.....	6
IV. Health/Life/Safety.....	7
V. Sustainability.....	8
VI. Technology/Science.....	10
VII. Policy Background.....	11
VIII. Oregon Facility Policies	14
IX. Model Facility Policies from Other States.....	18
Appendices	19
a. Pilot Project Profiles	
b. Economics of School Facilities	
c. School Siting Report	
d. Innovation Partnership Background	

Executive Summary

The State of Oregon is in the bottom 25% nationally when judged on support for school facilities, both for funding and technical assistance. Across Oregon, students are learning in aging, substandard facilities that lack basic safety equipment and are not built to withstand the sizable earthquake seismologists warn us is coming. They are attending schools that lack the technology and science equipment required for the education they will need to be competitive in the twenty-first century. Most of our schools are also models of energy inefficiency. Besides producing over 400 million pounds of carbon per year, heating these outdated structures needlessly wastes tax dollars that could be better spent paying our teachers and reducing class sizes. The current situation is the result of more than two decades of deferred maintenance and lack of funding.

Oregon has also failed to develop an adequate process for determining when and where new schools should be built, either to replace old facilities or to accommodate population growth. Sections of the law that *would* help to create smarter siting are routinely ignored. Present policy offers strong incentives to site schools on the edge of urban growth boundaries, rather than within community. Neighborhoods are losing their traditional centers, and students are attending schools that can only be accessed by driving. Locating schools away from communities also serves to remove them from the public eye. One important consequence, education advocates fear, is that citizens without school-age children will lose touch with school issues and be less likely to support the bond measures that provide Oregon's only source of funding for facility improvement.

Another critical issue is that of equity. The passage of Measure 5 in 1990 was meant to equalize funding for school programming across the state by removing disparities between districts with differing tax bases. When funding for educational programming moved to the state, however, operation and facility funding was left to the individual districts. The results have been disastrous. In districts where the voting public is able and willing to support school facilities, we see state-of-the-art theatres, stadiums, and newly-constructed, high-performance schools. In districts without the capacity to pass a bond, cost-cutting measures are the norm, including removing light bulbs, sealing windows to save on energy costs, and buildings with poor drainage, mold, and no fire alarms.

Research on the topic definitively concludes that the quality of the learning environment has an effect on the student. A 2006 report "Growth and Disparity: A Decade of Public School Construction" published by Better Educational Success Together (BEST), concludes:

Our analysis also reaffirms our worst suspicions: Despite record spending on school construction, low-income and minority students, who already experience

disadvantages, have had far less investment in their school facilities than their more affluent, white counterparts and the conditions for these students continues to be substandard.

Another key finding in the report stated:

The money spent on schools serving low-income students was more likely to fund basic repairs, such as new roofs or asbestos removal, while schools in more affluent districts were more likely to receive funds for educational enhancements such as science labs or performing arts centers.

Across the country, there are examples of policies that have overcome all of these issues. In order to create better school facility practices in Oregon, we need to educate planners and school administrators, change legislation, and create funding for sustainable planning and siting.

Federal money must also be a part of this equation, and there has never been a more timely moment to ask for federal aid to improve our school facilities. With a new administration in Washington and stimulus money available for infrastructure improvements, Oregon must step forward make its needs known. School districts that can demonstrate need with hard data will be the ones to receive funding. It is precisely that data, however, that we are lacking.

In August 2008, the *Center for Innovative School Facilities* was chosen by the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Trust for Historic Preservation as one of six organizations in the nation to lead an effort to examine school siting policies on a local level. The Center created a broad-based committee of school, government, business, and community leaders to examine current policy and make recommendations for improvement. During this period the Center also partnered with the 21st Century School Fund (21CSF) to bring a Long Range Facility Planning software pilot to Oregon. During the data collection for the pilot, several important trends and statistics emerged. Even more striking, however, was our finding that we lack basic information about the state of our school facilities. Clearly, a statewide effort to define the scope and specifics of the issue is needed, in order to bring our schools the level that our students deserve.

This report represents an important first step. It includes an overview of some of the facts we have discovered, the past and present State of Oregon facility policy, an examination of national best practices, and issues identified by the Center's stakeholder committee.

Emerging Statistics¹

Oregon has **7,875 school buildings**, totaling 94 Million Sq. Ft. That is equivalent to:

- 85 US Bancorp Towers
- 1,620 Football Fields
- 3.3 Sq. Miles

Estimated total **property value** is \$23,500,000,000 (based on \$250/sq.ft.).

Our schools produce **400 million pounds of CO2** per year. That is the equivalent of:

- 33,134 Cars
- 8 Million Barbeques
- 39,000 African Elephants
- It would take planting 8 Million Trees per year to offset this impact.

Based on a sample of 15% of Oregon's schools, **average electricity cost is \$.52/sq. ft.** In our sample, the range goes from \$.24/sq. ft. to over \$2.10/sq. ft. We note that schools with lower electricity/sq. ft. costs tend to have higher natural gas and oil costs. Useful information would be which schools are the energy net-savers and why.

Around 83% of the buildings were **built before 2000** when sustainability practices became the norm.

More than 67% of Oregon school buildings do not have **functioning fire alarms**. At least 38% have non-functioning fire alarms and no **automatic sprinklers**. These percentages have been adjusted to reflect the self-insured districts (Portland, Beaverton and Salem-Keizer) and assume their 100% compliance.

In the Center's 18 Pilot Projects for Long Range Facility Planning the **square feet per student range** from 47 SF in North Clackamas School District to 200 SF in Seaside SD.

¹ Sources: CISF's Statewide Inventory, PACE Insurance Data, NCES Common Core Data, The National Center for Education Statistics, The National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, Building Educational Success Together (BEST)

Issue Statement

Need

Oregon is one of only a handful of states that does not have a State School Facility Program, or a regular funding source to assure equity of quality learning environments for its students. As a result, our children are being educated in buildings that are not only substandard (**70% of school buildings without operable fire alarm systems**) but also consume a disproportionate amount for energy. This creates a substantial negative influence on Oregon's carbon footprint and student learning ability. Since the passage of Measure 5 in 1990, our schools have been underfunded, and 19 years of deferred maintenance is starting to cause serious safety and programmatic problems.

Oregon's school districts are usually the second largest, and sometimes the largest, property owner in our communities. With more than **7,875 buildings** making up over **94 million square feet**, Oregon's schools have an enormous and unmeasured impact on the state's carbon footprint. Moreover, 83% of Oregon's school buildings were built before 2000, before sustainable building practices and design became the norm.

"At a time when we are proposing that Oregon lead the nation in sustainable practices and business, we are avoiding the fact that one of the bases of society, its ability to educate its youth, is struggling to do so in mostly un-green buildings," said Chris Dudley, retired, Oregon School Board Association.

Background

Right now, Oregon has more than \$500 Million in shovel-ready school facility renovation projects. Funding 10% of this need or \$50 Million would have a three-fold impact --

- Generate approximately 1,700 construction related **jobs**
- **56% energy cost savings** by retrofitting lighting and window systems
- Measurable **increase in learning** for students in classrooms where correct levels of diffused natural light are introduced

As referenced in the proposed amendments to ORS 195.110, high performance public schools play an essential role in the vitality of our communities. Retrofitting of existing schools and well-designed additions can:

- Contribute positively to neighborhood identity and community stability
- Promote walking and bicycling and reduce auto dependence
- Demonstrate and inspire sustainable living
- Encourage civic and social learning as well as shared and flexible use
- Emphasize life cycle uses and costs as the standard for school retrofitting, replacement, and construction

Health/Life/Safety

Creating an effective learning environment begins with health/life/safety planning and implementation. Students cannot be expected to learn if their environment is uncomfortable or dangerous. Health/Life/Safety includes emergency contingency plans and drills, as well as programs to prepare staff in case of an emergency. For the purposes of this Briefing Book, we will focus on facility impacts on the learning environment.

In Oregon, school safety discussions have been primarily focused on seismic preparedness. The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries conducted a study on the ability of Oregon's school buildings to withstand earthquakes at the behest of the Legislature. The survey showed a huge need for seismic retrofits across the state. Superintendents from around the state have repeatedly stated that the study was seriously flawed, giving recommendations for massive changes to solid buildings, and not even listing buildings in need of massive reconstruction.

Even with flawed data, we know more about the seismic issue than we do about other important aspects of Health/Life/Safety. Research has shown that fire alert and response systems are below standards, but there are a variety of important factors that are not tracked or aggregated.

At least 65% of Oregon school buildings do not have functioning fire alarms. At least 38% have non-functioning fire alarms and no automatic sprinklers.

Moving forward, we need to know:

- What percentage of schools have had complaints about air quality or a higher than expected number of sick days due to respiratory illness?
- What percentage of schools have performed water quality test? What are the results of the tests?
- What percentage of schools have hazardous materials in the building?
- How many schools are using green cleaning/pest control methods?
- How many schools are near high pollution sites?
- How many schools have performed an analysis of entrances and exits, and their ability to control/lock them down
- Do the students have safe routes to school? How many students walk to school in areas without sidewalks? Bike to school without bike lanes?
- What schools have been assessed for structural soundness and ability to withstand a major seismic event?

Sustainability

In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development defined sustainability as, “Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” Since then, as the need to address climate change has entered the mainstream, sustainability has become an important consideration in all types of construction projects. For schools, projects using sustainable methods or materials are increasingly being used as learning tools and ways to involve the community. Increasing amounts of grants and incentives have also started to follow sustainable projects.

There is a strong correlation green schools and student performance:

- 13.5%-87% reduction in symptoms associated w/ asthma, colds & flu.²
- 15% reduction in absenteeism and 5% increase in test scores.³
- 20% faster learning in math and 26% faster learning in reading.⁴

Green Schools also lead to significant energy savings:

- According to the US Department of Energy, \$6B in energy is used by schools annually...and 25% (\$1.5B) is wasted.
- \$8/SF total Operation and Maintenance savings for green vs conventional building.⁵
- On average, green schools use 33% less energy, 32% less water, and generate 74% less waste than conventional schools.⁶

The school districts involved in the Pilot Project have provided the Center with utility use data, but the data is only enough to infer major trends. In order to improve energy use statewide, the data needs to be aggregated and analyzed. Currently, power companies have this data, but they only track the schools within their service areas.

Oregon has 7,875 school buildings, totaling 94 Million Sq. Ft. That is equivalent to:

- 85 US Bancorp Towers
- 1,620 Football Fields
- 3.3 Sq. Miles

² Carnegie-Mellon University Center for Building Performance

³ “Washington High Performance School Buildings: Report to Legislature” Paladino & Company

⁴ “Daylighting in Schools” – Heschong Mahone Group

⁵ “The Costs and Financial Benefits of Green Buildings: A Report to California’s Sustainability Task Force.” – Gregory Katz et al.

⁶ “Greening Americas Schools – Gregory Katz

Our schools produce 400 Million pounds of CO2 per year. That is the equivalent of:

- 33,134 Cars
- 8 Million Barbeques
- 39,000 African Elephants
- It would take 8 Million Trees per year to offset this impact.

Based on a sample of 15% of Oregon's schools, electricity costs average \$.52/sq. ft. In our sample, the range goes from \$.24/sq. ft. to over \$2.10/sq. ft. The schools that have lower electricity/sq. ft. costs tend to have higher natural gas and oil costs.

83% of the buildings were built before 2000.

In order to improve our schools sustainability practices, we need to know:

- Electricity usage and district plans for limiting use
- Water usage and percent of districts that use low flow fixtures or other water saving measures
- Use of natural gas/use of oil. Related to this, what is the method of heating and cooling the school?
- What percentage of school districts have published standards on school siting and construction?

Technology/Science

Economists agree that the percentage of high paying jobs requiring Calculus and Lab Science experience will increase significantly in the next several decades. Unfortunately, as school budgets are slashed, state of the art science labs and high level math courses are cut.

In order for Oregon students to be ready for the next generation of jobs (and the proposed new Diploma Requirements), resources must to be allocated toward increasing the ability of districts to provide hands-on scientific instruction in every school.

Technology significantly levels the playing field in this category. Internet content and video links allow students to share disparate experiences that they would not otherwise have access to.

Unfortunately, little statewide data is available on this issue. In order to undertake a science/technology initiative, we need to know:

- What percentage of schools have high speed internet access in every classroom
- What percentage of schools have instructional laptops and projectors (instructional AV equipment) in every classroom?
- Which schools have Science Labs? What elements make up an acceptable science lab?
- How many schools have enough energy outlets to run a proper science lab?

Policy Background: The Roots of the Current Crisis

The modern history of Oregon school facility practices and policies begins with the passage of Measure 5 in 1990. This measure amended Article XI, Section 11 of the Oregon State Constitution, placing a cap on property taxes on real estate. Initially, property taxes were capped at \$15 per \$1,000 of assessed value per year and gradually lowered to \$5 per \$1,000. This resulted in large budget shortfalls, requiring programmatic cuts in school districts across the state. Core academic subjects were prioritized, while programs like music and Talented and Gifted (TAG) were altered or cut. The measure anticipated the budget problems that it would create and required local jurisdictions to direct property tax funds toward public safety and education, creating an inability to provide other social services.

The other major effect of the measure stemmed from an attempt to equalize school funding across the state. Before Measure 5's passage, local jurisdictions were required to raise most of the funds for educational needs, resulting in funding disparities between districts with differing tax bases. To create greater equity across Oregon, the State was given the responsibility of funding schools. School districts are allocated funds based on a formula largely determined by weighted ADM (average daily membership). From a programmatic standpoint, the change in funding source resulted in fewer dollars for the classroom. From an operational standpoint, the move was disastrous.

When funding for education programs moved to the state, facility funding was left with the school district. As a result, schools have been forced to rely on passage of local bonds to pay for facility repairs, renovation, and construction. In districts where the base in taxable property is small, or the community tends to resist voting in favor of bonds, school districts often have to wait for a facility emergency to receive funds.

Because of this funding mechanism, facility work is frequently deferred in favor of keeping money and resources in the classroom. Across the state, school districts are faced with the choice of hiring teachers or hiring maintenance staff or funding needed building maintenance and repair. In the short run, putting the money directly into educating children makes sense, but usually leads to long-term problems. Basic maintenance measures deferred for too long create more expensive problems down the road. When school districts are unable to perform necessary maintenance on the operating systems, or hire people with the expertise to do it, these systems break down prematurely.

The attempt to create greater educational equity has in fact created immense disparities from a facilities perspective. In districts where the voting public is able and willing to support school facilities, we see state-of-the-art theatres, stadiums, and newly-constructed, high-performance schools. In districts without the capacity to pass a bond, cost-cutting measures are the norm, including removing light bulbs, sealing windows to save on energy costs, and buildings with poor drainage, mold, and no fire alarms.

Research on the topic definitively concludes that the quality of the learning environment has an effect on the student. In the 2006 report “Growth and Disparity: A Decade of Public School Construction” published by Better Educational Success Together (BEST), it concludes:

Our analysis also reaffirms our worst suspicions: Despite record spending on school construction, low-income and minority students, who already experience disadvantages, have had far less investment in their school facilities than their more affluent, white counterparts and the conditions for these students continues to be substandard.

Another key finding in the report stated:

The money spent on schools serving low-income students was more likely to fund basic repairs, such as new roofs or asbestos removal, while schools in more affluent districts were more likely to receive funds for educational enhancements such as science labs or performing arts centers.

In many school buildings across Oregon, students spend their days in environments that do not support their learning, and do not demonstrate the student’s value.

Construction Excise Tax

The 2007 Oregon Legislature enacted Senate Bill 1036 which created a construction excise tax dedicated to school facility funding. It gives local service districts (which includes schools as defined by ORS 174.116) the right to impose a tax on new construction. Money resulting from the tax can only be used for “construction of buildings and permanent improvements of the school district.”

A major shortcoming of SB 1036 is the small amount of money generated by the tax. Sherwood School District and Portland Public Schools are on the high end of money received but each get less than \$4 million per year. With the restrictions on spending these dollars (and limitations on the cost of collection and administration by the local government), this money sometimes goes unused. Construction of buildings and permanent improvements have price tags that far exceed money generated from the tax. If the difference cannot be obtained, the money goes unspent.

Bond/Safety Requirements- ORS 332.176

In 2007, Senate Bill 242 amended ORS 332.176. It includes a requirement for school districts to evaluate potential safety improvements for any bond funded project that costs more than \$1 million. The requirements state:

- (2) Prior to receiving approval from the electors of the school district for bonded indebtedness for a large construction project, a school district shall:
 - (a) Evaluate the need for safety improvements within one mile of an elementary school or 1.5 miles of a secondary school where the large construction project is to be completed. The safety improvements should provide safer alternative routes to schools and may include improvements for pedestrians, bicycles and motor vehicles.**

(b) Evaluate the potential for joint funding of safety improvements with other public and private entities.

(c) Consider including the funding of safety improvements within the funding of the large construction project. The consideration of and the school district board's decision on the funding for safety improvements as part of a large construction project shall be part of the public record relating to the project. [2007 c.163 §1]

Oregon Facility Policies

School facility policies and practices in the State of Oregon include:

Funding: Excise Tax, Bond Measures, SB 1149 Energy Upgrades

Site Standards: No minimum acreage requirements. About 20 years ago, Oregon did impose site size requirements, but the state law- and administration regulations- are now silent on the matter. Thus it is up to local governments and school districts in Oregon to decide how large the school sites should be.

Maintenance: No regular funding source

Planning: School Districts must obtain a conditional use permit for a proposed new school. The permit must be approved and issued by the local planning agency of the jurisdiction. Schools cannot locate outside Urban Growth Boundaries designated in local comprehensive development plans. SB 336 states that “high growth school districts” (defined as districts with more than 5,000 students and increased growth of 6% or more in the last three school years) shall identify school facility needs based on population growth and land use designations over a five-year period. Local governments must inform school districts if zoning/land use policies are enacted that will significantly affect future district development. If there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for the five-year period covered by the plan, the city or county, or both, and the school district shall cooperate in identifying land for school facilities.

Transportation: Oregon spent \$179 million on student transportation in 2001-02, up from \$150 million in 1998-99.

Schools as Center of Community: None Available

Model Facility Policies in Other States

“Our current policies [referring to site standards] encourage the construction of massive, isolated schools that are inaccessible to the communities they serve. Rather than walking or biking to their neighborhood school, many students spend more time stuck on buses than they do with their families. And perhaps worst of all, many children are ignored in these large schools. Anonymity and education don’t go together...One of the keys to improving education is a sense of community where teacher, student, and parent feel a sense of ownership of their school.”

-Governor Mark Sanford (South Carolina)
2003 State of the State Address

Common Policies and/or Legislative Approaches that appear in states with the most successful school facility programs:

- Flexible acreage standards that allow communities to determine the best use of the site- whether it is an existing site or a new site
- Policies that encourage joint planning for and joint use of community facilities, including school buildings, libraries, sports areas, etc., to maximize community investment and use
- Policies and procedures that allow private funds, or other public funds, to be used in conjunction with school funding to maximize resources available for the facility and the site
- Policies that require feasibility studies comparing the cost of building a new school with the cost of renovating, and perhaps expanding, an existing school
- Policies that facilitate the sale or reuse of an older or historic building for another purpose if the building cannot be renovated as a school

Notable Policies by State

Funding	Site Standards	Maintenance	Planning	Transportation	Schools as Centers of Community
Florida North Dakota Rhode Island	Maine South Carolina	Arizona Florida Massachusetts Vermont	California Maryland North Dakota Rhode Island Washington	Maine	Colorado Delaware Iowa Maine North Carolina West Virginia

Alaska: School districts are encouraged to develop maintenance management plans and maintenance training programs.

California: Requires school districts to work more closely with city and county planning officials on school siting. If either the school board or the local governing body requests a meeting, the other party must agree to meet.

Colorado: Most of Colorado's school districts are rural districts. Often the school is the only nonresidential, non-ranch, non-farm, or non-commercial building in a town or region. The school thus becomes an important focal point and center of activity. Schools are the location of libraries, meeting places, weddings, sports events, social events, club meetings, adult education, etc. Decisions regarding the use of school facilities are left up to the school districts.

Delaware: The Delaware Governor's Cabinet Committee recommended, "State investments in public facilities, such as schools... would be strategically located to foster community identity and vitality, in a manner that complements the historic character of these communities. In communities, the state will renovate, reconstruct or replace existing educational facilities that have community support and fit into sensible development patterns."

Florida: School boards are required to develop school facility maintenance policies that include a timetable and funding for the correction of deficiencies found during annual safety inspections.

Iowa: Encourages the use of schools as centers of community. State law (Chapter 28E) allows political subdivisions to cooperate in a variety of ways with school districts to provide space for community libraries, relationships with YMCAs/YWCAs, meals-on-wheels program for senior citizens, etc.

Maine: Among the factors that the State Board of Education must consider when it reviews school district requests for site approval for new schools are: the extent to which the community was involved in the site selection process, whether a "renovation vs. new construction analysis" was performed and the impact of the site on student transportation, vehicular traffic and student safety.

The state operates a School Revolving Renovation Fund to support small-scale renovation projects that, when carried out, can help to avoid problems resulting from deferred maintenance.

Maryland: School construction projects must be consistent with the local government's plans for growth and community revitalization. They should also encourage revitalization of existing neighborhoods and communities.

Massachusetts: School districts receive "incentive percentage points," which enhance prospects for state financial aid, when they receive excellent or good school "maintenance ratings."

Districts with poor track records in this area receive zero points.

Minnesota: State guidelines encourage school districts to “consider flexible design and the multipurpose use of spaces in designing educational spaces.” Such spaces include: media centers, cafeterias and auditoriums for community as well as school use. The guidelines also state that “Designing school facilities to increase community use should include... a large, mall-like building easily modifiable to accommodate program and partnership changes.” Minnesota encourages school/community partnerships, and state grants sometimes provide incentives for such partnerships.

North Carolina: The North Carolina *Community Schools Act* promotes “greater community involvement in the public schools and greater community use of school facilities.” School uses that are encouraged include: use of school facilities by charitable and civic organizations; use of volunteers in the community for tutoring, counseling, and cultural programs; and better communication between school faculty and citizens in the community. There are many examples in North Carolina of shared or joint usage of school facilities and of shared parks and recreational facilities.

North Dakota: School districts are required to explain how they are collaborating with relevant political units – e.g., local governments – when they apply for state financial assistance for new school construction or renovation projects.

South Carolina: Eliminated acreage requirements for schools in 2003 at the request of Governor Mark Sanford. In Sanford’s state-of-the-state message, he said, “Our current policies [referring to site standards] encourage the construction of massive, isolated schools that are inaccessible to the communities they serve. Rather than walking or biking to their neighborhood school, many students spend more time stuck on buses than they do with their families. And perhaps worst of all, many children are ignored in these large schools. Anonymity and education don’t go together... One of the keys to improving education is a sense of community where teacher, student, and parent feel a sense of ownership of their school. In addition to depriving many students of a quality education, the remotely sited mega schools also accelerate developmental sprawl into rural areas- and what comes with it- increased car trips, lengthened bus routes, and a disappearing countryside. Please help me to bring back smaller, community-centered schools. First, let’s work with the State Department of Education to eliminate acreage requirements so that school boards have greater flexibility in site selection.”

Rhode Island: Developed an addendum to its application for financial assistance that explains the concept of “smart growth schools.”

Vermont: May deny applications for state financial assistance for new schools if school maintenance has been deferred. State guidelines state: “No state construction aid shall be available for any proposed project or construction which has arisen in whole or in part from significant deferred maintenance.” “Deferred maintenance” is defined as “costs for construction repairs or other improvements necessitated by the lack of reasonable and timely maintenance including periodic minor repairs of school buildings and mechanical systems.”

Washington: Growth Management Act requires schools, as well as other public facilities, to be located within designated urban growth areas whenever possible.

West Virginia: All new schools are designed with community use in mind and community use is one of several design criteria.

Appendix A: Pilot Project Profiles

This new national long-range school facility planning software is being piloted in Oregon and offered for the Statewide Inventory Pilot projects at reduced rates by Innovation Partnership's Center for Innovative School Facilities (CISF), the Oregon Association of Education Service Districts (OAESD), and the 21st Century School Fund (21CSF).

This Pilot Project utilizes the full capacity of FORMAT-Pro; providing 550 data points of information per property, combined with trainings that will help school managers to effectively use the software and establish in-house long range facility planning. This new software tool will allow school leadership to address the impact of school facilities on:

Educational Efficacy – FORMAT-Pro can link data on facility design, condition and utilization to important educational indicators such as, instructional leaders, teacher retention, and student learning outcomes thereby addressing the significance of the school facility as a vehicle for 21st century learning, and making explicit the links between school facilities and educational outcomes.

Good Government – FORMAT-Pro (by compiling facility budget and expenditure data) can introduce data-driven decision making into this realm to help school districts manage operating and capital funds, and ensure that limited public funds are meeting the most pressing needs in the most efficient ways; such an information system would promote and improve savings which can be plowed back into core instructional priorities;

Community Development – by positioning a school's real estate decisions in the broader framework of a neighborhood's development, community economic trends and zoning -- benefits that come from possible partnerships and timing opportunities become apparent improving project value and supporting a better understanding of investment and partnership opportunities.

Banks School District

Number of Schools: 3 (1 Elem, 1 MS, 1 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:167,630

Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown

County: Washington

Enrollment: 1,159

Sq. Ft./Student: 145

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Beaverton School District

Number of Schools: 53 (33 Elem, 10 MS, 10 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:4,991,651
Total Site Sq. Ft.: 33,178,778
County: Washington
Enrollment: 37,221
Sq. Ft./Student: 134
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Bend La-Pine School District

Number of Schools: 28 (17 Elem, 6 MS, 5 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:2,311,630
Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown
County: Deschutes
Enrollment: 15,800
Sq. Ft./Student: 146
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Centennial School District

Number of Schools: 10 (7 Elem, 1 MS, 1 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:872,975
Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown
County: Multnomah
Enrollment: 6,466
Sq. Ft./Student: 135
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Colton School District

Number of Schools: 3 (1 Elem, 1 MS, 1 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:124,805
Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown
County: Clackamas
Enrollment: 721
Sq. Ft./Student: 173
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Crook County School District

Number of Schools: 8 (5 Elem, 1 MS, 2 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:268,365
Total Site Sq. Ft.: 17,354,304
County: Crook
Enrollment: 3,199
Sq. Ft./Student: 84
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

David Douglas School District

Number of Schools: 16 (10 Elem, 3 MS, 1 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:950,718
Total Site Sq. Ft.: 69,611,058
County: Multnomah
Enrollment: 10,452
Sq. Ft./Student: 91
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Hermiston School District

Number of Schools: 8 (6 Elem, 2 MS, 1 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:616,478
Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown
County: Umatilla
Enrollment: 4,776
Sq. Ft./Student: 129
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Lowell School District

Number of Schools: 2 (1 Elem, 1 MS/HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:76,367
Total Site Sq. Ft.: 76,900
County: Lane
Enrollment: 273
Sq. Ft./Student: 280
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

North Clackamas School District

Number of Schools: 29 (20 Elem, 3 MS, 3 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:722,348
Total Site Sq. Ft.: 1,966,499
County: Clackamas
Enrollment: 15,338
Sq. Ft./Student: 47
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

North Santiam School District

Number of Schools: 5 (3 Elem, 1 MS, 1 HS)
Total Sq. Ft.:366,200
Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown
County: Marion
Enrollment: 2,256
Sq. Ft./Student: 162
Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

North Wasco County School District

Number of Schools: 7 (1 Elem, 1 MS, 2 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:492,731

Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown

County: Wasco

Enrollment: 2,792

Sq. Ft./Student: 176

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Portland Public Schools

Number of Schools: 88 (65 Elem, 12 MS, 11 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:7,524,367

Total Site Sq. Ft.: 23,693,198

County: Multnomah

Enrollment: 39,528

Sq. Ft./Student: 190

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Redmond School District

Number of Schools: 12 (8 Elem, 2 MS, 2 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:882,375

Total Site Sq. Ft.: Unknown

County: Deschutes

Enrollment: 6,768

Sq. Ft./Student: 130

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Roseburg School District

Number of Schools: 12 (9 Elem, 2 MS, 1 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:842,700

Total Site Sq. Ft.: 8,886,240

County: Douglas

Enrollment: 6,148

Sq. Ft./Student: 137

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: No

Seaside School District

Number of Schools: 5 (3 Elem, 1 MS, 1 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.:310,519

Total Site Sq. Ft.: 32,587,236

County: Clatsop

Enrollment: 1,549

Sq. Ft./Student: 200

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Tigard-Tualatin School District

Number of Schools: 19 (10 Elem, 3 MS, 2 HS)

Total Sq. Ft.: 1,460,374

Total Site Sq. Ft.: 62,517,312

County: Washington

Enrollment: 12,623

Sq. Ft./Student: 116

Bond Passage in Last 5 Years?: Yes

Also Participating:

City of Portland

METRO

Clackamas ESD

High Desert ESD

Lane ESD

NW Regional ESD

Umatilla-Morrow ESD

Appendix B: Economics of School Facilities

Each high school drop-out costs Oregon taxpayers \$8,460 avg. per year

Nearly 80% of prison inmates are HS drop-outs & cost taxpayers \$23,000+ each per year

A college graduate contributes \$8,250 to state coffers annually

A Certificate of Deposits generates 2.7% annual return : a new school increases area home values by 6% in three years.

Appendix C: School Siting Report

This report was prepared by the Center for Innovative School Facility with grant support from The National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Environmental Protection Agency.

For decades, Oregon schools have been leaving the established neighborhoods that they have traditionally served for larger sites on the edge of Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB). Lack of available, affordable land within the city core, along with outdated ideas regarding school siting requirements have created unintended consequences, including:

- Decrease in community involvement and support
- Increased traffic congestion due to the inability to walk or ride bikes to schools
- Contribution to the youth obesity epidemic

The financial constraints and lack of facilities support for Oregon school districts have created an environment that makes it easier to site schools outside of existing communities. Because school districts have no regular source of adequate facility dollars, they have become reliant on bond passage to pay for construction and renovation, and levies to fund operations. When schools move outside of communities, the large percentage of voters who do not have kids in school lose touch with the importance of maintaining school facilities. They no longer see the school and its impact everyday. As a result, in many communities bond measures only pass when the school encounters a crisis that cannot be ignored. In many other states, small regular bonds that support normal maintenance and upkeep are the norm and help to avoid this boom/bust cycle.

The intent of this report is to examine the factors that have created Oregon's current school siting methodology, and to offer suggestions for how to bring the state up to date with the best practices from other parts of the country. It will:

- Examine the laws that have had an impact on the issue
- Summarize studies of past performance,
- Analyze best practices from around the country
- Propose legislative changes.

Measure 5- Property Tax Caps

The modern history of Oregon school siting practices and facility policies begins with the passage of Measure 5 in 1990. This measure amended Article XI, Section 11 of the Oregon State Constitution, placing a cap on property taxes on real estate. Initially, property taxes were capped at \$15 per \$1,000 of assessed value per year and gradually lowered to \$5 per \$1,000. This resulted in large budget shortfalls, requiring programmatic cuts in school districts across the state. Core academic subjects were prioritized, while programs like music and Talented and Gifted (TAG) were altered or cut. The measure anticipated the budget problems that it would create and required local jurisdictions to put property tax funds toward public safety and education, creating an inability to provide other social services.

The other major effect of the measure stemmed from an attempt to equalize school funding across the state. Before Measure 5's passage, local jurisdictions were required to raise most of the funds for educational needs, resulting in funding disparities between districts with differing tax bases. To create greater equity across Oregon, the State was given the responsibility of funding schools. School districts are allocated funds based on a formula largely determined by weighted ADM (average daily membership). From a programmatic standpoint, the change in funding source resulted in fewer dollars for the classroom. From an operational standpoint, the move was disastrous.

When funding for education programs moved to the state, facility funding was left with the school district. School districts were required to work with budget shortfalls in the classroom while losing regular funding for facility needs. As a result, schools rely on passage of local bonds to pay for facility repairs, renovation, and construction. In districts where the base in taxable property is small, or the community tends to resist voting in favor of bonds, school districts often have to wait for a facility emergency to receive funds.

Because of this funding mechanism, facility work is frequently deferred in favor of keeping money and resources in the classroom. Across the state, school districts are faced with the choice of hiring teachers or hiring maintenance staff or funding needed building maintenance and repair. In the short run, putting the money directly into educating children makes sense, but usually leads to long-term problems. Basic maintenance measures deferred for too long create more expensive problems down the road. When school districts are unable to perform necessary maintenance on the operating systems, or hire people with the expertise to do it, these systems break down prematurely.

The attempt to create greater educational equity has in fact created immense disparities from a facilities perspective. In districts where the voting public is able and willing to support school facilities, we see state-of-the-art theatres, stadiums, and newly-constructed, high-performance schools. In districts without the capacity to pass a bond, cost-cutting measures are the norm, including removing light bulbs, sealing windows to save on energy costs, and buildings with poor drainage, mold, and no fire alarms.

Research on the topic definitively concludes that the quality of the learning environment has an effect on the student. In the 2006 report "Growth and Disparity: A Decade of Public School Construction" published by Better Educational Success Together (BEST), it concludes:

Our analysis also reaffirms our worst suspicions: Despite record spending on school construction, low-income and minority students, who already experience disadvantages, have had far less investment in their school facilities than their more affluent, white counterparts and the conditions for these students continues to be substandard.

Another key finding in the report stated:

The money spent on schools serving low-income students was more likely to fund basic repairs, such as new roofs or asbestos removal, while schools in more affluent districts were more likely to receive funds for educational enhancements such as science labs or performing arts centers.

In many school buildings across Oregon, students spend their days in environments that do not support their learning, and do not demonstrate the student's value.

Construction Excise Tax

The 2007 Oregon Legislature enacted Senate Bill 1036 which created a construction excise tax dedicated to school facility funding. It gives local service districts (which includes schools as defined by ORS 174.116) the right to impose a tax on new construction. Money resulting from the tax can only be used for "construction of buildings and permanent improvements of the school district."

A major shortcoming of SB 1036 is the small amount of money generated by the tax. Sherwood School District and Portland Public Schools are on the high end of money received but each get less than \$4 million per year. With the restrictions on spending these dollars (and limitations on the cost of collection and administration by the local government), this money sometimes goes unused. Construction of buildings and permanent improvements have price tags that far exceed money generated from the tax. If the difference cannot be obtained, the money goes unspent.

Bond/Safety Requirements- ORS 332.176

In 2007, Senate Bill 242 amended ORS 332.176. It includes a requirement for school districts to evaluate potential safety improvements for any bond funded project that costs more than \$1 million. The requirements state:

- (2) Prior to receiving approval from the electors of the school district for bonded indebtedness for a large construction project, a school district shall:*
- (a) Evaluate the need for safety improvements within one mile of an elementary school or 1.5 miles of a secondary school where the large construction project is to be completed. The safety improvements should provide safer alternative routes to schools and may include improvements for pedestrians, bicycles and motor vehicles.*
 - (b) Evaluate the potential for joint funding of safety improvements with other public and private entities.*
 - (c) Consider including the funding of safety improvements within the funding of the large construction project. The consideration of and the school district board's decision on the funding for safety improvements as part of a large construction project shall be part of the public record relating to the project. [2007 c.163 §1]*

School Facilities in Oregon RE: ORS 195

Oregon currently has a number of laws that require cooperation and planning between school districts and their local jurisdictions. Specifically, ORS 195.110 outlines the relationship and planning process for school districts. The section applies to all large school districts (over 2,500 students) and requires them to designate someone as their liaison to the city and county, who in turn are required to schedule and host at least two meetings a year with this representative.

The school district is required to present a facility plan to their local jurisdictions that includes the following elements:

- (5)(a) The school facility plan must cover a period of at least 10 years and must include, but need not be limited to, the following elements:
 - (A) Population projections by school age group.
 - (B) Identification by the city or county and by the large school district of desirable school sites.
 - (C) Descriptions of physical improvements needed in existing schools to meet the minimum standards of the large school district.
 - (D) Financial plans to meet school facility needs, including an analysis of available tools to ensure facility needs are met.
 - (E) An analysis of:
 - (i) The alternatives to new school construction and major renovation; and
 - (ii) Measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites.
 - (F) Ten-year capital improvement plans.
 - (G) Site acquisition schedules and programs.
- (b) Based on the elements described in paragraph (a) of this subsection and applicable laws and rules, the school facility plan must also include an analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary.

During this review, if it is concluded that there is not enough available land for the school district to carry out its plan, the school district is authorized to:

...take necessary actions, including, but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary, or petitioning a metropolitan service district to add one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary pursuant to applicable law.

School districts are not allowed to place a moratorium on new construction. A School District's facility plan can only be amended by agreement of the district and the local jurisdiction. ORS 195 lacks an enforcement mechanism, and is frequently ignored.

Many of the elements required in Periodic Review are outlined in ORS 195. Local jurisdictions are not permitted to ignore sections of the law as they relate to parks and urban land reserves, but school needs are often ignored. Facilities and services that are defined as infrastructure in the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines Goal 11 are required to be included in Periodic Review. Goal 11 defines police protection; sanitary facilities; storm drainage facilities; planning, zoning, and subdivision control; health services; recreation facilities and services; energy and communication services; and community governmental services as infrastructure in urban areas. Schools are absent and not required to be included in long range planning.

Urban Growth Boundary

Pressures to expand Urban Growth Boundaries surface regularly as fast-growing school districts seek to obtain large tracts of undeveloped land for new schools. Even in slower-growing communities, pressures to build schools on large sites in outlying areas exist. This new construction, especially when not coordinated with local land use and transportation planning, can pose several problems, such as:

- Spawning residential sprawl in areas poorly equipped to handle new growth
- Chewing up farmland, making it harder for farmers to continue farming
- Triggering disinvestment in older neighborhoods if combined with the closing of existing schools important to the vitality of such neighborhoods
- Foreclosing options for students to walk or bike to school
- Increasing local area traffic
- Obligating state and local taxpayers to pay higher student transportation expenses over many years

Lack of funding for predevelopment planning often leaves districts with the standard large site designs for schools which exacerbate these problems, for they often limit the ability and/or willingness of school districts to build schools on smaller sites that could more easily be accommodated within UGBs. Although the State of Oregon does not impose acreage requirements on schools, school architects and facility planners continue to recommend outdated site standards no longer advocated by the Council for Educational Facility Planners International (CEFPI). After receiving criticism for promoting “school sprawl,” CEFPI removed these arbitrary standards from the 2004 edition of its planning guide for school facilities. Nonetheless, the old standards continue to influence school siting decisions.

At the same time, many communities and educators are calling for schools that serve as “centers of community.” They want smaller schools, neighborhood schools, schools to which students can walk. This “neighborhood school” movement reflects the view that smaller, community-centered schools are better for children and better for communities. Studies show that small, community-based schools are safer, experience less vandalism, involve more parents and members of the community in school activities, and increase property values.

Taken together, four factors play an especially important role in determining whether a school is in, or anywhere near, the center of a community: site size, distance, travel mode, and site design.

- The size of a school site affects the distance between the school and the neighborhood it serves. A 600 student middle school consumes about 13 city blocks the size of those in downtown Portland (200' x 200'); a 2,000 student high school about 22 city blocks
- Distance affects the travel mode used by students to get to school. The greater the distance, the more students drive (or are driven or bused). The shorter the distance, the more students can walk or bike. Distance is the greatest barrier to walking to school.
- Travel mode affects school site size as well as site design. The more students who arrive by motor vehicles, the more land needed to accommodate vehicles and the storm water runoff from large, impermeable parking surfaces.
- The more students drive (or are driven or bused) to school, the more auto-centric (and the less pedestrian friendly) the school's site design. It is not uncommon for school parking lots to exceed the footprints of the schools themselves.

Why Johnny Can't Walk to School

In *Why Johnny Can't Walk to School*, a study of school siting issues (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2002), author Constance Beaumont identified factors that have led schools to be sited outside of existing communities across the country.

- Arbitrary acreage standards (in statute, or as in Oregon the product of conventional wisdom) that discourage the retention of existing, community-centered schools in walkable neighborhoods while encouraging the construction of new schools on large, often remote sites on the outskirts of town
- Exemptions are made for school districts from local planning and zoning laws (expanding UGB, etc.)
- Building codes are written with new construction in mind, then rigidly applied to older schools that could otherwise be upgraded through code compliance alternatives
- Policies that make it difficult for new schools to be constructed on the site of existing older schools

Additionally, many schools adhere to minimum acreage requirements that are now discredited but still in circulation. Conventional wisdom dictates at least 10 acres of land for an elementary school, 20 acres for a middle school, and 30 acres for a high school – plus one acre for every 100 students. The reality of the lack of available land in urban centers across the country has forced schools to become more creative. There are award-winning high schools sited on two acres of land, or on contiguous floors in office buildings. The lack of recreational space is mitigated by partnerships with local municipalities or private business that arrange for activities and needs that cannot be provided on school grounds. In Maine, the state has actually mandated maximum acreage requirements.

Because large sites cannot easily be found within cities, schools increase their footprint even more by having to provide parking for students who drive themselves to school – or who are driven or bused. In many cases, massive parking lots have replaced neighborhoods as the settings for schools. In Oregon, the school district transportation costs are partially reimbursed by the State, eliminating an incentive to site schools closer to existing settlements and inside Urban Growth Boundaries.

Beaumont also questions the oft-held assumption that building new is always more cost-effective than large scale renovations and suggests that cost/benefit analyses could be improved, especially if long-term transportation costs to more remote sites associated with newer schools were considered and if architects experienced in working with older buildings were consulted. Beaumont writes:

In general, it is wise for school districts and school renovation advocates to retain consultants experienced in renovation and code compliance alternatives to assist in the architectural evaluation of a school. 'The ADA requirements are really a deal breaker,' says Mike McGlone, an architect with Alamo Architects in San Antonio, 'but the challenge of meeting them is often blown out of proportion by people who are looking for another reason not to renovate a school.'

In addition to public policies, the following local practices can undermine efforts to keep schools within existing communities and to avoid “school sprawl:”

- *Deferred Maintenance:* If a school’s structure and basic operations are not properly maintained, expensive repairs become necessary, thereby making new construction more cost effective.
- *Working at Odds with Affected Municipalities:* In some Oregon cities and counties, schools are in constant contact with local jurisdictions, enjoying an open and productive relationship. Starting in 2010, amendments to ORS 195 will require school districts and local municipalities to work together in the planning process. Until this process is mandated and the law enforced, cities and counties will continue to plan for every necessary feature except schools. A major factor contributing to schools being sited on the edge of the UGB is lack of involvement in local planning. Oftentimes districts begin the process of siting a new school after all of the desirable land has been designated for other uses.
- *Bias Toward New Construction:* As noted above, renovation of existing buildings is frequently not fully considered.
- *Vested Interests on School Planning Committees:* The makeup of a school planning committee will dictate bias and preconception. It is important to have a diverse group of citizens on these committees, who represent all of the interests of the community.
- *Fear of Speaking Out:* The positive aspects of building a state-of-the-art new school are obvious and well publicized. Community members who support renovation of existing buildings often rely on intuitive arguments because there are fewer resources to help them make their case.
- *Influence of Developers:* One option for mitigating the high cost of land is to accept donated or discount land from a developer. An easy way to raise property values in a new development is to site a school in the middle. Unfortunately, brand new developments do not have the population density to support a school, requiring students from outside to travel to it.³

³ *Why Johnny Can't Walk to School* also features multiple case studies and recommendations for further action. It can be found at: http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/historic-schools/additional-resources/schools_why_johnny_1.pdf

Transportation

In December 2008, ECONorthwest published a report prepared for the Oregon Department of Education evaluating public school transportation formulas entitled “Oregon Public School Transportation: An Evaluation of Alternative Methods.” The state of Oregon currently subsidizes between 70-90% of busing costs. The provision was originally intended to offset the huge travel costs incurred by rural districts. Even with help from the State, many rural school districts have moved to a four-day schedule to save money on transportation.

It is not the intent of the report to imply that school districts are siting schools outside of communities because they can save money on transportation. District leadership takes into account a long list of factors when considering potential sites, and ultimately makes a decision based on the best interest of their students and community. That being said, the state transportation subsidy eliminates a significant incentive to locate schools closer to existing neighborhoods and inside UGBs. School districts typically consider the cost of land *in the short term* when they make siting decisions, but the longer-term transportation costs – to the state and to the locality – are often not prioritized as highly. Travel-related greenhouse gas emissions are rarely considered. The policy saves some school districts millions of dollars per year in operating costs. Clearly, eliminating this subsidy would put an unacceptable hardship on school districts across the state, but there are alternatives that encourage neighborhood siting while continuing to help rural districts, but best practices and more efficient methods could make a positive difference.

The ECONorthwest report identified two focus areas: (1) Could districts deliver transportation services similar to levels delivered during the 2007-2008 school year but at a reduced cost? and (2) Is it likely that a change in the finance system could facilitate that cost reduction? The report found:

- “Approved cost formulas provide weak incentives for efficiency...districts that identify ways to deliver the same level of service, at a lower cost, are rewarded with only \$0.30 for every dollar of savings they find. The state recoups the rest.”
- “Expenditures could be reduced by an estimated 9 percent if inefficient districts adopted the practices of the most cost-efficient districts... transportation expenditures would have been about \$19.6 million lower in the 2006-2007 (a 9 percent reduction in total transportation costs)”
- Districts have become more efficient in delivering student transportation since 1999-2000
- Operational efficiency- and inefficiency- is found in small and large districts alike
- “Simple cost efficiency measures, such as cost per rider and cost per mile, fail to account for the environmental factors in which each district operates”
- “Alternative finance methods- that place the full fiscal consequences of transportation decisions at the district level- should accelerate the move to cost-efficiency. Any number of funding methods- from block grants to efficiency-based formula- would strengthen the incentives for efficiency relative to the status quo.”

The report concludes with a method for making policy decisions that will create greater efficiency in transportation methods. The report states environmental factors have not been fully considered when developing this funding formula. A broad view of “environmental” should be used when reconsidering the funding formula. Factors that get at quality of life in the communities should be included.

School Siting Issues

In August 2008, the *Center for Innovative School Facilities* was named as one of six agencies nationwide to receive grant money for the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to examine school siting issues at a state level. The Center convened a broad-based stakeholder group that identified the following issues and possible solutions:

Issues Identified by Stakeholder Committee

Siting:

- **Jurisdictional Boundaries:** School Districts have different jurisdictional boundaries than the cities, counties, etc. that they serve making the already difficult task of coordinating and planning that much more so.
- **State Transportation Funding Formula:** When school sites are selected, the true costs of transportation are not taken into account. And, while transportation costs are seldom a factor in the site selection, sites on the edge of urban growth boundaries do increase the “community cost” of the facility.
- **Safe Routes to School:** Lack of safe walking and biking routes to school
- **Cost and Availability of Land:** Land within existing communities is hard to find and often too expensive. Currently there is little help for school districts in covering cost differences between community locations and sites further away
- **Lack of Planning Coordination:** Because schools are not considered “infrastructure,” future school locations are not planned for. Schools are often left out of plans developed by local jurisdictions forcing schools out of communities to find available land.

Life Cycle Costs

- **Old Schools are Being Retrofitted Inadequately:** Usually due to funding shortages, older schools are often left for an extended period with deferred maintenance and then renovated at the least cost possible failing to extend the building life the preferred 30 – 50 years.
- **School Districts Need Better:** Case studies and information on the cost of long-term leasing vs. buying, lease/purchase and other alternative financing methods need to be available to districts.

Shared Use

- **Current Policies and Systems Encourage Competition vs. Collaboration Between Jurisdictions and School Districts:** Parks and School Districts, local governments and Districts are often forced to compete for the same land, sports and recreation dollars rather than having a basis for working together.
- **Disincentives for Companies to Work with Schools:** When for-profit companies attempt to partner with schools, they take on extra costs that make it difficult for the partnership project to make adequate profit to be viable.
- **Reliance on Property Tax and Local Bonding as Sole Forms of Development Money:** As one of the few states that have no statewide capital bond program, Oregon schools are

dependent on a single source of revenue. Alternative financing methods are sorely needed.

- **“First Cost” Dominates Development Decisions:** There are a number of measures that would save school districts money in the long run for a relatively small increase in First Cost. However, School Districts are unable to pay in advance for the planning and construction measures that would pay for themselves in as little as 5-7 year

School Siting Stakeholders Steering Committee

- Gil Kelley (Chair), Planning Bureau, City of Portland
- Don Arambula, Crandall Arambula Architects
- Marc Butorac, Kittelson
- Jay Coalson, Green Building Services
- Risa Davis, Bosco Milligan Foundation
- Noelle Dobson, Active Living by Design
- Jennifer Donnelly, Transportation and Growth Management Program, Oregon Department of Transportation
- Dick Feeney, The Chalkboard Project
- Kaaren Heikes, Northwest Center for Educational Options
- Dana Hepper, Stand for Children
- Kelly Hossaini, Miller Nash
- Donna Jordan, Lake Oswego City Council
- Robert Liberty, Metro
- Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon
- Mel Rader, Upstream Public Health
- Karl Rohde, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
- Roger Roper, State Historic Preservation Office
- Dick Steinbrugge, Beaverton School District
- Gregg Stewart, Mahlum Architects
- Dave Williams, Oregon School Boards Association
- Gill Williams, David Evans and Associates
- Jerry Zelada, ODOT BikePed Advisory Committee
- Bill Zelenka, Crook County Planning

Policy & Legislative Committee

- Nolan Lienhart, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca
- Kate Allen, Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.
- Bob Clay, City of Portland
- Jon Chandler, Oregon Homebuilders Association
- Justin Cutler, City of Gresham
- Doug Goe, Orrick
- Renee Hackenmiller-Paradis, Oregon Environmental Council
- Sue Hildick, Chalkboard Project
- Jim Imhof, Hill International
- Jules Kopel-Bailey, ECONorthwest
- Krina Lemons, Salem-Keizer Education Foundation, OSBA
- Jeremy Lyon, Hillsboro Schools
- Robin McArthur, Metro
- Bob McKean, Albina Community Bank
- Kevin Noreen, Sherwood Schools
- Jeremy Rogers, Oregon Business Council
- Barbara Rommel, David Douglas Schools
- Charles Rynerson, Portland State University
- Andy Shaw, Metro
- Jill Sherman, Gerding Edlen
- Diane Shiner, Mahlum Architects
- John Southgate, City of Hillsboro