B[illegible] B[illegible]

Portland Public Schools
[illegible]
A[illegible]16, 2012

Blanchard Education Service Center
501 N. Dixon Street
be limited to three minutes. All citizens must abide by the Board s Ru

Citizen comment related to an action item on the agenda will be hear
that issue. Citizen comment on all other matters w ill be heard during

This meeting may be taped and televised by the media.

[illegible]

1. [illegible] 5:00 pm

2. [illegible] 5:20 pm

3. [illegible] 5:50 pm

4. [illegible] 6:20 pm
   Young Women s Leaders hip Academy and Boise Elliott/Humboldt

5. [illegible] 7:00 pm

6. [illegible] 7:20 pm

7. [illegible] 9:00 pm

The next meeting of the Board will be a Regular Meeting on [illegible]
A[illegible]23, 2012, [illegible]5:00pm [illegible] here in the Board Auditorium.

[illegible]

Portland Public Schools recognizes the diversit y and worth of all individuals and groups and their roles in society. All individuals and groups shall be treated with fairness in all activities, programs and operations, without regard to age, color, creed, disability, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation.
Board of Education Policy 1.80.020-P

$165.000. This work is currently included in the construction documents prepared by the project's architect, DLR Group, and is included in the construction solicitation package as an "add alternate"

Potable water line replacement. The existing galvanized water lines in the burned portion of the building were undamaged by the fire, but are significantly deteriorated. This condition has reduced available water flow and increased the propensity for leaks. Approximately $50,000 has been allocated to replace these lines. The existing lines within the unburned portion shall remain as there is little financial advantage to replacing these lines at this time.

IT Upgrades. The IT department has identified several areas of improvement needed to bring the Marysville School closer to parity with other schools that have been improved over the past few years. These improvements include additional data drops in classrooms, wireless access throughout the school facility, integrated clock/bell/speaker systems, and additional motion detectors in corridors to better protect valuable IT equipment, Qualifying improvements in these areas are reimbursed by the Federal E-Rate program at a ratio equal to our Title 1 Free and Reduced lunch rate which at the Marysville School is 82%. After reimbursement, total out of pocket expenses for the District are anticipated to be approximately $26,000.

Gym expansion. The solicitation documents included an "add alternate" item to fully expand the gym, add telescoping bleachers, a bike shelter, storm drain improvements and several trees. The engineers estimate for this work is approximately $500,000 and will likely exceed the project budget unless another funding source is identified. If so, the work can be included in the basic construction contract award. Staff is not aware of any specific fundraising efforts. When the contract award recommendation is made, at a future Board meeting in May, staff will identify specific recommendations regarding the gym expansion and seismic upgrade add alternates.

III. RELATED POLICIES/BEST PRACTICES

8.80.015-P Capital Improvements – Process for the completion of capital projects.

IV. FISCAL IMPACT

The additional costs associated with the added seismic scope will be funded from Fund 405. In addition to the $300,000 previously committed to support the rebuild project, the $165,000 estimate for the seismic improvement would result in a total contribution of $465,000 from Fund 405. Adequate funds in Fund 405 exist for this purpose.

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

P.O. Box 3107 / Portland, Oregon 97208-3107
Telephone: (503) 916-3741 FAX: (503) 916-2724

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD AND STAFF REPORT

LONG RANGE FACILITY PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE UPDATE

Board Meeting Date: April 16, 2012

Executive Committee Lead: CJ Sylvester, COO

Department: Facilities and Asset Management

Staff Lead: Robert Alexander, Program Director, Planning and Asset Management

I. ISSUE STATEMENT

This report is an update to the Board of Education for three Long Range Facility Plan Advisory Committee (Committee) meetings #5, #6, and #7 held March 13, 2012, March 20, 2012 and April 3, 2012.

II. BACKGROUND

The Superintendent in December, 2011 convened a 39 member committee to recommend a Plan for possible consideration by the Board of Education in May, 2012. The Committee represents a broad cross section of the community including representatives of parents, students, PTA, unions, business interests, architects and neighborhood associations. This Plan, while not a plan for a specific bond, will lay the groundwork for evaluating the need for resources over a 10 year period. It will also meet the requirements in Oregon Revised Statutes 195.110 requiring an updated Plan.

The March 13, 2012 meeting was held at Sunnyside Environmental School where the Committee discussed results of Guiding Principles which they developed further in small groups. They also heard reports on school utilization - capacity formula/enrollment balancing; alternatives to construction and efficient use of school sites. The March 20, 2012 meeting at Markham had Issue Papers on Special Program Considerations: Pre-K - head start, teen parent service, on-line learning Universal access; historic preservation, sustainability; and capital investments - tools, bonds and partnerships. It featured small group exercises on enrollment utilization and condition of facilities. The April 3, 2012 meeting at Faubion included Issue Papers on Capital Tools, Accessibility, Sustainability, and Principles of Historic Stewardship. There have also been developed a series of "tools" which map issues for Committee consideration including enrollment, capture rate, utilization and enrollment, and facility condition index among other items. These are all posted on the website for access and use by the Committee and the public.

The Committee has added one additional meeting for a total of nine, to provide more time to develop and discuss the financing scenarios. The April 10, 2012 meeting will be an exercise to garner Committee direction on those funding scenarios for long term financing alternatives to finance components of the Plan and finalize the Guiding Principles. The final meeting, April 24, 2012, will be further development of scenarios and perhaps a recommended scenario to address the long term needs of the district.

III. RELATED POLICIES/BEST PRACTICES

The following Board policies will inform and direct the Plan creation:

1. Resolution 3986 - Criteria to Determine the Order of Rebuilding and Renovation of PPS School Buildings to Create 21st Century Schools, Adopted: 10/13/2008;

2. Resolution 3987 - Adopting Guiding Principles to Use for Developing and Implementing a 21st Century School Facilities Plan, Adopted: 10/13/2008;
3. Resolution 4042 - Establish a New Fund, Fund 405, the 21st Century Capital Project Fund, Adopted: 2/23/2009;
4. 8.80.010-P - High Performance Facility Design, Adopted: 6/1971, Amended: 8/12/2002.

IV. FISCAL IMPACT

The Long Range Facility Plan will assist the Board in reviewing future capital program alternatives to support school capital investment. The Plan will provide a framework for efficient and effective ways to allocate resources with a sustainable investment strategy.

V. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Thispaperdescribessomeof the measuresthe District hasand canconsiderin makingmore efficient usesof its schoolfacility sites.

ELEMENTS OF EFFICIENT USE OF SCHOOL SITES

Multi-story buildings

The District makes extensive use of multi-story buildings. Currently 53 of the Districts 88 active school sites have two or more stories. Local building codes previously restricted younger students (K thru 2nd grade) from being taught on floors above or below the main floor. However, these codes have been revised to remove this restriction when certain conditions are satisfied such as installing fire sprinkler systems. The District currently has numerous K-5 and K-8 multi-story buildings without sprinkler systems which restrict the flexibility of interior use. At the same time, multi-story buildings provide significantly more student capacity using the same footprint as a single-story building. As land costs increase, multi-story buildings become

LONG

SUMMARY

There are a variety of ways in which the District makes efficient use of its school sites including use of modular classrooms, building multi-story schools, sharing use of school sites for both District and other public/community agencies, locating schools on smaller sites, alternative parking arrangements and use of swing sites.

However, the District must consider specific site conditions and the values and demands of the community when evaluating these options. Site conditions such as steep slopes, wetlands and development code regulations that establish use standards for school buildings and modular classrooms, etc. are also important considerations. Community values may include providing enough parking for volunteers, connected and safe walking paths, biking, transit access providing fields for sports, extracurricular activities and shared uses with the Parks and Recreation Department and other community service providers.

ISSUE PAPER #5.2
ALTERNATIVES TO CONSTRUCTION

BACKGROUND

The LRFP will address other ways to accommodate programmatic growth or change that would not necessitate new construction or renovation. A variety of methods can be employed to alleviate the need for new or expanded sites. These can include: bussing students around the District to increase utilization at under enrolled schools, making boundary changes to improve student distribution, scheduling year around school, allowing split shifts, sharing space with other districts, creating magnet schools to attract students to facilities with declining enrollment, consideration of different grade configurations to alleviate pressure in overcrowded facilities or locating modular buildings on existing over crowded sites. This paper explores the implications of some of these strategies.

RELEVANCE FOR FACILITIES PLAN

Pursuant to the school facility planning statute, ORS 195.110, PPS must study alternatives to building new schools or performing major renovations when planning how to accommodate projected enrollment.

(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:

(E) An analysis of:

(i) The alter“This specify” what alternatives must be studied. This ... explores ... program changes, the use of modular classrooms, and public/private partnerships as alternatives to new construction and major

ideas overlap with the statute's requirement that the efficient use of school sites also be analyzed. Please see Issue Paper #4 for that discussion.

ELEMENTS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CONSTRUCTION

Program changes

The District has historically reviewed program alternatives and considered a variety of changes that schools could institute

Public/private partnerships

There may be opportunities for public/private partnerships to support District programs in lieu of new construction or major renovations. For example, PPS recently leased a portion of the ground floor of an affordable family housing development in NW Portland for an early childhood learning program. In general, lease arrangements are made on a case by case basis to support educational programs objectives.

The Ramona Early Learning Program does not have a library, gymnasium, or cafeteria, which is not unusual for alternative programs or private schools but is unusual for PPS schools. However, the last elementary school that PPS opened – Rosa Parks School in North Portland – was constructed in collaboration with the Boys & Girls Club and is sited adjacent to a Portland Parks & Recreation gymnasium with agreements in place for mutual use and benefit.

The District's Career Technical Education programs have historically, and will in the future, have robust partnerships with industry both in the schools and with internships at industry partner sites.

SUMMARY

Program changes, use of modular classrooms, vacant buildings and public/private partnerships can provide additional capacity and may influence the extent of major renovations.

It is important for the District to explore options for increasing the amount of school capacity without having to make major capital investments. It is requested that the Committee indicate whether these strategies have potential as alternatives to new capacity improvements and major renovation from a community perspective, and whether there are other strategies to suggest.

PPS Board Resolution No. 3986, criteria to determine the order of rebuilding and renovation of PPS school building to create 21st century schools, identified enrollment as a key criteria by which to assess capital investment in district schools: "right size" schools by "analyzing transfer patterns and making adjustments, evaluating boundary changes to balance enrollment between adjacent schools, and increasing the physical capacity of the school".

The instructional space and core facilities of every school should be sufficient to support the district's desired enrollment size that will support the delivery of the best educational model. The district overall has sufficient facility space for the forecast 50,399 students of 2021. However many individual schools do not have adequate space for their forecast enrollment of 2021. One of the tasks of the district's enrollment balancing process and long range facilities plan is to ensure adequate space and capacity for the number of students needed for the district's desired program, so that every student has access to a high quality education regardless of race or class.

STUDENT ASSIGNMENT PRINCIPLES

Portland Public Schools provides a guaranteed school for every grade K-12 student based upon their home address. PPS also provides a number of options for students to attend other schools, including other district neighborhood and focus (or magnet) schools, independently operated charter and alternative schools, and schools designed to meet in

Portland modee ofboithnanteeg
neighborhood schools ans arobjus schoicet

s. Int

p(tiols, whled otherurbain districssarde)-5.9d mre( )]TJ T* .001
gart(ante(s.)]TJ T* 0 Tc(o)Tj 0 -1.1366 TD .0005 Tc .0017 T
studen's ifJeosfelsnr neighborhoodare(enrol(ed ch)Tj -1.9692(and)]T03 Tc .0019 Tw

data analysis process, which incorporates historic, current and forecast enrollment data with demographic characteristics and transfer patterns. The results of the analysis include:

- A list of schools with projected enrollment significantly greater or lesser than school capacity,
- An assessment of the degree to which forecast enrollment may inhibit delivery of an adequate and effective academic program and/or cost efficient use of a school, and
- Options to address identified enrollment issues, including:
  a. enrollment changes through transfer limits or boundary adjustments,
  b. program changes, which may include different grade configurations,
  c. facility modifications to increase capacity, and
  d. opening or closing schools.

In recent years, PPS has seen increased enrollment across the district. This trend is expected to continue and it is likely that more schools will be operating at or above enrollment capacity. These schools will have to offer educational programs with less space per student to do so. At the same time, some schools continue to see declining enrollment, or are operating in buildings with such small capacity that they could never reach enrollment targets for educational programs. Schools in these categories (see Exhibit B) would be considered for the types of changes listed above.

Each of the options listed above have the potential for positive and negative academic and operational impacts. Facility changes are often seen as solutions of last resort because of the cost of adding new capacity. However, enrollment or program changes have the potential to be disruptive to a school community, and may have a negative impact on student achievement.[1] Enrollment and facility planning staff meet with regional administrators and other district leaders to refine the analysis, including potential risks and benefits, before developing enrollment action plans which are shared with the Superintendent and School Board annually. The 2011 enrollment analysis list for elementary, middle and K-8 schools is attached to this paper as Exhibit B, for reference. (Note: The utilization rate used for this analysis was based on teachers assigned to a school divided by the number of classrooms in the building. A different method for calculating utilization is proposed later in this paper.)

A community engagement process is conducted at each school subject to changes due to over or under-utilization. The process allows stakeholders to provide input on the risks and benefits of each potential solution, both for the school in question and for nearby schools, before a single option is selected by the Superintendent and recommended to the School Board for approval.

SCHOOL SIZE TARGETS

While school building size is often a reflection of the educational models in place at the time a school was constructed, school size targets are based on current thinking regarding the number of students needed to meet a district's program goals. Targets are based on existing resources and staffing ratios, and are not meant to serve as program ideals, but rather as ranges for planning purposes. School size targets may vary through the years as educational program models and funding levels change. While larger schools are more efficient from a staffing and operations perspective, they may not provide the personalized school climate and learning supports that are available at smaller schools. The following enrollment targets were developed for the 2011-12 school year.

[1] Douglas Ready, Valerie Lee & Kevin G. Welner, Educational Equity and School Structure: School Size, Overcrowding, and Schools Within r Schools http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/1882.pdf (2004)

2011-12 PPS School Size Target Ranges*

School type	Floor	Target	Ceiling
Elementary			

The instructional model allows for a determination of design capacity (all potential instructional spaces being used 100% of the school day) and a functional capacity (design capacity minus the instructional spaces being used for non-instructional purposes – office space, resource rooms, space leased to other users). The determination of functional capacity is best performed at the individual school level. Determining what percentage of school day instructional spaces are being used (utilization) can be done by assigning a school-wide utilization factor to all instructional spaces or by having building administrators identify how often instructional spaces are being used.

The utilization rate identifies how much of the functional capacity is being used. Most schools do not operate at 100 percent of the available student capacity. Teacher planning periods, specialized classrooms used by a portion of school students (e.g. science labs, art rooms) mean that not all instructional spaces are used every period of every day. However, the program needs of each school may require the use of traditional instructional spaces for non-instructional uses such as resource rooms, counselors, therapists, etc.

The functional capacity and utilization of instructional spaces identified by school principals and administrators provides the most accurate assessment of how each school program makes use of available instructional space. PPS staff recommends that student capacity identified by each school principal be the capacity information used for school utilization and planning purposes. Annual updates of student capacity using the instructional model should be conducted to note changes in school programs and utilization of spaces. As the use of a student capacity model for the district is new, the model should be evaluated within a short period of time (2 years) to determine the need for changes to the model that more accurately reflect the student capacity of district schools.

Any student capacity model adopted by the district should only be developed for the purposes of comparing student capacity to future enrollments and any target enrollments established by the district. As noted above, the identification of enrollment and capacity disparities should be a signal of

Other changes that impact utilization include the district-wide increase in numbers of students who receive additional services for language-instruction or disabilities, and the trend of inviting partner organizations into schools to provide mentoring, counseling and other supports. When considered together, it is clear that school utilization is an evolving measure, and that our facilities as currently configured may not be “right-sized” to meet the needs of future students.

SUMMARY

We recommend that the long range facility plan advisory committee endorse:

- The district’s data analysis and enrollment balancing process as the mechanism by which to identify discrepancies between school enrollments, program sizes, and student capacities;
- Consistent application of an instructional student capacity model district-wide on an annual basis;
- Incorporation of each schools’ utilization of available student capacity into the long range facility plan;
- A thorough consideration of program space needs when the district’s capacity model is u.3(a)1.n.e/TTi x e on
- Consisinto the exiscs(Con)-5 Tw .2(s, 6(iconsevede)-5.
- x p l
- x

2011-12 SCHOOL SIZE TARGETS

Program targets are based upon existing resources and staffing ratios, and are applied to each neighborhood/comprehensive school. The numbers for each school configuration represent the estimated students needed to provide adequate staffing and programming across all grade levels. Schools below program floors have enrollment patterns significantly below these thresholds, especially those that are not able to generate at least 2 sections per grade level. These schools will be reviewed for potential program, boundary and/or grade level changes. If none of those options result in sustainable enrollment, closure may be considered.

Capacity ceiling is 100% utilization: the same number of teachers as classrooms in a building. Schools with utilization patterns consistently above this threshold will be considered for program, boundary, grade level and/or facility

ExhibitB

Enrollment Data Analysis Preliminary 2011 Grades PK-8 DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

School Information				2011 Prelim data			2010 Data				
Cluster	School	Grade Structure	Class-rooms	School Enroll	Utili-zation		School Enroll	Utili-zation	Capture Rate	Enroll change	Notes, Priority options
Cleveland	Abernethy	K-5		21 455	93%		421	88%	68%	34	
Cleveland	Buckman	K-5		29 490	84%		497	84%	87%	-7	
Cleveland	Duniway	K-5		25 425	81%		442	79%	86%	-17	
Cleveland	Grout	K-5		27 359	77%		361	76%	58%	-2	
Cleveland	Hosford	6-8		34 534	82%		548	86%	55%	-14	
Cleveland	Lewis	K-5		19 363	111%		396	107%	70%	-33	Full but stable; monitor
Cleveland	Llewellyn	K-5		23 545	105%		485	90%	75%	60	High growth continues; program changes in 2011-12, possible boundary change in 2013-14
Cleveland	Sellwood	6-8		33 488	62%		474	67%	75%	14	
Cleveland	Whitman	K-5		25 360	70%		347	78%	72%	13	
Cleveland	Winterhaven	K-8		16 347	87%		352	91%		-5	
Cleveland	Woodstock	K-5		26 491	88%		466	85%	59%	25	
Franklin	Glencoe	K-5		25 454			480	28	Franklin	Woodmere	K-5 22 298 92%
								Grant	Alameda	K-5	31 782 107%
											Moved off priority list due to enrollment growth
											Consider boundary change to adjacent schools; implement in 2013
Grant	Beaumont	6-8		36 482	59%		455	54%	63%	27	discussions
Grant	Beverly Cleary	K-8		33 674	83%		604	80%	63%	70	High growth; monito
Grant	da Vinci Arts	6-8		32 462	69%		464	70%		-2	
Grant	Irvington	K-8		29 485	81%		529	85%	70%	-44	Possible inclusion in Alameda discussion
Grant	Laurelhurst	K-8		28 680	108%		704	106%	79%	-24	Monitor enrollmen
Grant	Sabin	PK-8		22 392	81%		362	60%	49%	30	Moved off priority list due to enrollment growth; ACCESS classrooms not counted; include in Alameda discussion; Address Beaumont guarantee for implmentation in

Blue highlight = enrollment above 100% utilization enrollment below program target floor

Student Database Extract as of October 3, 2011

Enrollment Data Analysis Preliminary 2011 Grades PK-8 DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

School Information				2011 Prelim data		2010 Data				
Cluster	School	Grade Structure	Class-rooms	School Enroll	Utili-zation	School Enroll	Utili-zation	Capture Rate	Enroll change	Notes, Priority options
Jefferson	Beach	PK-8	34	582	79%	561	90%	50%	21	
Jefferson	Boise-Eliot	PK-8	35	389	64%	390	71%	65%	-1	
Jefferson	Chief Joseph	K-5	19	485	95%	408	95%	54%	77	
Jefferson	Faubion	PK-8	19	435	99%	401	116%	58%	34	
Jefferson	Humboldt	PK-8	22	220	59%	230	82%	46%	-10	
Jefferson	King	PK-8	34	292	61%	288	62%	40%	4	
Jefferson	Ockley Green	K-8	34	270	56%	310	59%	34%	-40	
Jefferson	Vernon	PK-8	30	504	82%	376	73%	41%	128	
Jefferson	Woodlawn	PK-8	29	443	93%	478	98%	42%	-35	
Lincoln	73%	42%								

EXHIBIT C: School Enrollment Change Options

OPTION	Description	Best Conditions for this Option	Option Benefits	Option Concerns
Boundary Change	Shift the boundary line between two or more schools to change the number of neighborhood students assigned there	One or more nearby schools are overcrowded/under enrolled (depending on the problem); nearby schools offer similar program, services, same HS feeder patterns and no transportation challenges	Doesn't destabilize special programs; applies to only new students (in most situations); predictable set of criteria for decision	Actual impact can vary from projection; takes years to implement fully; historic allegiance to existing boundaries; forum to air biases
Program Change	Move a stand alone program, such as self r contained SPED, immersion or partner service to a different location	Boundary changes are not feasible; space is available for program at another school; change does not create hardship for vulnerable population	Doesn't take years to implement; impacts students (in most cases) who live in other neighborhoods	Potential hardship for vulnerable population; destabilize effectiveness of program
Grade Reconfiguration	Change the grade structure of a school in order to increase or reduce the overall enrollment	Current grade configuration is not large enough/too large to be sustainable AND is not enabling adequate achievement results for students; change does not school facility to add more classroom space, including installing modulars	Relief for overcrowding when other changes are not feasible; enrollment size is adequate; site is appropriate for change; funds are available	Keeps neighborhood program intact
School Closure	End the current educational program of a school	Current grade configuration and attendance boundary are not large enough to be sustainable AND are not enabling adequate achievement results for students; no other change is feasible to improve conditions without destabilizing other schools; change does not overcrowd nearby schools, change HS feeder pattern or cause a transportation burden	Improve conditions for academic achievement; long r term cost savings from consolidation	Loss for a school community; massive system impacts; no assurance that achievement will increase for students; short term transition costs; increased transportation need

EXHIBIT D – DESCRIPTION OF CAPACITY MODELS

Net Area Model

The net area model first determines a permanent capacity as the gross square footage of a school facility and then subtracts the square footage of special education (SPED) classrooms (based on an average school district size for SPED classrooms) and then divides by a square footage per student factor. In the application of the net area model to PPS schools, the gross area per student ratios identified in the

Exhibit E: Additional Student Assignment Resources

District enrollment policies and directives

Student transfers (policy): http://www.pps.k12.or.us/files/board/4_10_051_P.pdf
Student transfers (admin directive): http://www.pps.k12.or.us/files/board/4_10_054_AD.pdf

Student assignment to neighborhood schools (policy):

BACKGROUND

The majority of operating funds for public schools in Oregon are allocated by the state under a funding formula that is primarily based upon the number of students enrolled in each school district. Three-quarters of Portland Public Schools (PPS) general fund budget comes via the state school fund (SSF), which is funded by local property taxes and by state appropriations.

CAPITAL BONDS

Any capital bond has to be voter-approved and is repaid with an additional local property tax. PPS may seek approval in May or November in any year, because of the voter turnout rules for other elections.

General Obligation (GO) Bonds are a familiar school capital financing instrument. Typically, a school district determines a total dollar amount of need, and then asks for voter authorization of debt in that amount. The total bond debt is typically long-term; twenty or twenty-five years is a common repayment period. The district then sells these long-term GO bonds, and 1g1 30

classrooms at several sites. All of these funding sources will help towards the cost of these projects but PPS will need additional capital for the majority of the costs of each of these projects.

SUMMARY

PPS needs to renovate or replace essentially all of its school buildings. The cost of this work in current prices is in the range of $2.5 - $3 billion. PPS will take advantage of every additional funding source (such as those described above) that is available but these will come nowhere close to the amount of funding that is required. The only source of capital that will allow PPS to do what is needed is voter-approved capital bonds.

ISSUE PAPER #6.2
PRINCIPLES OF ACCESSIBILITY & BEYOND

BACK

4 PERCEPTUAL INFORMATION

@LAHDMS BNMCHSHNMR NQ SGD TRDQiR RDMRNQX @AHKHSHDR

a)

ISSUE PAPER 6.3
SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN

BACKGROUND

Portland Public Schools (PPS) has worked to incorporate sustainable practices that preserve resources and minimize environmental impact in its daily operations and into future design plans. // 2 HR /NQSK@MCiR RD-BNVMCQK@QMFCDRNSMDQNEOSDGQDSXBHSXiRK@QFDR the Portland Public Schools Board of Education attends to the environmental, social and economic future of Portland as it sets policies and practice. These three pillars of sustainability shall be integrated into all facilities decisions.

RELEVANCE FOR FACILITIES PLAN

Upholding these pillars begins by following the logic of the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle. PPS practices this in regard to solid waste and materials, as well as towards energy usage through a methodology of: behavior adaptation, efficiency improvements and, finally, energy generation.

Pursuant to the school facility planning statute, ORS 195.110:

(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:

> C) Descriptions of physical improvements needed in existing schools to meet the minimum standards of the large school district.

In future capital work, the district shall extend this thinking through the design, construction and operation of high performance buildings and educating building occupants on maximizing the

environmental performance of every PPS building. Whole building systems, the construction process, building materials and furnishings will be designed to conserve environmental and financial resources for the life of building projects. And, as with all district action, social equity interests will play a critical role in the successful implementation of these principles. PPS buildings serve the present and future; as such, all plans should take into account the resources available for at least seven generations.[1]

PPS needs to develop resource-savings techniques that are easy to understand and operate. Systems must be simple and easy for teachers/staff/students to understand the resource-saving technique. Without this level of continual training of teachers, staff and students, the facilities team will be forced to address these improvements H S G D H S G-DNQM k@ @GH,@QV@MSD only via technology. PPS is committed to involving students, families, teachers and community partners in all aspects of the following principles.

1. WHOLE SYSTEM DESIGN

SUPERINSULATED, PASSIVE SCHOOLS

Building designs will consider the integration of all building systems to increase passive building performance.

a) Integrate passive design elements with active building systems in the design of new or remodeled buildings, to the maximum extent feasible. Starting with optimal building orientation in new construction and well-insulated shells in all major work, buildings shall take advantage of natural ventilation, sunlight, shading and thermal masses to regulate interior temperatures and help maintain comfortable environments year round. All spaces shall take advantage of daylighting opportunities.
b) Use low-tech infrastructure that supports high-tech learning environments.
c) Attain minimum LEED silver certification, or equivalent, for all major renovations; achieve minimum LEED gold certification, or equivalent, for new construction. Use the Living Building " G @ K K D M F D R G olistic approach as aspirational guidelines for all design and planning.

2. LONGEVITY

DURABLE, PRACTICAL, HANDSOME MATERIALS

Facilities will be designed to ensure long-term, effective performance.

a) Specify durable materials and systems that require minimal maintenance, non-toxic upkeep @ M C @ Q D R D M R H S H U D S N S G D D @ Q S G i R K H L H S D C Q D R N T Q B D
b) Design building layout and building systems to provide flexibility for shifting populations and program needs throughout generations.
c) Plan walls, load-bearing and otherwise, that consider the potential need for school reconfiguration or expansion in the future.
d) Establish a culture of understanding and ownership for how users interact and relate with the building.

---

[1] Clarkson, Linda, Vern Morrissette, and Gabriel Régallet. "Our Responsibility to the Seventh Generation." IISD.org International Institute for Sustainable Development, 1992. Web. <http://www.iisd.org/pdf/seventh_gen.pdf>.

8. WATER AND WASTE

CLEANER WATER TO THE RIVERS

School facilities will incorporate water-conservation and waste-reducing infrastructure.

a) Identify opportunities to implement greywater reuse systems such as in toilets or for irrigation.
b) Identify opportunities to manage stormwater on-site including reuse of stormwater as greywater.
c) Select plants and landscaping that require low upkeep and no irrigation after establishment.
d) Install infrastructure that supports the reuse of materials (e.g. dishwashers to support reusable trays).
e) Furnish buildings with consistent, easy-to-recognize recycling and compost receptacles.

9. TRANSPORTATION

FEWER ENGINES RUNNING

Minimize fossil fuel expenditures for student and staff commutes.

a) Encourage bicycle and pedestrian travel through grounds layout and building design.
b) Site and building design should provide safer, more efficient pick-up and drop-off areas for students to minimize vehicle congestion and idling.
c) Ensure students and staff have access to covered, well-lit bike parking.

10. INFORMATION FEEDBACK

SMARTER BUILDINGS

Building system performance will be effectively measured, monitored and modified.

a) Provide access to building performance data and the opportunity for classroom curriculum use

ISSUE PAPER 6.4
PRICIPLES OF HISTORIC STEWARDSHIP

E@AQHB @MC BG@Q@BSDQ NE /NQSK@MCiR MDHFGANQGNNCR 3G communities more livable as well as instilling civic pride and sense of place. By maintaining these buildings we also maintain the original fabric of the community they serve, which preserves this culture of place. Historic rehabilitation within Portland Public Schools is a primary consideration and key component to thoughtful, sustainable, cost effective development.

RELEVANCE FOR FACILITIES PLAN

Pursuant to the school facility planning statute, ORS 195.110:

(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:

(C) Description of physical improvements needed in existing schools to meet the minimum standards of the large school district
(E) An analysis of:
(i) The alternative to new school construction and major renovation

3GD ADRS OQ@BSHBDR NE jQDCTBD QDTRD QDBXBKDk B@M AD @ all the energy-saving, environmentally sensitive strategies that can be employed, reuse is the most sustainable. In regards to issues such as solid waste disposal, energy conservation, embodied energy,

3. MODERNIZATION OF HISTORIC SCHOOLS

Adapt to current educational and cultural goals while meeting modern building standards.

a) Reflect current needs of all students to meet the challenges of the global economy.
b) Strengthen and expand the uses of each school as central to community.
c) Implement accessibility upgrades and universal design elements to ensure access and inclusivity for all students, staff, families and community members.
d) Require energy efficient upgrades to ensure cost effectiveness and contribute to sustainability.
e) Seismically improve buildings for life safety and to protect these resources.

4. EXISTING IS SUSTAINABLE

Reuse is more environmentally responsible than new construction [1].

a) Evaluate and balance the potential lifecycle savings of new construction with the embodied energy investment of existing historic buildings.
b) Require full feasibility studies of renovating older and historic schools by design professionals with historic renovation expertise prior to considering demolition of school buildings. Investing in historic school buildings saves construction and demolition debris from landfills.
c) Recognize that building reuse conserves energy.
d) Deconstruct buildings when necessary (versus demolition) to reduce waste.
e) Require salvage and reuse of historic features, many of which are irreplaceable.

5. TEACHING THE VALUES OF REUSE

Students, parents and teachers cultivate the sense of ownership that naturally results from reuse and rehabilitation, galvanizing the community as a whole.

a) Recognize that historic district designations and historic rehabilitation help to maintain and increase property values over time [2].
b) Acknowledge that historic rehabilitation creates more local jobs than new construction, with a greater proportion of construction costs in labor and less in materials [3].
c) Recognize that neighborhood schools encourage walking and biking in a city that values walkable neighborhoods.
d) Require feasibility studies which include environmental impacts to compare reuse options of historically significant buildings as compared to new construction.

SUMMARY

Portland Public Schools recognizes the importance of historic buildings and their place in our community. Their renovation supports the sustainability goals of the District while supporting local communities and preserving our history.

References

[1] Preservation Green Lab, National Trust for Historic Preservation. 2012. The Greenest Building: Quantifying the Environmental Value of Building Reuse. http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/sustainability/green

ISSUE PAPER #7.1
TEN-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

improvements including modernization, major alterations and other improvements to District facilities as described here. Typically funded through one or more general obligation bonds (GO Bonds), requiring a ballot measure(s) that voters approve, a large capital construction program is the primary means to address needed improvement work throughout school districts in Oregon.

RELEVANCE FOR FACILITIES PLAN

Pursuant to the school facility planning statute, ORS 195.110:

(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:

(F) Ten-year capital improvement plan

The statute requires consideration of a capital plan to address needed capital improvements to school district facilities. This paper describes some of the planning considerations to develop the plan. For purposes of defining terminology, Article XI, Section 11k of the Oregon Constitution defines "capital costs" as costs of land and other assets having a useful life of more than one year, including costs associated with acquisition, construction, improvement, remodeling, furnishing, equipping, maintenance or repair.j " @ O H S @ K B N R S R k C N D R M N S H M B K T C D B N R S R N E Q

CAPITAL ASSET RENEWAL (CAR) PLAN

The CAR Plan is a strategy designed to extend the useful life of District facilities, ensure public capital

B. Educational facility improvements: Work scopes that improve educational adequacy and provide a more modern learning environment, such as:
    1. Classroom updates to support teaching, learning and a rigorous program such as media and technology labs, science labs and equipment, music and visual and performing arts rooms -- according to the needs at each school.
    2. Interior space improvements and/or additions.
    3. Auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria and media center (library) upgrades and additions.
    4. Science room upgrades and additions.
    5. Addition of covered play areas and structures, expansion of multi-purpose rooms and gymnasiums to assist in compliance with expanded Physical Education requirements for grades K-8, effective 2017.
    6. Special Education (SPED) classroom upgrades: upgrade existing SPED classroom

8. Fire & Life Safety: Fire alarm panel upgrades, building sprinkler system additions and upgrades.
9. Electrical: Replace and upgrade interior lighting and supplement exterior lighting where safety issues have been identified.
10. Communications & Security (Technology): Wired and wireless infrastructure improvements. Access control improvements to allow building and specific door access via a centrally managed badge/key card access system.
11. Specialties (e.g. cabinets, stage equipment & bleachers): Inspection program items. Upgrade as needed and appropriate. Signage improvements for monument and way finding.
12. Special Demolition & Hazardous Material: Abatement of asbestos containing materials.
13. Site work: Paving & storm drain management improvements. Playground equipment, structural improvements to covered play and hard surface area improvements. Paths of travel, outdoor classrooms, learning gardens and site landscaping.

Note: ADA/Universal design requirements are incorporated into the individual building system components. For example, addition of elevators to multi-story buildings is included in the j " N M U D X @ M B D R k B @ S D F N Q X K R N D M S Q @ M B D Q @ L O R @ C I @ S G D j 2 H S D k B @ S D F N Q X 2 D D Principles for Accessibility & Beyond D M E S N H Q S K D C j more details.

Building code compliance is assumed in all design and construction work. For example, many upgrades are driven based on certain existing conditions such as the requirement to provide fire sprinkler systems throughout a building when more than 50% of the building is being altered. In some instances these requirements are not identified until plan review by the City of Portland.

D. Land acquisition: Any land requirements to support District plans.
E. Ancillary facilities: Those items necessary to support non-school facilities (BESC, nutrition services, transportation, warehousing, etc.). Lower priority at present. However, ancillary facilities should be considered as part of any capital improvement plan as they exist to support District schools and student needs.
F. Bond costs: Debt service, financing and legal costs, PPS staff & consultant costs to manage at program level.

E. Leverage partnerships

Public and private providers of educational, health, social and culturally relevant j V Q- @ Q N T M C k

K-8 Schools	
Site size	2 to 10 acres
Site features	Covered Play area 2 basketball courts Soft play area with play equipment Soccer field size grass area Room for three double modular buildings (6 classrooms)
Typical enrollment	

abatement or exterior site work (walkways, outdoor learning areas, play fields/equipment, parking, exterior signage, storm drain systems, lighting, athletic facilities, etc.)
In addition to the

SUMMARY

PPS has identifie N69gos iden-

The district currently provides alternative education options, community based programs, charter schools and special services including Special Education, English as a Second Language, and Home learning. The district also partners with agencies that provide Head Start, full and half-day Kindergarten, and Pre-Kindergarten programs. These programs typically have space and facility requirements that were not anticipated during the era of design and construction of most PPS facilities.

EARLY LEARNERS AND CHILDCARE

Many PPS schools offer on-site early learning programs and before and after school childcare. These programs have shown results in improved school readiness of children entering Kindergarten. The space and equipment needs of these spaces are often such that they cannot be accommodated in general education classrooms.

EARLY LEARNERS AGENDA

The PPS Office of Early Learners recently completed a Birth-Five School Readiness Plan that seeks to expand partnerships with wrap-around service providers to broaden access to services and programs for students and parents with an aim to expanding the number of low income Pre-K children and families served, ensuring children enter first grade [illegible] The plan calls for the development of school based early learners education consortiums with community non-profit and health and human service partners over the next five years. Current early learner programs are scattered throughout 26 PPS school sites. The plan suggests the centers be co-located in vacant one story schools, under-enrolled schools and/or school sites that have already initiated collaborative community partnerships in north, northeast and southeast (high poverty) regions of thr -2(o)-2(s 3. ET G [( )] f[(pr

TEEN PARENT SERVICES (TPS)

/ / 2 iTeen Parenting Services (TPS)

administration of many special services programs was transferred to the Multnomah Educational Service District (M.E.S.D.), causing a 77% decrease from the number of students reported in special service programs in 2001-02.[1]

SPED program administrators have indicated the need for additional and/or larger classrooms. The PSU enrollment forecast for PPS cannot provide an estimate of the number of SPED students in 2022. However, PPS SPED program staff indicate that an average of 200 additional SPED stu3(d6E 1 0 74 Tm [( )] T

EDUCATION OPTIONS

Alternative education options can be either district operated or community based. A central B N L O N M D M S N E S G D L H R R H N M N E / N Q S K @ M C / T A K H B 2 B G N N K R H R highest educati N M @ K @ M C O D Q R N M @ K O N S D M S H @ K k $ C T B @ S H N M . O S H I options for all youth that empower, engage, and prepare them for college, work training, and B H S H Y D M R G H O V G H K D R D Q U H M F @ R @ U @ M D F T @ S Q C E N Q to R X R S D L H providing an appropriate learning environment for all students. These options are developed to meet the needs of a specific student population. Alternative education options can be either a program of a school or an independent school 3 N L D D S R S T C D M S i R M D D C R @ K S D Q M @ S H U offer something different from or in addition to the regular curriculum and may offer something different from regular school hours.

In 2011, PPS enrolled over 1,600 students in alternative programs primarily housed in PPS facilities. This represented a 5.8% increase over the last 10 years. These programs include the ACCESS program,

For more in depth information:

Portland Public Schools Guiding Principles

- Develop community assets that support life-long learning and wellness and that help to knit our community together.
- Balance the needs of neighborhood schools and those of focus option schools to best serve the larger PPS student population.
- Provide program support for strong enrollment in response to the desire for small

- Use practices

- Assess the physical condition of District facilities on an ongoing basis.
- Utilize best practices to ensure significant improvements, renovations or new