



Summary Report

First Summit on School Planning and Siting in Washington ■ Highline Community College ■ February 2007

Summary Report

First Summit on School Planning and Siting

Prepared for:
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504

Prepared by:



Jones & Stokes

711 South Capitol Way, Suite 504
Olympia, WA 98501
Contact: Meg O'Leary
(360) 357-6817

February 2007

This document should be cited as:

Jones & Stokes. 2007. Summary Report. First Summit on School Planning and Siting. December 2006. (J&S 61022.06.)
Olympia, WA. Prepared for Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. February.

A message regarding some content in this First Summit Summary report from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI):

Conclusions in this report reflect participants' impression of present laws and procedures. Sometimes, these impressions conflicted with actual rules and procedures. One issue this raises is the need for improved communication of the reality of the present responsibilities, rules and procedures. This maybe a necessary first step before developing solutions to the issues raised in this report. Some examples are cited below:

- 1) **Changes to Rules are made by the Legislature:** Whereas the legislature does make laws which are embodied in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) can be altered by the state agency authorized by the legislature. Some elements of the report seek to have the legislature amend WAC's, but actually OSPI (until recently, the State Board of Education) and CTED would perform this task.
- 2) **Current Methodology used to Determine "Unhoused Students" is not Based on Projected Needs:** Actually the determination of the area needed is based on housing the student enrollment projected typically 5 years into the future, so the issue is more complex:
 - a) OSPI uses the "Cohort Survival" method to project student enrollments, a nationally accepted but conservative methodology that it uses trends of the previous 5 years' actual enrollments to project the next 5 years. This is in contrast to the OFM econometric based projections used by cities and counties. The cohort survival method minimizes the impact of sudden changes in population, such as military base reconfigurations or master planned communities.
 - b) The calculation of "Unhoused Students" also includes a space-per-student allocation (SSA). The SSA was recently restored by the legislature to levels of the early 1980's, but is still below current national numbers and many local districts' needs.
- 3) **Perception that Current Minimum Site Size "Standards" favors Larger School Sites outside Urban Areas:** WAC 392-342-020 establishes a threshold of site acreages for the purpose of the school district, documenting for the record that it has considered the education and physical education of the students as well as the impact on the surrounding neighborhood, etc. Therefore these are guidelines, not standards that must be adhered to. Further, the implementation of High Performance Buildings Program legislation mandates use of either the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol (WSSP) or the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver protocol, both of which have criteria that encourage in-fill sites.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Summit Purpose.....	1
Summit Organization and Participation.....	2
School Siting Issues and Challenges.....	4
School Siting Recommendations	6
Summit Recommendation Letters.....	8
Annotated Bibliography	19

Appendices

- Appendix A. Summit Information
- Appendix B. Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Materials
- Appendix C. Safe Neighborhood Planning Pilot Project, Spokane
- Appendix D. Executive Order 06-02: Regulatory Improvement

Acronyms

CTED	Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development
DAHP	Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
DOH	Washington State Department of Health
GMA	Growth Management Act
OFM	Washington State Office of Financial Management
OSPI	Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
SEPA	Washington State Environmental Policy Act

Introduction

Planning and siting schools in Washington State involves local school districts, local county and city governments and state agencies. The current process for planning new or expanded schools, obtaining sites and permits for constructing schools, and providing supporting infrastructure to the schools faces many challenges as well as opportunities for improvement.

In response to these challenges, the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) and the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) sponsored the first statewide summit on school siting on Monday, December 4, 2006, at Highline Community College in Des Moines, Washington.

This report provides a discussion about the conditions prompting the summit, a summary of proceedings, and recommendations from summit participants. It is organized into three sections:

1. The purpose and format of the summit, and a list of the key issues and challenges faced by school districts and local government planners, transportation engineers, and public health officials in planning for and siting schools.
2. Recommendation “letters” to the state legislature, state agencies, local governments, and school districts with suggestions about how to improve the school siting process.
3. An annotated bibliography and several appendices. The bibliography includes reference materials from other communities about school siting issues. The appendices include summit materials, a list of panelists, a case study and other resource materials.

Summit Purpose

The increasing complexity of school planning and siting prompted the need for statewide assessment and problem solving. Common trends such as permit delays, lack of adequate funding for school construction, and the challenges of securing suitable land were emerging and creating challenges for the many organizations and individuals involved in school siting and planning activities. The rise of these local issues to the state level led to the introduction of bills in the 2005 and 2006 legislative sessions, one of which proposed the creation of a public school facilities element under the growth management act. Though the bills failed to pass, the issues relating to school planning and siting are regarded as one of the key policy priorities among legislators, CTED and OSPI.

In 2005, CTED earmarked funds within their Regional Collaboration Competitive Grants program to finance a pilot project for innovative local government and school district coordination. The Clark County Quality Schools Task Force was awarded the grant in 2006.

For the last few years CTED and OSPI have been jointly seeking opportunities to improve coordination between school districts and local governments (including city and county planners, transportation engineers, public health officials and other relevant departments) in providing for schools. After consultation with stakeholders to gauge interest in a statewide forum, CTED and OSPI convened a summit with representatives from state agencies, local governments, and school districts. The purpose of the summit was to identify and assess key issues and challenges, discuss potential solutions, and determine next steps. Particular topics of interest included the impacts of school facilities on existing community infrastructure and public services and strategies to better align the planning of school facilities with community and regional comprehensive planning efforts.

The summit is a first step to addressing the complexities faced by local and regional governments and school districts in successfully planning and siting new schools and providing them with support infrastructure. In addition to identifying the key issues and challenges and initiating a discussion about potential solutions, the summit provided an opportunity to share information, build relationships and develop common understanding about issues faced by agencies involved in school siting.

Summit Organization and Participation

The summit drew together over 80 participants from a variety of backgrounds including state agencies (CTED, OSPI, DOH, DAHP), school districts, local and regional governments, elected officials, school board members, consultants, building industry and construction associations, and school task force members. The daylong summit included four panel presentations, two working group sessions, and facilitator reports on the group session highlights. The summit agenda and complete lists of panelists and participants are included in Appendix A.

Panel Presentations

The twenty-minute panel presentations offered the local government and school district perspectives, and set the stage for more in-depth discussion and problem solving in the afternoon working group sessions.

School Planning & Siting Panel

Three panel speakers discussed the lack of coordination between state agencies, local governments and school districts; the challenge of acquiring land for new schools; site assessments; land-banking; enrollment projections; transportation and

accessibility; and the assertion that neighborhood-centered schools are best. Recommendations and insights included viewing schools as public facilities; improving interagency communication and collaboration; adopting school district capital facility plans by reference in comprehensive plans; and streamlining the permit process.

Panelists included Forrest Miller, Director of Support Services at Lake Washington School District; Mike McCormick, planning consultant; and Barbara Wright, Deputy Director of the Environmental Division of Seattle/King County Public Health.

Permitting Processes Panel

Two panel speakers discussed the need for local control of permitting; involving key decision-makers early on; establishing and maintaining interagency communication; simplifying and streamlining permit process.

One case study was presented in order to underscore the complexity of the permitting process. Construction of one new 62,500 sq. ft. elementary school inside the UGA involved 15 agencies, 17 permits and approvals, and \$150,000 in permitting fees (the contract award was \$22.5 million). The consequences of delay were estimated at \$130,000 per month (assuming \$20 million project at 8% per year). In addition, delays often prompt installation of portable classrooms, which adversely impacts the learning environment.

Panelists included Michael Gunn, Director of Facilities and Planning for the Everett School District, and John Doan, City of Sumner Administrator.

Fiscal Impacts and Finance Panel

Panelists discussed how capital projects are funded, and explained the relative benefits and challenges of each funding source. For example, state matches are not available until the school is overcrowded, and they only pay a small portion of construction costs. Voter-approved bonds and capital levies require a fixed schedule and offer minimal flexibility for project scope expansion. Panelists also discussed the cascading challenges of timing land purchase with bond approval, overcrowding with state match eligibility, state matches with commitment of funds, and commitment of funds with the actual receipt of funds. It was recommended that the state legislature and state agencies improve the current system in order to provide adequate funds for school planning, siting and construction.

Speakers included Debra Aungst, Puyallup School District Assistant Superintendent and Mike Bailey, City of Renton Finance and Information Services Administrator.

Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Panel

The lunch break included a panel of representatives from Clark County, who shared their experiences with the Clark County Quality Schools Task Force, a pilot project

funded by the CTED Regional Collaboration Competitive Grants program. The task force, which has been meeting since early August 2006, was established to address the impacts of growth on K–12 capital facilities. The primary focus of the task force has been to identify how quality education might be made available for all children in appropriate facilities at the time they enroll. Clark County Quality Schools Task Force purpose and protocol materials are included in Appendix B.

Presenters included Marty Snell, Clark County Community Planning Director; John Deeder, Evergreen School District Superintendent; and Steve Madsen, Government Affairs Director for Building Industry Association of Clark County.

Working Group Sessions

Following the morning panel presentations, summit participants were organized into two working groups. Each group was led by a facilitator and asked to identify issues and challenges for each of the three topic areas—planning and siting, permitting processes, and fiscal impacts. After lunch, summit participants were organized into two new groups and asked to identify potential short- and long-term actions that could be taken to address the issues and challenges identified earlier in the day. They were also asked to identify specific responsibilities for the state legislature, state agencies, local governments, and school districts.

At the end of the summit, Senator Jim Kastama, Washington State Senate, shared brief remarks about school siting issues.

School Siting Issues and Challenges

Participants agreed that school facilities are an essential element of a healthy community. In addition to their primary role in providing an environment conducive for education, school facilities contribute to neighborhood identity, provide a location for informal and formal recreation activities, and can be a focal point for communities. Because of these public benefits, planning and siting of school facilities is an important function of both general-purpose governments and school districts throughout Washington. However, the current process for planning new or expanded schools faces many challenges.

Summit panelists described some of these challenges and their experiences in planning and siting new schools, providing the backdrop for meeting participants to identify and further elaborate on key issues and challenges. Several themes emerged from the issues identification exercises that help provide context for the recommendations that follow.

Need for Collaboration and Shared Understanding

Summit participants shared a variety of issues related to the challenges of effective collaboration. One prevalent issue is the lack of understanding among most school

districts of the roles, responsibilities and challenges faced by local governments. Conversely, local governments have limited knowledge about the same issues for school districts. Certain practical considerations make it difficult and expensive to coordinate efficiently. Some school districts are served by multiple jurisdictions and some jurisdictions are served by several school districts. This increases the complexities involved in population and enrollment forecasting, land use decision-making, efficient co-use of facilities, and coordinated permitting. Another barrier to effective collaboration is the lack of time and resources.

Local government plans and decisions about development frequently do not include thorough consideration of schools; likewise school district plans and acquisition of school sites typically do not include full consideration of local government land use plans and development approvals. It was noted that school districts often wait too long to coordinate with local governments about the development process and that local governments are not always clear on the full requirements and conditions of certain permits. The “time” factor was also mentioned—both groups of organizations face heavy workloads, diminishing resources, and an expectant public that demands results. There is not enough time to complete their respective assignments, let alone spend time understanding or assisting one another.

New Approaches to School Siting

Changing demographics and needs over time force school districts to abandon unused facilities in one area and stock up on temporary portables in another. Participants noted that the state system for school planning and funding is traditional and prescribed—it is inflexible, does not encourage creativity, and has not responded to changes over time. School districts and local governments identified the need to plan more effectively for the long-term, not just for the immediate “un-housed” student population.

The state’s current minimum acreage standards for new schools favors larger school sites (WAC Chapter 392-342, Section 392-342-020). Due to the high cost of land in urban areas, schools often find land on the fringes of urban growth areas where it is more plentiful and less expensive. This leads to inefficient and costly provision of services and is in direct conflict with the state’s Growth Management Act (GMA). In addition, there is little incentive to consider smaller school sites, to locate schools within mixed-used developments, to jointly construct and/or use facilities, and to consider creative strategies to integrate and recognize schools as an important community asset.

Funding

Funding issues included a review of the state match program, creative ways to purchase land, elimination of the supermajority for bond issues, and joint use and construction of facilities.

Impact fees were also discussed. Some participants noted that impact fees do not cover the real costs of school construction, that they face significant opposition from developers, and that they are not a panacea for overall school funding shortfalls. Participants pointed out that impact fees are not being used to finance new school construction—which is the intent—but rather, they are paying for temporary, portable classrooms. Some recommended a review of impact fee use throughout the state to understand how effectively and broadly they are used and whether their use could be expanded.

Other broad funding concerns included state funding for education, limited resources for ongoing maintenance, and legislative budget priorities for funding for schools.

Community Impacts

Many issues were shared from a community health and safety perspective. Participants discussed the various reasons why many students do not walk to school and how to encourage more walking and biking. Many of these comments revolved around the Safe Routes to Schools grant program and ideas about how this could be used more effectively to reduce vehicle trips.

Participants mentioned the need to identify and protect cultural and archaeological resources, as well as recognize the value of historical resources through the school planning and siting process. Other concerns included the social, environmental, and potential health costs of siting schools in less than desirable locations.

Permitting

Issues with permitting include multiple agencies, multiple permits, conflicting permit approval timeframes, unclear requirements, changes in permit conditions, staff changes throughout the permit process, and regulatory standards that are too expensive to implement. In addition, others mentioned that the permit process is too long, is costly, and is difficult to synchronize with school construction dates. It was noted that local governments typically do not provide incentives for infill development and often require costly improvements not directly related to school impacts, and that flexibility is limited in zoning and development standards.

School Siting Recommendations

In the working group breakout sessions, summit participants were asked to identify specific short- and long-term solutions and the responsibilities of various agencies in carrying out these actions. A summary of key short-term recommendations is listed below; followed by more detailed recommendations to the Washington State Legislature, state agencies, cities and counties and school districts.

Key Short-Term Recommendations

Washington State Legislature

- Revise the Growth Management Act to include a school element in all local government comprehensive plans.
- Revise the population projection and enrollment forecast allocation process (WAC Chapter 392-343, Section 392-343-045).
- Develop more accurate ways of predicting under- and over-enrollment.
- Revise acreage standards for new schools (WAC Chapter 392-342, Section 392-342-020).
- Develop policies that favor remodeling existing schools and encourage selection of infill sites for new schools.
- Create and fund a task force to address school siting issues.
- Change Washington State law to require a simple majority to pass bonds for school construction.
- Eliminate the sales tax on public school construction materials.
- Eliminate unfunded mandates.
- Increase “Safe Routes to Schools” grant funding.
- Provide financial incentives for schools sited inside urban growth boundaries.
- Provide financial incentives for preservation, rehabilitation, and/or reuse of historic schools

Washington State Agencies

- Encourage and financially support collaboration among agencies involved in school siting issues.
- Change “basis of future needs” to include projected enrollment, not just currently “un-housed students.”
- Provide financial incentives for collaboration.
- Consider a statewide review of impact fees and whether the use of impact fees should be expanded.
- Review streamlined permitting efforts of other agencies and identify potential solutions for permit streamlining.
- Provide statewide leadership in addressing school siting issues.
- Develop technical assistance tools to support collaborative school siting.
- Develop a “health impact assessment” to better incorporate data.

Washington Counties and Cities

- Propose interagency agreements with local school districts to identify roles, responsibilities, and communication protocols for school planning.
- Consider policy and development guidelines revisions that support schools development, value schools as an important community asset and integrate schools into the community.
- In cooperation with school districts, seek opportunities for private sector engagement in the process of planning, siting, and funding schools.
- Build internal knowledge about school siting issues. Sharing information is essential to understanding the opportunities and challenges of other organizations.
- Create an expedited permit review process for schools.

Washington School Districts

- Develop, in coordination with local governments, interagency agreements to identify roles, responsibilities, and communication protocols for school planning.
- Include bicycle and pedestrian safety in educational curriculum to encourage non-vehicular transportation to schools.
- Build internal knowledge about school siting issues.
- Work with local governments to develop a streamlined permitting process.

Summit Recommendation Letters

The purpose of the summit was to begin a dialogue among diverse stakeholders engaged in school planning and siting. The agenda, process and working group format were structured to generate as many ideas as possible and did not include voting, screening or prioritization. What emerged was a series of “letters” directed at four key audiences—the Washington State Legislature, state agencies, local governments and school districts. These letters address specific recommendations for each of the key groups that play a role in improving the school siting process in Washington. It is important to note that the recommendation letters do not represent consensus among all the participants, nor were they officially submitted; rather they identify general suggestions for the agencies that have the authority to affect procedural or legislative change.

Many of the recommendations have implications for all four audiences, and that action taken by one group on an issue—for example, new legislation—results in implied actions for other groups. These have not been repeated in each letter.

It is presumed that state agencies, local governments, and school districts will implement changes as directed by the legislature.

Summit participants urged the state legislature, state agencies, local governments and school districts to take immediate action on the short-term recommendations so that students, parents, businesses, school districts, and local governments will benefit from these improvements as quickly as possible.

Recommendations to Washington State Legislature

Short-Term: 2007 Session

Planning and Siting

1. Revise the Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW) to include a school element in all local government comprehensive plans, and strengthen GMA to more specifically require interagency collaboration. By doing so, the legislature will ensure:
 - More consistent forecasting of population and enrollment growth;
 - Coordinated capital facilities planning, including the identification of safe routes to schools incorporated into six-year transportation plans;
 - Planning and construction of adequate school facilities;
 - More early and ongoing collaboration between school districts and local governments;
 - Development of strong and mutually beneficial relationships between school districts and local governments; and
 - Provision of funding to support these efforts.
2. Revise the population projection and enrollment forecast allocation process (WAC Chapter 392-343, Section 392-343-045). Currently, there is a lack of consistency between the use of OFM population projections and OSPI enrollment projections. Specific recommendations follow:
 - Establish consistency between OFM population forecasts and OSPI enrollment forecasts.
 - Provide county authority to coordinate allocation among local jurisdictions and school districts.
 - Factor land use type into land use projections.
 - Require consistency between local jurisdictions and school districts, including school districts that encompass more than one jurisdiction and jurisdictions that encompass more than one school district.

3. Develop more accurate ways of predicting under- and over-enrollment. This will allow:
 - Change in the “basis of future needs” to include projected enrollment, not just currently “un-housed students.”
 - More accurate planning and forecasting—for both school districts and local governments; and
 - Identification of and securing appropriate funding for future needs, not just for those schools that are already overcrowded.
 - Increase the flexible use of existing schools and other public spaces.
 - Innovative and adaptive programming choices.
 - Flexibility in school designs, sites, and facilities appropriate for the local community.
4. Revise acreage standards for new schools (WAC Chapter 392-342, Section 392-342-020); develop policies that favor remodeling existing schools and encourage selection of infill sites for new schools; and allow local school boards and local governments to agree on local site sizes. This will allow:
 - Consideration of school sites at sizes appropriate for local area;
 - Coordination between school districts and local governments to identify school sites that are consistent with other GMA policies;
 - Coordination between school districts and local governments to identify creative development concepts (such as locating schools within mixed-use developments), explore joint use of facilities, preserve historic resources, and value schools as important community assets that play a role in the quality of life in each community; and
 - Good planning and efficient provision of services.
5. Create and fund a task force to address school siting issues. This should include school districts, state agencies (CTED, OSPI, DAHP, DOH), and local government planners, urban designers, crime prevention specialists and other private and public organizations that are involved in school siting issues. The purpose of the task force is to:
 - Lead future efforts to gather data, share information, and develop solutions to school siting issues.
 - Identify and showcase models of successful school siting throughout the state and the country.
 - Disseminate information on a statewide basis about best practices, successful models, and further advancement of school siting issues and solutions.

- Create a resource inventory and technical assistance hub for information sharing and further study.
- Review the long-term recommendations of the First Summit on School Planning and Siting and suggest additional research and/or more specific approaches and strategies to improving school siting.

Funding

6. Change Washington State law to require a simple majority to pass bonds for school construction. The current supermajority limits the ability of school districts to pass bonds for school construction and can pit school district needs against other community initiatives.
7. Eliminate the sales tax on public school construction materials. Sales tax contributes significantly to the cost of school construction.
8. Eliminate unfunded mandates.
9. Increase “Safe Routes to Schools” grant funding and expand its use for:
 - Eliminating barriers to walking or biking to school;
 - Addressing safety concerns about walking or biking to school, especially in central urban areas;
 - Changing school transportation funding that promotes bussing;
 - Encouraging design standards that promote connections between neighborhoods and schools; and
 - Discouraging school transfer requests that encourage vehicular transportation.
10. Provide financial incentives for schools sited inside urban growth boundaries to:
 - Offset the higher cost of land located within urban areas;
 - Promote efficient use of land and provision of services, and preservation of natural resources;
 - Support creative development of school sites in conjunction with local governments including development of schools in mixed-use developments, flexibility in design standards (two-story buildings, reduced setbacks, reduced parking requirements); and
 - Encourage continued collaboration between local governments and school districts.
11. Provide financial incentives for preservation, rehabilitation, and/or reuse of historic schools; and/or establish grant program for rehabilitation of historic schools modeled after the state’s Historic County Courthouse Rehabilitation Grant program.

Long-Term: After 2007 Session

Funding

12. Consider the following revisions to the state matching funds program.
 - Consider other sources of revenue for state match for school construction. Funds are inadequate to address the construction needs through the state.
 - Revise state matching formulas to be based on the real cost of schools, not on how much the state has to distribute.
 - Revise state matching formula and standards that encourage school districts to continue to use, and, when appropriate, rehabilitate historic and existing schools.
 - Increase the amount of funding for school construction; funding is not keeping up with cost increases or growth.
13. Consider support for more creative financing solutions to funding new schools.
 - Encourage private donation of land through tax credits for land donations to school districts.
 - Authorize school districts to create LIDs (Local Improvement Districts) to pay for part of school construction.
 - Allow school districts to refinance school construction bonds more than one time.
 - Provide state funds that would pay local governments for transportation impact fees owed by school districts.
 - Provide construction funds for facilities for new educational programs (such as recommended by “Washington Learns”) so there are no unfunded mandates.
 - Provide incentives and/or grants for planning collaboration by school districts and local governments.
14. Create incentives for walkable communities and address long-term safety and public health issues.
 - Review and revise physical education requirements.
 - Require non-bus alternatives within one-mile radius of schools.
 - Require walk/route plans for all schools.

Recommendations to Washington State Agencies

Short-Term: 2007

Planning and Siting

1. Encourage and financially support collaboration among agencies involved in school siting issues. There are no real incentives and/or requirements for collaboration between local governments and school districts for school siting. In addition to supporting changes to the Growth Management Act (GMA) that reflect the need for interagency coordination, state agencies should consider:
 - Sponsorship, coordination, planning and leadership of future summit meetings on school planning and siting;
 - Showcasing best management practices or successful models of collaboration from other areas;
 - Planning and conducting workshops that provide specific strategies to increase successful collaboration; and
 - Benchmarking to track progress over time.

Funding

2. Provide financial incentives for collaboration.
3. Consider a statewide review of impact fees and whether the use of impact fees should be expanded.

Permitting

4. Review streamlined permitting efforts of other agencies. Identify potential solutions for permit streamlining. Successful examples of permit streamlining are underway, including the Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance permit streamlining efforts. Consider:
 - Programmatic permitting process for schools;
 - Consolidation of permit approvals from state agencies; and
 - Collaboration among state agencies to shorten and simplify permit process.

Technical Assistance

5. Provide statewide leadership in addressing school siting issues. CTED and OSPI are logical leaders, with the participation of DOH and DAHP.
 - Sponsor and arrange for statewide forums, conferences, and presentations at annual conferences.
 - Develop consistent and documented data sources for planning purposes.

- Coordinate with statewide industry associations to disseminate information, solicit input, and test solutions.
6. Develop technical assistance tools to support collaborative school siting efforts. Many tools were identified that would be useful to assist school districts and local governments in planning and siting new schools and expanding existing schools.
- Develop materials—manuals, guides, workshops, training materials, newsletters—to share ideas and experiences around the state, such as the Clark County Quality Schools program and programs of other districts/local governments.
 - Establish or augment websites to feature resources, models, and examples.
 - Collect and inventory resources for funding, technical assistance, and other successful models.
 - Review city/county standards and development guidelines. Consider model ordinances for co-location and shared use of school facilities, applicability of flexible design and development standards, and model impact fees.
 - Recognize differences between urban and rural communities.
 - Develop a “healthy community tool kit” to provide guidance to local governments and school districts about how to integrate public safety and health issues into effective planning for schools.
7. Develop a “health impact assessment” to better understand and incorporate data.

Long-Term

Technical Assistance

8. Continue the development and refinement of tools for school siting.
- Develop and issue joint guidelines.
 - Develop model ordinances for co-location and shared use of school facilities, applicability of flexible design and development standards, and model impact fees.
 - Explore ways to engage the private sector in the process of planning, siting, and funding schools.
 - Serve as a clearinghouse for information about school siting issues.

Recommendations to Washington Counties and Cities

Short-Term: 2007

Planning

1. Propose interagency agreements with local school districts to identify roles, responsibilities, and communication protocols for school planning.
 - Plan for the same time horizon.
 - Coordinate forecasts of population and enrollment.
 - Improve consistency and coordination among multiple school districts within one jurisdiction and multiple jurisdictions within one school district.
 - Increase participation of local government staff on school facilities committees and school district staff on local government planning committees; consider formal membership on each other's planning commissions, boards, and committees.
 - Share facilities.
 - Coordinate bond measures and other initiatives.
 - Create and communicate a shared vision about the provisions of schools.
 - Establish an early warning system and reciprocal communication to alert affected jurisdictions/school districts of potential growth and associated impacts to school facilities.
 - Include public health input early in the process.
2. Consider policy and development guidelines revisions that support schools development, value schools as an important community asset and integrate schools into the community.
 - Allow alternative uses of schools when school populations decline, and prepare plans for converting facilities.
 - Ensure that subdivision approvals include safe routes to schools.
 - Plan for the completion of sidewalks and other safe routes to school for both new and existing facilities.
 - Promote programs and standards that encourage alternatives to vehicular transportation (shared parking, reduced impact fees when sharing parking facilities, and increased parking fees).
3. In cooperation with school districts, seek opportunities for private sector engagement in the process of planning, siting, and funding schools.
4. Build internal knowledge about school siting issues. Professionals in their respective organizations know their jobs but are less knowledgeable about those

of their counterparts (school districts and state agency staff). Sharing information is essential to understanding the opportunities and challenges of other organizations. Consider the following.

- Local government staff training about school siting and planning, permitting, and funding issues from the perspectives of other organizations.
- Designation of consistent project managers for school siting issues.
- Participation in state-agency-sponsored forums, task forces, and other efforts to improve school planning and siting.

Permitting

5. Create an expedited permit review process for schools. Consider the following ways to improve the process.
 - Work with state agencies to develop a master permit for schools.
 - Require all responsible staff, including public health officials, to participate from the beginning and have agreement on permit conditions at all levels of the organizations.
 - Develop a more streamlined process for modernizing facilities.
 - Communicate regularly and at key project milestones to ensure clarity and agreement between planners and school districts.
 - Negotiate expedited permit process between school districts and local governments.
 - Coordinate public process meetings and hearings so that schools districts and local governments demonstrate coordination and reduce the number of total meetings.
 - Consider innovative ways to expedite Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review such as planned action review or revised SEPA checklist formats.

Long-Term Planning

6. Consider special zoning code for schools to increase predictability of appropriateness of schools at specific locations.

Recommendations to Washington School Districts

Short-Term: 2007

Planning

1. Develop, in coordination with local governments, interagency agreements to identify roles, responsibilities, and communication protocols for school planning.
 - Plan for the same time horizon.
 - Coordinate forecasts of population and enrollment.
 - Include local government staff on school facilities committees and school district staff on local government planning committees; consider formal membership on each other's planning commissions, boards and committees.
 - Increase consistency and coordination among multiple school districts within one jurisdiction and multiple jurisdictions within one school district.
 - Share employees among school districts and local governments.
 - Share facilities.
 - Coordinate community bond measures and other initiatives.
 - Create and communicate a shared vision about the provisions of schools.
 - Establish an early warning system and reciprocal communication to alert affected jurisdictions/school districts of potential growth and associated impacts to school facilities.
 - Include public health input early in the process.
 - Recognize that some local governments are working with multiple school districts and that school districts can help by partnering with their neighboring school districts.
 - Communicate honestly with local governments to identify "real" impacts and worst-case scenarios to eliminate surprises during the siting and permitting process.
2. Modify approach to school facilities planning.
 - Review developments approved by local governments; actively and regularly participate in local governments' development review process; and apply student generation rates per dwelling unit to estimate additional school enrollment from approved development.
 - Use existing facilities efficiently before looking to new construction.
 - Consider overall costs of school planning and building, not just construction, including the longer-term lifecycle costs.

- Plan long-term for alternative uses of schools when school populations decline.
 - Plan long-term for conversion of schools in collaboration with local governments (may include conversion to other uses and joint uses of facilities)
 - Working with the Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation to identify and protect archaeological/historic resources on school property.
3. Include bicycle and pedestrian safety in educational curriculum to encourage non-vehicular transportation to schools, reduce perception of fear, and develop community consciousness about community health impacts.
 4. Build internal knowledge about school siting issues. Professionals in their respective organizations know their jobs but are less knowledgeable about the jobs of their counterparts (local government staff and state agency staff). Sharing information is essential to understanding the opportunities and challenges of other organizations.
 - Provide training to school superintendent about school siting and planning, permitting and funding issues from the perspectives of other organizations.
 - Designate consistent project managers for school siting issues.
 - Participate in state-agency-sponsored forums, task forces and other efforts to improve school planning and siting.

Permitting

5. Work with local governments to develop streamlined permit process including consistent communication and collaboration at key project milestones.

Long-Term Planning

6. Continue collaboration with local governments in school planning efforts.

Permitting

7. Continue to work collaboratively with local governments to streamline the permit process.

Annotated Bibliography

Resources

Center for Cities and Schools: www.citiesandschools.org.

- The Center works to promote high quality education as an essential component of urban and metropolitan vitality through interdisciplinary research, professional education, and collaborative practice.

Smart Schools Smart Growth Initiative: www.smart-schools.org.

- The Initiative is a multi-partner, national effort to bridge the movements for education equity and smart growth to build healthier, more sustainable communities.

Planning and Siting

A Roundtable Discussion: Dealing with Schools. 2004. Planning Commissioners Journal. Number 56. Fall.

- A discussion of school planning issues with four planners.

Atlanta Regional Condition. Linking School Siting to Land Use Planning.

- This document describes planning and administrative considerations in school siting along with implementation guidelines, lessons learned, and case studies.

Beaumont, C.E., Pianca, E.G. 2002. *Why Johnny Can't Walk to School*. National Trust for Historic Preservation.

- This document describes what is being lost with the decline in the number of neighborhood schools and how public policies encourage this. Case studies of communities that have focused on neighborhood schools are presented and recommendations for improvements to public policy are suggested.

Bingler, S., Quinn, L., Sullivan, K. 2003. *Schools as Centers of Community: A Citizen's Guide for Planning and Design*. National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities.

- This document presents schools as integrated components of the community through extension of services across generational boundaries and/or through expansion of the learning environment to include the broader community beyond the confines of the school itself. It offers six design principles for ensuring that schools meet the needs of their students and communities; it describes 13 case studies that illustrate

these principles. The process for implementing the principles is broken down into 19 steps.

Boles, Gene. 2005. *Best Practices Guide for Coordinated School Planning*. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Florida.

- This slide presentation provides a guide for coordinating school planning efforts between school boards and local governments.

Florida Department of Community Affairs, Department of Community Planning. 2002. *Primer on School Planning and Coordination*.

- This document identifies several issues related to a lack of coordination between school boards and local governments. A planning initiative is presented involving a pilot program and the development of a best practices guide for coordinated school planning.

Gurwitt, R. 2004. "Edge-ucation: What Compels Communities to Build Schools in the Middle of Nowhere?" *Governing*.

- This article describes the trend to build new schools in outlying areas, the growing concern for this practice, the policies that encourage it, and the coordinated planning needed to avoid it.

Institute for Public Administration, College of Human Services, Education and Public Policy, University of Delaware; Office of Governor Ruth Ann Minner. 2003. *The Future of School Siting Design and Construction in Delaware*.

- This report includes the considerations relevant to sizing and site selection and describes how school planning affects community development patterns and quality of life as identified through a policy forum begun in 2000. A list of recommendations for further study is also included.

Maine Department of Education, State Board of Education, State Planning Office and Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services. 1999. *The ABCs of School Site Selection*.

- This brochure outlines the considerations of school site selection and design and briefly describes a few case studies.

Michigan Land Use Institute. *Hard Lessons: Causes and Consequences of Michigan's School Construction Boom*.

- This report describes the relationship between new school construction changes in surrounding land uses, and the socioeconomic characteristics of the community. Several recommendations are presented calling for specific actions aimed at preventing the undesirable consequences associated with the siting of new schools in Michigan.

Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program. 2005. *Planning for Schools and Liveable Communities: The Oregon School Siting Handbook*.

- The handbook describes challenges in funding, land availability, transportation, accessibility, and planning before going on to make recommendations to be implemented through three outlined steps. It includes answers to frequently asked questions, including several pertaining to land use planning and school facility planning.

Salveson, D. and Hervey, P. 2003. *Good Schools—Good Neighborhoods*. Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina.

- This report identifies trends in North Carolina school construction and factors that influence the location and design of schools with suggestions for building and maintaining walkable neighborhood-scale schools. Two case studies are presented to illustrate points.

Torma, Tim. 2004. “Back to School for Planners.” *Planning Commissioners Journal*. Number 56. Fall.

- This article describes the impacts schools have on communities and the role planners can play in decisions about school construction and renovation.

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. *Travel and Environmental Implications of School Siting*.

- This study offers empirical evidence that school proximity to students influences students’ modes of transportation to and from school, that the quality of the environment along routes to schools influences students’ modes of transportation, and that these factors affect air quality due to their influence on automobile usage.

Public Safety

Safe Neighborhood Planning Pilot Project. Spokane. This is the final report on the 2005 Legislative Proviso pilot project. For more information, contact Janet Rogerson, Senior Planner, CTED at (360) 725-3047. See Appendix C of this Summary Report.

Appendix A

Summit Agenda

Summit Panel Speakers

Summit Participants

Summit News Release

Summit Agenda

Your Next New School – Where Will It Be and Who Pays? First Summit on School Siting in Washington

December 4, 2006

Highline Community College

Student Union Building 8, Mt Constance Room

2400 S. 240 Street

Des Moines, WA

Purpose: To identify the issues, potential solutions, and real world experiences related to locating and funding future schools.

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 8:30 | Reception |
| 9:00 | Opening Remarks and Welcome |
| 9:30 | School Planning and Siting – Panel Presentation |
| 9:50 | Permitting Processes – Panel Presentation |
| 10:10 | Fiscal Impacts and Finance – Panel Presentation |
| 10:30 | Break |
| 10:40 | Working Groups: Identify Issues and Initial Solutions for All Topics |
| 12:00 | Lunch Break
(Clark County Quality Schools Panel Presentation begins at 12:20) |
| 1:00 | Facilitator Report on Morning Working Groups |
| 1:30 | Working Groups: Advanced Problem Solving and Real World Experiences |
| 2:45 | Facilitator Report on Afternoon Working Groups |
| 3:15 | Closing Remarks – Legislative Perspective |
| 3:30 | Adjourn |

Summit Panel Speakers

School Planning & Siting Panel

Forrest Miller

Director of Support Services
Lake Washington School District
(425) 882-5108
fmiller@lwsd.org

Mike McCormick

Land use consultant
(360) 754-2916
mike.mccormick@comcast.net

Barbara Wright

Deputy Director
Environmental Division Public Health – Seattle & King County
(206) 205-3752
barbara.wright@metrokc.gov

Permitting Processes Panel

Michael Gunn

Director Facilities & Planning
Everett School District No. 2
(425) 385-4199
mgunn@everett.wednet.edu

John Doan

City of Sumner Administrator
(253) 299-5500
johnd@ci.sumner.wa.us

Fiscal Impacts & Finance Panel

Debra Aungst

Assistant Superintendent, Manager Services
Puyallup School District
(253) 841-8760
daungst@puyallup.k12.wa.us

Mike Bailey

Finance & Information Services Administrator
City of Renton
(425) 430-6858
mebailey@ci.renton.wa.us

Clark County Quality Schools Panel

John Deeder

Superintendent
Evergreen School District
(360) 604-4005
jdeeder@egreen.wednet.edu

Marty Snell

Community Planning Director
Clark County
(360) 397-2280 x4112 marty.snell@clark.wa.gov

Steve Madsen

Government Affairs Director
Building Industry Association of Clark County
(360) 694-0933
smadsen@biaofclarkcounty.org

Summit Participants

Abad	Ruth	ruth.abad@doh.wa.gov	State Department of Health
Allen	Marnie	marnie@marnieallenlaw.com	Consultant for school districts
Anderson	Kathleen	stanande@whidbey.net	
Aungst	Debra	aungstd@puyallup.k12.wa.us	Puyallup School District
Bagg	Carter	Carter.bagg@k12.wa.us	OSPI
Bailey	Mike	mebailey@ci.renton.wa.us	City of Renton
Ballash	Heather	heatherb@cted.wa.gov	CTED
Bauer	Leonard	leonardb@cted.wa.gov	CTED
Belieu	Terrence	tbelieu@co.pierce.wa.us	Pierce County
Berkholtz	Karin	karinb@cted.wa.gov	CTED
Brown	Gregory	gregoryb@spokaneschools.org	
Carlson	Cathie	ctcarlson@bethelsd.org	Bethel School District
Ciske	Sandra	sandra.ciske@metrokc.gov	Public Health - Seattle & King County
Claybrooke	Charlotte	claybrc@wsdot.wa.gov	WSDOT
Dargel	Tom	tom.dargel@bsd.wednet.edu	Bremerton School District
De Benedetti	PJ	pjdeben@mlsd.wednet.edu	Moses Lake School District
Deeder	John	jdeeder@egreen.wednet.edu	
DeLong	David	ddelong@tpchd.org	Tacoma/Pierce County Health Department
Dixon	Jeff	jdixon@auburnwa.gov	
Doan	John	johnd@ci.sumner.wa.us	City of Sumner
Draper	Walter	walt.draper@bsd.wednet.edu	
Duncan	Enid	enid.duncan@gmail.com	Private Educator
Erkkinen	Mike	merkkin@co.pierce.wa.us	Pierce County
Farris	Paul	pfarris@wonders.eburg.wednet.edu	Ellensburg School District

Flanagan	Kevin	kflanagan@nacarchitecture.com	
Gildroy	Craig	cgildroy@nwi.net	City of Chelan
Gordon	Casey	Casey.Gordon@k12.wa.us	OSPI
Griffin	Sharon	sharon.griffin@bsd.wednet.edu	
Griffith	Greg	greg.griffith@dahp.wa.gov	Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
Gunn	Michael	mgunn@everetsd.org	Everett School District
Hansen	Jim	jhansen@bethelsd.org	Bethel School District
Hardin	Tim	thardin@tpchd.org	Tacoma/Pierce County Health Department
Hennessy	Eileen	eileen.hennessy@metrokc.gov	Public Health - Seattle & King County
Horenstein	Todd	todd.horenstein@vansd.org	Vancouver School District
Howell	Brock	brockwhowell@gmail.com	Futurewise
Janis	Dave	davej@bicyclealliance.org	
Jatczak	Patricia	patricia.jatczak@k12.wa.us	OSPI
Jolma	Kevin	Jolma.kevin@bgsd.k12.wa.us	
Kask	M.	kaskinc@aol.com	Kask Consulting, Inc.
Kattermann	Michael	mkattermann@ahbl.com	
Kelleher	Pat	Psk98926@yahoo.com	Ellensburg School District
Kenworthy	Bob	BKenworthy@auburn.wednet.edu	Auburn School District
Kissee	James	james.kissee@doh.wa.gov	Washington State Department of Health
Kredel	Lorri	lkredel@walottery.com	Washington State Lottery
Lein	Vaughn	vaughn@lsw-architects.com	LSW Architects, PC
Lillquist	Nancy	lillquis@kvalley.com	Ellensburg City Council
Madsen	Steven	smadsen@biaofclarkcounty.org	Building Industry Association of Clark County
Martinson	Reg	rmartins@egreen.wednet.edu	
Maupin	Will	willmop@comcast.net	City of Bremerton
McCormick	Mike	mike.mccormick@comcast.net	Planning Consultant
McMurry	Diane	mcmurry@verizon.net	

Miller	Forrest	fmiller@lwsd.org	Lake Washington School District
Minnihan	Patty	timinnihan@msn.com	
Nason	David	dnason@ahbl.com	
O'Leary	Meg	moleary@jsanet.com	Jones & Stokes Consulting Services
Ousley	Nancy	nancyo@cted.wa.gov	CTED
Pederson	John	jpederson@spokanecounty.org	Spokane County
Posner	Melinda	mposner@jsanet.com	Jones & Stokes Consulting Services
Reitenbach	Paul	paul.reitenbach@metrokc.gov	King County
Riehl	Greg	riehlg@orting.wednet.edu	Orting School District
Rogerson	Janet	janetr@cted.wa.gov	CTED
Rowe	Mark	mark.rowe@metrokc.gov	King County
Skelton	Joan	jimizoid@juno.com	
Snell	Martin	Marty.Snell@clark.wa.gov	Clark County
Spencer	Andrea	Andrea.Spencer@ci.bremerton.wa.us	
Stiffarm	Denise	denises@prestongates.com	Puget Sound School Coalition
Therien	Ned	ned.therien@doh.wa.gov	State Board of Health
Tilton	Terry	wsbuilding@qwest.net	State Building & Construction Trades Council
Tobiason	Ray	rtoby@comcast.net	OSPI
Wedins	Dick	wedins@fairpoint.net	Ellensburg School District
White	Jim	jim.w.white@doh.wa.gov	State Department of Health
Wolf	Karen	Karen.wolf@metrokc.gov	King County
Wright	Barbara	Barbara.Wright@METROKc.GOV	Public Health - Seattle & King County
Young	Randall	ryounghyco@aol.com	Henderson, Young & Company
Yuan	Grace	grace@prestongates.com	Preston Gates & Ellis

Summit News Release

Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development and
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

December 9, 2006

Contacts: Nancy Ousley, CTED, (360) 725-3003

Thomas Shapley, OSPI, (360) 725-6014

State And Local Officials Meet To Explore Need For Better School Planning

School Siting Summit Report Due in January

OLYMPIA -- Last week more than 60 officials from cities, counties, school districts and other organizations gathered at a School Siting Summit to discuss how to improve the way schools are planned for in Washington. The summit was co-sponsored by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED).

Attendees heard presentations from experts in school financing, planning, permitting and construction. The speakers identified a number of issues that complicate the current process for choosing when and where schools are located.

Another panel of speakers discussed a promising approach in Clark County, called the Quality Schools Initiative, in which representatives from Clark County, its cities, and its school districts meet regularly to examine growth trends in detail and discuss how to best serve existing and new neighborhoods with quality schools.

“In Clark County we decided to become very proactive as a consortium of districts on this issue,” said John Deeder, Superintendent of the Evergreen School District in Vancouver. “It is this type of collaboration that we feel will help keep schools in the loop as decisions regarding growth are made. We want to be proactive in our planning for new schools.”

Summit participants identified a number of potential solutions that could streamline decision-making around school siting decisions. A report on the results of the Summit will be available online from OSPI and CTED in January.

###

Appendix B

Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Purpose and Protocols

Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Memo

Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Purpose and Protocols

Revised, August 10, 2006

Purpose

To develop recommended plans, timelines and policies that will ensure that the school facilities necessary for quality education are available for all children in Clark County.

Meeting ground rules

We will:

- Treat everyone with respect.
- Listen carefully with the intent of understanding.
- Let others finish before speaking.
- Share the air – let others speak once before speaking twice.
- Raise issues honestly, clearly and early in the process.
- Focus questions and comments on the subject at hand and stick to the agenda.
- When discussing events or issues of the past, apply them productively to the present discussion and purpose of the Task Force.
- Seek to find common ground.
- Put cell phones on silent mode.

Other meeting protocols

- Meetings will end on time. If agenda items cannot be completed on time, the group will decide if the meeting should be extended or if an additional meeting should be scheduled.
- Meetings will be facilitated.
- We will attend all meetings and will prepare for meetings by reading materials in advance and arriving on time.
- If we have an unavoidable conflict that requires us to be late or absent, we will notify Tina Redline.
- If one of us anticipates having an unavoidable conflict, that member may designate an alternate. The alternate must attend regularly and/or receive regular and thorough briefings by the member. The alternate may sit at the table and participate in deliberations, but may not participate in “votes.”

- Direction for agendas will be set at the previous meeting and will be finalized by John Deeder, Bill Barron, and Jeanne Lawson. We will notify Jeanne Lawson with any requests for additional items on the agenda.

Accessibility to the public

- While the primary purpose of the Task Force meetings is to provide a forum for deliberation, meetings will be open to the public for observation.
- Interested members of the public are encouraged to provide more thorough comments in writing. All written comments will be circulated to each member of the Task Force.

In other communications, members will

- Be free to speak with each other about issues and in ways that support the group process. Do not take actions or discuss issues in any way that undermines the group process.
- Call or email the staff with information that the other members and the project team need to be aware of. When sending information by email for distribution, note whether the information is of a critical nature or just background information.
- Notify staff about any communications with the news media.
- Communicate with our respective constituents and their decision-making bodies to ensure that our constituents are well informed of the group's discussions and progress and to ensure that issues are identified that need to be communicated to the rest of the Task Force.
- Disclose any direct conflicts that any of us have regarding a decision to be made by the Task Force. These conflicts will not prevent the member from participating in discussions or decisions of the group.

Decision making

- Task Force will make decisions on recommendations to the decision-making bodies (such as the Board of County Commissioners and school boards).
- Decisions will be by consensus (informed consent). Consensus is the point at which all members can support the decision as the most viable choice for the group as a whole, although it may not be their personal favorite.
- If consensus cannot be reached initially, the committee may decide to delay the recommendation to a later date.
- Decisions will be frozen unless the Task Force as a whole reaches consensus that a decision needs to be revisited.

Clark County Quality Schools Task Force Memo

DATE: October 26, 2006
TO: Michael Grubbs, Superintendent
Green Mountain School District
FROM: Clark County Quality Schools Task Force
SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Policy Relating to School Capital Facilities

As you may know, the Clark County Quality Schools Task Force has been meeting since early August of this year. Comprised of representatives from all of the county's school districts (except Green Mountain), the development community and Clark County government, the task force was established to address the impacts of growth on K-12 capital facilities. A roster of task force members is enclosed for your information.

Our primary focus has been to identify how quality education might be made available for all children in appropriate facilities at the time they enroll. In recent meetings the task force has spent time evaluating the local comprehensive planning process under the auspices of the state Growth Management Act (GMA). Of specific interest has been how school facilities can be better planned and coordinated with city and county capital facilities planning. A proposed Comprehensive Plan policy has been the result.

The task force will be asking the Board of County Commissioners to consider this policy as part of the current comprehensive plan update process. Should the Board favorably consider this policy for the current update, the county will undertake a consultative process with the cities and the school districts during 2007 in an attempt to reach agreement on final language of what would become a countywide planning policy. We have included a draft of proposed policy language along with a sample resolution of adoption for your early review and comment.

The task force is very pleased with both the letter and spirit of this policy. We view it as a response that could better enable the siting of appropriate school facilities in a more coordinated and timely fashion despite of the challenges posed by GMA and current funding mechanisms.

We look forward to working with you as we finalize and attempt to implement this important new direction for our children.

Please call Bill Barron, County Administrator at 397-2232 should you have questions.

Proposed County Planning Policy Regarding School Capital Facilities

Current funding mechanisms for schools present unique capital facilities and planning challenges under the Growth Management Act (GMA). In order to assure full consideration of school capital facilities in the development and implementation of city and county comprehensive plans, a permanent school forum shall be established. The forum is established by the county, participating cities and school districts and shall serve as an advisory body only. It shall consist of representatives from the county, its cities and school districts, and may include representatives from special purpose districts and other interest groups. The forum shall undertake the following:

1. Uniform data collection. Identify, monitor, and report to the community, at least annually, on the adequacy and key performance indicators related to school capital facilities plans;
2. State and federal law issues. Develop issue papers and consensus recommendations regarding provisions of state and federal law, which impact the adequacy and/or timely provision of school capital facilities.
3. Policy development and implementation. Actively participate in the development or amendment of city and county comprehensive plans and development regulations relating to or impacting schools, including;
 - a. Location of Urban Growth Areas;
 - b. Location and mix of residential land use designations;
 - c. Commercial/industrial tax base within each school district;
 - d. Potential location of future school sites;
 - e. Potential co-location of school facilities with other public facilities (i.e. parks);
 - f. Phasing of residential development;
 - g. Private/public partnerships;
 - h. School facility permitting processes;
 - i. School impact fees; and
 - j. Last resort safety net considerations.

Appendix C

Safe Neighborhood Planning Pilot Project: Spokane

Safe Neighborhood Planning Pilot Project: Spokane

Final Report on 2005 Legislative Proviso Pilot Project

Summary

Safe Neighborhoods through Community Planning Pilot Project

Neighborhood safety is a critical factor in building and maintaining strong communities. Crime and the perception of crime can negatively impact the accomplishment of community and state planning goals, such as compact development, housing, economic development, revitalized downtowns, citizen participation, and walkable communities. As the impacts of crime spread across our communities, so does awareness of planning tools and strategies that can be used to fight the problem.

Washington State has assisted safe neighborhood planning efforts through a pilot project to encourage local governments to prioritize and plan for crime reduction. In 2005 the Legislature appropriated \$50,000 for a safe neighborhoods pilot project. This summary describes the steps taken to award the grant and the process used by the City of Spokane to carry out the pilot project.

Executive Summary

Through the successful completion of the grant project, the City of Spokane is demonstrating ways to link planning and community design to crime prevention and the creation of safe neighborhoods. The project:

- Builds upon prior state-funded planning efforts.
- Documents the latest research and initiatives in community policing and neighborhood participation, and demonstrates leadership in such initiatives.
- Illustrates a strong and positive connection between planning, law enforcement, and the neighborhood residents and businesses.
- Confirms that crime prevention is not simply a police department function.
- Recognizes three fundamentals for safe neighborhoods: stronger community-based policing programs, use of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles, and an improved community image.
- Emphasizes the process of planning for safe neighborhoods, and provides a model for other communities to follow.

- Concludes that although CPTED principles may be incorporated into a plan, the creation of an element establishes a more significant role for planners to help develop a community document, direction, and commitment for safe neighborhoods.

The Safe Neighborhoods Legislative Proviso

In 2005 the Washington State Legislature funded the “Safe Neighborhoods Through Community Planning” Pilot Project. With passage of ESSB 6090, the Legislature appropriated a budget proviso to the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED): “\$50,000 of the general fund-state appropriation is provided solely for one pilot project to promote the study and implementation of safe neighborhoods through community planning.” ESSB 6090 Sec. 127(14)

Carrying Out the Safe Neighborhoods Legislative Proviso

In response to the legislative proviso, CTED’s Growth Management Services (GMS) Unit developed the parameters for a pilot project to help a local government create and implement a local safe neighborhoods program, and provide a model for other cities and counties as they plan for safe neighborhoods.

An advisory group was chosen for their expertise in planning, safety, and crime prevention. The eight advisors include representatives from the Seattle Police Department’s Crime Prevention Unit, the Planning Association of Washington (PAW), the Association of Washington Cities, planning consulting firms, the University of Washington’s Northwest Center for Livable Communities faculty, and staff from CTED’s Safe and Drug Free Communities and Growth Management Services programs. Each advisor reviewed project materials, and these comments were considered in preparing the final documents.

Grant applications were due on December 9, 2005, and although the turn-around time for applications was just one month, the opportunity generated considerable interest from consultants, partnering entities, and citizens. The cities of Lakewood, Puyallup, SeaTac, and Spokane submitted applications.

The advisory group met at the Seattle CTED office on December 14. Following review and discussion, the group unanimously recommended the City of Spokane’s proposal as the pilot project.

Execution of the Safe Neighborhoods Pilot Project

The City of Spokane initiated its “Safe Neighborhood East Central Spokane Project” on January 1, 2006. GMS staff, Janet Rogerson, provided technical assistance and tracked the project’s progress. The project was chronicled on Web sites including the City of Spokane’s Neighborhood Business Centers at www.spokanenbc.org, and the

East central Neighborhood Partnership Center at <http://faculty.spokanefalls.edu/eastcentralpc>. The city submitted a Status Report on March 15, 2006, and a Closeout Report with the following grant deliverables on June 15, 2006:

- CD and hard copy of the draft Safe Neighborhoods Element to the East Central Neighborhood Plan.
- CD and hard copy of the draft Safe Neighborhoods Workbook as a guide for communities across the state to use and apply safe neighborhoods and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles in planning.
- CD with multiple PowerPoint presentations developed as part of the project.

In addition to the expected deliverables, the following were submitted:

- Binder including research articles and review.
- CPTED Training DVD.
- CODE 101 DVD.

Through the successful completion of the grant project, the City of Spokane has demonstrated ways to link planning and community design to crime prevention and the creation of safe neighborhoods, and provided a model for other communities to follow. The Safe Neighborhoods Element to the East Central Neighborhood Plan states; “This ‘element’ to the neighborhood plan brings together the successful application of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) Principles, the latest research and initiatives in community policing and neighborhood participation and leadership in such initiatives, and recognition of the need to maintain and improve the image of every neighborhood to support residents, businesses, and community organizations to enhance the quality of life within the community.”

A key aspect of the Safe Neighborhood East Central Spokane Project was the existence and development of partnerships between neighborhood residents, community-based organizations, community policing initiatives already in place, local institutions of higher education, and city planning.

The project demonstrates a collaborative effort under the direction of the City of Spokane’s Neighborhood Business Centers. The consultant, Eastern Washington University (EWU) urban planning and criminal justice, led the research and implementation of the community planning efforts, working closely with consultants on CPTED. The project built on the successful relationships that have been developed between a Neighborhood Planning Stakeholder Committee, the East Central Neighborhood Council/Steering Committee, the East Spokane Business Association, and the East Central Community Organization. The project was carried out working closely with the Community Policing process within the City of

Spokane, and with the East Central COPS Shop, which participated in the neighborhood planning process, and has incorporated design assessments into some work in the neighborhood.

The East Central neighborhood planning process had mobilized 90 human service organizations and 40 faith-based organizations within the neighborhood to address community issues and carry out plan priorities. These groups assisted in review of research and crime statistics, helped assess neighborhood issues and needs related to safe neighborhoods, and participated in the identification of alternative actions and priorities for the Safe Neighborhood Element to the neighborhood plan.

As the Safe Neighborhoods Element states: “By using planning processes and community development models, this ‘Safe Neighborhoods Element’ empowers residents to take the lead in a process, facilitated by planners working with police and other city staff, to study crime issues, assess the problems, issues and needs and develop alternatives; and finally to set priorities and an implementation plan for neighborhood action to create safe neighborhoods.”

The Safe Neighborhoods Workbook is serving as a guide for communities across the state. The city and its consultants are presenting Safe Neighborhoods material at conferences and are co-sponsoring training workshops to circulate the Safe Neighborhoods Workbook and serve as a community mentor.

Next Steps

Although the grant-contracted work has been completed, the City of Spokane considers planning for safe neighborhoods an on-going effort. Strengthening existing relationships, broader use of CPTED assessments, council adoption of the Safe Neighborhoods Element, and expansion of the Safe Neighborhoods planning process to neighborhoods citywide are anticipated. These processes also may prove valuable as models statewide.

Conclusion

The Washington State Safe Neighborhoods Through Community Planning pilot project is enabling the City of Spokane to provide a valuable resource for their community and for the state. Although CPTED principles may be incorporated into a plan, the creation of an element establishes a more significant role for planners to help develop a community document, direction, and commitment for safe neighborhoods. The Safe Neighborhoods Element illustrates a strong and positive connection between planning, law enforcement, and the neighborhood residents and businesses, and confirms that crime prevention is not simply a police department function.

Dr. Dick Winchell, consultant from EWU, concludes that three fundamentals for safe neighborhoods exist: stronger community-based policing programs, use of CPTED principles and strategies, and an improved community image. The safe neighborhoods planning process sets the stage for addressing crime reduction in a comprehensive and integrated way, addressing these three fundamentals, and leading to the creation and strengthening of safe neighborhoods for a vital Washington State.

For information, contact Janet Rogerson at janetr@cted.wa.gov or 360-725-3047. For further details, see the Safe Communities Planning topic on the CTED's Growth Management Services Web page at www.cted.wa.gov/growth.

Appendix D

Executive Order 06-02: Regulatory Improvement

Washington State Office of Regulatory Assistance

The Office of Regulatory Assistance (ORA) will be an important partner in establishing interagency coordination and streamlining school planning and permitting processes. ORA is responsible for the Governor's Regulatory Improvement Program, as directed by Executive Order 06-02 (full text included below), and is the designated government contact for state permitting and regulatory issues. ORA can provide case studies and experience with development and implementation of expedited permitting processes, master permits, and negotiated decision-making timelines. For details, visit www.ora.wa.gov. For information on Executive Order 06-02, visit www.governor.wa.gov/execorders/eo_06-02.pdf.

Executive Order 06-02: Regulatory Improvement

WHEREAS, this Administration wants to make it easy to do business in the state of Washington; and

Citizens and businesses deserve state agencies that will be innovative and creative in simplifying their procedures for permits, licenses, regulatory compliance and all other business operations; and

Businesses should expect state agencies to provide:

- Clear rules and regulations;
- Consistent, high-quality, problem-solving service;
- Timely responses;
- User-friendly processes; and

All state agencies and other levels of government should work to reduce multi-agency barriers for business; and

Citizens need results that protect the public health and safety and do not compromise environmental quality; and

The top priorities of this administration include improving and simplifying the licensing, permitting, tax collection and other state business systems; and

The directors of certain state agencies, and a representative for local jurisdictions, signed a Project Charter in January 2006, which guides the development and implementation of a one-stop business portal for Washington citizens and businesses.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Christine O. Gregoire, Governor of the state of Washington, direct all regulatory, taxing, licensing, and permitting agencies and programs to improve and simplify service to Washington citizens and businesses.

The Governor's Regulatory Improvement Program will work with agencies to:

A. Develop a One-Stop Business Portal. This single, secure, online portal will make licensing, permitting, regulatory approvals or filings, and tax collection easier for business.

B. Provide Multi-Agency Reviews for Permits. Agencies will ease the burden of dealing with multiple agencies for permits by streamlining the process with features such as multi-agency permit teams, concurrent permit reviews, offering single points of contact, and providing on-line tools, education, and outreach. State agencies also will develop permit review systems and procedures that include local and federal agencies.

C. Engage in On-going Regulatory Improvement. The Director of the Office of Regulatory Assistance will work with state, local and federal agencies to make on-going improvements that will make the permitting, licensing, and regulatory processes easier and more effective. To do this, the Office of Regulatory Assistance will:

- Consult regularly with stakeholders;
- Develop and implement innovative regulatory best practices;
- Work with local and federal governments to develop coordinated permitting, licensing and related regulatory systems;
- Utilize the latest technology to ensure all the work of businesses and citizens with the state is as efficient and user-friendly as possible; and
- Report annually to the Governor on the status of regulatory improvement work plans.

D. Listen to Our Clients. Agencies will use surveys, focus and advisory groups, interviews, complaint tracking or other methods to understand citizen and business perspectives and to improve service design and delivery.

E. Talk Clearly to the Public. Agencies will make their letters, instructions and processes clear and understandable to citizens and businesses. They will standardize and simplify forms and applications. They will write their processes, rules, online tools, and public information in clear language that will improve accessibility, reduce processing times and increase user-friendliness.

F. Be Accountable. Agencies that collect taxes or provide permits, licenses, approvals, and other regulatory services will:

- Establish measurable service delivery standards to address issues such as turnaround or response times, professionalism and helpfulness, consistency, efficiency and effectiveness, and overall quality of service outcomes;
- Regularly measure progress;
- Report quarterly through Governor and agency Government Management, Accountability, and Performance (GMAP) review sessions;
- Consider benchmarks from similar agencies or programs;
- Set targets for improvement; and
- Use Plain Talk standards (Executive Order 05-03) for written materials.

This Executive Order shall take effect immediately.

Signed and sealed with the official seal of the state of Washington, on this _____ day of February, 2006, at Olympia, Washington.

By:

Christine O. Gregoire

Governor

BY THE GOVERNOR:

Secretary of State