

School Siting and Sustainability in Illinois: Examining the Significance of School Location and Community-Centered Schools

February 2009

Supported by:

Healthy Schools Campaign
Office of the Lt. Governor
Landmarks Illinois
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
Active Transportation Alliance
AIA Illinois
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Table of Contents

Declaration: Benefits of Community-Centered Schools Executive Summary

Project Background

Introduction

School-Siting Realities in Illinois

- Schools, Communities, and Government: Conflicting Priorities and Jurisdictions
- School Siting + Children’s Health
- School Siting + Air Pollution and Traffic Congestion

Why do Illinois school districts face school siting decisions?

- Population Changes and School Reorganization
- Inadequate or Perceptions of Inadequate School Buildings
- Increase in School Choice and Competition between Schools
- Recent Trends in Education Policy and Philosophies of School Organization

Challenges to and Recommendations for Addressing Community-Centered School Siting

i. Policy Challenges

A. Misaligned State and Local Incentives and Policies

1. Acreage Standards
2. School Transportation Reimbursement Policies
3. School Construction & Renovation Reimbursement Policies
4. School Maintenance Resources and Policies
5. Green Building Standards and Requirements for Schools Seeking State Assistance

B. Lack of Coordinated Planning

1. Interaction between School Districts and Local Government
2. Lacking Public Input on School Siting Decisions

C. Lack of Accurate Data

1. Comprehensive Feasibility Studies

Model Policy

- i. School District Policies in Illinois
- ii. State Policies

Appendices

- 1. Safe Routes to School Projects**
- 2. Municipal School Land Dedication Requirements**
- 3. Older and Walkable Illinois Schools**
- 4. Impact Fees by Illinois Community**
- 5. School Enrollment Projections from 2007/2008 to 2012/2013 by County**
- 6. Educational Resources**
- 7. Constitution of the State of Illinois**
 - Article X - Education
 - Article XI – Environment
 - Article XII – Local Government
- 8. State of Sustainability of Illinois Schools**
- 9. Additional LEED requirements suggested by Healthy Schools Campaign**
- 10. Illinois State Board of Education: Construction Applications**
- 11. Ten Steps for Successful and Sustainable School Facility Planning**

Works Cited

Introduction

The message of this report is simple: Illinois schools should be located in community-centered locations.

The benefits of community-centered schools¹ are numerous. Environmentally, community-centered schools can reduce dependence on motorized transportation, avoid development of open space and agricultural lands, and make more efficient use of building resources. Increasing convenience and safety for students, parents, and staff to walk or bike to school creates potential health benefits. Community-centered schools can save families and the district money on transportation spending and also can create positive economic benefits to local businesses who profit from nearby school activity and to homeowners whose property values are enhanced by proximity to the school. Community-centered schools are more often than not schools built before World War II; retaining such schools means retaining local history and often significant architectural icons. Finally, community-centered schools are good for the community, more easily affording joint use of facilities for community functions and serving as neighborhood anchors due to a central presence.

The content of this report aims to summarize the various benefits of community-centered schools in Illinois; highlight barriers to protecting existing community-centered schools and constructing new schools that are in community-centered locations; and propose model policy suggestions that support community-centered schools. Given the content, the report will serve as a tool for school boards, school administrators, and public officials to assure that Illinois has the resources to make more sustainable school siting decisions and more fully understand the values of existing community-centered schools.

School-Siting Realities in Illinois

In 2007-2008, Illinois was home to about 870 school districts and approximately 2,056,641 enrolled students². Being the fifth most populated state in the country, the cumulative impacts that Illinois school facility decisions have on economic, environmental, and community resources as well as human health are significant. As is true in other states, Illinois currently faces an epidemic of childhood obesity³, diabetes, and asthma; growing environmental concerns about sprawl, loss of farmland, energy security, and climate change; and a dire economic situation causing dwindling budgets. All of these issues affect and are affected by school siting decisions. And while schools and districts are not charged with eliminating these social concerns, Illinois schools and school districts can and must play a role in addressing them.

Many new schools constructed in Illinois are not being located in community-centered locations while existing community-centered schools are threatened by neglect and pressure to compete with new schools. Although urban communities often make walkability more possible than in rural school districts, a number of rural and smalltown school districts boast walkable, community-centered schools. Still, little is known about walkable, community-centered schools statewide, as school siting information is not currently reported to state agencies. Furthermore, the large number of school districts and history of strong local control of school decisions makes collecting school siting information a large, difficult task.

¹ For the purpose of this report, a community-centered school will be defined as a school that is both located in a walkable, community location and is fully integrated into the life of the community.

² Illinois State Board of Education Data Analysis and Progress Reporting, Feb. 2004.
http://www.isbe.net/research/pdfs/public_school_enrollment.pdf

³ In 2005, 15.8% of Illinois 10-17 year-olds were overweight. Source: U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau. The National Survey of Children's Health. *Overweight and Physical Activity Among Children: A portrait of States and the Nation 2005*. Also see:
http://family.samhsa.gov/fgmap/state_stats.aspx?id=16

Schools, Communities, and Government: Conflicting Priorities and Jurisdictions

Decisions of where to locate schools can be difficult in part because of differing priorities from various parties affected. Schools are primarily concerned with student educational performance and safety, while community members may be just as concerned about property values, traffic congestion, and noise generated by the presence of students. Meanwhile, local government is charged with providing services to everyone in the community at a reasonable, affordable cost. Rarely are all groups pleased with school siting decisions, though consensus from different parties is not impossible. Further complicating the satisfaction from such decisions is that school siting decisions do not have to be approved by local government even though such decisions often affect services of local government, community dynamics, and population changes.

Another source of conflict for school siting decisions in Illinois is the reality that school district boundaries cross multiple municipal and service boundaries. As a result, it is difficult for school districts and municipalities to reconcile differences in policies and community wishes. For example, some school districts serve numerous communities which often have set differing minimum acreage requirements for new school construction, have differing land use ordinances, and have differences in utility services and local taxes. Such complications caused by school districts overlapping other municipal and service boundaries make it easy for school districts – which are not bound to follow municipal rules – to ignore municipal policies. School referenda create time constraints which may not get met if the district was forced to comply with all combined rules of each community and service district its borders overlap.



School Siting and Children's Health

Though Illinois has recently taken action to combat negative health trends seen in children, the means for addressing issues of children's health have largely been focused on reducing exposure to toxins, offering healthier foods, and better ventilation in buildings. Relatively little has been done to recognize the significance of school location and to address children's health concerns by making schools more accessible through active forms of transportation.

School facilities are certainly not the only types of structures commonly in Illinois situated in ways not conducive to forms of active transportation; a significant percentage of residential neighborhoods, work places, and places of worship are also located in such a way that vehicular transport is all but necessary. Making community-centered school siting a solution to better children's health may strengthen the argument to confront other types of sprawling development, and may help develop habits that affect the next generation's adult preferences to live, work, play, and worship in environments where healthy, active living is possible and practical.

Table 1. Blue Cross Blue Shield childhood obesity fact sheet.

Simply having walkable school locations does not necessarily ensure that students, parents, and employees will walk or bike to school. Educational programming and public information will continue to be needed in order to help schools encourage walking and biking to school.

School Siting + Air Pollution and Traffic Congestion

A number of areas in Illinois fail to meet federal air quality standards, including the greater Chicago area and the Metro East area of southwest Illinois, and efforts are being made to reduce air pollution as a result. National studies indicate that nearly 25% of morning vehicular traffic congestion is related to school commutes.⁴ A study by the National Trust for Historic Preservation found that just over 15% of students arrived at school by personal vehicle in 1969; in 2001, the percentage was close to 50% of students⁵. And in 2001, a greater percentage of youth ages five to eighteen lived farther from school than in 1969: 79% of those surveyed in 2001 lived more than one mile from school compared with 66% in 1969, and 50% lived more than three miles from school in 2001 compared with 34% in 1969⁶.

25 % of morning traffic congestion in the U.S. is related to school commutes.

It is therefore imperative that school districts and the State of Illinois more closely examine possible relationships between school location, school transportation choices, air quality and traffic congestion. Furthermore, with concerns about climate change and a rise in childhood asthma, connections between school location and air pollution from school transportation should be studied and subsequent recommendation implemented in order to minimize possible negative impacts.

Why do Illinois school districts face school siting decisions?

Population Changes and School Reorganization

In many cases, population changes are a driving cause of school siting decisions, and in many cases, population changes drive school reorganization. Localized population growth, changing population distribution, and sudden increases of young families with children – mainly in suburban Chicagoland communities and near smaller Illinois cities – means some school buildings cannot accommodate their current student population, leading the district to consider building additions or building new, often outside of town and away from walkable neighborhoods⁷.

At present, a majority of Illinois counties are projecting decreases in student enrollment⁸. Often times in rural communities experiencing population decline, consolidation decisions get settled by placing a single large campus where driving distances are balanced throughout the district, but make walking to school impossible for everyone⁹. In other cases, districts wish to leave due to declining quality of the area.

⁴ NHTSA 2003, Department of Environment.

⁵ National Trust for Historic Preservation unpublished study; also see *Why Johnny Can't Walk to School* report (2001).

⁶ Fig 2a. Distance to School for Youth 5 to 18 Years of Age, NPTS 1969.

http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/kidswalk/then_and_now.htm

⁷ An example would be Lockport Township High School's Central Campus.

⁸ During the 2007-2008 school year, Illinois had a total student enrollment of approximately 2,056,641 students. According to a report issued the Illinois State Board of Education, projected student enrollment in Illinois is expected to decrease to 2,032,451 in the 2012-2013 school year. Of the 102 counties in Illinois, 27 counties are expected to see a net increase while the remaining 75 counties are expected to see a net decrease in student enrollment between 2007 and 2012.

⁹ The average Illinois school district area has increased from 4.8 square miles during the 1941-1942 school year to an average of 66.6 square miles in 2008. In the 1941-1942 school year, Illinois had 12,047 school districts. In 1983, the number of school districts declined to 1008 districts. Today, Illinois has 870 school districts. See Appendix 5 for more information.

Aside from population changes, school reorganization may also be caused by other political, economic, social, and educational factors as well, including:

- Projected geographic changes in residential settlement within the district
- Economic hardships that lead to a dwindling property tax base affecting school funding
- Aging buildings that are determined to be beyond repair
- Desire to offer better, more diverse programming and educational services at larger campuses
- Projected financial savings in administrative costs by reducing duplicated services.

Consolidation and reorganization decisions are largely made on the local level, as school boards have the authority to consolidate school buildings within their borders and are given this authority in the School Code¹⁰. Little is known statewide about the frequency and nature of consolidations made within Illinois districts if the consolidation is caused by a school closing and the subsequent consolidations simply involve reorganization of existing buildings within the district. The only reporting of consolidation decisions required is when new buildings are proposed as a result of consolidation, in which case a referendum must be brought for vote and passed to approve construction and provide bonding (fact check). Districts do not have to share consolidation information with the Illinois State Board of Education unless such a decision leads them to seek Health Life Safety funding (fact check). In the past twenty five years, Illinois has seen significant number of consolidation of school districts (see Appendix 5, Table 1). Types of school consolidation are described in Article 11E of the School Code (105 ILCS 5/11E)¹¹.

Inadequate or Perceptions of Inadequate School Buildings

Sometimes, the building itself is at the heart of school siting decisions. Illinois currently has a significant number of districts reporting inadequate school facilities and facility repairs as indicated by the Capital Needs Survey from December 2006, which reported \$8.2 billion in capital needs¹². A lack of state funding to address these capital needs coupled with tough economic times means that many school facilities are facing neglect and hoping facilities can adequately last before outside again becomes available.

While many districts report capital improvement needs, sometimes this is more of a preference or perception of inadequate facilities, even though school buildings are adequately serving the school population. For example, older schools today are often assumed to not be capable of adapt to technological improvements. This is generally not true, as a number of examples of older, community-centered schools have been modernized with built-in smart classroom equipment, security systems, and automatic lighting and HVAC systems¹³. Rather than restoring an historic façade, many opt to tear down older buildings or renovate with modern architecture. When schools are torn down or abandoned, the surrounding neighborhood often experiences general decline.

Increase in School Choice and Competition between Schools

An increase in school choice and more private schools in education system has led to an increase in pressure for existing public schools to retain and attract students. A common response to this increasing competition is to provide luxurious and often space-intensive amenities such as football stadiums and field hockey courts in order to remain competitive. To prevent pressure to relocate to sights with more space,

¹⁰ See (105 ILCS 5/10-21.3) (from Ch. 122, par. 10-21.3) Sec. 10-21.3. Attendance units.

¹¹ See Illinois General Assembly website,

<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010500050HArt%2E+11E&ActID=1005&ChapAct=105%26nbsp%3BILCS%26nbsp%3B5%2F&ChapterID=17&ChapterName=SCHOOLS&SectionID=72165&SeqStart=80500000&SeqEnd=83300000&ActName=School+Code%2E>.

¹² Capital Needs Assessment Survey Results, December 2006. See

http://www.cdb.state.il.us/schools/CapNeedAssess_2007.pdf.

¹³ One example is Joliet Central High School built in 1899, which has been successfully retrofitted with such technologies.

other amenities such as historic arts facilities and unique architecture can also be enhanced and marketed to stay competitive. Sometimes having multistoried buildings or shared facilities with other schools or local park districts can prevent duplication of such facilities, saving space and money.

DRAFT

Challenges to and Recommendations for Addressing Community-Centered School Siting

The following section of this report identifies some of the policy challenges that community-centered schools face while offering suggestions on policy changes and voluntary best practices to better support community-centered schools.

i. Policy Challenges

A. Misaligned State and Local Incentives and Policies

1. Acreage Standards: Local and State Level Concerns

Local Acreage Standard Concerns:

Large Local School Acreage Standards Encourage Sprawl, Discourage Walkability

Fortunately, Illinois sets no state minimum acreage requirement for schools. But because Illinois education system is controlled mostly on the local level, many communities and school districts have set their own acreage standards or have adopted outdated Council of Educational Facility Planning International¹⁴ standards believed to be required. Even if a district sets requirements for small, community-centered school siting, school districts do not have to comply with municipal policies given that school districts are not considered government entities. Some states such as South Carolina have prohibited minimum acreages for school sites¹⁵.

With no statewide minimum acreage requirement and local control of school districts, school acreage varies greatly by district and by community. For example, Joliet Central High School is situated on 34 acres and houses 2,700 students while Oswego High School is located on 104 acres with capacity for 2,400 students. Some districts have maintained many small-acreage school sites in walkable areas of their communities. Other districts continue to refer to overly generous acreage standards that reflect suburban, sprawling circumstances or have created required minimum acreage standards of their own, negating the possibility of smaller school sites embedded in the heart of communities. Council of Educational Facility Planning International, created in the 1970s, once suggested school districts follow a generous one-size-fits-all facility acreage standard that left little room for considering space-confined, community-centered school sites. CEFPI acreage recommendations have since been eliminated as mentioned in publications such as *Schools for Successful Communities: An Element of Smart Growth* (2004) publication and *A Primer for the Renovation, Rehabilitation of Older and Historic Schools* (2004). However, many Illinois school districts continue to reference outdated CEFPI acreage suggestions and in some cases have codified outdated CEFPI acreage suggestions into district policy. Furthermore, many Illinois school districts are mistakenly think there is a State minimum acreage standard.

State-Level Concerns Regarding School Acreage Standards

State Agencies Referring School Districts to Other States' Acreage Standards

¹⁴ Council of Educational Facility Planning International (CEFPI). See: <http://www.cefpi.org>

¹⁵ See South Carolina Code of Laws 59-23-250, Article 2 *School Building Codes, Specifications, And Inspections* <http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t59c023.htm>.

With Illinois having no official state standard on minimum school acreage, the State Board of Education refers inquiring school districts to reference minimum acreage standards in other states¹⁶. In some cases, other states being referenced have set large acreage requirements or suggestions for specific school types. By referring districts to such standards, it is possible that Illinois districts are being discouraged from considering small-acreage, in-town school sites encouraged to consider siting a school on a green grass location away from the community center¹⁷.

Capital Development Board's Policy of Reimbursement of Land Acquisition may not Encourage Compact, Community-Centered School Siting

The Illinois Capital Development Board allows reimbursement of land acquisition up to a certain acreage size, which if exceeded the state will not offer State reimbursement for purchasing land. These maximum funded acreages are described as follows:¹⁸

- five acres plus one acre for each additional 100 students for elementary schools
- fifteen acres plus one acre for each additional 100 students for junior high schools
- twenty acres plus one acre for each additional 100 students for high schools.

By not setting a minimum school acreage standard and setting a maximum school acreage for State reimbursement, it may seem that state policy encourages or permits small, community-centered school siting decisions. However, there is certainly room for Illinois administrative rules to be more explicit about benefits of small acreage school sites in walkable, community-centered locations and provide specific examples of successful school siting projects that have smaller acreages and community-centered locations.

Recommendations for Local Level Acreage Policy Concerns:

Develop Educational Materials and Programming for Districts, Municipalities

State agencies and non-profit organizations could put together materials or host workshops for school district officials and local municipal officials with goals of explaining benefits of community-centered school locations and encouraging flexibility in acreage standards so as to allow community-centered school sites that may have small acreages. While it may be impractical to suggest local municipalities and school districts to reduce or abolish minimum acreage standards, providing information about benefits of small acreage, in-town school locations could produce positive results.

¹⁶ From State Board of Education – please add link to administrative rules where this is listed:

The following information is offered by the Illinois State Board of Education as a guide for designing new school facilities or for designing the rehabilitation of existing school facilities. School boards are advised to employ an Illinois licensed architect or engineer experienced in the design of educational facilities. The information provided below is suggested only and is not to be considered required.

GENERAL

A. SITE

1. The necessity for larger sites is due to a number of trends such as: a) space for outdoor teaching areas, b) single-story structures, c) single-load corridors, d) campus and cluster-type layouts, e) the school-within-a-school concept of school organization, f) consolidation of attendance areas resulting in larger schools, more buses, and regulations and practices requiring on-site bus loading and unloading, g) parking space for the increasing number of teacher and pupil cars.
2. Recommended areas.
 - a. For elementary schools: a minimum of 5 acres plus with an additional acre for each 100 pupils of predicted ultimate enrollment. Thus an elementary school of 200 pupils would have a site of 7 acres.
 - b. For junior high schools: a minimum site of 20 acres plus an additional acre for each 100 pupils of predicted ultimate maximum enrollment. Thus a junior high school of 500 pupils would have a site of 25 acres.
 - c. For senior high schools: a minimum site of 30 acres plus an additional acre for each 100 pupils of predicted ultimate maximum enrollment. Thus a senior high school of 1000 pupils would have a site of 40 acres.

¹⁷ Conversations with Illinois State Board of Education staff.

¹⁸ Administrative Code, Title 71: Public Buildings, Facilities and Real Property, Chapter 1: Capital Development Board Chapter I: Capital Development Board, subchapter a: rules; part 40 standards for award of grants: school construction program; section 40.130 construction grants. See <http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/071/071000400001300R.html>

Encourage School Districts and Local Governments to do Collaborative Planning

Many local governments have or are in the process of developing comprehensive plans, which often specify land use planning policies, growth ordinances, and reference long-range population and economic projections. School districts and local governments should be encouraged to work in partnership to address respective and mutual goals. This might be done through helping municipalities and districts craft ordinances or district policies to ensure community-centered, compact school sites.

Recommendations for State-Level Acreage Policies and Procedures

Develop New Educational Materials and Community-Centered Schools Portal

One way to help promote sustainable school siting decisions would be to create an online portal of Illinois school facility projects that renovated or built new facilities on small-acreages in community-centered locations. Such a portal could serve as a reference tool for districts and school boards wrestling with decisions of where to locate a new school and would like to have reference materials of successfully renovated older schools and community-centered schools.

The portal should be housed in an appropriately central and highly visible location, possibly on the website of a major Illinois educational agency or professional non-profit organization. The database would include projects containing specific data – school acreage, costs of renovation versus new construction, project square footage, school amenities, dates of renovation, and information on process for public input on renovation and siting decisions - helpful to other districts looking for comprehensive data comparisons of schools that have small acreages as well as schools on larger acreages. More specifically, such a database should include comparative new school construction vs. renovation comprehensive cost analyses that factor in the costs associated with expansion of local utility infrastructure and services, impacts on transportation spending, and projections on how projects affect the ability for students to walk or bike to school. A few examples of small footprint schools in Illinois can be found in Appendix A.

Create State Incentives for Best Practices

Incentivizing smaller school acreages could also likely encourage better school siting decisions. This could be done by offering state assistance in the form of expedited or increased financial assistance or technical expertise to school districts that choose to remain in community-centered locations as near as possible to the neighborhoods they serve. Standards or administrative rules may need to be created or amended in order to clarify such incentives or new funding prioritization.

Amend the School Construction Law and Administrative Rules

Language could be added to the School Construction Law stating that in order to qualify for school construction/renovation funding or to increase a school's grant index and move up the state funding priority list, school districts must conduct a comprehensive feasibility study and report the findings to the Capital Development Board proving that their selected school site or facility improvement project will not increase busing demands and that the site chosen enables equal or greater opportunity for walking or biking to school¹⁹.

Challenge Eligibility of Land Purchases for State Reimbursement

Another option would be to eliminate the purchasing of new land as being an eligible expense for state reimbursement. Other states such as (insert example) exclude land purchases as eligible expenses for state reimbursement. Furthermore, Illinois school districts sometimes receive land donations from developers or other entities for school construction sites or have adequate land already for on-site expansions, negating the need for financial assistance in purchasing land.

¹⁹ Insert reference to which section of SCL where this could be done.

Develop Language, Guidance on How to Assess Land Donations

Developing administrative language or online education materials could help school districts more fully assess possible impacts the location of donated land could have on the community before accepting donated land. In many cases, accepting donated land can often result in locating a new school in an area that makes walking or biking to school impossible or unsafe for a greater number of students than in-town locations where schools were previously situated, as donate land is often cheaper if far from town and undeveloped. A full analysis of issues that donated land may present in the future may prevent unwanted consequences such as increased traffic congestion and sprawl. Several Illinois school districts have accepted donated land in floodplains or other sensitive areas, later leading to damage to the facility and safety hazards²⁰.

Further Study of School Siting Implications of Land-Cash Ordinances, Impact Fees

A number of communities in Illinois have created ordinances or impact fees for new residential development. While there many benefits associated with impact fees for development - helping communities finance classroom additions needed due an increasing number of new families with school-aged children and creating a revenue source for new municipal infrastructure and services – such impact fee policies often get coupled with a municipal standard created for acreage requirements for new schools. Often times, these acreage standards are rather large (see Appendix 3 and 4). Further examination is needed to understand how impact fees affect the possibility of walkable, in-town school location.

Successes

Several years ago, the National Trust for Historic Preservation approached the Council of Educational Facility Planning International Publications to see if they would update their recommended standards for school acreage requirements, seeing that the older and larger suggestions were favoring large schools relocated outside of community centers. As a result, CEFPI agreed and created a publication with updated standards entitled *Schools for Successful Communities: An Element of Smart Growth (2004)*. Also, the publication called [A Primer for the Renovation, Rehabilitation of Older and Historic Schools \(2004\)](#) has also proven to be a useful tool for those looking to work with older, space-confined school sites and facilities.

Capital Development Board, Illinois State Board of Education, and the Healthy Schools Campaign have also created a series of publications called *Build Smart* and the *Healthy, High-Performing School Guide*, materials that can be useful in assisting school districts with the process of planning and executing major school facility projects²¹. While these materials are very useful in pointing out ways to make school



Lindblom Math & Science Academy

School size: 7.5 acres
 Built: 1912
 Enrollment: 1,500 students
 Location: Chicago

Striking Features:

- Large, historic auditorium
- Renovated science labs
- Interior lighting retrofits
- Upgraded gymnasium



²⁰ Consider including reference to St. Charles story mentioned by Mark Bishop.

²¹ See Capital Development *Build Smart* materials <http://www.cdb.state.il.us/buildsmart.shtml>

structures more environmentally friendly, additions could be made to more specifically promote walkable school locations and smaller school footprints.

1. School Transportation Reimbursement Policies Unsustainable, may Discourage Community-Centered School Siting

The State requires by law that Public Act 93-0489 requires the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Capital Development Board (CDB) to file a comprehensive assessment report of the capital needs of all school districts to the General Assembly every two years²².

Current state policy on school transportation reimbursement states that school districts will provide free bus transportation for any student living within one and a half miles from their assigned school. Busing service must also be provided to students living within one and a half miles of the school who have proven to have a significant hazardous barrier to walking or biking to school. Hazard bus claims are verified after a school board submits a written petition, conducts a safety study with findings to the Department of Transportation on behalf of the student or students wish to have bus service (insert footnote).

The State reimburses regular pupil transportation at a maximum rate of 80% of allowable costs. Exact State pay-out is calculated on a prior-year basis, figured by calculating the difference between a district's allowable costs and the computed minimum local taxes, which is determined by subtracting a district's General State Aid equalized assessed valuation multiplied by a qualifying rate assigned to each district type. District types maintaining grades 9 to 12 use a qualifying rate of .05%. Elementary schools maintaining grades K to 8 use a qualifying rate of .06% and Unit districts maintaining grades K to 12 use a qualifying rate of .07%. Each school district must have a transportation fund tax rate of at least .12%. A penalty is assessed via a claim reduction if the district does not establish such a rate.

A maximum of 80% is reimbursed by the State for districts' allowable costs for transporting students with disabilities with no local revenue offsets. Vocational transportation is paid at 80% of allowable costs with no local revenue offsets²³.

The State's hazard route busing program operates on a prior-year reimbursement system. As such, the costs have already been borne and school districts have no incentive to transfer busing money to active transportation. Changing school transportation reimbursement programs into a grant program would force school districts to compete and active transportation could become a criterion in the grant decisions.

Concerns

Large Increase in State Transportation Reimbursement Receipts Fiscally Unsustainable

Appropriations for school transportation reimbursement have risen dramatically in recent years, going from \$234,915,900 in Fiscal Year 1994 to \$722,800,000 in Fiscal Year 2009, a 307.7% increase over fifteen years²⁴. At this rate, the State has been increasing expenditures approximately \$32.5 million per year, an average annual increase in State reimbursement of approximately 8.6%²⁵. Given the State's budget deficit, this substantial increase in transportation reimbursement expenses needs to be further

²² See <http://www.cdb.state.il.us/schools/SURVEY%20iNSTRUMENT%201.xls>

²³ See Article 29 of the Illinois School Code and subsequent administrative rules.

²⁴ Figures exclude expenditures for District 299, which receives transportation funding from federal block grants. <http://webprod1.isbe.net/ptcrs/inquiry/inqhome.asp>. And for parent guardian reimbursement, see http://www.isbe.net/budget/FY09_Budget_Book.pdf.

²⁵ Figures from Illinois State Board of Education's Division of Transportation.

examined. It may be difficult for the State to sustain projected transportation reimbursements at current levels in the future, which could be further aggravated if fuel costs rise significantly. Furthermore, transportation funding appropriated by the General Assembly has no upper restriction.

Transportation Reimbursements a Possible Disincentive for Community-Centered School Siting

While transportation reimbursement funding from the State helps communities pay for an invaluable service for students, such funding is often a disincentive for siting schools in a community-centered location that often reduce busing needs. With no appropriation cap, school districts are not encouraged to consider the impact of school siting decisions on transportation reimbursement request, knowing that additional busing expenses needed based on new location of a school facility will largely not have to be paid by the district. This may be a disincentive to community-centered school siting. Moreover, the State offers reimbursement to individuals whose children attend schools that do not provide transportation through the Parent/Guardian State Pupil Transportation Reimbursement Program²⁶. The State does not offer any incentives to families with children in private schools to engage in active transportation, only private vehicle transportation.

Increasing Consolidations Could Mean Increasing Bus and Vehicular Transportation Needs

Another concern is that a continuation of the current trend in increasing school consolidations could have an adverse impact on the amount of State school transportation reimbursement receipts. As has been documented, consolidation of schools typically leads to an increase in the geographical size of a school or unit district, and therefore a likely increase in motorized transportation for students now needing to travel farther. As the total number of miles driven by Illinois school buses increases, so will the resulting air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. An increase in busing and subsequent air pollution could aggravate chronic respiratory problems prevalent amongst Illinois' citizens²⁷ and conflict with goals to minimize contributions to climate change.

Recommendations

Create Incentives to Reduce Busing Mileage and Expenses

One opportunity to address the concerns of rising busing costs and bus mileage is to create incentives for districts to reduce busing. Such incentives could include:

- Expedited reimbursement requests for schools proving a reduction in total bus miles driven and total costs sought for reimbursement
- Allowing school districts to keep a percentage of the money saved if reimbursement requests and total mileage can be proven to be reduced from the year before
- Rewarding schools that develop carpooling, walking, and biking programs
- Preserving current and finding additional funding sources for Safe Routes to School
- Allowing districts to use hazard busing funding to eliminate barriers to walking and biking

Alter Transportation Reimbursement Formula to Reward Community-Centered Siting, Reduced Busing

Language could be added to Illinois State Board of Education's administrative policies to lower the maximum reimbursement percentages of schools that relocate school facilities to locations that create greater demand for school busing. Similarly, the funding formula could be changed to create a higher reimbursement rate or sustained reimbursement rate for districts that reorganize schools or create new

²⁶ See ISBE Parent/Guardian Pupil Transportation Program webpage at http://www.isbe.state.il.us/Funding/html/parent_guardian_transport.htm and administrative rules at <http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/120ark.pdf>. According to Illinois State Board of Education, the costs for Parent Guardian Transportation for 2007-08 were \$172,682,069.63, up from \$161,995,441.19 in 2006-07.

²⁷ See American Lung Association *Trends In Asthma Morbidity And Mortality, November 2007*.
http://www.lungusa.org/atf/cf/%7B7a8d42c2-fcca-4604-8ade-7f5d5e762256%7D/ASTHMA_TREND_NOV2007.PDF

schools that prove a decrease in busing mileage and greater opportunities for students to walk or bike to school.

Cap Transportation Reimbursements

Given economic and environmental concerns, it may be appropriate for the State to set a cap on total state expenditures on reimbursement costs for a future date. Placing a cap on total state expenditures could drive school districts to rethink relocations and make more thorough long-term feasibility studies when considering school consolidation or relocating the outsides of town.

Gather More Information

Studies may need to be conducted in order to assess the fiscal and environmental impacts of increasing school consolidation in Illinois. More specifically, studies providing the following information could be particularly useful:

- Impact of state reimbursement for school transportation on larger state budget concerns
- How state reimbursement dollars are required to be spent
- Studies showing how much money, bus mileage, and air pollution/GHG emissions are saved by school districts participating in alternative school transportation programs such as Safe Routes to School.
- Potential benefits of spending hazard busing funds on fixing local barriers to walking and biking
- Volume of pollution/GHG emissions generated by Illinois school buses, and compare increases in bus mileage to such emissions.
- Assessing the impacts of bus and school related vehicular emissions on state and regional air quality improvement goals.

Successes

Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs are helping schools reduce personal driving and reliance on busing. Such programs have potential to alleviate some of the burden on the State for transportation reimbursement. Paul Revere Intermediate School and Paul Revere Primary in Blue Island have instituted Walking School bus and Bicycle Train programs while eliminating parents' ability to drop off or pick up students on the school grounds, dramatically increasing the percentage of students who walk or bike to school and cutting down on personal trips and busing. Dr. ML King, Jr. Elementary in Urbana has instituted a comprehensive SRTS program with the help of Illinois Department of Transportation funds and local and statewide partners. King students have celebrated active transportation on their trips to school on International Walk to School Day, received bicycle giveaways and on-bike skills education from the Urbana Police Department and a local bike cooperative, as the City of Urbana ensured safer walking routes by installing new traffic signage and keeping sidewalks clear of snow. See Appendix 1 on SRTS.

Illinois' Safe Routes to School
In 2007, the Illinois Safe Routes to School program has awarded more than \$8.6 million to 62 communities for pedestrian and bike safety training, active transportation infrastructure, and educational programming. \$13.6 million will be awarded in 2008-2009.

2. School Construction & Renovation Reimbursement Policies Favor Large, Rapid Growth Districts

The State of Illinois developed a school construction grant program after the enactment of the School Construction Law (PA 90-548) in 1997, authorizing \$1.4 billion in funding for new school construction

and renovations on buildings found to be functionally over 100 years old or when converting non classroom space into classroom space. Governor Ryan's Illinois FIRST program authorized \$2.3 billion in funding in 1999²⁸. Then in 2003, the Illinois General Assembly authorized \$930 million²⁹.

Concerns:

Lack of State Funding for School Construction and Renovation

No major school construction and renovation financing programs have been authorized since 2003³⁰. Many school districts that were entitled for state funding prior to 2003 have yet to receive funding and are on a waiting list. Grant entitlement figures are determined after the Capital Development Board conducts an onsite survey assessing a number of criteria after receiving an application from a school district.

School Construction Law Language Favors Largest, Fastest Growing School Districts

While school construction and renovation funding for Illinois school districts was long overdue prior to the School Construction Program and well appreciated by school district recipients, funded projects have often included oversized schools that are not located in central areas of Illinois communities they serve, thus presenting environmental, public health, transportation, and financial challenges for the future. One concern is that current language used in the School Construction Law to prioritize the criteria by which districts are judged for eligibility gives funding preference to large and fast-growing districts while smaller districts - elementary districts with less than 200 students, high school districts with less than 200 students, and unit districts with less than 400 students - do not qualify at all³¹. Essentially, state grants are favoring larger schools and incentivizing sprawl. Small rural districts which often do not qualify for state funding or are ranked lower on the funding priority list due to enrollment numbers may be at risk for facility deterioration, thus making such facilities susceptible to failing Life Safety requirements or functional age requirements. Where this is the case, repairs may quickly become too expensive to fix and lead school districts to consolidate, tear down buildings, or abandon historic community-centered schools in favor of a newly constructed school elsewhere.

Furthermore, the School Construction Law language suggests that aging buildings should be replaced. This highlights a bias against aging buildings and does not encourage districts to fairly considering the value of renovating and maintaining existing buildings, possibly encouraging the demolition of aging of schools. Language in such a law should suggest a fair and equal consideration given to renovation of

²⁸ To see the Overview of the Illinois FIRST program, visit <http://www.ioc.state.il.us/FiscalFocus/article.cfm?ID=214>.

²⁹ Conversation with Illinois State Board of Education; see:

<http://www.ilga.gov/commission/cgfa2006/Upload/FY2003budgetsummary.pdf>

³⁰ According to State Board of Education, the School Construction Law (PA 090-548) December 1997 authorized \$1.4 billion; Governor Ryan's Illinois FIRST program authorized \$1.1 billion, and the General Assembly authorized \$930 million in FY 03.

³¹ In regards to ineligible small districts, see School Construction Law 105 ILCS 230/5-25, *Eligibility and Project Standards*, <http://law.justia.com/illinois/codes/chapter17/17801.html> and Section 5-30:

Sec. 5-30. *Priority of school construction projects.* The State Board of Education shall develop standards for the determination of priority needs concerning school construction projects based upon approved district facilities plans. Such standards shall call for prioritization based on the degree of need and project type in the following order:

- (1) Replacement or reconstruction of school buildings destroyed or damaged by flood, tornado, fire, earthquake, or other disasters, either man-made or produced by nature;
- 2) Projects designed to alleviate a shortage of classrooms due to population growth or to replace aging school buildings;
- (3) Projects resulting from interdistrict reorganization of school districts contingent on local referenda;
- (4) Replacement or reconstruction of school facilities determined to be severe and continuing health or life safety hazards;
- (5) Alterations necessary to provide accessibility for qualified individuals with disabilities; and
- (6) Other unique solutions to facility needs.

The State Board of Education may not make any material changes to the standards in effect on May 18, 2004, unless the State Board of Education is specifically authorized by law.

(Source: P.A. 93-679, eff. 6-30-04.)

older buildings and new construction. Case studies have many times proven renovations to be considerably less expensive than new construction.

Sporadic Nature of State Funding

Another concern is that current school construction funds are appropriated by the Illinois General Assembly rather than tied to a consistent revenue stream or other reliable source of funding that can be guaranteed year to year. As a result, this can lead to lulls in school renovation and construction funding. Such sporadic availability of funding can lead to a number of problems for school districts, particularly for poor districts and districts having fewer than the minimum enrollments required by the State, that struggle to raise local funds to pay for needed capital improvement projects. Furthermore, because the School Construction Grant program ended in 2003, dozens of entitled schools have been left stranded on a waiting list with hopes of one day being awarded the funding they were assured.

Recommendations:

Amend language in School Construction Law priority list

Even though funding has not been appropriated for the School Construction program in several years, the following are possible amendments that could be made to the School Construction Law to ensure more equitable protection of older and often community-centered schools when funding becomes available:

- Remove language that currently states “replace aging buildings” and substitute with language that suggests renovation of existing buildings (ex. “improve aging buildings”).³²
- Add conditions that projects for which school districts seek state funding for renovation or new construction cannot to exceed CDB maximum acreage standards.³³ At present, schools can go beyond CDB maximum school acreage standards, though are not eligible for reimbursement for acreage beyond the maximum.
- [others]

Modify Health Life Safety 10-Year Facility Review for Better Historic Preservation Oversight

The Health Life Safety review could be modified to require the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency to be consulted earlier in the process of the 10-Year Health Life Safety review than is currently required. While it is a success that current policies require IHPA be consulted during the Health Life Safety review process, such a consultation is often too late in the process for an older building to be considered for historic preservation/qualification for National Register³⁴.

Designate Consistent State Funding Program for School Building Renovations

Many states have dedicated a consistent revenue stream to enable an ongoing state funding available to schools needing to renovate older buildings. Some examples include the Maryland Aging Schools Program, which is funded through a real estate transfer tax, and a similar program in Massachusetts. Illinois could consider finding or enhancing existing revenue streams to ensure more stable funding for school renovations and capital improvements.

Successes:

In 2007, the General Assembly passed Public Act 095-0416 that requires all schools applying for state funding for school construction or renovation after July 1, 2007 to obtain and prove US Green Building Council’s LEED certification, Green Globe green building certification, or meet the green building criteria created by the Capital Development Board³⁵. As green building certification standards evolve to

³² See School Construction Law 105 ILCS 230, Sec. 5-30-2.

³³ Et al.

³⁴ See Illinois State Agency Historic Resources Preservation Act 20 ILCS 3410 (P.A. 86-707).

³⁵ See Illinois Public Act 095-0416 - <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0416&GA=095>

weight facility location, walkability, historic structures and building renovations, school districts will be driven to give greater consideration about where schools are located in order to obtain required certification. Such a policy could put Illinois at the forefront of sustainable school development policy by indirectly promoting walkable and efficient school facility locations due to advancing green certification standards.

3. Inadequate School Maintenance Resources and Policies May Deter Upkeep of Older, Community-Centered Schools

Illinois has legislation enabling the State Board of Education to provide maintenance grants to school districts, though has not awarded such maintenance grant funding in several years.³⁶ Currently, there are no state funds allocated specifically to maintenance funding. The responsibility for providing maintenance funding is on the school district. Illinois law requires school districts to dedicate a revenue stream to pay for school maintenance.

Concerns:

Illinois Historic Preservation Agency Consultation Occurs too Late in Health Life Safety Review

The Illinois State Agency Historic Preservation Act (P.A. 86-707) requires that state funding awarded to a capital improvement project cannot compromise the historic integrity of historic structures. This act gives the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency the authority to review capital projects before state funding is awarded. While it is good that historic preservation groups are consulted about capital improvement projects before full approval, too often the projects seeking state funding are already too far along in the process of the project to make historic preservation assessments meaningful.

School Construction Law (105 ILCS 230/5-1) May Have Funding Bias Against Older School Facilities

As mentioned in the previous section, language in the School Construction Law Section 5.30 provides a list of prioritized circumstances for which the state will offer capital reimbursement funding.

Sec. 5-30. Priority of school construction projects. The State Board of Education shall develop standards for the determination of priority needs concerning school construction projects based upon approved district facility plans. Such standards shall call for prioritization based on the degree of need and project type in the following order:

- 1) Replacement or reconstruction of school buildings destroyed or damaged by flood, tornado, fire, earthquake, or other disasters, either man-made or produced by nature;
- 2) Projects designed to alleviate a shortage of classrooms due to population growth or to replace aging school buildings;
- 3) Projects resulting from interdistrict reorganization of school districts contingent on local referenda;
- 4) Replacement or reconstruction of school facilities determined to be severe and continuing health or life safety hazards;
- (5) Alterations necessary to provide accessibility for qualified individuals with disabilities; and
- (6) Other unique solutions to facility needs.

According to the State Board of Education, funding has yet to be issued for reasons beyond the top two criteria. This language, particularly in Section 5-30.2 and Section 5-30.4, does not seem to encourage renovation, suggesting aging buildings should be torn down and replaced³⁷.

Recommendations:

Amend School Construction Law

Language in the School Construction Law must be amended so as not to suggest “replacing aging schools,” but rather should suggest renovation of older schools.

³⁶ See 105 ILCS 230/5-100 Sec. 5-100 - *School maintenance project grants*.

³⁷ See Illinois Public Act 95-0416.

State Should Create and Maintain Centralized, Publically-Accessible Database of School Facility Maintenance Needs

Creating an historic preservation assessment as well as a school maintenance database would be helpful, giving the General Assembly a better sense of the types and costs of maintenance requests. The database could be created after compiling data collected using the capital needs surveys that is already taken. Once such a database is created, decisions could be made about time tables that could enable the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency to more easily address historical integrity suggestions before decisions are made that compromise the integrity of historic structures. States such as Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Maine, and Washington all have central databases that are used to house information about facility conditions and maintenance needs³⁸.

Create Schools Maintenance Fund

Maintenance funding should be reliable and available each year. Creating a revolving fund for maintenance projects could be helpful. Possible funding sources could come from a state capital bill, federal economic stimulus funds, or revenue streams based off reliable fee collections already taking place in Illinois.

Require Percentage of School Budgets Be Spent on Facility Maintenance

While local maintenance funding is required in some fashion in Illinois, other states require that a certain amount of total school district budgets be devoted to facility maintenance spending³⁹.

Need for Information:

Health Life Safety assessment decisions should be studied to see what impacts these requirements have – if any - on facility maintenance decisions. In particular, Health Life Safety assessment decisions should be reviewed to see if such requirements lead schools to favor new construction or to neglect older facilities in hopes of receiving Health Life Safety funds⁴⁰.

Successes:

Illinois issued a maintenance funding program in 2003 where \$50,000 matching grants were offered by the State. While this was helpful, state funding has since ceased for school maintenance. The state does require that all districts have in place a local revenue stream for maintenance spending⁴¹.

³⁸ See e-mail from Renee Kuhlman (Jan 19): Arizona State Legislature: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us>; Connecticut: <http://www.state.ct.us.sde/dgm/sfu/reports.htm>; Florida FISH program: <http://www.firn.edu/doe/edfacil/fish/index.htm> and Department of Education Facility Planning Survey: <http://www.fldoe.org/edfacil/planningsurvey/excel/AverageAgeNSFJuly2008.xls>; Hawaii State Legislature: <http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov>; Maine: <http://janus.state.me.us/legis/statutes/20-A/title20-Asec15917.html>; Washington: <http://www.leg.wa.gov/WAC/index.cfm?section=180-27-405&fuseaction=section>.

³⁹ To view maintenance policies of other states, see *State Policies for School Construction and Renovation: Seen Through a Community Preservation Lens*, National Trust for Historic Preservation, May 2003. Massachusetts has a School Building Assistance Program and requires school districts to spend at least half of their maintenance budgets each fiscal year; Maine has created a School Revolving Renovation Fund intended to reduce deferred maintenance concerns and assist districts with emergency repairs. Maine requires local school boards establish capital improvement programs that enable two percent of current replacement value be spent on capital renewals; school districts are also required to establish facility operation and maintenance plans for school buildings, which are reported to the Department of Education.

⁴⁰ See Illinois Administrative Code 180, Title 23: Education And Cultural Resources, Subtitle A: Education, Chapter I: State Board Of Education, Subchapter D: Construction And Building Maintenance, Part 180 -Health/Life Safety Code For Public Schools. <http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/180ARK.pdf>.

⁴¹ **Insert administrative rules from ISBE.**

4. Green Building Standards and Requirements do not Adequately Ensure Community-Centered School Siting

The LEED Green Building Rating System is flexible, not a ‘one-sized fits all’ approach. There are a few prerequisites all projects must meet, and beyond that project teams can choose which credits to pursue based on their environmental and performance goals as long as they meet the minimum threshold for certification. For example, points can be awarded for recycled construction materials, passive solar design, and installing features such as bike racks and showers, automatic lighting sensors, and green infrastructure to reduce stormwater run-off and water pollution.

Several types of LEED building standards have been tailored to specific types of buildings⁴². Most pertinent is the LEED for Schools rating system⁴³, which is specifically designed to address the characteristics of the design and construction of K-12 schools, though can also be used for other types of facilities such as university educational buildings, K-12 athletic facilities, or interpretive centers. LEED for Schools is based on LEED for New Construction, and addresses issues such as classroom acoustics, master planning, mold prevention, and environmental site assessment. While it is a success that LEED for Schools has added credits for school siting that affords access to public transit, dense development and community connectivity, bike racks, and other community-centered school features, these credits are not required. Thus it may still be feasible for schools to achieve LEED for Schools certification without adequately addressing school location and walkability.

While this is certainly an environmental success in many ways, some LEED certified schools are located in places that do not accommodate safe walking or biking to school, potentially eliminating the benefits that are lost due to vehicular transportation emissions which may increase if a school moves from a walkable setting to a location far from residences. Luckily, LEED green building standards are currently being updated, and LEED 2009 weighs point values in specific areas, including site location, walkability, and building renovation.

The Energy Efficient School Construction Act, Public Act 095-0416, requires that Illinois schools applying for state construction grants after July 1, 2007 must obtain LEED Silver certification, Green Globes, or meet the green building standards of the Capital Development Board and its Green Building Advisory Committee⁴⁴. Because LEED standards will soon give additional weight for walkable building locations and building renovation, schools seeking state funding will need to follow suit and hopefully choose to locate in locations more conducive to the stewardship of natural, financial, and community health resources.

Recommendations:

Develop Pilot Program to see if LEED for Schools Impacts LEED Ratings, School Siting

US Green Building Council’s Chicago and Central Illinois chapters are interested in developing a pilot project to assess how the new LEED for Schools certification program affects overall LEED ratings and how the new standards impact school siting decisions. A partnership between USGBC Chicago and Central Illinois chapters and Illinois education agencies could be helpful in determining the effectiveness of the program and implications on new state requirements for schools seeking state reimbursements for capital improvements.

⁴² See all LEED Rating Systems at <http://www.usgbc.org/>.

⁴³ See the Building Green Schools web page at http://www.buildgreenschools.org/documents/leed-s_ratingsystem.pdf.

⁴⁴ See Public Act 95-0416, and <http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/151ark.pdf> Section 151.30 f.

Add Additional Requirements to Current LEED Requirements for Illinois Schools to Ensure Walkable, Community-Centered School Siting

States and local USGBC chapters have the authority to adopt more stringent rules on green building if voted on. It is the wish the Illinois USGBC chapters adopt tougher standards than those required in Public Act 95-0416. With this premise, Healthy Schools Campaign has developed a set of recommendations it believes the US Green Building Council should adopt to strengthen green building requirements stated in Public Act 095-0416 to ensure LEED certified schools are located in safe, walkable locations (see Appendix 9 for more detail). These recommendations include a suggestion that: the US Green Building Council not award credits for rebuilding schools on brownfield sites in fear that protection of children from exposure to latent toxins may not be guaranteed by developing on these sites; and that two of the following three provisions be required: 1) school must be located within 0.5 miles of public transportation, 2) safe infrastructure in place around the school to encourage non-vehicular transportation to and from school, and 3) buses and school fleets be retrofitted with particulate and emissions capturing devices to minimize children's exposure to harmful pollutants that can trigger negative respiratory responses.

Current administrative rules set specific requirements for the year of the respective green building standards. For example, LEED standards beyond those set in 2008 cannot be applied to school projects, and Green Globes standards have to be the 2007 version of the standards in order to be recognized for compliance⁴⁵.

B. Lack of Coordinated Planning

1. Lacking Interaction Between School Districts and Local Government

Concerns:

School districts are exempt from complying with local government policies

Interaction between school districts and local government varies greatly in Illinois. In many cases, school district boundaries overlap multiple municipal and township boundaries, making it impractical to attempt to comply with the ordinances of each governing entity. School districts are not required by Illinois law to consult with local governing about where a school should be located⁴⁶. The decision of whether or not to work closely with municipal government in school siting decisions is thus largely determined by school boards. Because school districts are not by law required to consult with local governing about where a school should be located, school boards and officials may feel uncomfortable or unclear as to how to work closely with local governments when determining what to do with an existing school building or where to build a new school.

Lacking or Untimely Interactions between School Districts and Local Government

⁴⁵ Each application submitted on or after July 1, 2007, shall also include information demonstrating that the project conforms to the "green building" requirements of Section 5-40 of the School Construction Law [105 ILCS 230/5-40]. Conformance may be demonstrated by providing evidence of: 1) *certification under the United States Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Green Building Rating System* [105 ILCS 230/5-40] posted at www.usgbc.org (2008; no later editions or revisions are incorporated); or 2) *a rating under the Green Building Initiative's Green Globes Green Building Rating System* [105 ILCS 230/5-40] posted at www.thegbi.org/commercial/about-green-globes/rating-and-evaluation-process.asp (2007; no later editions or revisions are incorporated); or 3) compliance with green building standards established by the Illinois Capital Development Board, when codified by that agency in its rules in Title 71 of the Illinois Administrative Code. <http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/151ark.pdf>

(Source: Amended at 32 Ill. Reg. 7410, effective April 22, 2008)

⁴⁶ School districts are required to ensure that sites meet certain criteria as stated in <http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/071/071000400001300R.html>.

There are multiple government entities at the local level. Each has a unique role and responsibility with a number of overlapping boundaries and policies. A lack of or untimely interaction between school districts and local government is a common concern in Illinois. Many municipalities have in place a planning department and comprehensive planning ordinances. School districts and divisions of local government make decisions independently that can impact each other. For example, a school district moving forward with relocating a school facility to a new green grass site within a given municipality's boundaries with little or late notice to the city or village officials may lead to a lack of public awareness of the additional costs that will be needed to expand municipal utilities and city services for a new school before a referendum is brought to the community. Conversely, the creation by a local government of a TIF district would have consequences for the taxing base of the school district where the TIF district is to be located. The lack of coordination on both sides of the planning process can lead to ill relations between the school district and the local community, creating future impediments in circumstances when such collaboration could be helpful.

State Policies Do Not Encourage Joint Use of School Facilities

The Capital Development Board policy not extend funding eligibility to school facility projects intended for joint use with the local community, instead limiting funding to spaces solely used for education of the district's students. Such funding policies may have an affect of discouraging joint use of facilities.

Recommendations:

Build on Current State Laws and Administrative Language to Promote Collaborative Planning on Siting

The framework of interaction between school boards and local governments as illustrated in Public Act 094-0225 or other similar statutes could be modified or expanded to specifically encourage school districts and local governments to interact during the school facility planning process. Modifying the language to suggest that school districts notify local governments might also be appropriate. Such language could follow existing language that directs the process used when school districts and local government interact to arrange school district fire inspections, involving a process in which information is reported to and distributed by regional offices of education. It seems especially beneficial for school districts and local governments to consult each other in cases where school districts and local governments would be expecting services or in cases of disputed policies and ordinances. These types of suggestions are mentioned in publications such as the *Build Smart* materials posted on the Capital Development Board website⁴⁷. For instance, such consultation only seems natural instances where a school district is seeking expanded utilities, a municipality has interest in joint use of school facilities for a community service or program, or when municipal land use zoning ordinances are applicable to property owned by a school district.

Offer Assistance to Municipalities and School Districts on How to Adopt Policy Language to Guide and Encourage Collaborative Planning

State agencies and educational organizations, in partnership with a School Siting Task Force or other group of interested stakeholders, could work together to help school districts adopt district policies that encourage collaborative planning. The Illinois Association of School Boards already has in place a process of working with school boards to develop district policies, IASB could be a key leader in such efforts. Furthermore, state agencies or a task force could work with municipalities to adopt ordinances to better guide interaction and collaborative planning with school districts that serve their communities.

⁴⁷ See Capital Development Board *Build Smart*, Chapter 3
<http://www.cdb.state.il.us/schools/Chapter3.pdf>.

Change Capital Development Board Funding Policy on Jointly Used Facilities

Funding for school facilities that allow for joint use of facilities should be made eligible for state reimbursement. This would involve changing Capital Development Board's policy language⁴⁸.

Require Local Collaboration between Districts and Municipalities to Promote Sustainable School Siting

Requiring school districts and local government to interact during a school facility planning process in order to communicate about specific sustainability concerns could be another possibility to consider. For example, language could be inserted into the school code that requires school districts to conduct studies on how school relocation would affect traffic patterns, congestion, and other particular environmental concerns of the municipality and local community and report the findings to the Regional Office of Education (examples: protection of prime farmland, air quality, or stormwater). Because communications between school districts and municipalities about school construction and renovation projects already pass through ROE offices, such a requirement might not be too difficult. A school siting task force or the Green Governments Coordinating Council could then receive the information reported to ROE offices and likewise share best practices with ROE offices for dissemination to school districts.

Successes:

Existing statutes guiding communication between school districts and local government

Illinois has existing statutory language that guides a process in which municipalities, a fire protection district, or county government in the case of unincorporated areas, can request notification of school district plans for construction or alteration of a public school facility within that entity's jurisdiction. One example can be found seen in Public Act 094-0225.⁴⁹ Such language could be useful to reference as a starting point for specifying ways school districts and local governments could collaborate on issues of school facility planning.

Joint Use of Facilities

In a number of Illinois communities and school districts, school districts and local governments are working together to ensure joint use of school facilities by the school and members of the community. Joint use of facilities has proven to be financially appealing in many cases, ensuring that facilities are used to greater capacity and paid for by multiple parties rather than one. Such joint uses often include technology centers, early childcare centers, libraries, spaces for community or club meetings, and physical fitness facilities. These joint uses may lay the foundation for creative use of school facilities in the future, should changing enrollment or other financial circumstances lead to deactivation of the building for school purposes. Furthermore, research shows that student education performance can be enhanced by joint use facilities and school-community programs (Martin, Melaville, and Shaw).⁵⁰

Peoria School District 150

A number of school districts have championed significant involvement of the public and local community in school facility and location decisions. Many of these successes have involved community charrettes inviting public input about school siting and facility development issues. For example, Peoria School District 150 recently conducted a charrette, leading the district to decide that new schools would become birth-to-eighth grade facilities, offering programs and facilities that make the schools community-center [insert more info – contact Dave Ryon or Dr. Judy Helms or Best Practices Inc.].

⁴⁸ Insert to administrative rules or legislation with language stating that projects funded are intended for those explicitly tied to classroom space, not jointly used facilities.

⁴⁹ See Public Act 094-0225 - <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=094-0225&GA=094>

⁵⁰ Blank, Martin J., Atelia Melaville, and Bela P. Shah, Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools. (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Coalition for Community Schools, 2003)

2. Lacking Public Input on School Siting Decisions

The degree of public input can be an important determining factor in a district's decision of whether to renovate or relocate and where to relocate if new construction is the chosen option. State law permits the public to submit comment to school boards, meaning that the public can comment on district decision making processes regarding school siting and renovate vs. relocate decisions⁵¹.

Concerns:

School boards sometimes are restricting public input on school siting

A concern raised in many communities is that school boards and district officials are not accepting adequate input from the community when making decisions about capital improvement and school location. In many cases, school facility decisions are made quickly and with inadequate process for gauging public sentiment or presenting information to parents and residents. Sometimes, consultants hired by school boards to assess the costs of renovation and new construction are selected with the understanding to promote new construction over renovation. As a result, the consultant or architect presents findings that favor new construction and may not fairly represent the costs of renovating an existing structure or fail to recognize the benefits of keeping existing facilities. Overall, the authority of school boards and district officials can limit public input, as authoritative discretion allows boards and superintendents to limit public comment during open meetings and state law permits closed meetings⁵².

Public fails to comment on school siting where input opportunities exist

In other instances, the public fails to take advantage of given opportunities to voice their thoughts on school siting decisions. This, too, results in decisions that may not reflect consensus of the community as a result of missed opportunities for comment.

Recommendations:

Add Data Collection Items on Public Input to the List of Capital Needs Assessment Survey

While the Open Meetings Act already ensures that the public is guaranteed the right to information discussed and presented at school board meetings and offered the opportunity to comment, more could be done to ensure greater community participation on school siting decisions. The Capital Needs Assessment Survey could be modified to provide space where descriptions of efforts to encourage public input in the school facility decision could be documented or by adding check boxes for things like building age.

Create state incentives for public involvement and collaborative planning with local government

A state incentive could be created that gives a higher grant index to schools seeking state reimbursement funding for capital improvement projects that can prove they have provided at least __ (period of time, number of public input sessions, etc) for public involvement in the project. Proof of public input in the form of organized public forums could also be included in formulas dictating transportation funding.

Develop online resources on public input process

Creating a simple, step-by-step guide on how to include public input could be created and posted online in a highly visible location could be very helpful (see draft Ten Step Guide for Better Public Input in Appendix 11).

Successes:

⁵¹ IASB Policy Reference Manual Section 2:230.

⁵² IASB Policy Reference Manual Section 2: School Boards. Also see School Code 105 ILCS 5/Article 10 - *School Boards*.



Longfellow School, Rock Island
Built 1934
Addition added to accommodate 150
additional students

Rock Island – Milan School District 41

One example is Rock Island-Milan School District, which recently embarked on a district wide effort to renovate two historic, community-centered schools and add an addition to Longfellow School to accommodate 150 additional students. Although this success story did not initially begin as a result of the school board inviting public participation, the district today has made great efforts to work the local community. In 2004, the school board conducted a study that determined the district had too many schools, and the school board began collecting data about which schools to tear down. A local community group wanted to make sure that walkability was included in the data, in favor of protecting the historic schools from being torn down. The community groups co-hosted public forums throughout the city to get public input on renovation and why the historic schools should be preserved.

Another example of successful public input was in the case of Urbana District 116. After a defeated referendum to consolidate, a later referendum was developed to instead raise funds for renovating the existing elementary schools. Members of the local community pushed to make this happen, and participated significantly by helping determining where students could be housed offsite during a one year renovation of Leal Elementary, helping clear out classrooms before remodeling, voicing which elements of the historic school should be kept and protected, and committing to stay in the district during the year of renovation when students were housed at an abandoned Jewel grocery store. The strong public participation led to greater local ownership of district school decisions and civic pride. Today, the district works closely with the community on capital improvement and school location decisions.

The 2004 publication entitled *Hard Lessons: the Causes and Consequences of the Michigan School Boom* highlights a striking comparison of two northern Michigan communities distinguished by the level of public participation. The Harbor Springs school board spent one year encouraging public comment on whether to keep the historic, community-centered school or whether to build new. After organizing more than 70 public input sessions and seeing strong community participation, the district decided to renovate the eighty-eight year-old high school and build a new middle school downtown. On the contrast, in 1999 nearby Charlevoix school district decided its schools needed facility upgrades and organized two public sessions, the school board doing much of its work in closed meetings. When the district decided to abandon the historic high school and build a new school on a 74-acre site far from town, the community was angered and developed resentment towards the school district that lingered long thereafter, even leading to lawsuits about the eventual location of the new school⁵³. This stark contrast highlights the value of public input and the long term effects that ensue from the level of public involvement permitted by the district.

C. Lack of Accurate Data

1. Feasibility Studies of Different Facility Options not Comprehensive

Concerns:

Feasibility Studies Incomplete and Fail to Account for Externalities

⁵³ *Hard Lessons: Causes and Consequences of Michigan's School Boom*. Michigan Land Institute, 2004.

Often times, when a district is facility planning decisions, different options are weighed based on cost comparisons. It is common for these cost comparisons to not incorporate the costs of utility expansion to serve a new school, escalating costs to transport students, the costs of losing the ability for students to safely walk or bike to school and burdens on families or students that may then have to drive to and from school, the costs of converting the older facility, and the costs associated with possible sprawl and degraded air quality based on a new and distant location for a school. Without these costs and full information, voters presented with referenda may not be able to make sound siting and facility improvement decisions. Furthermore, as more communities are concerned about contributions to climate change, feasibility studies would ideally also assess the impacts of various facility decisions and siting locations on contributions to climate change.

Recommendations:

Develop Online Evaluation Tool to Promote Comprehensive Feasibility Studies

Developing a thorough online evaluation tool for school districts to access that enables a consistent measure for calculation of comprehensive total costs of new construction and renovation may be welcomed by districts trying to create full cost decisions and by advocates looking for tools to assess the quality of the comparisons the district is presenting to them. Such a tool should be centrally located online for greatest possible access and visibility.

Lovington School District

Having an older, historic high school and middle school in need of repairs, Lovington Consolidated Unit School 303 in Lovington, Illinois voted down a referendum to consolidate build a new school on the basis of cost and the length of time students would have to spend riding buses to schools. Currently, about two-thirds of middle and high school students walk or bike to this community-centered rural school.

Successes:

Illinois does not set standards on price ratios between renovation and new construction as a means to guide such decisions, unlike some states which have a 60% rule, which requires that if renovation costs 60% of new construction, the policy is to do new construction.

ii. Non-Policy Challenges for Community-Centered Schools

A. Changing Population and Demographics

1. Consolidation & Reorganization of Schools Puts Pressure on Districts to Relocate Schools

As described in the Why Schools Face School Siting Decisions sections, consolidation and reorganization of schools and districts occur for a number of reasons, many of which are difficult to avoid. Still, the externalities of school consolidation and reorganization should be further examined in light of environmental, financial, and health concerns.

Concerns:

Possible Impacts of Consolidation on School Transportation Demands, Walkability

While consolidating or reorganizing school districts and school facilities to better serve school district's needs is often a reasonable and sometimes necessary solution, there may potentially burdensome impacts created by consolidation decisions that need to be better understood. Few if any studies have been conducted in Illinois to investigate the impacts of school and district consolidation on air pollution, district

air quality, ability of students to safely walk or bike to school, or on bus mileage. Though locally controlled, school consolidation decisions may have numerous implications for Illinois taxpayers when state funds are used to support school consolidations from Health Life Safety funds or if transportation costs and subsequent reimbursement requests increase.

Implications for School Demolition

See section on demolition on page 29.

Recommendations:

Encourage Greater Long Range Planning

State policies should encourage districts to rely on population projections that are further into the future (example: ten-year projections or more) when making facility planning decisions. Basing consolidation decisions on short-term projections often fail to provide the appropriate capacity for districts, which can cause costly consequences on district finances. Furthermore, thorough studies examining a multitude of issues should be conducted, presented, and referenced before proceeding with consolidation initiatives. Language could be added to *BuildSmart* documents and in administrative rules to reflect these suggestions. Cooperating with comprehensive plans developed by local municipalities or county governments could be one way of basing consolidation decisions on data already collected and being used by local governments.

Require Districts to Conduct a Feasibility Study Before Consolidating

At present, the Illinois State Board of Education has developed small grants for districts looking to conduct consolidation feasibility studies. While many districts have applied for such grants and are doing feasibility studies, one consideration would be to require feasibility studies to be conducted before submitting a referendum on consolidation. Such feasibility studies would be submitted to an appropriate state agency such as the Illinois State Board of Education for review. The receiving state agency could then decide whether the findings deem the consolidation appropriate for state funding if new construction is being sought as a result of consolidating with a lens of

Supplement environmental impact assessment process

When state funds are sought for capital improvement projects, the environmental impact statements that are now required by law and already assess impacts on wetlands could be expanded to include an assessment of how consolidation decisions could affect air quality and emissions due to changes in transportation patterns as well as impacts on sprawl and loss of prime farmland due to new school construction or campus expansion⁵⁴.

Modify Illinois State Board of Education language for feasibility study criteria

The Illinois State Board of Education has a grant program for districts wanting to conduct feasibility studies to determine whether or not to consolidate schools or the district with other districts. Although the feasibility data points the State Board include impacts on transportation, the wording could be modified to ask for comparisons of impact of consolidation on transportation spending due to changes in mileage and projected fuel costs and impact on the percentage of students able to walk or bike to school.

Successes:

⁵⁴ See Farmland Preservation Act [505 ILCS 75], Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 [20 ILCS 830], and Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 58.15]. Some counties such as Kane and DeKalb have their own farmland protection programs.

A number of schools have chosen not to consolidate on the basis of cost, school transportation concerns, changes in local property values due to school changes, and community attachment to existing school facilities that might be compromised after consolidating.

Lovington CUSD 303

Lovington Consolidated Unit School District 303 has an elementary, middle, and high school located in Lovington, a small town with a population of approximately 1,200 people southeast of Decatur. The entire town circles around the school, which is the largest employer in the community, employing twice as many people as all the businesses in town combined. Lovington schools offer many programs to the community – meals on wheels, boys and girl scout meetings, little league, sports, breakfast programs, kids play on the playground on weekends. A traffic study once conducted at the school campus showed that 70% of the traffic in town was school-related. The district has about 340 students and roughly two out of three walk to school each day. Walking to school wouldn't be possible had the school relocated. The district only uses four buses and three full bus routes.

Lovington High School is 101 years old. Hundreds of alumni photos line the interior hallways. The high school had two additions put on 87 years ago; 55 years ago, a gym was added. In 2000, the slate roof was replaced. The elementary school behind the high school was built in 1969 on the same property. The high school was the first building in town to have electricity and running water and the school was heated with fireplaces.

In 2004, the community looked at deactivating the high school, saying the building was too old and that a larger building for the district was needed to benefit the students. The community went to vote on a referendum, and the referendum was voted down 4 to 1. According to current superintendent Roy Smith, "It said to me the importance of the school to the community. You show me a town where the school is torn down and town remains – the school makes all the difference. My goal is to save my school and save my district."

In 2006, the district's ten-year Life Safety assessment on the facilities was conducted, and one of the architects said that \$6 million dollars would be needed to bring the building into shape. The superintendent said, "You're fired. There's no way this building can need \$6 million in repairs. Another architect was brought in for a second opinion, saying that \$33,000 would be needed to necessary repairs. We did get an estimate to replace the building, saying it would take \$7 million to build something else on the same property. We had the space. I've got about a \$2.8 million dollar per year budget. Takes a long time to save \$7 million on a \$2.8 million/yr budget and we're the third largest taxed district in the state."

At a March 2007 meeting with various state agencies and legislators, the district was told that because it had less than 400 students in the district, it would not be eligible for capital funding. Afterwards, the district began working with Landmarks Illinois.

In 2008, \$10,000 was spent by the district to see if consolidating the district with three nearby districts would be feasible. In the end, the four districts all voted this proposal down. It was determined that students would have to ride buses for 90 minutes a day if the districts consolidated.

B. Public Awareness of Significance of School Siting is Inadequate

1. Lacking Awareness and Availability of Educational Materials on Sustainable School Siting

Low-density development patterns and school designs have been common for more than a generation, so common that many do not recognize negative environmental impacts of schools or other structures constructed in locations that only can be accessed by vehicle. Thus, the significance of walkable location is still an emerging issue that has yet to truly transform policy. A good starting point would be to better educate Illinois school district personnel and the public about these issues.

Concerns:

Sustainable School Siting Issues are not Widely Understood

Many are not aware of the challenges posed by school location. There is also a general lack of awareness of resources already available that can assist school districts in assessing the value of existing school facilities and siting facilities in walkable, community-centered locations. More state-specific data and public information is needed to help school districts realize the environmental, human health, and economic impacts of abandoning community-centered schools in favor of schools located out of town or in unwalkable locations, as data about these impacts are not being collected nor being studied at this time.

Current Information and Resources are Widely Dispersed and Often Difficult to Locate

Materials already developed by state agencies and advocacy groups are often hard to find. Materials such as *Build Smart* and the *Healthy, High-Performing Schools* guide could be located in more visible locations on state agency websites to show that sustainable school facility issues are prioritized. Also, Illinois seems to have no central portal for sustainable school siting information.

Recommendations:

Collect Data on School Siting Variables

In order to more fully understand the impacts of school siting decisions, statewide data needs to be collected and studies conducted. Adding items such as school acreage, proximity to residential centers, school building age, and presence of sidewalks and safe non-vehicular transportation routes connecting schools and nearby neighborhoods to the lists and facility surveys currently used by the State when conducting Health Life Safety Reviews, Capital Needs survey, or the CDB survey could allow better analysis of how walkable Illinois schools. If amending the State lists is not feasible, statewide surveys could possibly be done by non-profit organizations or voluntarily requested by state agencies such as the Illinois State Board of Education or Capital Development Board. Once collected, this information could be analyzed by a task force or group of interested stakeholders, helping to inform policy changes or public advocacy campaigns to make more in Illinois aware of how walkable Illinois schools currently are.

Develop Partnerships

Greater collaboration between educational advocacy groups, children's health organizations, historic preservation groups, planning agencies and advocates, and Illinois education agencies and professional organizations could be very productive for school siting initiatives. For example, collaborative efforts to produce and distribute educational materials could spare duplication of the work and ease burdens on Illinois State Board of Education and other education organizations that are currently unable to devote staff time to collect data and educate the public about school siting. Creating a school siting task force could also be helpful.

Make School Sprawl a Publicized State Level Issue and Educational Resources Easier to Locate

A public information campaign needs to be developed on the issue of school-initiated sprawl. Broad stakeholder support and institutional buy-in are critical to making such a campaign successful. Political leaders could do much to publicize the realities of school-initiated sprawl and making suggestions to minimize state policies that encourage school-initiated sprawl. Furthermore, educational resources for school districts need to be placed prominently on websites and centrally located for greater exposure.

Successes

Numerous Illinois school districts have worked to educate parents, families, and school officials about the benefits of community-centered school locations, walkability, and the values of keeping and maintaining older neighborhood schools, many of which have been previously described. The Safe Routes to School program provides funding and assistance for education efforts such as the development of charettes and providing workshops on active school transportation. See Appendix 8 for a table of organizations and useful online educational resources currently available.

C. Local Determination to Teardown Older Schools, Build New

In today's age of rapid technological advancement, older buildings are often perceived as unable to adapt to technological needs of our time. While there are numerous examples of older, community-centered school facilities that have been successfully upgraded with modern technological installments, the broader perception has yet to be fully overcome. Sadly, the insistence that older schools cannot perform and adapt has sometimes lead Illinois districts to tear down the school. Sometimes a new school is built atop the site of the former school, other times the facility is relocated.

Concerns:

Demolition of Historic, Community-Centered Schools Often Not a Last Resort

As is the case in many states, a number of historic schools in Illinois situated in walkable neighborhoods have been torn down. A variety of circumstances lead to such decisions, usually when a building is in a severe state of disrepair; however, sometimes older buildings with potential for successful renovations have been torn down. Unfortunately, little information is collected and publicized about school teardowns.

Before older and historic school buildings are torn down, it is critical that school districts and those involved with such decisions take into account the broader values such facilities possess, many of which are frequently overlooked. Historic school buildings are not only important for sentimental reasons and community memories - significant historical events held in the school building, striking architectural features, prominent alumni - but for economic, social, and environmental reasons. For example, deterioration of surrounding neighborhoods and property values, demolition and waste disposal costs, and possibilities for creative reuse of an existing building. Every constructed building has embodied energy - every piece of a constructed building requires significant energy inputs. Once torn down, embodied energy is lost. Tearing down an existing building would likely result in a net energy savings, even if the motivation for teardown is to replace the building with an energy efficient new building. Landfilling the construction debris must also be taken into account as it becomes more expensive to create new landfills.

Recommendations:

Collect Data about School Teardowns

While school demolition is ultimately a local district issue, there are actions Illinois can take to better understand the process and implications of school teardowns. One suggestion would be to conduct a survey to find the number of schools that have been torn down in Illinois. A task force could produce the findings from such a survey could be assessed in order to better understand why facilities were demolished. Furthermore, having data about school teardowns could later enable conducting a study that assesses the impact of school tear downs on surrounding neighborhood property values and as a means for determining how much solid waste, hazardous waste, and recyclable building material is generated by school teardowns.

Change Policies to Allow Earlier IHPA Consultation During the Health Life Safety Review

Another suggestion would be change the time frame when IHPA is consulted during the Health Life Safety review, which at present is usually too late for preservation status to be considered.

Successes:

A number of schools in Illinois have been saved from demolition for a variety of reasons.

[insert examples: see Landmarks Illinois, etc]

DRAFT

Success Stories of Historic, Community-Centered Schools in Illinois:

Longfellow School, Rock Island

After several years of debate and inclusion on Landmarks Illinois' 2007 *Ten Most Endangered Historic Places in Illinois* list, the Rock Island-Milan School District agreed to retain and renovate Longfellow School, an elementary school built in 1934. When the school district's Long Range Facility Study Report announced in 2004 there were "too many schools" in Rock Island, school board members began the long and arduous process of analyzing data about which schools, if any, to close.

A decade-old coalition called Neighborhood Partners soon realized several schools were likely to close and the 12 key decision-making variables the school district was considering focused on building deficiencies and staffing efficiencies, but not critical components related to the importance of a "neighborhood" school. After writing letters, taking surveys and lobbying, Neighborhood Partners was successful in getting the fact that "Johnny *Can Walk To School*" added as a data variable. The KeyStone Neighborhood Association and S.O.S. (Save Our School) group sponsored Chicago architect Bill



Latoza and University of Illinois-Chicago professor Michael Klonsky to address the importance of preserving small, neighborhood schools. Neighborhood Partners then co-hosted a series of eight forums all over the city where school board members heard from and answered questions posed by hundreds of interested citizens.

Due to the grassroots mobilizing efforts of these groups, the school board decided not only to retain Longfellow, but to build an addition that will accommodate 150 more students. After the district-wide restructuring, the one historic school (out of three) slated to close is on the city's primary east-west arterial, affording a much better opportunity for adaptive reuse. Finally, the school district just broke ground for a new magnet school located on the site of a burned convent and school in the heart of the city, adjacent to two historic districts. In a continuing spirit of civic engagement, the school district is working closely with historic district residents regarding traffic impact and building design.

Leal Elementary, Urbana District 116

In the 1900s, the district defeated a referendum to consolidate elementary schools. Then, eight years ago, the subject was revisited and a referendum for renovation funding was passed – the community wanted to keep up the historic Leal Elementary School.



Built in 1935, Leal Elementary School boasts striking architecture and many original art deco features. The elementary school is walkable, as are many of the schools in Urbana. Property values surrounding Leal are very tied to the presence of the historic school, as is the sense of community and neighborhood pride. The community has had considerable involvement in the district's process of how to plan the renovation of the school. The district decided to buy a few nearby houses in order to accommodate the expansion of the school. While the school was being gutted and renovated,

the district rented an empty Jewel grocery store for a year to house students for one year during construction. Teachers and families helped with the temporary move to the Jewel school, as well as local residents in the neighborhood.

The neighborhood surrounding Leal Elementary experienced a downturn during the one year renovation process. Neighborhood residents found it difficult to sell homes during that year; after renovation was done, property values rebounded, and school enrollment jumped considerably from 250 students to over 400.

Once complete, the renovated Leal School building retained its original walls, basic infrastructure, and most of the original art deco features of the building, also incorporating a number of energy efficiency upgrades to the lighting and HVAC system.

Farragut Elementary, Joliet⁵⁵



Located in a historic neighborhood, this school of 560 students was recently renovated in a way that maintained its historic nature. A local preservation group worked closely with the school architects to make sure the 1915 building maintained its character while making modern changes to address accessibility problems. The school was in need of repair, having not been touched since the 1950s. Some feared the state of disrepair would soon cause the school to close. The renovation, once complete, generated a renewed sense of community pride.

Carlinville High School

Built in 1920s, Carlinville High School has remained a community anchor for generations. The school is surrounded by residential neighborhoods and is in walking distance of downtown businesses and restaurants. Approximately 30% of students walk or bike to school. After a fire damaged much of the building's interior in the late 1980s, the school was renovated and the historic façade and many structural features were preserved at the request of local residents. The community strongly supports the school still today.



⁵⁵ See <http://www.iasb.com/printit.cfm?whichpage=www.iasb.com/jac06/article03.cfm>

ii. Model Policies:

Illinois School District Policies:

Cook County SD 130

Cook County School District 130 has implemented policies into their district policy manual that encourages joint use of facilities and meets multiple district goals and objectives⁵⁶. The district has in recent years undertaken a number of sustainability projects, including development of Safe Routes to School programming to reduce vehicular traffic and encourage walking and biking to school; investigating the possibilities of developing green rooftops; installing solar panels, and much more. Given these environmentally friendly projects, the school board is now in the process of updating district policy to make sustainability an official policy that guides operations and capital improvement projects into the future. To view the Cook County School District 130 policy manual, visit <http://www.district130.org>.

Urbana District 116

District policy in Urbana District 116 explicitly expresses an agreement to work with the Urbana Park District to allow joint use of facilities and provides language about payment when expenses are incurred for use of district property for park district activities. Section 2.520 of Chapter 2 in the board policy manual also states that the school board will “cooperate with local government units in matters that affect the schools’ responsibilities.” This is a good example of ways that school districts and local governing bodies can jointly achieve goals and foster greater cooperation. Urbana District 116 also encourages parent, student, staff, and interested citizen participation in advisory committees, task forces and study groups, stating that such involvement “will enhance and improve decision-making effectiveness within the district.”⁵⁷

Rock Island-Milan District 41

See previous section.

Peoria School District 150

(waiting for text from district contact, David Ryon - 'dave.ryon@psd150.org')

⁵⁶ Cook County School District Policy Manual, Section 4.150: Facility Management and Expansion Programs.

⁵⁷

Model State Policies:

Florida

Florida has been one of a few states with state laws that require local governments and school districts work together during the school facility planning process. More specifically, Florida law now mandates school concurrency, meaning that counties, local governments, and school districts work together to ensure that school capacity is available at the time of impact of residential development. Due to Florida's rapid growth, the State has been aggressive in assuring that municipal services, infrastructure, and public education are coordinated together concurrently, thus reducing the stresses of overcrowded schools and inadequate or delayed services⁵⁸. Also, unlike Illinois, all Florida school districts are organized by county, meaning no district boundaries overlap county lines and that school districts are large in size. This county school district system makes it convenient to collaborate with county government and make uniform county-wide school facility and siting policies.

Such policies are also tied to the Florida Growth Management Act, which requires that all counties and over 400 Florida municipalities adopt local government comprehensive plans to guide future growth and development. Such plans incorporate planning for housing, land use, transportation, infrastructure, conservation, recreation and open space, intergovernmental coordination, and capital improvement needs. Development permits are thus not granted until such public services are proven to be provided and available. Except for the Florida Intrastate Highway System, local governments are charged with determining the level-of-service standards within their jurisdiction⁵⁹.

<http://www.co.palm-beach.fl.us/pzb/planning/schoolconcurrency/index.htm>

<http://www.bmolaw.com/inthenews/schoolconcurrencyarticle.pdf>

<http://www.acscp.org/statewide%20school%20concurrency.pdf>

<http://www.acscp.org/>

Maryland

Maryland is one state that provides significant state funding to school districts for deferred maintenance of school facilities, building repairs, and capital improvements for existing public school buildings and school sites used by students. This program called the Aging Schools Program was first enacted in 1997 through Senate Bill 795, but has been continually extended⁶⁰. Maryland has also championed the Maryland Public School Construction Program, which allocates funding via real estate transfer taxes and other alternative forms of financing⁶¹.

See Rachel Carlson Elementary School - <http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/schools/rachelcarsones/>.

Michigan

In 2006, Michigan passed Public Act 276, requiring Michigan school boards to adhere to the provisions of their communities' master plans, instead of allowing school boards to make siting decisions independent of local planning. Furthermore, school boards intending to significantly expand existing high schools or athletic facilities are by law required to communicate with local township planning officials⁶².

South Carolina

⁵⁸ See <http://www.acscp.org/school%20concurrency.doc>

⁵⁹ See pg. 4, <http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/dcp/complanning/concurrency1.pdf> and S. 163.3177(10)(f), F.S..

⁶⁰ See <http://www.pscp.state.md.us/Programs/ASP/ASP2009AdminProceduresGuide.pdf>

⁶¹ See <http://mlis.state.md.us/2004rs/billfile/HB1230.htm>

⁶² Public Act 276 <http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2005-2006/publicact/pdf/2006-PA-0276.pdf>

[insert text – see SC press release from Renee]

Title 6 - Local Government - Provisions Applicable to Special Purpose Districts and Other Political Subdivisions. Chapter 29. South Carolina local government comprehensive planning enabling act of 1994.⁶³

Rhode Island

Rhode Island has a comprehensive RIDES program that addresses school siting issues in school construction⁶⁴. [insert more text if board feels this section is worth including]

See http://www.edfacilities.org/ri/space_requirements.cfm.

DRAFT

⁶³ See <http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t06c029.htm>

⁶⁴ See Rhode Island RIDE program, Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Schools - <http://www.ride.ri.gov/Finance/Funding/construction/>.

Declaration: Benefits of Community-Centered Schools

“Whereas...”

Locating schools in walkable neighborhoods and integrating school facilities into the community may:

- i. Provide human health and educational performance benefits associated with an increased possibility for students and faculty to walk and bike to school.
- ii. Increase community access to school facilities and possibilities of joint use of facilities for both school and community programming.
- iii. Create an opportunity for school buildings to be visual and geographic anchors in the neighborhood and in the community.
- iv. Maintain or increase property values in the surrounding neighborhoods.
- v. Negate the need for expanding municipal services and utilities which could otherwise be costly to local taxpayers.
- vi. Avoid consuming nearby farmland, open space, or wildlife habitat by not choosing to build new schools outside of town.
- vii. Save the district money by potentially reducing school busing mileage and associated costs, also potentially saving state tax dollars by reducing the amount of money a school district requests for state transportation reimbursement.
- viii. Reduce air pollution associated with reducing vehicular school transportation.
- ix. Save families money and time by reducing school commutes for families living near such schools.
- x. Generate potential economic benefits to local businesses as a result of maintaining business activity and foot traffic in the core areas of the community near the school.

Summary of Challenges for Community-Centered Schools in Illinois

<p>General Cultural Trends</p>
<p>Perceptions and Trends</p> <p><u>Perceptions: “Newer is Better”</u> The public mindset seems to suggest older schools cannot perform well.</p> <p><u>School Choice and Competition Between Schools</u> More private school options and increased mobility of families puts pressure on existing schools to offer large sports facilities and other amenities to retain and attract students and families.</p> <p><u>Recent Trends in Education Policy and Philosophy</u> Organizing schools with new grade clustering and by topic is changing district landscapes.</p>
<p>Education and Awareness of Reference Materials</p> <p>Although the CDB and ISBE offer online materials to help guide districts with school construction and renovation, districts and school boards seem to lack materials that thoroughly describe how to plan small-acreage, community-centered schools.</p>
<p>District Population and Demographics Changes</p> <p>A majority of Illinois counties are projected to see a decline in student enrollment in the future while a small number of mostly suburban counties are growing rapidly, putting strains on many districts to adapt by reorganizing, consolidating, and sometimes tearing down existing schools. Illinois school capital funding policies seem to favor rapid-growth districts and disqualify small rural school districts from being eligible for capital funding.</p>
<p>Policy Challenges</p>
<p>Acreage Standards</p> <p>Luckily Illinois has no state minimum acreage requirements; however, many municipalities and school districts have created their own minimum acreage requirements – often large minimum acreages - reflecting local preferences or outdated acreage recommendations once suggested by the Council of Educational Facility Planners International (CEFPI), which has since eliminated acreage suggestions.</p>
<p>State Funding Programs and Policies</p> <p><u>School Transportation Reimbursement</u> Generous state transportation reimbursement may act as an incentive for districts to relocate to sites where busing needs may increase by limiting the costs of siting decisions to the community.</p> <p><u>School Construction & Renovation Reimbursement Programs</u> State reimbursement policies prioritize districts with the greatest number of students and districts that are growing the fastest, a bias that may encourage sprawl and that adequately fails to consider qualitative concerns such as school building age or the needs of small school districts.</p> <p><u>School Maintenance Funding</u> No explicit state funding is given for facility maintenance, except to remedy urgent Life Safety concerns. A lack of state funding or incentives may be discouraging regular</p>

upkeep of older buildings. Many states have ongoing maintenance funds and inventory maintenance issues and aging buildings.

Planning and Collaboration Process

Collaboration Between School Districts, Community, and Local Government

Many school districts do not work collaboratively with the community or local government when making school siting decisions. Illinois does not require school districts to work with local government to collaborate logistical matters regarding capital improvement projects and school siting decisions.

Public Input on School Siting Decisions

Illinois does not require public input on school facility planning.

Full Costs Comparisons Between Renovation and New Construction

When districts consider whether to renovate or expand current facilities or build new on a different site, comparisons between these options often do not take into account the total costs associated with building new, failing to address the expenses of necessary utility extensions, municipal service expansions, increased transportation costs, and the environmental, health, and economic consequences that such decisions may create for the future.

DRAFT

Suggested Actions and Policy Changes

- i. Create a School Transportation Task Force, which would be required to:
 - review current funding formulas for school transportation reimbursement
 - develop a working definition and terms for “walkable school” (or other term – “active transportation accessible school”?) to be used consistently by the State and referenced by Illinois school districts
 - analyze impact of school reorganization and consolidation on State’s school transportation reimbursements
 - incentivizes school transportation best practices, including incentivizing district decisions to increase safe possibilities for students to walk or bike to school
 - find ways enable districts to spend transportation dollars to fix barriers that are the cause of hazard busing requests

- ii. Create a revolving fund for school district facility maintenance needs and eligibility standards for dispersal of funds

- iii. Add to the list of information recorded during Health Life Safety reviews and Capital Needs Surveys to include age of school buildings, school acreage, and school maintenance requests

- iv. Create publicly accessible school databases of:
 - School age
 - School acreage
 - School maintenance requests and awarded maintenance funding

- iv. Conduct studies on walkability of Illinois school districts; post findings

- v. Update the BuildSmart and Healthy, High-Performing School Guide to more specifically address the significance of school location, promote walkability, and (HHPHG) feature older schools that have been renovated green in addition to the currently featured newly constructed green school facilities; make both documents more visible on websites where posted

- vi. Adopt Healthy Schools Campaign’s suggested additions to US Green Building Council’s LEED standards required in Public Act 095-0416

- vii. Require earlier input from Illinois Historic Preservation Agency during the Health Life Safety Review process

viii. Modify ISBE's materials on school consolidation feasibility studies that ask feasibility studies to include:

- financial costs of impacts of consolidation on school transportation
- impacts on length of bus rides and bus route mileages
- asking whether utility expansions would be needed because of consolidations, and associated costs
- comparisons of projected percentage of students in the district who can currently walk/bike to school vs. after facility changes resulting from consolidation; how consolidations can encourage the greatest percentage of students to be able to walk or bike to school (based on a definition)

ix. Update grant index formula to include an additional factor that would lead to higher index scores for districts that can provide proof that three or more open public forums were offered for public comment on school facility planning and location

x. Amend Public Act 094-0225 by adding mention of planning and public works departments and regional planning agencies as eligible parties that can request notice of school facility improvements and request opportunity for comment.

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Safe Routes to School

The Illinois Safe Routes Program

The Illinois Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) is administered by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). SRTS uses a multidisciplinary approach to improve conditions for students who walk or bike to school. The program has three main goals:

1. To enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school
2. To make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age; and
3. To facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity (within 2 miles) of both public and private primary and middle schools (grades K-8).

Illinois Safe Routes to School funds both infrastructure improvements to the physical environment as well as non-infrastructure projects. Eligible project sponsors include schools and school districts, governmental entities and non-profit organizations. Projects may be organized on a variety of jurisdictional levels.

Projects are funded at 100% with no local match required. Between 70% and 90% of funds will support infrastructure projects. 10% to 30% of funds will support non-infrastructure programs.⁶⁵ In the 2007 funding cycle, \$8.6 million was available through the IDOT SRTS Program. Almost 300 applications were submitted requesting over \$77.7 million.⁶⁶ 62 Illinois communities were awarded funds in 2007, with over \$290,000 awarded to non-location specific projects.⁶⁷ \$13 million will be awarded in the 2008-09 funding cycle.

⁶⁵ See <http://www.dot.il.gov/saferoutes/SafeRoutesISRPCContent.aspx>

⁶⁶ Et al.

⁶⁷ See <http://www.dot.il.gov/saferoutes/Files/Final%20Recommendations%202007%20Funding%202-1-08-Total%20List.xls>

Appendix 2: Older and Walkable Illinois Schools

Older and Walkable Illinois Schools

School Name	Community	Number of Acres	Renovation Costs	Year Built	Year Renovations, Additions
Joliet Central High School	Joliet	34	\$37 million (between two schools)	1901	1917, 1922, 1924, 1931
Lindblom Science Academy	Chicago	7.5	\$30 million	1912	2003 - 2005
Farragut Elementary	Joliet		(contact Principal)	1915	1950s, recent
Carlinville High School	Carlinville		Contact Principal Patrick Drew	1920s	Wings added in 1950s, 1988 interior renovation after fire
Longfellow School	Rock Island	Call Dave Rockwell	\$1.455 million	1934	Currently addition underway to accommodate 150 more students
Leal Elementary School	Urbana	2	\$8.8 million	1935	1967, 2001

Appendix 3: Municipal School Land Dedication Requirements

Minimum School Acreages in Illinois Communities						
Community	Elementary School	Minimum Number of Students	Middle School	Minimum Number of Students	High School	Minimum Number of Students
Normal ⁶⁸	11	600	29	900	50	1200
Elgin ⁶⁹	11	600	29	1200	55	2500
Oswego ⁷⁰	15	600	25	900	80	1200
Edwardsville ⁷¹	25	450	40	600	75	1500
Springfield				None		
Carbondale				None		
Rock Island				None		
Danville				None ⁷²		

⁶⁸ See McLean County Regional Planning Commission newsletter, Spring 2002 - http://www.mcplan.org/e_o/archive/4-3Spring02.pdf.

⁶⁹ See CMAP school siting report - <http://goto2040.org/ideazone/forum.aspx?id=780#10602>.

⁷⁰ Et al.

⁷¹ Information acquired from a conversation with Edwardsville village staff

⁷² Danville references maximum acreages set by the State.

Appendix 4: Impact Fees by Illinois Community

[please finish – talk with Dominicc about using this format]

City of Edwardsville School Impact Fee Worksheet					
	Acres/School	Max. Students	Acres/Student	\$/Acre	\$/Student
Elementary	25	450	0.056	\$135,000.00	\$7,500.00
Junior High	40	600	0.067	\$135,000.00	\$9,000.00
High School	70	1500	0.047	\$135,000.00	\$6,300.00
Student Ratio/Unit					
Single Family			Apartments		
2 Bed S.F. Detached		Max. Allowable Fee	35% of Max. Allowable Impact Fee	1 Bed Apt.	
Elem.	\$7500.00 0.411	\$3,082.50	\$1,078.88	Elem.	\$7500.00 0.053 \$397.50 \$139.13
Jr. High	\$9000.00 0.138	\$1,242	\$434.70	Jr. High	\$9000.00 0.019 \$171.00 \$59.85
Sr. High	\$6300.00 0.222	\$1,398.60	\$481.51	Sr. High	\$6300.00 0.019 \$119.70 \$41.90
TOTAL		\$5,723.10	\$2,003.09	TOTAL:	

Normal's School Land Dedication Ordinance⁷³

Normal's School Land Dedication formula, part of the Public Land Dedication And Reservation Requirements (Section 16.6-1-8, Municipal Code of the Town of Normal) describes the basis for both land dedication or fee payment in lieu of land. Each is a function of the expected impact of new development on the school system and reflects the assumed fair market land values (\$35,000 per acre), and the amount of land required for schools of various sizes and levels, as shown in Chart A.

School Classification	Maximum Number of Students	Minimum Acres per Site
Elementary	600	11
Junior High	900	29
Senior High	1,200	50

Where dedication of appropriate land for a school site is not possible, a compensatory cash contribution is substituted. Chart B translates the formula into the school impact fee required per housing unit within each of Normal's residential zoning districts.

Normal Zoning District	Total Fee Per Acre	Fee Per Dwelling Unit
R-1AA	\$1,303.40	\$651.70
R-1A	\$2,606.80	\$651.70
R-1B	\$3,910.20	\$651.70
R-2	\$9,123.80	\$651.70
R-3A	\$3,391.50	\$188.42
R-3B	\$13,566.00	\$188.42

Proceeds of cash contributions are placed in escrow by the Town, for eventual use by the school district in acquiring land and building new school facilities.

⁷³ See McLean County Regional Planning Commission newsletter, Spring 2002 - http://www.mcplan.org/e_o/archive/4-3Spring02.pdf.

Appendix 5: School Enrollment Projections from 2007/2008 to 2012/2013 by County⁷⁴

Projected K-12 School Enrollment Increases by County (2007/2008 - 2012/2013)

County	Number	Percent (%)
Adams	-318	-3.48
Alexander	-245	-22.48
Bond	-24	-1.06
Boone	2307	22.3
Brown	-97	-16.03
Bureau	-343	-6.57
Calhoun	-15	-2.28
Carroll	-225	-8.67
Cass	6	0.28
Champaign	131	0.57
Christian	752	12.7
Clark	-191	-6.83
Clay	-82	-3.46
Clinton	-125	-2.42
Coles	99	1.3
Cook	5973	0.75
Crawford	-208	-6.75
Cumberland	-211	-12.66
DeKalb	1219	7.2
DeWitt	-308	-11.99
Douglas	-146	-5.42
DuPage	7661	4.6
Edgar	-323	-10.94
Edwards	-89	-9.98
Effingham	-354	-6.11
Fayette	-169	-5.88
Ford	14	0.58
Franklin	-116	-1.87
Fulton	-278	-5.37
Gallatin	-121	-15.28
Greene	-168	-7.83
Grundy	1868	18.1
Hamilton	-142	-12.66
Hancock	-453	-14.93

Hardin	22	3.2
Henderson	-54	-5.16
Henry	-464	-5.46
Iroquois	-520	-11.44
Jackson	-185	-2.52
Jasper	-173	-12.27
Jefferson	-503	-8.83
Jersey	-188	-6.88
JoDaviess	-213	-7.07
Johnson	27	1.5
Kane	16174	13.4
Kankakee	117	0.64
Kendall	11817	57.4
Knox	-331	-4.45
Lake	14811	10.3
LaSalle	-103	-0.623
Lawrence	-15	-0.635
Lee	-238	-4.82
Livingston	-598	-9.35
Logan	-181	-5.23
Macon	-1136	-7.2
Macoupin	-809	-9.89
Madison	-393	-0.95
Marion	-394	-5.48
Marshall	-155	-11.57
Mason	-131	-4.13
Massac	92	3.7
McDonough	-222	-6.43
McHenry	10996	19.5
McLean	842	3.5
Menard	-86	-3.45
Mercer	-135	-9.63
Monroe	507	10.1
Montgomery	-501	-11.79
Morgan	-101	-1.97
Moultrie	14	0.71
Ogle	-104	-1.03
Peoria	656	2.3
Perry	-141	-5.11
Piatt	-218	-7.19
Pike	-247	-9.72
Pope	-90	-18.87
Pulaski	-167	-15.87
Putnam	-45	-4.98
Randolph	-310	-7.65
Richland	-298	-13.82
Rock Island	-915	-4.06
Saline	63	1.5
Sangamon	24	0.09
Schuyler	-32	-3.13
Scott	-36	-3.73
Shelby	-693	-24.1
St. Clair	-960	-22.26
Stark	-82	-8.2
Stephenson	-528	-7.67
Tazewell	-873	-4.77

Union	2	-0.062
Vermillion	6	0.04
Wabash	-213	-12.62
Warren	-233	-9.12
Washington	-21	-0.975
Wayne	-153	-6.21
White	-251	-11.07
Whiteside	-687	-7.59
Will	40651	33.5
Williamson	-156	-1.71
Winnebago	3684	7.8
Woodford	398	5.1

Of the 102 counties in Illinois:

- 75 Illinois counties are projected to have a net enrollment decrease from 2007/2008 to 2012/2013
- 27 Illinois counties are projected to have a net enrollment increase from 2007/2008 to 2012/2013
- 16 Illinois counties are projected to have an enrollment increase of 3% or more

⁷⁴ See Public School Enrollment Projections 2004-2005 – 2012-2013, Illinois State Board of Education Data Analysis and Progress Reporting - http://www.isbe.net/research/pdfs/public_school_enrollment.pdf

Illinois School Reorganizations, 1983-2008

School Reorganization, 1983-2008	Definition of Terms⁷⁵
Consolidations	<p style="text-align: center;">55</p> <p>The formation of a new school district from two or more existing districts. A consolidation must be approved at a referendum vote by a majority of those voting within each district</p>
Annexations	<p style="text-align: center;">66</p> <p>A school district is dissolved and completely absorbed by one or more other school districts. In most instances, an annexation must be approved at a referendum vote by a majority of those voting within each district. However, school districts with a population under 5,000 have the option of submitting a petition to dissolve with their local Regional Board of School Trustees (seven-member locally elected board), which will make the decision on the annexing district(s). This option does not have an election requirement, but a majority of voters within the potential dissolving district can sign an opposition petition to stop the dissolution action.</p>
Conversions	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>The formation of new elementary districts and a single new high school district from existing unit districts or from an existing unit district or districts and an existing high school district or districts. A conversion must be approved at a referendum vote by a majority of those voting within each district</p>
Deactivations	<p style="text-align: center;">12</p> <p>The closing of a school facility in one school district and sending the students, on a tuition basis, to a school or schools outside of that district's boundaries. A deactivation must be approved at a referendum vote by a majority of those voting within the district proposing to close the facility. A referendum vote is not held within the district or districts that will potentially receive the students. Instead, school board approval is needed from each receiving school district.</p>
Total	<p style="text-align: center;">138</p>

Table 1.

⁷⁵ Definitions provided by State Board of Education

Appendix 6: Educational Resources

Org/Agency	Useful Information	Website
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	School siting report about northeastern Illinois includes specific figures on municipal school acreage standards, rush hour traffic tied to school transportation, impact fees, and policy suggestions.	http://goto2040.org/ideazone/forum.aspx?id=780#10602
US Environmental Protection Agency	A variety of reports on school siting and public health, land use, and issues dealing with toxic sites.	http://www.epa.gov/schools/siting.html
National Trust for Historic Preservation	Neighborhood school resources, reports, photos, and lists of prominent historic structures	http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/historic-schools/
Smart Growth	Online resources on collaborative planning and benefits of walkable, compact locations, including case studies, fact sheets, and press releases.	http://www.smartgrowth.org/
Center for Neighborhood Technology	Resources on transportation and planning, affordable housing, community development, and public participation.	http://www.cnt.org/toolbox
Illinois State Board of Education	Houses administrative rules that guide school renovation and construction. Data on school enrollment, population, other school laws and policies.	http://www.isbe.net
Illinois Capital Development Board	Build Smart – reference materials to help guide sustainable school construction and planning; information about Illinois legislation affecting funding for school capital projects	http://www.cdb.state.il.us/green_initiatives.shtml
Healthy Schools Campaign	Healthy, High-Performing School Guide; information about the significance of walkability and children's exposure to toxicity	http://www.healthyschoolscampaign.org/programs/envhealth/
Landmarks Illinois	Threatened and successfully renovated historic schools in Illinois	http://www.landmarks.org/
Active Transportation Alliance	Safe Routes to School Program information; reports and information about school transportation.	http://www.activetrans.org
American Institute of Architects - Illinois	Offers reports, project examples, and architectural tools on school design, school-related state legislation, and links.	http://www.aiail.org/
Congress for the New Urbanism	Houses a number of reports and project links regarding walkable, community-centered schools.	http://www.cnu.org/

Appendix 7: Constitution of the State of Illinois

<http://www.ilga.gov/commission/lrb/conmain.htm>

ARTICLE X - EDUCATION

SECTION 1. GOAL - FREE SCHOOLS

A fundamental goal of the People of the State is the educational development of all persons to the limits of their capacities.

The State shall provide for an efficient system of high quality public educational institutions and services. Education in public schools through the secondary level shall

be free. There may be such other free education as the General Assembly provides by law.

The State has the primary responsibility for financing the system of public education.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

SECTION 2. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION - CHIEF STATE EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

(a) There is created a State Board of Education to be elected or selected on a regional basis. The number of members, their qualifications, terms of office and manner of election or selection shall be provided by law. The Board, except as limited by law, may establish goals, determine policies, provide for planning and evaluating education programs and recommend financing. The Board shall have such other duties and powers as provided by law.

(b) The State Board of Education shall appoint a chief state educational officer.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

ARTICLE XI - ENVIRONMENT

SECTION 1. PUBLIC POLICY - LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

The public policy of the State and the duty of each person is to provide and maintain a healthful environment for the benefit of this and future generations. The General Assembly shall provide by law for the implementation and enforcement of this public policy.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

SECTION 2. RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

Each person has the right to a healthful environment. Each person may enforce this right against any party, governmental or private, through appropriate legal proceedings subject to reasonable limitation and regulation as the General Assembly may provide by law.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

ARTICLE XII - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. MUNICIPALITIES AND UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

"Municipalities" means cities, villages and incorporated towns. "Units of local government" means counties, municipalities, townships, special districts, and units, designated as units of local government by law, which exercise limited governmental powers or powers in respect to limited governmental subjects, but does not include school districts.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

SECTION 10. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

(a) Units of local government and school districts may contract or otherwise associate among themselves, with the State, with other states and their units of local government and school districts, and with the United States to obtain or transfer any power or function, in any manner not prohibited by law or by ordinance. Units of local government and school districts may contract and otherwise associate with individuals, associations, and corporations in any manner not prohibited by law or by ordinance. Participating units of government may use their credit, revenues, and other resources to pay costs and to service debt related to intergovernmental activities.

(b) Officers and employees of units of local government and school districts may participate in intergovernmental activities authorized by their units of government without relinquishing their offices or positions.

(c) The State shall encourage intergovernmental cooperation and use its technical and financial resources to assist intergovernmental activities.

(Source: Illinois Constitution.)

Appendix 8: State of Sustainability Practices Implemented by Illinois Schools

Illinois Sustainable Schools Compact

The compact⁷⁶ program developed by the Lt. Governor's Office challenges Illinois schools and school districts to pursue up to twelve environmental goals categorized sustainability goals into three categories: operations, buildings and grounds, and curriculum. To date, over 175 schools are participating in this program.

Environmental Mandates in the Constitution of the State of Illinois

Illinois requires by law and in the constitution that sustainable use of natural resources and environmental protection be taken seriously. The Constitution of Illinois states that, "The public policy of the State and the duty of each person is to provide and maintain a healthful environment for the benefit of this and future generations. The General Assembly shall provide by law for the implementation and enforcement of this public policy," also stating that "each person has the right to a healthful environment."⁷⁷

Green Governments Illinois Act

On October 17, 2007, Illinois passed the Green Governments Illinois Act (Public Act 095-0657), further instituting green policies and environmental accountability at the state government level by creating a council of state agencies to oversee the greening of government⁷⁸. One requirement within the Green Governments Illinois Act is that all 70 state agencies create and report a sustainability plan for their respective agencies to the newly created Green Governments Coordinating Council which consists of a representative from 15 state agencies and chaired by the Lt. Governor.

Green Solutions website

A number of resources demonstrating how to work towards more sustainable operations have been made available on the Green Solutions website⁷⁹. Though tailored to state agencies rather than school districts, these materials could be of use to interested school district administrators, staff, and business officials. For example, the GoGreen Planning Pro currently offered on the website allows agencies and organizations to assess their sustainability efforts, create sustainability plans and track their progress. A similar tool specifically for schools and districts could be created.

Sustainability Practices in Illinois Schools – Required by Law

Schools throughout Illinois have been actively working towards achieving sustainability goals in a number of ways. Several environmentally friendly practices are now required of school districts by law. For example, on August 13, 2007, the Green Cleaning Schools Act (Public Act 095-0084) was enacted, requiring that all Illinois schools transition to using certified green cleaning products⁸⁰. Another law entitled the Anti-Idling Act requires that school buses and other diesel vehicles weighing more than 8,000 pounds not idle longer than ten minutes in any given 60-minute period (Public Act 094-0845)⁸¹. The act aims to reduce diesel emissions and soot levels, thus reducing negative human health impacts and general

⁷⁶ <http://www.standingupforillinois.org/green/compact.php>

⁷⁷ Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article XI – Environment, Section 1 and 2.

See <http://www.ilga.gov/commission/lrb/con11.htm>

⁷⁸ See <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0657&GA=095>

⁷⁹ See <http://www.standingupforillinois.org/green/sustainplan.php>

⁸⁰ See <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0084&GA=095>

⁸¹ See <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=094-0845&GA=094>

air pollution. A new law now also requires that school districts applying for state funding for school construction and major renovations after July 1, 2007 obtain green building certification⁸².

Sustainability Practices in Illinois Schools – Voluntary Initiatives by Schools and School Districts

Although schools are now required to implement a number of environmentally friendly practices by state law, many schools and school districts have gone above and beyond state requirements, choosing to incorporate environmentally friendly practices into their operations such as:

Environmentally Friendly Practices	Examples
<p>Green Building and Renovation⁸³</p> <p>Dozens of Illinois schools including Albany Park Multicultural Academy in Chicago and Bolingbrook High School have now achieved or are applying for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification⁸⁴.</p>	[insert photo]
<p>Green Infrastructure⁸⁵</p> <p>Schools such as Unity Point School District are creating rain gardens, bioswales, and other forms of green infrastructure that absorb and filter stormwater runoff.</p>	[insert photo]
<p>Green Fleets⁸⁶</p> <p>Schools such as McLean County CUSD 5 are greening their fleets with hybrid and flex-fuel vehicles and particulate-capturing devices, reducing air pollution and emissions.</p>	[insert photo]
<p>Recycling and Composting⁸⁷</p> <p>Bradley-Bourbonnais Community High School recently diverted 3,154 pounds of electronic waste through a successful recycling effort. Gage Park High School's Environmental River and Conservation Club has used vermicomposting to generate compost used for gardening.</p>	[insert photo]
<p>Lighting Retrofits and Energy Conservation⁸⁸</p> <p>CUSD 300 (Algonquin) has recently saved \$1.2 million from energy conservation and retrofit initiatives, and St. John the Baptist Elementary and Elwood CUSD 203 recently led the state in selling compact fluorescent bulbs and LED products.</p>	[insert photo]
<p>Renewable Energy Development⁸⁹</p>	[insert photo]

⁸² See Illinois Public Act 095-0416 - <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=095-0416&GA=095>

⁸³ See US Green Building Council - <http://www.usgbc.org> (get document with all LEED certified projects...)

⁸⁴ See online map of LEED certified and LEED registered schools in Illinois:

http://www.buildgreenschools.org/leed/leed_schools_maps.html#heartland

⁸⁵ See <http://www.greenmapping.org/maps/>; <http://www.CleanWaterIllinois.org>;

⁸⁶ See <http://www.epa.state.il.us/p2/green-schools/clean-school-bus.htm>

⁸⁷ See http://www.commerce.state.il.us/dceo/Bureaus/Energy_Recycling/; <http://www.illinoisrecycles.org/>

⁸⁸ See Lights for Learning - <http://www.lights4learning.org/>; DCEO -

http://www.commerce.state.il.us/dceo/Bureaus/Energy_Recycling/

⁸⁹ See http://www.commerce.state.il.us/dceo/Bureaus/Energy_Recycling/; <http://www.illinoisolarschools.org/>;

<http://www.illinoiscleanenergy.org/>

<p>Reagan Middle School (Dixon) has installed a 51 KW solar photovoltaic unit on site, Erie CUSD 1 and Bureau Valley School District have erected wind turbines, and Palestine CUSD 3 has installed a geothermal system on school property. Many Illinois schools are now doing the same.</p>	
<p>Alternative School Transportation⁹⁰</p>	<p>[insert photo]</p>
<p>Safe Routes to School programs at Paul Revere Intermediate and Primary Schools (Blue Island), Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School (Urbana), and Massac County School District make it possible for and encourage students to walk and bicycle to school, instead of depending on motorized transportation.</p>	
<p>Sustainable Landscaping⁹¹</p>	<p>[insert photo]</p>
<p>Schools like St. Monica Academy in Chicago are using native plants and green infrastructure to filter stormwater on site while creating habitat and enhancing science curriculum.</p>	
<p>Sustainable Food and Procurement⁹²</p>	<p>[insert photo]</p>
<p>Schools like Oak Park District 97, Township High School District 211, Prairie Crossing Charter School in Grayslake, and Chicago Public School are including locally and sustainably raised fruits and vegetables into school lunch offerings.</p>	
<p>Environmental Education and Service Learning⁹³</p>	<p>[insert photo]</p>
<p>A number of educational organizations, non-profits, institutions, and agencies are working to green Illinois education standards and extracurricular offerings</p>	

⁹⁰ See <http://activetrans.org/>; <http://www.dot.state.il.us/saferoutes/saferouteshome.aspx>; <http://www.dot.il.gov/saferoutes/DisplayNews.aspx>

⁹¹ See <http://s189530336.onlinehome.us/School/>; <http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/landscape.cfm>;

⁹² See Farm to School program <http://www.farmentoschool.org/state-home.php?id=35>;

⁹³ See <http://www.eeai.net/>; <http://www.chicagobotanic.org/education/index.php>; <http://www.kidsoutside.info/>; <http://www.ista-il.org/>

Appendix 9: Additional LEED requirements suggested by Healthy Schools Campaign

Section 1 – LEED Credits that should not be allowed

A. Sustainable Sites Brownfield Redevelopment

- Brownfield Redevelopment SS Credit 3 - We should not offer LEED credits to redevelop former hazardous waste sites for use in a public school.

Rationale: Healthy Schools Campaign has concerns that contamination may show up later that was not detected initially because of instrument or method detection limitations. By removing brownfield redevelopment from the allowable credits, we are NOT PROHIBITING brownfield redevelopment for school use. Rather we are saying that we should not create incentives for schools to build on previously identified hazardous waste sites. If a school chooses to build on a redeveloped brownfield, we would not necessarily oppose this decision.

However, unlike in a commercial setting, the risks from potential exposures to hazardous waste fall to children rather than adults. Children have behavior patterns and physiological issues that place them in a greater risk category for environmental exposures than adults. For these children, we cannot create incentives to encourage land use of this type.

Section 2 - LEED Credits that should be a Prerequisite

A. Sustainable Sites

- Sustainable Sites Alternative Transportation- Make two of the following three credits a prerequisite instead of each being a credit.
 - **Credit 4.1 Alternative Transportation:** Public Transportation Access- Option 1: Locate project within ½ mile of an existing or planned and funded commuter rail, light rail, or subway station. OR Locate project within ¼ mile of one or more stops for two or more public or campus bus lines usable by building occupants. A school bus may count as one of these options. OR Show that the school where the project is located has an attendance boundary in which at least 80% of students live within no more than ¾ mile for Grades 8 and below and 1-1/2 miles for grades 9 and above. In addition, locate the project on a site that allows pedestrian access to the site from all residential neighborhoods that house the planned student population. And in all cases, provide dedicated walking or bike routes to the transit that extend from the school building at least to the end of the school property in two or more different directions, ensuring that walking routes and bike lanes have no barriers on school property (i.e. fences).
 - **Credit 4.2 Alternative Transportation:** Bicycle Use- Provide secure bicycle racks and/or storage for 5% or more of all building staff and students above third grade level AND provide shower and changing facilities for 0.5% of staff FTE. AND provide dedicated bike lanes that extend at least to the end of the school property in 2 or more different directions, ensuring that bike lanes have no barriers on school property (i.e. fences).
 - **Credit 4.3 Alternative Transportation:** Low-emitting and alternative fuel vehicles- Develop & implement a plan for the buses and maintenance vehicles serving the school to use 20% natural gas, propane, biodiesel, or low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles or provide preferred parking for 5% of the total vehicle parking capacity of the site and at least one designated carpool drop-off area for low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles.

Rationale: Motor vehicle emissions contribute to smog, climate change and particulate pollution, all of which have a negative impact on human health. Children with asthma and respiratory illnesses are particularly at risk. Additionally, walking and bicycling opportunities should be provided to the extent possible to combat obesity and other health related diseases. By requiring a choice of two of the above as a prerequisite, we are ensuring first and foremost, how transportation and its affect on health and the environment are considered when a new school is designed and its site is selected. By allowing a selection of two from the three above credits, there is still recognition of the importance of flexibility in LEED implementation.

Appendix 10: Illinois State Board of Education Construction Applications

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/html/apps.htm>

School Construction Law (Public Act 90-548) 

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/public_act_90-548.pdf

ISBE Rules for Administration of the School Construction Program, Code 151

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/rules/archive/pdfs/151ark.pdf>

CDB Rules for Administration of the School Construction Program, Part 40

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/cbd_title_71.pdf

New Applications: Instructions and Transmittal

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/instruction_transmittal_form.pdf

Form 35-77 - Application for School Construction Grant Entitlement

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-77_application_sc_grant_entitlement.pdf

Form 35-77a - Update for School Construction Grant Program

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-77A_update_grant_entitlement.pdf

Form 35-79 - District Facility Plan

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-79_district_facilities_plan.pdf

Instructions for Completing Section IV of the District Facility plan

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/instructions_section_IV.pdf

Form 35-80 - Available Capacity Worksheet

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-80_available_capacity_worksheet.pdf

Form 35-81 - Facility Evaluation Worksheet

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-81_facility_evaluation_worksheet.pdf

Form 35-82 - Temporary Relocation Loan or Grant Application (ISBE)

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-82_application_temporary_relocation.pdf

Form 35-83 - Construction Grant Application Worksheets

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/F35-83_construction_grant_application.pdf

Field Inspection Score Sheet

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/fiss.pdf>

Construction Grant Application Program Statement, Capital Development Board

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/construction_grant_applicat.pdf

Facility Evaluation Summary Sheet

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/fess.pdf>

Field Inspection Guide

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/fig.pdf>

Updated Applications: Instructions and Forms for Updating Applications

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/SCP_update_application.pdf

CDB Project Standards: List of Eligible School Construction Program Expenditures

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/pdf/project_standards_CDB.pdf

School Renovation Grant Program (Federal)

<http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/html/reno.htm>

Sprinkler Code 105 ILCS 5/22-23

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/health_safety/pdfs/sprinkler.PDF

Temporary Relocation Program

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/construction/html/t_relo_details.htm

Appendix 11: Ten Step Process for Successful and Sustainable School Facility Planning

- 1.** Create a district committee to assess short-term and long-term student and school facility needs comprised of representatives that appropriately reflect the various interests and perspectives of the community.
- 2.** Develop partnerships and communication with local government, planning groups, and community and parent organizations.
- 3.** Assess existing municipal ordinances, comprehensive plans, and long-term population and economic projections for the community.
- 4.** Conduct a study that comprehensively compares renovation of existing facilities, building new on the existing site, and constructing new on a different site. Comparisons should assess impacts on
 - o student safety
 - o transportation costs
 - o land use
 - o air quality
 - o proximity of sites to sources of significant pollution or toxins
 - o walkability
 - o bus routes
 - o local traffic patterns and congestion
 - o property values in neighborhoods closest to the school
 - o student health
 - o community use of and access to school facilities
 - o total financial costs of the facility options, reflecting costs associated with the factors listed above
 - o other community concerns.
- 5.** Draft a report of the initial findings of comparing district facility decisions.
- 6.** Present initial findings to the community by arranging a series of public forums.
- 7.** Provide at least [insert time suggestion - three months?] for public input on the data and findings of the committee.
- 8.** Incorporate public input on the committee's finding into the report
- 9.** Present final decisions about district's school siting and facility improvement decisions.
- 10.** Implement decisions

Works Cited:

Beaumont, Constance and Elizabeth Pianca. **Why Johnny Can't Walk to School: Historic Schools in an Age of Sprawl.** October 2002, National Trust for Historic Preservation.

http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/historic-schools/additional-resources/schools_why_johnny_1.pdf.

School Siting Strategy Report, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning.

<http://www.goto2040.org/schoolsiting.aspx>.

5 ILCS 220/1 (from Ch. 127, par. 741) Sec. 1. Intergovernmental Cooperation Act. (Source: P. A. 78-785.)

<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=92&ChapAct=5%20ILCS%20220/&ChapterID=2&ChapterName=GENERAL+PROVISIONS&ActName=Intergovernmental+Cooperation+Act%2E>

Our Common Future, published by the World Commission on Environment and Development.

TITLE 71: PUBLIC BUILDINGS, FACILITIES AND REAL PROPERTY
CHAPTER I: CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD, SUBCHAPTER a: RULES
PART 40 STANDARDS FOR AWARD OF GRANTS: SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
SECTION 40.130 CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

<http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/071/071000400001300R.html>

Practical Issues in Adopting Local Impact Fees

Jerry Kolo and Todd J. Dicker

State and Local Government Review Vol. 25, No. 3 (Fall 1993): 197-206

Reprinted by permission of the authors and the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, University of Georgia.

<http://stormwaterfinance.urbancenter.iupui.edu/PDFs/KoloDicker.pdf>

Normal publication, Visions. 2002 http://www.mcplan.org/e_o/archive/4-3Spring02.pdf

Flint schools should do more homework before tearing down Central High School. John C. Davidek
 Flint Journal letter, Monday December 29, 2008

http://www.mlive.com/opinion/flint/index.ssf/2008/12/flint_schools_should_do_more_h.html

Model Policies for Preserving Historic Schools, Katherine Stevenson. National Trust for Historic Preservation. Model Public Policies. May/June 2006.

Hard Lessons: Causes and Consequences of Michigan's School Boom. Michigan Land Institute, 2004.

The Road...Less Traveled: An Analysis of Vehicle Miles Traveled Trends in the U.S. Robert Puentes and Adie Tomer

An Expert Review on the Strength of the Data in Support of Proposed Community Design Standards in LEED for Neighborhood Development. Prepared by: Farr Associates, August, 2008

Transportation Demand Strategies for Schools: Reducing Auto Congestion Around Schools - Washington State Department of Transportation, <http://depts.washington.edu/trac/bulkdisk/pdf/719.1.pdf>

RIDE School Construction Regulations (5/24/07),
<http://www.ride.ri.gov/Finance/Funding/construction/>.

Issue Analysis: Are Impact Fees a Viable Resource for School Districts Experiencing Growth? Ronda J. Bangert, Educational Leadership 600, Spring 2006.

Connecticut Public Act 96-270 www.cslib.org/pa/pa270.htm “Total cost effectiveness” means a cost analysis of new construction versus renovation which includes direct costs such as land acquisition, planning fees, construction costs and equipment and furnishing costs. For a new facility, the cost analysis must include a consideration of indirect costs associated with the project such as new sewers, roads, transportation, or utilities. Total project costs must also include fees associated with issuing bonds and/or short-term financing charges should the municipality wish to utilize these funding mechanisms.

(insert other documents – should footnotes be repeated here?)

DRAFT