

## **Examples of Possible Recommendations from School Construction Spending Issues Identified by the Task Force**

### **Potential Administrative or Specific Issue Recommendations**

1. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction should conduct a feasibility review of developing more standardized plans for school construction and/or other possible cost savings mechanisms.
2. The current State School Construction Assistance formula should be made more transparent in terms of the assumptions about what is to be funded.
3. As part of their feasibility study of establishing a statewide school facility information system, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction should ensure that the necessary data elements are included. This should include a focus on comparable information across school districts and needed information regarding the impact of educational reform and other programmatic changes (e.g. all day kindergarten, class size reduction, etc.).
4. A more robust program to provide regional assistance in school construction management should be established. Possible entities to be included: Educational Service Districts; Department of General Administration; and architectural services partners with the state's community and technical college system for project management.
5. An independent analysis of the current method of projecting enrollment used for determining eligibility should be conducted.
6. The funding formula should be revised to encourage/incentivize cooperative partnerships/joint use of facilities with early learning providers, social service providers, skills centers, community and technical colleges, and public baccalaureate institutions.
7. The Legislature should look at revising the method of determining "instructional space" as it relates to community facilities partnerships and should also review barriers, such as liability and maintenance considerations, in schools being used for this purpose.
8. The Small Repair Grant Program should be expanded and the eligibility criteria should possibly be revised to allow greater access (e.g. three year limitation, \$100,000 limitation, etc.).

9. The current statutory six year limit for the expenditure of impact fee revenues should be extended to allow for land acquisition and other possible longer term school construction related needs.
10. The Growth Management Act provisions should be further evaluated to determine if it allows needed school construction and acquisition of property, particularly outside of urban growth boundaries.
11. The fiscal impact of state/federal forest lands on school district resources for construction and interaction with the state's formula should be reviewed and possibly incorporated into changes in the funding formula.
12. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction should prepare a report on the implementation of the two percent rule for school facility maintenance and provide recommendations that would better incentivize proper maintenance of school facilities.
13. The needed bond requirements for subcontractors used on school construction projects should be evaluated.
14. The adequacy of non-building components of schools, such as safe walking conditions and sidewalks, should be evaluated.

### **Potential Larger and More Global Recommendations**

1. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and Institute for Public Policy should provide the Legislature more information on current school facility conditions in the state and information about the connection to student performance.
2. The funding formula should be revised to better address access to the School Construction Assistance Program for districts with multiple bond levy failures, lack of property tax base, low property tax valuation and/or small school districts.
3. The funding formula should be revised to reflect regional cost differences for school construction.
4. The funding formula should be revised to promote the more timely distribution of funds to fast growing school districts.

5. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Natural Resources should conduct a feasibility analysis and develop options for using existing state lands or acquire new lands in high growth areas of the states for schools (aka land banking).
6. A determination should be made regarding whether the 20 percent floor used in the state matching ratio should be maintained, increased, or decreased.
7. The current funding formula should be revised to accommodate changes, such as the need for specialized program spaces like science labs and historic school buildings.
8. The funding formula should be evaluated and possibly modified to address hyper inflation, but this should consider bid climate and other factors (example of other factors: project scope, scope creep, public works procurement method, cost estimating, etc) beyond inflation.
9. As part of phase two, the Joint Task Force on School Construction should review the feasibility and desirability of more significant overhaul of the state's method of funding school construction.
  - Does the current system produce the needed type of school facilities? Is this true statewide and for all districts?
  - Are modifications needed to the current funding system based on programmatic changes (eg. education reform, class size reduction, technology, etc)?
  - What is the appropriate role for local control?

Sec 14 in original bill, Sec 15 in proposed substitute bill

NEW SECTION. **Sec xx.** A new section is added to chapter 79.17 RCW to read as follows:

The legislature finds that high growth school districts are often unable to acquire lands best suited for siting new schools because current funding capacity is devoted to current needs. Once a new school is required in a community, districts that were unable to purchase land in advance of population growth must piece together multiple parcels at a high cost and in locations that are not optimal considering transportation needs and proximity to neighborhoods. The department shall coordinate with the superintendent of public instruction to assist high growth school districts in acquiring land suitable for future school sites. The superintendent of public instruction shall identify high growth school districts and shall accept applications from these school districts for land acquisition assistance. The department may use existing state land parcels if appropriate, may acquire preferred parcels with land replacement funds, or may trade state lands for preferred parcels. The department shall hold these future school site parcels as state lands based on an agreement reached with the school districts for future development. **The agreements must define the methodology for determining fair market value of the land at the time the school district desires to develop the site.** The agreements must also specify how long the land will be held as state land and the means of disposing of the land if it no longer is desirable as a school location.

**Bold text was added to the proposed Substitute Bill**