

Å



THRIVING CITIZENS EDUCATING

Bend-La Pine Schools 2010 School Facility Plan

April, 2010

Bend-La Pine Schools John Rexford, Deputy Superintendent Paul Eggleston, Director of Facilities

Project Advisory Committee Members

City of Bend Brian T. Rankin, Senior Planner



Project Home Page

Welcome to the Bend-La Pine Schools 2010 School Facility Plan (Plan). The format of this report is different than previous sites and facilities studies conducted by Bend-La Pine Schools (District). This report provides brief summaries and recommendations, less text, and improved access to technical documentation via links (in electronic form) and technical resources (in hard copy form). The focus is on the study's results and rationale, and assumes readers are capable of understanding technical tables and data.

This report is formatted to be viewed electronically as a PDF file versus a typical hard-copy report. It can easily be shared via the web and e-mail, and enables the use of links embedded within the document. The tabs above can be used just as a links in a web site for navigation and to access detailed information. Please contact John Rexford or Marsha Baro at (541) 383-6007 to receive a copy of this report, or download it at <u>www.bend.k12.or.us</u>.

Printing the PDF will not allow the use of links (<u>shown in underline blue</u>) and it will be more difficult to read as a stand-alone document. The SUBJECTS above include the major findings of the study (similar to chapters) and will reference documents in the TECHNICAL RESOURCES (similar to appendices). We hope this approach is useful and saves you time. This report will allow you to review for a broad understanding of the project's principles as well as drill down into supporting statistical data for more detail.





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

Overview & Recommendations

Page 1 of 3

PROJECT GOALS

The School Board established desired outcomes:

- Implement a community-based school planning process resulting in a 20-year school siting study for the <u>Bend urban area</u>, as well as <u>Sunriver</u> and <u>La Pine</u> areas.
- Develop a capital construction program based on the Plan.
- Create a plan consistent with <u>ORS 195.110</u>, which requires coordinated planning for school districts, cities, and counties.
- Establish a facilities committee representing the diversity of the school community.
- Address necessary topics such as enrollment projections, educational program needs, growth patterns, facility needs at schools, equity between schools, highest and best use of land holdings, deferred maintenance at existing facilities, financial planning, and others.

PROCESS

The process included:

- Forming a <u>34-person technical advisory</u> <u>committee (TAC)</u> divided into "New Sites, Schools, and Policy" and "Existing Facilities" sub-committees.
- Holding over 15 advisory committee meetings over nine months to complete the project.
- Hiring Portland State University's Population Research Center for <u>enrollment projections.</u>
- Relying on the District's legal counsel and City of Bend Long-range Planning staff for research and writing.
- Formulating an <u>interpretation of ORS 195.110</u> to meet its requirements and District's needs.
- Surveying each school Principal regarding facility needs and visiting school sites.
- Creating the Plan through analysis, discussion, exploration, transparency, and consensus.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use

e Technical Resources







Recommendations

Page 2 of 3

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The Technical Advisory Committee recommends the following to the School Board:

- Consider asking voters to approve a General Obligation bond for approximately \$79.7 million no earlier than November 2011 to fund needed <u>improvements to existing schools</u>, and <u>new school site acquisition</u> and construction.
- The new bond measure should fund improvements needed in existing schools and purchase only one new 15-acre elementary school site in the southeast area of the City of Bend. No new schools will be needed before 2018.
- Between 2010 and 2030 three small elementary schools (300 students), two 600-student elementary schools, two 800student middle schools, and one 1,500-student high schools should be open according to the following <u>schedule</u>:
 - The first new 300-student elementary school should be open by 2018 on a newly purchased 15-acre site located in the southeast Bend.

 - A new middle school should be open by 2022 on a site currently owned by the District adjacent to R.E. Jewell Elementary School. A second middle school may be needed by the year 2030.
 - The third new 300-student elementary school should be open by 2025 on a 15-acre site d Aa^A ` \&@@ ^aAn northwest Bend. By this time, one of the new 300-student schools will likely be expanded to a 600-student capacity. Two new 600-student elementary schools will likely be needed after year 2025 in the finalized and expanded Bend Urban Growth Boundary. Use attendance area boundary adjustments as needed.
 - A new high school should be open by 2026 on a site currently owned by the District in southeast Bend.



Recommendations

Page 3 of 3

ACF9 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Technical Advisory Committee recommends the following to the School Board:

- Given the severity of the recent economic recession, slowing population and enrollment growth, and uncertain fate of the proposed Bend Urban Growth Boundary, the committee recommends the District conduct another School Facility Plan in five years to re-evaluate the mid and long-term need Q[^][} åAGEFÍ Dítor new facilities àæ^åAA] Å[||{ ^} cAc åð•.
- Adopt the ten-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) including the <u>2010-2015 project list</u> and <u>2015-2020 project list</u>, but continue planning projects on a five-year schedule or during the City's periodic review to re-evaluate facility needs.
- Adopt the committee's recommendations on <u>new school locations</u> within potential school site "circles" and <u>site selection</u> <u>criteria</u>.
- Consider ideas for re-use and multi-use of existing school sites.
- Accept the committee's recommendation that most of the <u>alternative schedules</u> are un, [¦\æ]^ as alternatives to wellplanned capital construction. However, the committee recommended offering a second shift of classes or night school as a form of alternative learning for high school students and extending the school year within the state school-funding framework.
- In order to provide the community the educational programs and a safe environment set forth by the District's Educational Specifications, constructing strictly <u>two-story or multi-story buildings</u> will not result in a significant reduction of overall site size.
- <u>Funding</u> improvements, site acquisition, and school construction is best achieved with the use of traditional General Obligation Bonds versus implementing a construction excise tax, SDCs, levies, and transfer taxes.
- Adopt objective criteria for the city to use to determine impacts of zone and plan amendments on school capacity.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources



Enrollment Projections

Page 1 of 2

Portland State University's <u>Population Research Center (PRC)</u> provided enrollment projections for the District's Facility Plan. Click <u>here</u> for a link to the final report. The following narrative is from the Executive Summary of the "Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2011 to 2030-2031", by Charles Rynerson, Vivian Siu, Richard Lycan, and David West of the Population Research Center, Portland State University, March 2010.

"The Bend-La Pine School District (BLSD) enrolled 15,898 students in Fall 2009, an increase of 61 students from Fall 2008. This followed a loss of 13 students between Fall 2007 and Fall 2008. These two most recent years are in sharp contrast with the previous 19 years of uninterrupted gains of more than 200 students per year. K-12 enrollment growth averaged about 350 students per year from 1990 to 2000, and about 400 students per year from 2000 to 2007.

The enrollment trends align closely with the housing and employment trends describe in this report. Housing growth began to slow early in 2007, job losses became evident by the end of 2007, and the migration of families with children into the District tapered off beginning in 2008. In spite of this slowdown, there is still momentum from the District's recent high population growth and increase in births. All school levels, elementary, middle, and high, remain at or near their all time high enrollments. Kindergarten and 1st grade enrollments, typically the leading indicators of shifting enrollment trends, have not declined. They were each slightly larger in Fall 2009 than in Fall 2007.

The primary purpose of this study by the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) is to provide school enrollment forecasts that will be used by the District, Deschutes County, and the City of Bend for long range planning. These district-wide forecasts by grade level for the BLPSD are consistent with the Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast (DCCPF) adopted by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners in September 2004...Overall K-12 enrollment is forecast to remain close to its current level next year and then increase by 1,176 students in the period between 2010 and 2015. this average of 235 students annually is less growth than in any five year period over the past 20 years. For the balance of the forecast period, the 15 years from 2015 to 2030, the District is forecast to grow by an average of about 400 students per year, similar to the annual numeric growth between 1990 and 2007."

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

Enrollment **Projections**

Page 2 of 2

ELEMENTS OF THE PRC STUDY

The PRC study addresses the following topics:

- A 20-year enrollment forecast for the District by ٠ grade level summarized in Table 2 and annual forecasts by grade level in Table A.
- Population and housing trends 1990-2009. ۲
- Employment and migration. •
- Births and fertility rates. ۲
- Housing growth. •

1.1883

....

- Enrollment trends. •
- Private and home school enrollment. •
- Housing development and school enrollment. •
- Allocation of total population to the District. ۲
- Population forecasts. ۲
- Enrollment forecasts. •
- Forecast error and uncertainty.

Table 2					
Historic and Forecast Enrollment					
	Bend-La	Pine Scho	ol District		
					5 year
School Year	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12	growth
1990-91	4,416	2,288	2,777	9,481	
1995-96	5,180	2,791	3,322	11,293	1,812
2000-01	5,701	3,118	4,196	13,015	1,722
2005-06	6,491	3,245	4,949	14,685	1,670
2009-10	7,002	3,663	5,233	15,898	-
2010-11 (fcst.)	7,080	3,653	5,158	15,891	1,206
2015-16 (fcst.)	7,752	3,959	5,356	17,067	1,176
2020-21 (fcst.)	8,760	4,356	6,063	19,179	2,112
2025-26 (fcst.)	9,588	4,876	6,585	21,049	1,870
2030-31 (fcst.)	10,409	5,322	7,284	23,015	1,966
AAEG* 2009-10 to					
2030-31	1.9%	1.8%	1.6%	1.8%	

* Note: Average Annusal Enrollment Growth.

Source: Historic enrollment, Bend-La Pine School district; Enrollment forecasts,

Population Research Center, PSU. December 2009.

Project Home Page

Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & **Construction Schedule** Ten-year CIP and **Financial Plan**

Alternatives & Multipurpose Use

Technical Resources





New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

APPROACH: NEW SITES, SCHOOLSŽAND POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

The Plan predicts how many new schools will be needed between 2010 and 2030. This starts with the 20-year enrollment forecasts provided by PRC. Next, the capacity of existing schools is determined to estimate a district-wide need for new school capacity. The need for new schools by level is then determined for areas in and around Bend. Finally, the TAC identified areas for new school sites. Click <u>here</u> for a presentation on past planning projects, bond measures, and the planning context for the 2010 Plan.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The TAC's <u>interpretation of ORS 195.110</u> results in a Plan meeting the law's requirements, while preserving the District's successful and collaborative approach to planning, site acquisition, and school construction.
- 2. The District should anticipate opening the equivalent of four 600-student elementary schools, two 800-student middle schools, and one 1,500-student high school by the year 2030 to provide adequate capacity for new students.
- 3. By 2015, the District should acquire one new 15-acre elementary school site in the southeast of Bend.
- 4. No new elementary schools need to be opened until 2018, no middle schools until 2022, and no high schools until 2026.
- 5. All pew schools should be located in Bend, primarily in the southeast area of the City of BendÁ $@^{\Lambda}_{\Lambda}^{\Lambda} (\dot{A}_{\Lambda}^{\circ})^{\Lambda} (\dot{A}_{\Lambda}^{\circ$
- 6. The TAC recommends using smaller elementary schools with 300-student capacity that can be expanded to 600-student capacity to provide a smaller school, enhance the District's flexibility to meet future needs, and address uncertainty.
- 7. The TAC recommends a Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule detailing events and dates triggering specific actions such as acquiring sites, starting design and construction and opening new schools, and starting additional review and planning. These actions are put in the context of the next proposed bond, ten-year CIP, or longer-term planning projects.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections





New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

DETAILED APPROACH

- 1. The <u>Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule memorandum</u> explains how the need for new school capacity was estimated and calls for specific actions on a timeline. The schedule was created by analyzing:
 - The <u>capacity of existing schools</u>.
 - <u>District-wide capacity needs</u> over a 20-year period.
 - Student <u>generation at build-out</u> for the City of Bend and Bend UGB expansion area.
 - Needs for <u>new capacity by quadrants</u> (sub-areas) within the City of Bend.
 - <u>TAC recommendations</u> to add new capacity to meet anticipated needs.
 - Timing <u>considerations</u> and best practices when crafting a site acquisition and construction schedule.
 - Final <u>site acquisition and construction schedules</u> by school level integrating TAC input with anticipated needs.
- 2. The <u>Approach to Identifying New Sites for Schools memorandum</u> explains how the TAC decided where to locate new schools. The results implement the site acquisition and construction schedule. Maps showing TAC-recommended locations for new <u>elementary</u>, <u>middle</u>, <u>and high schools</u> were created.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources



Ten-year CIP & Financial Plan

Page 1 of 2

APPROACH: EXISTING-FACILITIES SUB-COMMITTEE

- This sub-committee represented a cross-section of the District and was made up of parents, teachers, and design and engineering professionals. The sub-committee produced capital improvement plans with needed improvements for the District's facilities by:
- Meeting over 15 times to review projects submitted via school site surveys, deferred maintenance lists and staff interviews and site visits.
- Evaluating over 650 facility improvements to determine the 180 projects to be included in the next bond proposal.
- Recommending projects affecting 12 elementary schools, all middle and high schools, and six support sites.
- Addressing the improvements with the following criteria in mind: safety/security, operational/instructional delivery, equity/parity, asset protection/building preservation, and energy/labor conservation. More projects are recommended for older facilities versus new facilities.
- Combining similar projects to save money and benefit from economies of scale. Themes emerged from the review including ventilation in older schools, replacing single pane windows with double pane windows, lighting retrofits, and painting building exteriors.
- Recommending a <u>five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)</u> and <u>ten-year CIP</u>. The recommended five-year CIP contains improvements the sub-committee recommends be included in the next bond measure. The ten-year CIP contains additional improvements scheduled to be competed between 2015 and 2020 if funding becomes available.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

Ten-year CIP & Financial Plan

Page 2 of 2

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

- The Plan estimates the cost to make improvements to existing schools, new site acquisition and school construction, and evaluates funding mechanisms:
- <u>Cost estimates for facility improvements</u> and site acquisition needed in the bond and in a ten-year Capital Improvement Plan were developed.
- Improvement costs were also <u>categorized by type</u>.
- The TAC narrowed down the list of facility upgrades in the <u>ten-year CIP</u> to a smaller list of more <u>improvements recommended to be included in a</u> <u>new bond measure</u> no earlier than November, 2011. A <u>model</u> suggests a consistent tax rate for could be maintained with a new bond after 2012.
- The <u>funding tools available</u> to ensure facility needs are met were discussed by the TAC. Specifically, the TAC examined the need to implement a construction excise, SDCs, transfer taxes, or use traditional funding streams such as General Obligation bonds to fund needed improvements.

TAC RECOMMENDATIONS

- Of the potential funding mechanisms described, the committee explored in depth the use of Construction Excise Tax to meet a portion of its facility needs. However, the committee did not recommend its use at this time, and it recognized that local general obligation bonds will continue to be the primary funding option for capital construction.
- The cost of the proposed bond is estimated at \$79.7 million. The timing of the bond should not occur before 2011 and the TAC recommends the School Board closely monitor the economy and other proposed tax measures to gauge the public's sentiment before formally proposing the bond.
- The District has strategically structured the cost and timing of past and future bonds so the proposed bond (after November 2011) would not increase the tax rate attributed to the District's bonds.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan

Alternatives & Multipurpose Use

Technical Resources





Page 1 of 1

ORS 195.110 requires school facility plans analyze alternatives to new school construction and measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including multi-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites. It also empowers districts to adopt objective criteria for the city and county to use to determine if adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected developments resulting from comprehensive plan and residential land use regulation amendments.

- <u>Alternatives to new school construction</u> to increase the capacity of schools typically include changing the school schedule. The TAC reviewed alternatives including year 'round single track and multi-track schedules, double shifts (day and nigh shift classes), and night school for high school students. The TAC strongly supported extending the school year and encouraging the District to offer additional night school classes for high school students, but did not recommend substituting multi-track and double shift schedules to increase capacity.
- <u>An analysis of a multi-story design</u> for a prototypical elementary school site shows that buildings occupy only approximately
 ten percent of a site, with the rest in fields, circulation, and other uses. Converting a prototypical elementary to multi-story
 would save less than one acre. Building strictly two-story or multi-story buildings will not result in a significant reduction of
 overall site size. All secondary schools and the 300-student elementary use multi-story designs, and multi-story designs
 should continue to be used where it is appropriate.
- The TAC evaluated all existing sites and facilities to create <u>recommendations on re-use and multipurpose use</u>. The
 evaluated <u>aerial photographs of all District-owned properties</u> and discussed opportunities and constraints with project and
 District staff. TAC recommendations consider sixteen of the sites as built out, but created specific ideas for re-use at eleven
 sites. Recommendations include partnerships with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District, building new schools, new
 access points, and recreational development opportunities.
- The project also resulted in developing <u>objective criteria</u> for the city to use to determine impacts of zone and plan amendments on school capacity.

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

ites & nedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

Multipurpose Use





Closing & Next Steps

This report is the culmination of many hours of thoughtful discussions over many different and sometimes contentious issues. The Plan's recommendations represent a consensus of the sub-committees and larger TAC's views, is an accomplishment and testament to the committee members, and reflects the TAC's thoughtfulness and dedication to the broader community.

The TAC recommends the Bend-La Pine School District Board of Directors a&&^] cthis Plan to guide the District's decision making related to topics addressed in this Plan. The TAC also strongly recommends the Board initiate a similar planning project by 2015, or as required by law./ÁV@Á/OĐÁ^&[{ { ^} å• Á@Á[æåÁæå[] oÁ àb &cãç^Á& ão \ ãæá[Áçæ] æ^Áč č \^Á &@ [|Áæ] &ãã • È

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Technical Advisory Committee Members

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET	To:	BEND-LA PINE SCHOOL BOARD
PO Box 431 BEND, OR 97709	FROM:	TAC MEMBERS
[541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX	SUBJECT:	TAC MEMBERSHIP AND THANK YOU
www.cl.bend.or.us	DATE:	4/19/2010
	CC:	

The 2010 Sites and Facilities Committee were comprised of 34 community members from various sectors of our community. The committee met in June of 2009 and decided to divide themselves into two sub-committees. Paul Eggleston directed the Existing Facilities Review Committee and John Rexford and Brian Rankin directed the New Sites, Schools, and Policy Sub-committee. The Technical Advisory Committee is considered the entire group of both sub-committees.

Several of the committee members had also previously served on the 2005 Sites and Facilities Committee as well as the 2000 Committee. The wealth of experience and knowledge coupled with the committees' dedication and participation are greatly acknowledged and appreciated. Bend-La Pine Schools are fortunate to have such a wealth of community support interested in the process of thoughtful planning for the future of our students. Thank you committee members:

Amy Bahrman Ron Barber Kevin Barclay Marsha Baro Charlie Beck Lisa Birk Skip Butler Blaise Cacciola Mary Dovlo	Angus Eastwood Paul Eggleston David Ford Ben Hansen Andy High Barry Johnson Steve Jorgenson Karen Kent Poggy Kinkado	Mike Larraneta Barbara McAuslund Michael McLandress Julie Mosier Tim O'Connell Brian Rankin John Rexford Scott Reynolds Mike Biloy	Damian Syrnyk Lucas Taroli Mike Tiller Dan Torrence Maureen Vega Janelle Wilcox Dan Wolnick
Mary Doyle	Peggy Kinkade	Mike Riley	

The 2010 Sites and Facilities Committee members thank the District Board of Directors, Superintendent Wilkinson and the District staff for their cooperation and participation in this project. Additional thanks to the Committee Chairman, John Rexford, Brian Rankin, and Paul Eggleston for their project management and planning work. Additional thanks to the efforts of Marsha Baro and Karen Kent for their organizational and logistical planning.





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

ORS 195.110

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources

(School Facility Planning)

195.110 School facility plan for large school districts. (1) As used in this section, "large school district" means a school district that has an enrollment of over 2,500 students based on certified enrollment numbers submitted to the Department of Education during the first quarter of each new school year.

(2) A city or county containing a large school district shall:

(a) Include as an element of its comprehensive plan a school facility plan prepared by the district in consultation with the affected city or county.

(b) Initiate planning activities with a school district to accomplish planning as required under ORS 195.020.

(3) The provisions of subsection (2)(a) of this section do not apply to a city or a county that contains less than 10 percent of the total population of the large school district.

(4) The large school district shall select a representative to meet and confer with a representative of the city or county, as described in subsection (2)(b) of this section, to accomplish the planning required by ORS 195.020 and shall notify the city or county of the selected representative. The city or county shall provide the facilities and set the time for the planning activities. The representatives shall meet at least twice each year, unless all representatives agree in writing to another schedule, and make a written summary of issues discussed and proposed actions.

(5)(a) The school facility plan must cover a period of at least 10 years and must include, but need not be limited to, the following elements:

(A) Population projections by school age group.

(B) Identification by the city or county and by the large school district of desirable school sites.

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

(D) Financial plans to meet school facility needs, including an analysis of available tools to ensure facility needs are met.

(E) An analysis of:

(i) The alternatives to new school construction and major renovation; and

(ii) Measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites.

(F) Ten-year capital improvement plans.

(G) Site acquisition schedules and programs.

(b) Based on the elements described in paragraph (a) of this subsection and applicable laws and rules, the school facility plan must also include an analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary.

(6) If a large school district determines that there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period covered by the school facility plan, the city or county, or both, and the large school district shall cooperate in identifying land for school facilities and take necessary actions, including, but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary, or petitioning a metropolitan service district to add one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary pursuant to applicable law.

(7) The school facility plan shall provide for the integration of existing city or county land dedication requirements with the needs of the large school district.

(8) The large school district shall:

(a) Identify in the school facility plan school facility needs based on population growth projections and land use designations contained in the city or county comprehensive plan; and

(b) Update the school facility plan during periodic review or more frequently by mutual agreement between the large school district and the affected city or county.

(9)(a) In the school facility plan, the district school board of a large school district may adopt objective criteria to be used by an affected city or county to determine whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development. Before the adoption of the criteria, the large school district shall confer with the affected cities and counties and agree, to the extent possible, on the appropriate criteria. After a large school district formally adopts criteria for the capacity of school facilities, an affected city or county shall accept those criteria as its own for purposes of evaluating applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment.

(b) A city or county shall provide notice to an affected large school district when considering a plan or land use regulation amendment that significantly impacts school capacity. If the large school district requests, the city or county shall implement a coordinated process with the district to identify potential school sites and facilities to address the projected impacts.

(10) A school district that is not a large school district may adopt a school facility plan as described in this section in consultation with an affected city or county.

(11) The capacity of a school facility is not the basis for a development moratorium under ORS 197.505 to 197.540.

(12) This section does not confer any power to a school district to declare a building moratorium.

(13) A city or county may deny an application for residential development based on a lack of school capacity if:

(a) The issue is raised by the school district;

(b) The lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section; and

(c) The city or county has considered options to address school capacity. [1993 c.550 §2; 1995 c.508 §1; 2001 c.876 §1; 2007 c.579 §1]





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

PRC Study

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources



BEND-LA PINE SCHOOL DISTRICT POPULATION AND ENROLLMENT FORECASTS 2010-11 TO 2030-31

Prepared By Population Research Center College of Urban and Public Affairs Portland State University

MARCH, 2010

Project Staff: Charles Rynerson, Demographic Analyst, Principal Investigator Vivian Siu, Research Assistant Richard Lycan, Senior Research Associate David West, Research Assistant

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
POPULATION AND HOUSING TRENDS, 1990 to 2009	7
Population	7
Employment	8
Population and Migration by Age Group	8
Births and Fertility Rates	10
Housing Growth	12
ENROLLMENT TRENDS	15
Private and Home School Enrollment	17
Housing Development and School Enrollment	18
ENROLLMENT FORECASTS	21
Allocation of Total Population to the BLPSD	21
Population Forecasts	23
Enrollment Forecasts	27
FORECAST ERROR AND UNCERTAINTY	33

TABLES AND CHARTS

Table 1. Total Population. 1990 to 2030	2
Table 2. Historic and Forecast Enrollment, Bend-La Pine School District	3
Table 3. City and Region Population, 1990, 2000, and 2009	7
Table 4. Population by Age Group, Bend-La Pine School District	9
Table 5. Annual Births, 1990 to 2007, Bend-La Pine School District	11
Table 6. Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits	13
Table 7. Bend-La Pine S.D., New Housing Units Built 2000 to 2008	13
Table 8. Bend-La Pine S.D., Enrollment History, 1999-00 to 2009-10	16
Table 9-10. Average Number of BLPSD Students per Housing Unit, Fall 2009	
Table 9. By Housing Type and Year Built	19
Table10. Homes Built 2000 to 2008 by Jurisdiction and Type	20
Table 11. Population Control Totals, 1990 to 2030	22
Table 12. Estimated and Forecast Births, Bend-La Pine School District	25
Table 13. Population by Age Group, Bend-La Pine School District, 1990 to 2030	27
Table 14. Grade Progression Rates, BLPSD History and Forecast	30
Table 15. Bend-La Pine S.D., Enrollment Forecasts, 2010-11 to 2030-31	31
Table 16. District-wide K-12 Forecast Error	34
Table A. BLPSD, Annual Enrollment Forecasts, 2010-11 to 2030-31	A-1

TABLES AND CHARTS (continued)

Population Change due to Migration, 1990 to 2000, BLPSD by Age Group	.10
Age-Specific Fertility Rates, 1990 and 2000, BLPSD & Deschutes County.	.11
Net Migration, 1990 to 2030, Bend-La Pine S.D., History and Forecast	.24
BLPSD Birth Cohorts and Kindergarten Enrollment	.28
BLPSD Enrollment History and Forecasts	.35
	Population Change due to Migration, 1990 to 2000, BLPSD by Age Group Age-Specific Fertility Rates, 1990 and 2000, BLPSD & Deschutes County. Net Migration, 1990 to 2030, Bend-La Pine S.D., History and Forecast BLPSD Birth Cohorts and Kindergarten Enrollment BLPSD Enrollment History and Forecasts

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bend-La Pine School District (BLPSD) enrolled 15,898 students in Fall 2009, an increase of 61 students from Fall 2008. This followed a loss of 13 students between Fall 2007 and Fall 2008. These two most recent years are in sharp contrast with the previous 19 years of uninterrupted gains of more than 200 students each year. K-12 enrollment growth averaged about 350 students per year from 1990 to 2000, and about 400 students per year from 2000 to 2007.

The enrollment trends align closely with the housing and employment trends described in this report. Housing growth began to slow early in 2007, job losses became evident by the end of 2007, and the migration of families with children into the District tapered off beginning in 2008. In spite of this slowdown, there is still momentum from the District's recent high population growth and increase in births. All school levels, elementary, middle, and high, remain at or near their all time high enrollments. Kindergarten and 1st grade enrollments, typically the leading indicators of shifting enrollment trends, have not declined. They were each slightly larger in Fall 2009 than in Fall 2007.

The primary purpose of this study by the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) is to provide school enrollment forecasts that will be used by the District, Deschutes County, and the City of Bend for long range planning. These district-wide forecasts by grade level for the BLPSD are consistent with the Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast (DCCPF) adopted by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners in September 2004.

PRC's methodology first required the allocation of DCCPF population totals for the County, Bend Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) area and the Unincorporated area to establish population forecasts explicitly for the BLPSD. Table 1 shows the results of the allocation.

	Total Pop	Table 1 ulation, 1990) to 2030	
	Deschutes County	Bend UGB	Deschutes Unincor- porated*	Bend-La Pine School District
1990 Census	74,958	33,513	32,157	50,815
2000 Census	115,367	52,029	46,657	79,383
2010 Forecast	166,572	81,242	59,127	115,262
2015 Forecast	189,443	91,158	65,924	130,081
2020 Forecast	214,145	100,646	73,502	145,545
2025 Forecast	240,811	109,389	81,951	161,568
2030 Forecast	266,538	119,009	91,371	177,990

*Note: The area reported here is slightly smaller than the actual unincorporated area. For consistency with the Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast, this is the area outside of the Bend, Redmond, and Sisters UGBs. It includes the City of La Pine, which incorporated in 2006.

Source, 1990 and 2000: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 Censuses, data aggregated to Bend UGB, Deschutes "Unincorporated" (see note above), and BLPSD boundary by Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC).

Source: 2010 to 2025, County, UGB, and Unincorporated forecasts, Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast, 2000-2005. Exhibit "E" to Ordinance 2004-012, adopted 9/8/04.

Source: 2030, County, UGB, and Unincorporated forecasts, Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan, 2009/2010 Draft.

Source: 2010 to 2030, Bend-LaPine S.D., population forecasts by PRC based on allocation of Coordinated Population Forecast.

After establishing population control totals for the District, we assembled a model to forecast population by age and sex in 10 year increments as well as school enrollment by individual grade and school year. Overall K-12 enrollment is forecast to remain close to its current level next year and then increase by 1,176 students in the period between 2010 and 2015. This average of 235 students annually is less growth than in any five year period over the past 20 years. For the balance of the forecast period, the 15 years from 2015 to 2030, the District is forecast to grow by an average of about 400 students per year, similar to the annual numeric growth between 1990 and 2007.

Between the current school year and 2020, elementary (K-5) grades add 1,758 students, middle (6-8) grades add 693 students, and high school (9-12) grades add 830 students. In the final 10 years of the forecast from 2020 to 2030, elementary grades add another 1,649 students, and secondary enrollment growth accelerates, adding another 966 students in middle grades and 1,221 students in high school grades. Table 2 contains a summary of

the enrollment forecasts by school level. More detailed forecasts by grade level are included in Table 15 and in the Appendix.

Hist Be	Table 2 Historic and Forecast Enrollment Bend-La Pine School District				
School Year	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12	5 year growth
1990-91	4,416	2,288	2,777	9,481	
1995-96	5,180	2,791	3,322	11,293	1,812
2000-01	5,701	3,118	4,196	13,015	1,722
2005-06	6,491	3,245	4,949	14,685	1,670
2009-10	7,002	3,663	5,233	15,898	
2010-11 (fcst.)	7,080	3,653	5,158	15,891	1,206
2015-16 (fcst.)	7,752	3,959	5,356	17,067	1,176
2020-21 (fcst.)	8,760	4,356	6,063	19,179	2,112
2025-26 (fcst.)	9,588	4,876	6,585	21,049	1,870
2030-31 (fcst.)	10,409	5,322	7,284	23,015	1,966
AAEG*, 2009-10 to 2030-31	1.9%	1.8%	1.6%	1.8%	

*Note: Average Annual Enrollment Growth.

Source: Historic enrollment, Bend-La Pine School District; Enrollment forecasts, Population Research Center, PSU. December 2009.

INTRODUCTION

The Bend-La Pine School District (BLPSD) requested that the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) prepare *long-range* enrollment forecasts for use in comprehensive planning by the District, Deschutes County, and the City of Bend. Historic enrollment figures through Fall 2009 are used as a baseline in the preparation of forecasts of district-wide enrollment by grade level for each year from 2010-11 to 2030-31. PRC has conducted similar studies for the BLPSD in the past. This study and the two previous studies have been conducted at five year intervals. The study completed in 2005 used historic enrollment through Fall 2004, and the study completed in 2000 used historic enrollment through Fall 1999.

Legislation adopted in 2007 specifically addresses school planning in Oregon. O.R.S. 195.110 states that "a city or county containing a large school district (2,500 students or more) shall: (a) Include as an element of its comprehensive plan a school facility plan prepared by the district in consultation with the affected city or county. (b) Initiate planning activities with a school district to accomplish planning as required under ORS 195.020." The statute also includes language requiring forecasts by school age group as part of a school district's long range facility plan.¹

Deschutes County, the City of Bend, and the BLPSD have been pioneers of this type of coordinated planning effort. Deschutes' population has grown by 128% since 1990, faster than any other Oregon county, and the BLPSD added about 6,400 students during the same period. Therefore, cooperation on issues such as siting new schools is essential. Both this study and the 2005 study were conducted with extensive involvement by the City of Bend Planning Department, and utilize the Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast (DCCPF) adopted by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners in September 2004.

¹Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 195 — Local Government Planning Coordination. 2007 Edition.

Information sources used in the study include the U.S. Census Bureau 1990 and 2000 Censuses and 2006-2008 American Community Survey (ACS), the DCCPF, birth data from the Oregon Center for Health Statistics, city and county population estimates produced by PRC, employment trends and forecasts from the Oregon Employment Department, and planning documents from the City of Bend.

The District serves the entire City of Bend and its Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), unincorporated areas adjacent to Bend, and all of the communities in Deschutes County to the south of Bend. These include Deschutes River Woods, Sunriver, and the City of La Pine, which incorporated in 2006. The rest of Deschutes County is covered by two other school districts, Redmond and Sisters.

Following this introduction are sections presenting recent population, housing, and enrollment trends within the District. Next, the "Enrollment Forecasts" section includes a discussion of methodology and summaries of the district-wide enrollment forecasts. The final section contains a brief discussion of the nature and accuracy of forecasts.

Population

During the decade between the 1990 and 2000 Censuses, total population within the boundaries of the BLPSD grew by 56 percent, from 50,815 persons to 79,383. The District's rate of population growth during the 1990s was similar to the 54 percent countywide growth. The City of Bend grew by 154 percent and the unincorporated area within the BLPSD boundary lost 10 percent in the decade, but that disparity was entirely due to the City's boundary expansion. A more relevant comparison is the population within the BLPSD which grew by 55 percent, and the population of the BLPSD outside of the Bend UGB, which grew by 58 percent.

In the current decade, population within the County and the BLPSD has continued to grow at a rate similar to the 1990s. Table 3 shows that annual average growth rates from 2000 to 2009 in Deschutes County and in the Bend UGB have remained in the four to five percent range.

City and	l Region P	Table 3 opulation,	1990, 2000), and 2009		
	Avg. Annua			Avg. Annual	I Growth Rate	
	1990	2000	2009	1990-2000	2000-2009	
City of Bend ¹	20,447	52,029	82,280	9.8%	5.1%	
Bend UGB ²	33,513	52,029	82,280	4.5%	5.1%	
City of La Pine ³	N/A	N/A	1,625			
BLPSD Unincorporated	30,368	27,354	N/A	-1.0%		
BLPSD Total	50,815	79,383	N/A	4.6%		
Deschutes County	74,958	115,367	170,705	4.4%	4.3%	

1. A portion of the City of Bend's population growth was due to the annexation of 17,040 persons between 1990 and 2000.

2. Historic population counts within existing UGB as of 2009.

3. The City of La Pine was incorporated in 2006.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 censuses; Portland State University Population Research Center, preliminary 2009 estimates.

Employment

Although the Bend area is known for its outdoor lifestyle that attracts newcomers of all ages and is a popular retirement destination, employment opportunities are an important factor in the area's population growth. Census Bureau ACS estimates indicate that labor force participation rates in the BLPSD are higher than statewide rates for residents under age 55, but lower for residents age 55 and over. During the 2006 to 2008 period, 92 percent of men and 78 percent of women age 20 to 54 were in the labor force.² Parents of school age children are likely to be economically active adults, so school enrollment growth depends in part on job growth.

While the number of employed residents in Oregon fell during the recession between 2000 and 2003, Deschutes County continued to gain workers during the period. During the recovery and boom from 2003 to 2006 employment grew by 24 percent in the County, far outpacing the State's eight percent growth. The number of employed Deschutes County residents increased in each of 17 years from 1991 to 2007, with annual growth exceeding four percent in nine of those years. However, the County lost jobs in both 2008 and 2009, and now has a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate over 15 percent, the highest rate among Oregon's metropolitan areas.³

Population and Migration by Age Group

Population by age group from the 1990 and 2000 censuses and more recent estimates are shown in Table 4. Every age group grew during the decade. The biggest growth between 1990 and 2000 was among persons in their 40s and 50s, while the smallest growth was among persons ages 65 to 69. The 65 to 69 year old age group lost population in Oregon and the U.S. between 1990 and 2000 because that cohort was born during the depression era of the early 1930s, when births fell from previous levels. The growth rate for schoolage population (53 percent) was nearly as high as total population (56 percent) between 1990 and 2000 the growth of the age 5 to 17 population has lagged behind total population, according to estimates from the ACS.

²U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey. Table C23001.

³Local Area Employment Statistics. Oregon Employment Department, OLMIS.

	Populat Bond Lo	Table 4 ion by Aç	ge Group	4	
		Fine Sch	2006 to	נ 1990 to 20	00 Change
	1990	2000	2008*	Number	Percent
Under Age 5	3,529	4,961	6,911	1,432	41%
Age 5 to 9	3,746	5,281	5,973	1,535	41%
Age 10 to 14	3,627	5,740	6,476	2,113	58%
Age 15 to 17	2,018	3,385	3,828	1,367	68%
Age 18 to 19	1,202	2,011	2,209	809	67%
Age 20 to 24	2,735	4,652	5,652	1,917	70%
Age 25 to 29	3,450	5,319	9,425	1,869	54%
Age 30 to 34	4,353	5,304	8,323	951	22%
Age 35 to 39	4,930	5,971	6,812	1,041	21%
Age 40 to 44	4,367	6,604	7,515	2,237	51%
Age 45 to 49	2,910	6,655	7,529	3,745	129%
Age 50 to 54	2,313	5,735	7,523	3,422	148%
Age 55 to 59	2,112	4,134	7,307	2,022	96%
Age 60 to 64	2,438	3,379	5,211	941	39%
Age 65 to 69	2,495	2,935	4,508	440	18%
Age 70 to 74	1,959	2,640	3,230	681	35%
Age 75 to 79	1,382	2,117	2,531	735	53%
Age 80 to 84	753	1,397	1,964	644	86%
Age 85 and over	506	1,163	1,794	657	130%
Total Population	50,825	79,383	104,721	28,558	56%
Total age 5 to 17	9,391	14,406	16,277	5,015	53%
share age 5 to 17	18.5%	18.1%	15.5%		

*Note: The 1990 and 2000 data are a complete census count, the 2006-2008 data are estimates based on a relatively small survey. Each age group estimate in 2006-2008 has a margin of error of several hundred persons.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 Censuses, data aggregated to BLPSD boundary by Portland State University Population Research Center; U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey, Table B01001, estimates published for BLPSD.

In the 1990s, about 90 percent of BLPSD's population growth was directly attributable to net migration (people moving in minus people moving out). By "surviving" the 1990 population and 1990s births (estimating the population in each age group that would survive to the year 2000) and comparing the "survived" population to the actual 2000 population by age group, we are able to estimate net migration by age cohort. Chart 1 shows the estimated population change that each age group contributed due to migration between 1990 and 2000. For example, among the cohort that was 20 to 24 in 1990 and 30 to 34 in 2000, about 2,500 more people moved into the BLPSD than out of it in the 1990s. All age groups added population due to migration, with the largest gains among adults ages 25 to 44 and children ages 5 to 14.



Births and Fertility Rates

The 31 percent increase in the number of births in the District from 690 in 1990 to 903 in 2000 lagged behind the District's 56 percent overall population increase. However, since 2000 the number of births to BLPSD residents has soared; the 2007 estimate of 1,397 was 55 percent higher than in 2000. This increase is consistent with the ACS age estimates showing the population in prime childbearing ages 25 to 34 growing faster in this decade than in the 1990s. Table 5 reports the number of births each year from 1990 to 2007 for the District.

Age-specific fertility rates for the BLPSD in 1990 and 2000 are shown in Chart 2. For comparison, Deschutes County fertility rates for 2000 are also included. Rates are calculated for each age group by dividing the average annual number of births in the three year period around each census (1989 to 1991 and 1999 to 2001) by the female population counted in the census. For example, there were an average of 181 births per year to mothers age 20 to 24 in 1989 to 1991 and a population of 1,339 women age 20 to 24 counted in the 1990 Census. So the fertility rate in 1990 for women age 20 to 24 was 181/1339 = 0.135 births per female, or 135 per thousand. Chart 2 shows that BLPSD fertility rates for women under age 30 fell between 1990 and 2000, while rates for women

Table 5 Annual Births, 1990 to 2007 Bend-La Pine School District		
'ear	Births	
990	690	
991	674	
992	680	
993	647	
994	693	
995	781	
996	804	
997	833	
998	850	
999	837	
000	903	
001	1,017	
)02	1,039	
003	1,094	
004	1,140	
005	1,234	
006	1,331	
007	1,397	


age 30 and over increased. Similar changes occurred statewide between 1990 and 2000, but the magnitude of the changes in the BLPSD was greater. The chart also shows that the District's age-specific fertility rates for women age 20 to 29 were significantly lower than countywide rates.

Another common measure of fertility is the Total Fertility Rate (TFR). This is an estimate of the number of children that would be born to the average women during her child-bearing years, based on age-specific fertility rates observed at a given time. The TFR for the District decreased from 1.97 in 1990 to 1.82 in 2000. State and County TFRs also decreased, from 2.20 in Deschutes County in 1990 to 2.06, and from 2.06 statewide in 1990 to 1.98.

Housing Growth

During the 1990s, the number of housing units within the District's boundaries increased by 13,430, according to Census data from 1990 and 2000. Because of the number of seasonal and vacation properties in the area, the relationship between housing growth and population growth may not be straightforward. The District contained 38,234 housing units in 2000, but only 31,652 households (occupied housing units), an occupancy rate of 83 percent.

Two independent sources indicate that about 16,000 housing units have been added to the District's housing stock in the nine years from 2000 to 2008. Building permits issued in the City of Bend and unincorporated Deschutes County are tabulated in Table 6 and completed homes recorded by the County tax assessor and City of Bend buildable lands inventory are shown in Table 7. Both sets of data reveal the slowdown in housing construction that began in 2007 and continues today.

Although housing growth in this decade is certain to exceed 1990s growth, Census Bureau estimates indicate that the occupancy rate has decreased further since 2000. The 2006 to 2008 ACS estimates a 79.9 percent occupancy rate, with a margin of error of plus or minus two percent.

Housing	Units Aut	Table 6 horized by	/ Building F	Permits
	City o	f Bend	Unincorporat Coเ	ed Deschutes
Year Permit Issued	Single Family	Multiple Family	Single Family	Multiple Family
1996	381	134	709	28
1997	563	192	739	92
1998	560	303	874	19
1999	824	187	738	19
2000	787	125	650	40
2001	944	222	622	0
2002	1195	299	596	0
2003	1058	648	661	20
2004	1663	570	813	12
2005	2050	506	935	12
2006	1517	162	823	8
2007	759	152	476	0
2008	276	83	228	0
2009 (Jan - Oct)	140	2	114	26

*Note: Figures are for all of unincorporated Deschutes County. Tax assessor data indicate that about 52 percent of unincorporated area homes built 2000-2008 are within the BLPSD.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Residential Construction Branch. Data available online at http://censtats.census.gov/bldg/bldgprmt.shtml.

Table 7 Bend-La Pine School District New Housing Units Built 2000 to 2008 Year Built

		Year Built								2000-08
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
Single Family	1,197	1,141	1,526	1,693	2,040	2,571	2,246	1,170	433	14,017
Multi-Family	101	142	160	293	694	325	99	37	158	2,009
Total	1,298	1,283	1,686	1,986	2,734	2,896	2,345	1,207	591	16,026

Note: Single family includes some units classified as "single family condos" and manufactured homes.

Source: Estimates compiled by PSU-PRC. The primary sources are tax assessor parcel data and the City of Bend Buildable Land Inventory. The assessor's data does not include housing unit counts, so the counts were derived from housing-related attributes, such as property code and land use.

ENROLLMENT TRENDS

The District enrolled 15,898 students in Fall 2009, an increase of 61 students (0.4 percent) from Fall 2008. This followed a loss of 13 students between Fall 2007 and Fall 2008. These two most recent years are in sharp contrast with the previous 19 years of uninterrupted gains of more than 200 students each year. K-12 enrollment growth averaged about 350 students per year from 1990 to 2000, and about 400 students per year from 2000 to 2007.

The enrollment trends align closely with the housing and employment trends described in the previous section. Housing growth began to slow early in 2007, job losses became evident by the end of 2007, and the migration of families with children into the District tapered off beginning in 2008. In spite of this slowdown, there is still momentum from the District's high population growth and increase in births since 2000. All school levels, elementary, middle, and high, remain at or near their all time high enrollments. Kindergarten and 1st grade enrollments, typically the leading indicators of shifting enrollment trends, have not declined. They were each slightly larger in Fall 2009 than in Fall 2007.

On the next page, Table 8 summarizes the enrollment history for the District by grade level annually from 1999-2000 to 2009-10. Five year enrollment comparisons show that in spite of the slowdown since 2007-08, enrollment growth in the most recent five years was similar to the previous five years. Enrollment grew by over 3,100 students (24 percent) over the entire 10 year period.

	В	end-La F	vine Scho	ool Distri	Tab ct. Enrol	ole 8 Iment Hi	storv. 19	99-2000	to 2009-1	0	
Grade	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
K	804	844	886	888	973	985	1,036	1,060	1,115	1,133	1,129
1	895	895	942	983	1,003	1,032	1,076	1,130	1,171	1,181	1,198
2	938	932	939	981	1,006	1,062	1,051	1,094	1,156	1,152	1,171
3	1,007	947	992	968	1,031	1,052	1,125	1,118	1,160	1,175	1,145
4	967	1,074	1,020	997	1,012	1,057	1,085	1,162	1,166	1,167	1,184
5	1,001	1,009	1,106	1,056	1,037	1,050	1,118	1,133	1,203	1,198	1,175
6	989	1,054	1,089	1,146	1,091	1,090	1,049	1,174	1,178	1,218	1,219
7	1,024	1,014	1,079	1,099	1,164	1,112	1,102	1,098	1,205	1,193	1,226
8	1,034	1,050	1,068	1,105	1,135	1,209	1,094	1,171	1,158	1,229	1,218
9	1,123	1,078	1,163	1,196	1,199	1,241	1,399	1,310	1,324	1,358	1,374
10	1,064	1,136	1,089	1,148	1,179	1,201	1,256	1,377	1,387	1,314	1,342
11	1,024	1,018	1,109	1,086	1,116	1,180	1,195	1,341	1,407	1,270	1,263
12	909	964	923	1,018	994	1,031	1,099	1,162	1,220	1,249	1,254
US*	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12,779	13,015	13,405	13,671	13,940	14,303	14,685	15,330	15,850	15,837	15,898
Annualah	2222	236	390	266	269	363	382	645	520	-13	61
Annual ch	ange	1.8%	3.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.6%	2.7%	4.4%	3.4%	-0.1%	0.4%
K-5	5,612	5,701	5,885	5,873	6,062	6,238	6,491	6,697	6,975	7,006	7,002
6-8	3,047	3,118	3,236	3,350	3,390	3,411	3,245	3,443	3,541	3,640	3,663
9-12	4,120	4,196	4,284	4,448	4,488	4,653	4,949	5,190	5,334	5,191	5,233
			1999-00 t	o 2004-05		2004-05 t	o 2009-10		1999-00 to	o 2009-10	
			5 yr. chg.	Pct.	-	5 yr. chg.	Pct.		10 yr. chg.	Pct.	
K-5			626	11%	-	764	12%		1,390	25%	
6-8	_		364	12%	-	252	7%		616	20%	
9-12	_		533	13%	-	580	12%		1,113	27%	
Total	_		1,524	12%	-	1,595	11%		3,119	24%	

Private and Home School Enrollment

Private schools in the Bend area listed by the Oregon Department of Education and the High Desert Education Service District (HDESD) enroll a total of about 1,100 children in grades K-8 and fewer than 100 in grades 9-12. We spoke with representatives of three of the four largest private schools in Bend, and learned that their enrollments have been stable or slightly declining since 2007-08. One school cited the economy as a reason for enrollment decline. This could mean that some families find private school tuition unaffordable and have switched to public schools, or that families are leaving the area due to job losses.

Private schools within the BLPSD enroll local students as well as students from beyond the BLPSD boundaries, and conversely, BLPSD residents may attend private schools located elsewhere in Central Oregon. So the number of students enrolled in private schools physically located within the District can not be used to measure overall private school share. The best source of data for private school enrollment of BLPSD residents is Census Bureau decennial censuses and more recent ACS. In 2000, approximately 1,185 of the grade 1-12 students living in the District were reported as private school students, a nine percent share.⁴ The 2006-2008 ACS, with a smaller sample size and therefore a greater margin of error, reported similar shares of BLPSD residents attending private schools. The 1,350 private school students in 2006-2008 represented 9.5 percent of BLPSD residents enrolled in grades 1-12.⁵ Both the 2000 Census and the 2006-2008 ACS reported a 20 percent or higher share of kindergarten enrollment in private schools. Notice that these data report children "enrolled in school" so they include children in public or private schools but not those who are home schooled.

Another difference between BLPSD enrollment and child population can be attributed to home schooling. Home schooled students living in the District are required to register with the HDESD, though the statistics are not precise because students who move out of

⁴U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, Summary File 3, Table P36 allocated to BLPSD area from block group data.

⁵U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey three year estimates, Table C14002.

the area are not required to drop their registration. Students who enroll in public schools after being registered as home schooled are dropped from the home school registry. In November 2009 there were 611 BLPSD residents registered as home schooled, including 412 students in grades K-8 and 199 students in grades 9-12. These figures are relatively unchanged from Fall 2006 and are lower than in 2004-05, when about 750 BLPSD residents were home schooled. The home schooled population accounts for about four percent of total BLPSD school age residents.

Comparing the population counted in the 2000 Census with the BLPSD enrollment by grade level confirms that the share of area children not attending BLPSD schools was consistent with the private and home school shares. BLPSD kindergarten enrollment in 1999-00 was 82 percent of the kindergarten-age population counted in the census, and BLPSD 1st-5th grade enrollment accounted for about 86 percent of the corresponding census population.

Housing Development and School Enrollment

A common concern of community members and school officials is the impact of new residential development on school enrollment. New housing generally contributes enrollment to local schools, but the average number of students in each home is often lower than anticipated and demographic trends in existing homes may either offset or exacerbate the enrollment gains from new housing. Also, the impacts vary by the characteristics of the new housing. In this section, we present estimates of student generation by jurisdiction for new housing in the BLPSD. These estimates help to inform the enrollment forecasts, and they can be used by District staff on an *ad hoc* basis to estimate potential student generation from future developments as they are proposed or approved.

We estimated the Fall 2009 number of students per housing unit in a geographic information system (GIS), matching student addresses with tax lots and their associated attributes. Student records contain no personally identifiable data such as names or birth dates, and the information is reported only in aggregate or summary form, such as in the tables in this section.

For the District, the average number of K-12 students per single family home built since 2000 is 0.34, about one student for every three homes. Homes built in the 1990s have a slightly lower K-12 student generation rate of 0.30, but house more high school students and fewer elementary students, on average, than the newer homes. The older student profile in homes that are 10 to 20 years old is not surprising; other school districts have similar characteristics. BLPSD also displays the typical pattern of having fewer students of all grade levels in homes that are more than 20 years old. There is an average of 0.24 K-12 students per home built before 1990. Although older homes may eventually turn over to young families, it is a gradual process and today's diverse households include a majority of households without children. Table 9 presents Fall 2009 student generation rates by year built for both single family and multiple family homes.

Table 9 Average Number of BLPSD Students per Housing Unit, Fall 2009 By Housing Type and Year Built								
Grade Level								
Housing Type and Year Built	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12				
Homes built before 1990								
Single Family	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.24				
Multiple Family	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.17				
Homes built 1990 to 1999								
Single Family	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.30				
Multiple Family	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.18				
Homes built 2000 to 2008								
Single Family	0.17	0.08	0.09	0.34				
Multiple Family	0.10	0.04	0.06	0.20				

Population Research Center, Portland State University

The inverse relationship between the age of home and the average number of K-12 students is a general trend found in most school districts. However, student generation rates in the District are low compared with Portland area districts where similar analyses have been conducted. The number of K-12 students per single family home built since 2000 ranges from a low of 0.41 in Portland Public Schools to a high of 0.57 in McMinnville S.D., all higher than the BLPSD's 0.34 average. At the time of the 2000

Census, 34 percent of households in the BLPSD included at least one child under 18, almost the same as the Portland area's 35 percent share. That suggests that household type is not the biggest factor in the BLPSD's low rates. Many individual subdivisions in the BLPSD outside of senior and resort communities have over 0.50 students per new home, and some have as many as 1.00 students per home. Most of the difference in the district-wide average is likely due to the high share of vacant and seasonal homes among the BLPSD's housing stock and the in-migration of "empty nest" homeowners.

Table 10 differentiates the student generation rates by jurisdiction, showing that average student generation rates are consistently higher in the incorporated cities of Bend and La Pine than in unincorporated Deschutes County. Within the City of Bend, there is an average of 0.37 BLPSD students per home built since 2000. La Pine's average of 0.42 students per new home is even higher. Unincorporated area homes built since 2000 are home to an average of 0.29 students each.

Homes Built 2000	to 2008 by Juris	sdiction a	and Type	
		Grade	Level	
Jurisdiction and Type	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
District Total	0.16	0.07	0.09	0.32
Single Family Homes	0.17	0.08	0.09	0.34
City of Bend	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.37
City of La Pine	0.20	0.10	0.12	0.42
Unincorporated Area	0.13	0.07	0.08	0.29
Multi-Family Homes	0.10	0.04	0.06	0.20

Population Research Center, Portland State University

ENROLLMENT FORECASTS

The population forecasts already established for Deschutes County and its cities and unincorporated area form the foundation for the BLPSD population forecasts. The DCCPF was adopted in September, 2004, by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners. Currently, the forecast is being incorporated into the Deschutes County 2030 Comprehensive Plan update. The adopted forecast covers the 2005 to 2025 period, and it has been extended to 2030 in the draft Comprehensive Plan.

In order to produce enrollment forecasts consistent with the DCCPF, several steps are required. First, population forecast controls for the BLPSD were developed by allocating DCCPF figures to the District's service area. Next, a model was built to forecast BLPSD population by age and sex. Within the model, the relationship between population and school enrollment is established based on historic data. The model simultaneously forecasts population, including area births, and school enrollment by grade level.

Allocation of Total Population to the BLPSD

The entire Bend UGB is within the BLPSD. In 2000, about 59 percent of the population of the area identified as "Unincorporated" in the DCCPF was within the BLPSD. However, there is no explicit population forecast for the District. Therefore, before a population and enrollment forecast model was built for the District, we established population controls for future years that are consistent with the DCCPF.

The data in Part A of Table 11 contains the known information that was used to allocate population to the BLPSD. The alternative BLPSD populations in Part B are based on the population history, forecasts, and shares in Part A.

The BLPSD forecast labeled "Method A" is based on the District maintaining a constant share of County population throughout the forecast period. This assumption was influenced by the fact that the Bend UGB, accounting for most of the BLPSD population,

		Та	ble 11							
Population Control Totals, 1990 to 2030										
A. Sour	A. Source Data: Population History, Shares, and Forecasts									
	1990	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030			
Deschutes County ¹	74,958	115,367	166,572	189,443	214,145	240,811	266,538			
Bend UGB ¹	33,513	52,029	81,242	91,158	100,646	109,389	119,009			
Share of County	44.7%	45.1%	48.8%	48.1%	47.0%	45.4%	44.6%			
Unincorporated ^{1,2}	32,157	46,657	59,127	65,924	73,502	81,951	91,371			
BLPSD	50,815	79,383								
Share of County	67.8%	68.8%								
BLPSD Unincorporated ³	17,302	27,354								
Share of Uninc.	53.8%	58.6%								

B. Development of Bend-La Pine School District Population Controls

	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
BLPSD Method A ⁴	79,383	114,617	130,354	147,351	165,700	183,402
Share of County	68.8%	68.8%	68.8%	68.8%	68.8%	68.8%
BLPSD Method B ⁵	79,383	115,907	129,808	143,739	157,435	172,578
Share of County	68.8%	69.6%	68.5%	67.1%	65.4%	64.7%
BLPSD Method C ⁶	79,383	115,262	130,081	145,545	161,568	177,990
Share of County	68.8%	69.2%	68.7%	68.0%	67.1%	66.8%

1. Sources: Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast, 2000-2005. Exhibit "E" to Ordinance 2004-012, adopted 9/8/04; Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan, 2009/2010 Draft.

2. This area is slightly smaller than the unincorporated area as of the 2000 Census. For consistency with the Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast, this is the area outside of the Bend, Redmond, and Sisters UGBs. It includes the City of La Pine, which incorporated in 2006.

3. BLPSD minus Bend UGB.

4. Constant share of County population.

5. Bend UGB plus constant share of unincorporated population.

6. Average of Methods A and B.

contains roughly the same share of County population (45 percent) at the end of the forecast in 2025 and 2030 as it did in 1990 and 2000. However, the difference between the BLPSD forecast under this method and the Bend UGB forecast implies that the District's share of Unincorporated population would increase 12 percentage points to 70.5 percent by 2030. That may not be realistic given the growth potential in other parts of the County, so Method A may result in a District population that is too high.

Instead of using Deschutes County total population, "Method B" uses the individual Bend UGB and Unincorporated area population forecasts. The method allocates 100 percent of the Bend UGB population and a constant 58.6 percent share of the Unincorporated area to the BLPSD. This results in the District's share of Deschutes County population declining by four percentage points, from 69 percent to 65 percent, during the forecast period. This is a large decline that reverses the trend observed between 1990 and 2000. Because the portion of the Unincorporated area within the BLPSD includes the recently incorporated City of LaPine as well as other relatively urbanized areas in the U.S. 97 corridor, Method B may result in a BLPSD forecast that is too low.

The populations using Methods A and B are very close until 2015, and diverge by only six percent by 2030. Although the difference is not large, based on the concerns about the shares of County and Unincorporated populations implied by these two methods, we conclude that the BLPSD populations that are most consistent with the DCCPF would be lower than Method A and higher than Method B. Therefore, results of Method C, the average of Methods A and B, are used as population control totals for the BLPSD forecast model.

Population Forecasts

A demographic cohort-component model was used to forecast population for the District by age and sex. The **components** of population change are births, deaths, and migration (residential relocation). An area's population grows when births outnumber deaths and when more people move into an area than out of it. These events occur at different rates for persons of different age groups, or **cohorts**. For example, people tend to relocate the most when they are in their 20s and the elderly have a lower chance than people in their 40s to survive over a five year period. Applying appropriate age- and gender-specific rates of fertility, mortality, and migration to the existing population cohorts of the District produces forecasts of future population including school-age children.

The 1990 and 2000 Census results are used as a baseline for the population forecasts. By "surviving" the 1990 population and 1990s births (estimating the population in each age group that would survive to the year 2000) and comparing the "survived" population to the actual 2000 population by age group, we are able to estimate the overall level of net migration between 1990 and 2000 as well as net migration by gender and age cohort. The net migration data were used to develop initial net migration rates, which were used

as a baseline for rates used to forecast net migration for the 2000 to 2030 period. Migration rates for the 2000 to 2010 period also utilized additional information that is available this decade, including births by age of mother and age group estimates from the ACS. Chart 3 shows estimated and forecast net migration by decade from 1990 to 2030.



We estimated the number of births to women residing within the District each year from 1990 to 2007, using data from the Oregon Department of Human Services, Center for Health Statistics. Detailed information including the age of mothers enabled us to calculate fertility rates by age group for both 1990 and 2000. Fertility rates for 2010 are lower than in 2000 for women under age 30 and higher for women age 30 and older. These trends are based on state and national observations, as well as the number of births by age of mother occurring within the District during the 2001 to 2005 period for which detailed birth data are available. After 2010, fertility rates are held constant. Birth forecasts through 2025 are shown in Table 12.

Table 12 Estimated and Forecast Births Bend-La Pine School District					
(ear	Births				
2000	903				
2001	1,017				
.002	1,039				
003	1,094				
004	1,140				
005	1,234				
006	1,331				
007	1,397				
008	1,412				
009	1,414				
)10	1,415				
011	1,430				
)12	1,445				
)13	1,468				
)14	1,498				
015	1,536				
)16	1,572				
017	1,608				
018	1,644				
019	1,681				
020	1,717				
)21	1,744				
)22	1,772				
23	1,799				
)24	1,827				
)25	1,854				

allocated to BLPSD boundary by PSU-PRC. 2008-2025 forecasts, PSU-PRC. Deschutes County's year over year job losses began in November 2007, nearly a year before the statewide decline, which began in October 2008. When job growth does resume, population growth may lag because of the number of existing residents who need the jobs. When population growth resumes, home building may lag because of the large inventory of unsold homes. Clearly, the weak economy has resulted in the current population growth slowdown that is likely to last for two more years. It does not undermine the long term growth forecasts, but if it continues beyond 2011, a reassessment of population and school enrollment growth may be necessary.

Just as the Bend area began to lose jobs before Oregon's statewide job losses began, the County's employment level may also bottom out before the State's. In the most recent 12 month period, from October 2008 to 2009, Oregon lost five percent of its jobs, while Deschutes County lost three percent. The Oregon Employment Department just released employment projections covering the 2008 to 2018 period, and the Central Oregon region of Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties leads the state's workforce regions with 14 percent job growth.⁶ Based on the three percent decline likely between 2008 and 2009, this forecast implies that 2009 to 2018 increase may amount to 17 percent, similar to the 20 percent growth in BLPSD population age 18 to 59 forecast between 2010 and 2020.

Population totals shown in Table 13 were established by the allocation of the DCCPF described earlier. Age group populations derived in the cohort-component model are influenced by the assumptions about migration, mortality, and fertility that are unique to this study.

⁶Regional Projections by Industry and Occupation 2008-2018. Oregon Employment Department, Workforce and Economic Research. November 2009.

			Table 1	3				
		Popula	tion by A	ge Grou	p			
	Bend-La	a Pine So	chool Dis	strict, 19	90 to 20	30		
	1990 2000 2010 2020 2030							
	Census	Census	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Number	Percen	
Under Age 5	3,529	4,961	7,008	8,566	10,019	5,058	102%	
Age 5 to 9	3,746	5,281	6,905	8,562	10,172	4,891	93%	
Age 10 to 14	3,627	5,740	7,116	8,516	10,330	4,590	80%	
Age 15 to 17	2,018	3,385	4,318	5,018	6,118	2,733	81%	
Age 18 to 19	1,202	2,011	2,846	2,921	3,703	1,692	84%	
Age 20 to 24	2,735	4,652	6,942	8,206	9,772	5,120	110%	
Age 25 to 29	3,450	5,319	8,411	9,607	10,617	5,298	100%	
Age 30 to 34	4,353	5,304	8,313	9,998	11,675	6,371	120%	
Age 35 to 39	4,930	5,971	8,583	11,314	12,784	6,813	114%	
Age 40 to 44	4,367	6,604	8,089	10,573	12,608	6,004	91%	
Age 45 to 49	2,910	6,655	8,121	10,251	13,377	6,722	101%	
Age 50 to 54	2,313	5,735	8,285	9,218	11,986	6,251	109%	
Age 55 to 59	2,112	4,134	8,195	9,454	11,643	7,509	182%	
Age 60 to 64	2,438	3,379	7,104	9,169	10,102	6,723	199%	
Age 65 to 69	2,495	2,935	5,333	8,750	10,046	7,111	242%	
Age 70 to 74	1,959	2,640	3,487	6,592	8,420	5,780	219%	
Age 75 to 79	1,382	2,117	2,442	4,216	6,916	4,799	227%	
Age 80 to 84	753	1,397	1,837	2,329	4,401	3,004	215%	
Age 85 and over	506	1,163	1,926	2,285	3,301	2,138	184%	
Total Population	50,825	79,383	115,262	145,545	177,990	98,607	124%	
Total age 5 to 17	9,391	14,406	18,339	22,096	26,620	12,214	85%	
share age 5 to 17	18.5%	18.1%	15.9%	15.2%	15.0%		•	
		100 100	100 110	110 120	120 120	-		
Population Change		30-00	25 970	20.204	20-30	-		
Doroont	5	20,330	33,019	3 0,204	JZ,44J	-		
Average Appuel		1 6%	40%	20%	2270	-		
Average Annual		4.0%	3.8%	Z.4%	2.0%			

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 and 2000 Censuses; data aggregated to BLPSD boundary by Portland State University Population Research Center. PSU-PRC Forecasts, 2010, 2020, and 2030.

Enrollment Forecasts

Historic school enrollment is linked to the population forecast in two ways. First, the kindergarten and first grade enrollments at the time of the most recent census (the 1999-2000 school year) are compared to the population at the appropriate ages counted in the census. The "capture rate," or ratio of enrollment to population, is an estimate of the share of area children who are enrolled in BLPSD schools. Capture rates based on census data are used to forecast kindergarten and first grade enrollments. If there is evidence that capture rates have changed since the time of the census, they may be adjusted in the

forecast. Because private school and home school enrollments have not changed very much this decade, capture rates are only one to two percentage points lower than in 1999-2000. Capture rates of 80 percent for kindergarten and 85 percent for 1st grade are used throughout the forecast.

The other way that historic population and enrollment are linked is through migration. Annual changes in school enrollment by cohort closely follow trends in the net migration of children in the District's population. Once the students are in first grade, a set of baseline grade progression rates (GPRs) are used to move students from one grade to the next. These rates, usually 1.00 for elementary grades, represent a scenario under which there is no change due to migration. Enrollment change beyond the baseline is added (or subtracted) at each grade level depending on migration levels of the overall population by single years of age.



Chart 4 compares the historic and forecast number of births in the District with the historic and forecast number of BLPSD kindergarten students. Births correspond to kindergarten cohorts (September to August). Although many children move into and out of the District between birth and age five, and not all District residents attend BLPSD kindergartens, the trend in kindergarten enrollment has generally followed the trend in the birth cohort. Kindergarten classes have consistently been larger than the corresponding number of births five years earlier, but the gap is narrowing. In the late 1990s, the number of BLPSD kindergarten class is only three percent larger than the number of births occurring to District residents between September 2003 and August 2004.

The increase in births accelerated with the booming economy in the mid-2000s, resulting in a 34 percent increase in births between 2002 and 2007 and a 25 percent increase in kindergarten enrollment between Fall 2002 and Fall 2007. In spite of the mid-decade increase in births, the size of incoming kindergarten classes in 2008 and 2009 changed very little from 2007 due to the slowing economy that affected migration flows. The expected lack of migration-fueled growth for the near term future means that the ratio of kindergarten enrollment to births will continue to decrease. Beginning in 2010-11, kindergarten enrollments are forecast to be less than the number of births in each cohort. Even so, the long range forecasts still include growth due to net migration between birth and age five, because the ratio of kindergarten to previous births remains near 90 percent, significantly higher than the kindergarten capture rate of 80 percent.

The District's growth has been fueled by migration; until the current school year there have consistently been more households moving in than out. This migration has contributed to the long term growth in District births and subsequent kindergarten enrollments, as shown in Chart 4. Table 14 illustrates how the BLPSD also gains students due to migration at nearly every grade level. Over the last 10 years, average GPRs for each grade from 2nd to 8th are in a range from 1.02 to 1.04, indicating growth of two to four percent more students each year attributable to migration of school-age

children. The forecast also includes enrollment growth due to migration, at slightly lower rates than in the past.

Table 14 Grade Progression Rates ¹ Bend-La Pine S.D. History and Forecast							
Grade Transition	Historic Average: 1999-00 to 2009-10	Baseline (without the influence of migration)	Forecast Average: 2009-10 to 2030-31				
K-1	1.09	²	1.08				
1-2	1.02	0.985	1.00				
2-3	1.04	1.010	1.03				
3-4	1.03	1.000	1.02				
4-5	1.04	1.000	1.02				
5-6	1.04	1.000	1.02				
6-7	1.02	0.995	1.02				
7-8	1.03	1.000	1.02				
8-9	1.11	1.080	1.10				
9-10	1.00	0.970	0.98				
10-11	0.98	0.960	0.97				
11-12	0.93	0.960	0.94				

1. Ratio of enrollment in an individual grade to enrollment in the previous grade the previous year.

2. The enrollment forecast model uses capture rates for first grade; K-1 baseline GPRs are not used.

Overall K-12 enrollment is forecast to remain near its current level next year and then increase by 1,176 students in the period between 2010 and 2015. This average of 235 students annually is less growth than in any five year period over the past 20 years. For the balance of the forecast period, the 15 years from 2015 to 2030, the District is forecast to grow by an average of about 400 students per year, similar to the annual numeric growth between 1990 and 2007. Because of the increasing enrollment base, average annual enrollment growth rates decline throughout the forecast. In the 1990s, 400 students represented four percent growth; by 2025, 400 students represent less than two percent growth.

There will be annual enrollment fluctuations that no forecast can anticipate, possibly including flat or declining enrollment offset by explosive growth. Population growth will

also fluctuate. The DCCPF and these enrollment forecasts both depict long run average expectations of growth.

Table 15 contains grade level forecasts for the District for five year intervals from 2010-11 to 2030-31. The forecasts are also summarized by grade level groups (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12). Annual forecasts are included in an Appendix.

	En	Bend	Table 1 La Pine Sc	5 hool Distric	ct				
Linfoliment Forecasts, 2010-11 to 2030-31									
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2015-16	2020-21	2025-26	2030-31			
K	1,129	1,136	1,245	1,398	1,521	1,648			
1	1,198	1,204	1,314	1,481	1,613	1,751			
2	1,171	1,192	1,265	1,461	1,595	1,731			
3	1,145	1,194	1,290	1,477	1,616	1,753			
4	1,184	1,157	1,319	1,472	1,621	1,761			
5	1,175	1,197	1,319	1,471	1,622	1,765			
6	1,219	1,188	1,322	1,471	1,625	1,770			
7	1,226	1,226	1,323	1,434	1,623	1,772			
8	1,218	1,239	1,314	1,451	1,628	1,780			
9	1,374	1,376	1,416	1,644	1,792	1,967			
10	1,342	1,343	1,402	1,579	1,723	1,894			
11	1,263	1,294	1,318	1,497	1,633	1,798			
12	1,254	1,145	1,220	1,343	1,437	1,625			
Total	15,898	15,891	17,067	19,179	21,049	23,015			
Americal	h a 1a a' a *	-7	235	422	374	393			
Annual c	nange	0.0%	1.4%	2.4%	1.9%	1.8%			
K-5	7.002	7.080	7,752	8,760	9,588	10,409			
6-8	3.663	3.653	3.959	4.356	4.876	5.322			
9-12	5,233	5,158	5,356	6,063	6,585	7.284			

31

FORECAST ERROR AND UNCERTAINTY

These enrollment forecasts indicate steady enrollment growth from 2010 to 2030, and are consistent with the DCCPF. However, forecasts should be understood to represent a range of outcomes even though discrete numbers are provided.

The previous enrollment forecasts prepared by PRC in 2005, based on identical Deschutes County population forecasts, employed a slightly different methodology and included five fewer years of historic enrollment as a baseline. The previous forecast for Fall 2009 was 277 students (1.8 percent) higher than actual Fall 2009 enrollment and its 2020 forecast was 723 students (3.7 percent) higher than the current forecast for 2020. The 2005 enrollment forecast used the DCCPF County populations as controls for a countywide cohort-component population and enrollment forecast and then allocated enrollment to BLPSD using a constant share of county enrollment. The lower 2009-10 enrollment and the current methodology that allows for a slight decline in BLPSD's share of County population results in a slightly lower enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment forecast in spite of using a similar cohort-component population and enrollment model.

Due to the nature of forecasting, there is no way to estimate a confidence interval as one might for data collected from a sample. The best way to measure potential forecast error is to compare actual enrollments with previous forecasts that were conducted using similar data and methodologies. In Table 16 the forecasted K-12 enrollments from the 2005 and 2000 studies are compared with actual K-12 enrollments through 2009-10

The preferred forecasts from the last two studies, the 2000 "medium" forecast and the 2005 "coordinated" forecast have remained relatively close to actual enrollments. The District's 2007-08 K-12 total was higher than both forecasts. After two subsequent years of little or no enrollment growth, the 2009-10 K-12 total is now lower than both forecasts. Chart 5 on the last page of this section compares the enrollment forecasts from the 2000 "medium" and 2005 "coordinated" forecasts with actual enrollments and the "coordinated" forecast from the current study.

		District-wid	Table 16 e K-12 Forec	ast Error					
School Actual K-12 Enrollment Forecasts by Forecast Year and Series Name ¹									
Year	Enroll.	2000 LOW	2000 MED	2000 HIGH	2005 COORD ²				
1999-00	12,779								
2000-01	13,015	13,013	13,151	13,157					
2001-02	13,405	13,275	13,494	13,533					
2002-03	13,671	13,530	13,855	13,947					
2003-04	13,940	13,791	14,175	14,335					
2004-05	14,303	14,056	14,596	14,831	14,373				
2005-06	14,685	14,326	14,992	15,311	14,748				
2006-07	15,330	14,602	15,380	15,782	15,091				
2007-08	15,850	14,882	15,706	16,192	15,443				
2008-09	15,837	15,169	16,057	16,624	15,804				
2009-10	15,898	15,460	16,338	16,987	16,175				
School		Percent	Error by Foreca	st Year and Seri	es Name ¹				
Year		2000 LOW	2000 MED	2000 HIGH	2005 COORD ²				
2000-01		0.0%	1.0%	1.1%					
2001-02		-1.0%	0.7%	1.0%					
2002-03		-1.0%	1.3%	2.0%					
2003-04		-1.1%	1.7%	2.8%					
2004-05		-1.7%	2.0%	3.7%	0.5%				
2005-06		-2.4%	2.1%	4.3%	0.4%				
2006-07		-4.7%	0.3%	2.9%	-1.6%				
2007-08		-6.1%	-0.9%	2.2%	-2.6%				
2008-09		-4.2%	1.4%	5.0%	-0.2%				
2009-10		-2.8%	2.8%	6.8%	1 7%				

1. Forecasts prepared in 2000 with base year of 1999-2000 included low, medium, and high scenarios. The forecast prepared in 2005 with a base year of 2004-05 was a cohort-component model consistent with the Coordinated Population Forecast.

2. The 2005 forecast was based on preliminary enrollment for 2004-05. Actual enrollment was 70 students lower.



APPENDIX

ANNUAL ENROLLMENT FORECASTS BY GRADE LEVEL

Table A																						
Bend-La Pine School District																						
Annual Enrollment Forecasts, 2010-11 to 2030-31																						
	Historic	Forecast																				
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31
Κ	1,129	1,136	1,152	1,146	1,157	1,213	1,245	1,278	1,313	1,344	1,372	1,398	1,426	1,450	1,473	1,495	1,521	1,549	1,574	1,598	1,623	1,648
1	1,198	1,204	1,217	1,239	1,237	1,255	1,314	1,349	1,385	1,423	1,456	1,481	1,509	1,539	1,565	1,589	1,613	1,641	1,671	1,698	1,725	1,751
2	1,171	1,192	1,198	1,216	1,244	1,248	1,265	1,325	1,360	1,396	1,435	1,461	1,486	1,514	1,544	1,570	1,595	1,619	1,647	1,677	1,704	1,731
3	1,145	1,194	1,216	1,228	1,252	1,287	1,290	1,308	1,370	1,406	1,443	1,477	1,503	1,529	1,558	1,589	1,616	1,641	1,666	1,695	1,726	1,753
4	1,184	1,157	1,206	1,235	1,254	1,285	1,319	1,322	1,341	1,404	1,441	1,472	1,507	1,533	1,560	1,589	1,621	1,648	1,674	1,699	1,729	1,761
5	1,175	1,197	1,170	1,226	1,262	1,288	1,319	1,354	1,357	1,376	1,441	1,471	1,503	1,538	1,565	1,592	1,622	1,655	1,682	1,709	1,734	1,765
6	1,219	1,188	1,210	1,189	1,253	1,296	1,322	1,354	1,389	1,393	1,412	1,471	1,502	1,534	1,570	1,598	1,625	1,656	1,689	1,717	1,745	1,770
7	1,226	1,226	1,195	1,224	1,209	1,281	1,323	1,350	1,382	1,418	1,422	1,434	1,494	1,526	1,558	1,595	1,623	1,650	1,682	1,715	1,744	1,772
8	1,218	1,239	1,239	1,214	1,250	1,242	1,314	1,357	1,385	1,418	1,455	1,451	1,464	1,525	1,558	1,590	1,628	1,657	1,684	1,717	1,750	1,780
9	1,374	1,376	1,398	1,404	1,381	1,425	1,416	1,495	1,542	1,573	1,609	1,644	1,639	1,654	1,721	1,757	1,792	1,833	1,865	1,895	1,931	1,967
10	1,342	1,343	1,345	1,369	1,379	1,359	1,402	1,393	1,470	1,516	1,547	1,579	1,613	1,608	1,623	1,688	1,723	1,758	1,798	1,829	1,858	1,894
11	1,263	1,294	1,295	1,299	1,325	1,338	1,318	1,359	1,351	1,425	1,470	1,497	1,528	1,561	1,556	1,570	1,633	1,667	1,701	1,740	1,770	1,798
12	1,254	1,145	1,174	1,177	1,181	1,206	1,220	1,198	1,238	1,232	1,301	1,343	1,368	1,397	1,428	1,423	1,437	1,496	1,528	1,560	1,597	1,625
Total [*]	15,898	15,891	16,015	16,166	16,384	16,723	17,067	17,442	17,883	18,324	18,804	19,179	19,542	19,908	20,279	20,645	21,049	21,470	21,861	22,249	22,636	23,015
Annual cl	2	-7	124	151	218	339	344	375	441	441	480	375	363	366	371	366	404	421	391	388	387	379
	cnange	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%	2.5%	2.6%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
	T				r	r	r		P		P		P	P	P					1	1	
K-5	7,002	7,080	7,159	7,290	7,406	7,576	7,752	7,936	8,126	8,349	8,588	8,760	8,934	9,103	9,265	9,424	9,588	9,753	9,914	10,076	10,241	10,409
6-8	3,663	3,653	3,644	3,627	3,712	3,819	3,959	4,061	4,156	4,229	4,289	4,356	4,460	4,585	4,686	4,783	4,876	4,963	5,055	5,149	5,239	5,322
9-12	5,233	5,158	5,212	5,249	5,266	5,328	5,356	5,445	5,601	5,746	5,927	6,063	6,148	6,220	6,328	6,438	6,585	6,754	6,892	7,024	7,156	7,284
Population Research Center, Portland State University, December 2009.																						





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Planning History

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page





Bend- La Pine Schools 2010 Sites and Facilities Study:

Background and Project Overview





Overview

- Planning Context Recent growth trends
- Previous Planning Efforts and Lessons "Fringe?", "Infill", "Expansion"
- → Project Overview New regulations and work plan



Population Growth



Source: 2005 City of Bend Residential Land Study



Predicted Population Growth: 2000 - 2025



Source: Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast: 2005-2025



Bend La-Pine Schools: Enrollment Growth



Source: Bend-La Pine Schools



Bend La-Pine Schools: Enrollment Forecast



Source: 2005 Bend-La Pine Schools Sites and Facilities Plan



Peaking Housing Market: 2004-2008

Figure 5: Sales Statistics for Residential Property in Bend

YTD Statistics t	hru December of	2004 2005		2006	2007	2008	% Change 2007-2008	
Residential								
Bend	Total Sold	2,284	2,849	2,074	1,520	1,120	-26.32%	
	Sold Volume	620,008,686	953,188,638	842,297,202	647,587,523	395,519,572	-38.92%	
	Avg. Sales Amount	271,457	334,570	406,122	426,044	353,142	-17.11%	
	Median Sales Amount	227,500	279,900	351,978	345,000	289,450	-16.10%	
	Avg. Days On Market	130	120	132	169	179	5.92%	

Source: Central Oregon Association of Realtors. www.centraloregonrealtors.com


Infill of Tax Lots in Bend UGB: 2001-2009





Old vs. New Planning Context

- "Get ahead of growth"
 - Community-wide consensus in the past may be changing now
 - Retain existing and find the best new sites for schools
- Escalating land costs and diminishing land supplies
 - Land costs are decreasing but supply is constrained
- Educational suitability and building systems
- Impacts planning strategy to focus on:
 - Accurately predicting where and when growth will occur need good demographics and coordination
 - Be very resourceful finding possible sites use GIS to find "needle in the haystack"
 - Co-use of school sites/parks
 - □ In context of urban expansion, where will growth occur?
- Current recession may change the planning context
 - Enrollment growth, *#* new sites/schools, community perception



Bend-La Pine Schools Siting Studies

- 1991 and 1995 Long-range Sites and Facilities Plans by Bend-La Pine Schools staff
- 1997 School Siting Study David Evans and Associates, Transportation Growth Management, BLPS staff
- 1997 Alternative School Schedule Committee and Analysis feasibility of alternative schedules to reduce need for new facilities and improve program delivery
- 2000 Sites and Facilities Study DEA, Portland State University PRC, Geo-Spatial Solutions, BLPS staff
- 2005 Sites and Facilities Plan Brian Rankin (from DEA), PSU, GSS, BLPS staff



Bend-La Pine Schools Bond Measures

- → 1991 \$44.5 million: 4 new elementary and 1 middle
- → **1996 -** \$58.5 million (failed)
- 1998 \$57.5 million: 1 new elementary, 1 middle, 1 high school
- → 2001 \$47.8 million: 2 elementary schools
- → 2006 \$119 million: 3 elementary schools



BLPS Sites and Facilities Studies: Summary of Approach

- Approach to studies:
 - 1997 report studied costs to serve fringe vs. internal schools and concluded long-term transportation costs of fringe sites were higher than additional expenditures for "infill" sites
 - Demographics and enrollment projections
 - Land inventories and site ranking for new sites
 - Facility review
 - TAC and community involvement
 - Agency coordination





Lesson: "Fringe?"





Lesson: "Fringe?"

Issues: Sometimes the fringe is the new center, may be difficult to determine where this is the case, risk

Opportunities: Lower land cost for district, school well integrated into the development and community, compatibility is established in MP, no NIMBY, creating a model situation at build-out

Coordination: Must plan to know the need and reduce risks, public/private coordination is necessary, issues of timing important, co-use with parks

Challenges: How long is it on the fringe? Infrastructure costs

Criticisms: Does this lead development outward? Would same levels of development otherwise take place?









Lesson: "Infill"

- **Issues:** Smaller infill schools are seen as highly desirable, may be so, but are also difficult to implement and may not always be the solution
- **Opportunities:** Broad support for the concept, sites may be available in a variety of redevelopment scenarios, lower transportation costs, possibly lower infrastructure and equivalent construction costs
- **Coordination:** Likely more community outreach with neighbors (perceived impacts), co-use is essential and may generate opportunities, multi-agency coordination may extend timeline
- **Challenges:** Difficult to implement Daggett, Pine Ridge, Kingston, infill strategy is situational, NIMBY, higher operating costs for district

Criticisms: Having enough space to deliver programs (physical education)







Lesson: "Expansion"

- Issues: Coordination does not guarantee results, legitimate differences of opinion on long-range planning
- Opportunities: City recently added 192 acres for new schools, maps and policies address school needs
- Coordination: Five years and counting, planning time frames don't always match
- Challenges: Land need estimates challenged by Central Oregon Landwatch, questioned by Department of Land Conservation and Development, subject of potential remand and appeals
- Criticisms: Time (two planning cycles), separate annexation delayed opening of elementary school



ORS 195.110 Requirements

Districts are required to prepare 10-year school facility plans:

- Population projections
- Site needs
- Improvements needed in existing schools
- Financial plans to meet siting and facility needs
- Analysis of alternatives to new school construction
- Ten year capital improvement plan
- Site acquisition schedules and programs
- Implemented by the city and county through their comprehensive plans and development codes
- Empowers districts to work with cities and counties to obtain needed sites during land use approval (i.e. large master plans and subdivisions)





Work Plan

	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Policy Component		_	_	-			
Review Existing							
Propose New							
Coordination Notice to Three Jurisdictions							
Enrollment Projections							
District (PSU)							
Draft District or Quadrant based enrollment							
Land Inventory							
Assemble Data							
Develop Siting Criteria							
Review Land Base							
Develop Alternative Schedules, Facilities Approaches							
Estimate New Schools Needed							
Collected Schools Needed							
Site Evaluation							
Apply Criteria to Land Base and Needed Sites							
10-Year CIP for Facility Repair/Replacement							
Public Involvement							
Advisory Committee	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Board Meetings					1		2
Web-based Information Sharing (District)			1			2	
Report Writing	Outline		To Date			Final Draft	Final





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Improvements to Schools: 2010-2015

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

			TOTAL
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT IIILE	PROJECT
1	Bear Creek ES	Replace/update all exterior siding and repaint	\$136,769
2	Bear Creek ES	Replace boiler system, update controls and ductwork	\$320,267
3	Bear Creek ES	Replace single pane windows	\$193,225
		BEAR CREEK ES TOTAL	\$650,261
4	Buckingham ES	Replace removable walls with permanent walls	\$236,000
5	Buckingham ES	Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at prototypical office area - provide more storage	\$1,570,095
6	Buckingham ES	Replace gym floor	\$73,278
7	Buckingham ES	Replace gym lighting	\$18,375
8	Buckingham ES	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$18,716
9	Buckingham ES	Replace driveway and parking asphalt	\$64,469
10	Buckingham ES	Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks	\$61,906
11	Buckingham ES	Soundproof library computer lab	\$12,430
12	Buckingham ES	Replace acoustical panels in gym	\$41,518
		BUCKINGHAM ES TOTAL	\$2,096,787
10			
13	Elk Meadow ES	Provide additional Storage	\$31,196
14	Elk Meadow ES	Repair/renovate north play field	\$331,685
15	EIK Meadow ES	Convert HVAC controls to DDC	\$479,375
10	EIK Meadow ES	Replace driveway and parking asphalt	\$39,041
1/	EIK Meadow ES	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$18,375
18	EIK Meadow ES	(Energy Upgrade)	\$54,513
		ELK MEADOW ES TOTAL	\$954,185
19	Ensworth ES	Irrigate and landscape along north fence	\$180,907
		ENSWORTH ES TOTAL	\$180,907
00	Link Lakes 50		#10.050
20	High Lakes ES	Repair/renovate east playground	\$18,253
21	High Lakes ES	Replace gym lights (SB4/9)	\$18,375
22	HIGH LAKES ES	Convert lighting control panel to DDC	\$8,85U
		HIGH LAKES ES TOTAL	\$45,478
22	Juniper FS	Benlace nhone system	¢۵
20	Juniner ES	Campus security fencing	φυ \$33 294
24 25	Juniner ES	Replace holler system undate controle	\$292 229 \$292 229
20		and ductwork	ΨΕΟΕ,ΕΟΟ
26	Juniper ES	Replace and repaint siding	\$175.680
-0	campor no		.

			TOTAL	
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT	
27	Juniper ES	Replace asphalt paving at parking	\$283,474	
28	Juniper ES	Replace single pane windows	\$214,613	

		JUNIPER ES TOTAL	\$999,299	
20	Kenwood ES	Renovate basement bathrooms	\$117 867	
20	Kenwood ES	Replace tile throughout hallways	\$104 029	
31	Kenwood ES	Replace me throughout hailways Replace parking and playaround	\$536 587	
01		asphalt	φ000,00 <i>1</i>	
32	Kenwood ES	New back stage curtain	\$12.268	
33	Kenwood ES	Replace fascia	\$8.776	
34	Kenwood ES	Replace and rebuild exterior awnings	\$14,750	
35	Kenwood ES	Replace fence	\$63,668	
36	Kenwood ES	Update overall classrooms and hallways	\$3,768,332	
		KENWOOD ES TOTAL	\$4,626,278	
			.	
37	LaPine ES	Repair/renovate parking lot asphalt	\$14,414	
38	LaPine ES	Add DDC system to heating controls	\$479,375	
39	LaPine ES	Upgrade exterior lighting to CCI	\$8,850	
40	LaPine ES	Replace 1-12 light bulbs with 1-8	\$54,513	
41	LoDino ES	(Energy Upgrade) Replace gym lighta (SR470)	¢10.075	
41	Larine ES	neplace gyll lights (36479)	φ10,375	
		LA PINE ES TOTAL	\$575.526	
			<i>\\</i>	
42	Lava Ridge ES	Rebuild north play field	\$305,937	
43	Lava Ridge ES	Replace cabinet doors in classrooms	\$39,549	
44	Lava Ridge ES	Rain gutters and down spouts, drainage	\$103,896	
		in courtyard		
45	Lava Ridge ES	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$18,375	
46	Lava Ridge ES	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8	\$54,513	
		(Energy Upgrade)		
			*-0-0-0	
		LAVA RIDGE ES TOTAL	\$522,270	
17	Pino Ridgo ES	Install Weather Trak Irrigation	¢14 750	
47	Fille Ridge ES	controllors	φ14,750	
48	Pine Ridge ES	Benlace ovm lights (SB 479)	\$18 375	
40	Pine Ridge ES	Acoustical treatment in main office entry	0,375 038 P\$	
40			φ0,000	
50	Pine Ridae ES	Liahting control to DDC	\$8.850	
			¥ -)	
		PINE RIDGE ES TOTAL	\$51,835	
51	RE Jewell ES	Remodel all restrooms including new	\$221,787	
		stalls and sinks		
52	RE Jewell ES	Create storage above gym and	\$543,864	
		restroom location, Install shower for Life	M 4 4 M M M	
53	RE Jewell ES	Regrade north playgrounds	\$144,569	

			TOTAL
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT
54	RE Jewell ES	Security fencing on north playground	\$60,401
55	RE Jewell ES	Add and replace exterior parking lot	\$76,700
		lights	
56	RE Jewell ES	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$18,890
57	RE Jewell ES	Light control panel on DDC	\$8,850
		°	
		RE JEWELL ES	\$1,075,061
			*• • • • • •
58	Thompson ES	Add kitchen serving area, storage for	\$310,930
		cateteria tables	
59	Thompson ES	Replace boiler system, update controls,	\$734,159
		ductwork and plumbing in custodial	
		room	
60	Thompson ES	Replace all windows (energy upgrade)	\$354,553
61	Thompson ES	Replace exterior and gym doors	\$46,853
62	Thompson ES	Upgrade restrooms and add staff	\$155,354
		restroom	
63	Thompson ES	Fire sprinkler building	\$74,250
		THOMPSON ES TOTAL	\$1,676,099
64	Three Rivers K-8	Need senarate additional area for band	\$1 263 500
04			ψ1,200,000
65	Three Rivers K-8	Replace avm lighting (SR 179)	\$21 168
66	Three Rivers K 9	Replace T_12 light hulbs with T 9	ψ∠1,100 ¢11 701
00		(Enorgy Lingrado)	φ11,734
67	Three Rivers K-8	(Linery) Opyraue) Kitchen expansion	\$320 040
07			ψ329,94 0
		THREE RIVERS K-8 TOTAL	\$1,626,342
68	Cascade MS	Remove accordion walls and make	\$44,250
		permanent	
69	Cascade MS	New bleachers and portable stage in	\$184,375
		main gym	
70	Cascade MS	Add four classrooms, remove modulars	\$2,329,800
71	Cascade MS	Replace gym and cafeteria lights (SB	\$61,950
		479)	
72	Cascade MS	Correct erosion at north side of track	\$125,014
73	Cascade MS	Finish fire sprinkler system	\$399,725
74	Cascade MS	Replace hall and PE lockers	\$352,673
75	Cascade MS	Replace cafeteria table system	\$38,498
76	Cascade MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$88,806
77	Cascade MS	Replace outside basketball court	\$77,967
		CASCADE MS TOTAL	\$3,703,057
70			
78	High Desert MS	Carpet replacement as needed, VCT in	\$20,705
-		hallways	***
79	High Desert MS	Replace cafeteria lights (SB 479)	\$20,213

			TOTAL	
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT	
80	High Desert MS	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$44,479	
81	High Desert MS	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8	\$54,513	
	Ū	(Energy Upgrade)		
82	High Desert MS	Resurface track	\$130.000	
83	High Desert MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$38,498	
84	High Desert MS	Benair/renovate asphalt	\$54 725	
04	Thigh Desert NO	riepail/renovate asphalt	ψ04,720	
		HIGH DESERT MS TOTAL	\$363.132	
			+	
85	La Pine MS	Remodel restrooms	\$749.484	
86	La Pine MS	Extend front entry cover	\$162,250	
87	La Pino MS	Add paying at rear of school widen	\$230 113	
07		west drive	φ200,110	
88	La Pino MS	Benlace classroom floor coverings	\$400.000	
20	La Pino MS	Replace cove base throughout school	φ - 00,000 ¢20 522	
09		replace cove base infoughout school	φ30,553	
			¢1 570 200	
			Φ1,572,36 0	
00	Bilot Butto MC	Poplage reafing system on P. 9. D	¢444.00E	
90	Pliot Butte MS	Replace rooling system on B & D	\$441,025	
		Buildings and locker room	* ~~~~~~~	
91	Pilot Butte MS	Landscape upgrades	\$200,000	
92	Pilot Butte MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$92,185	
93	Pilot Butte MS	Completely remodel boys and girls	\$1,339,358	
		locker rooms		
94	Pilot Butte MS	Replace floor covering as needed	\$21,230	
95	Pilot Butte MS	Replace and repair siding as necessary	\$92,308	
96	Pilot Butte MS	Remodel restrooms	\$625,580	
97	Pilot Butte MS	Replace hall lockers	\$191,529	
98	Pilot Butte MS	Resurface Track	\$130,000	
99	Pilot Butte MS	Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in	\$15,293	
00	I not batte me	multipurpose room	φ10,200	
		PILOT BUTTE MS TOTAL	\$3,148,507	
			<i>\\</i> 0,110,001	
100	Skwiew MS	Parking lot reconfiguration (safety)	\$262 329	
100		repair/repovate asphalt (including	<i>ΨLOLO</i>	
		backothall court)		
101	Skawiow MS	Descellation windows for noticed	¢01 004	
101	SKYVIEW IVIS	Operable gym windows for natural	 331,034	
400	01 1. 100	cooling	A 17 700	
102	Skyview MS	Fencing of fields	\$47,790	
103	Skyview MS	Replace gym lighting (SB 479)	\$39,813	
104	Skyview MS	Resurface track and runways	\$130,000	
		SKYVIEW MS TOTAL	\$510,965	
405	Developed 110		0001 050	
105	Bena Senior HS	Paint exterior of building	\$221,250	
106	Bend Senior HS	Remove rocks in Islands - replace with	\$85,226	
		concrete		

			TOTAL
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT
107	Bend Senior HS	Special Education classroom remodel -	\$5,107,410
		D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room	
		remodel/expansion	
108	Bend Senior HS	Replace exterior single pane windows in	\$370,225
		A, B & C Halls	
109	Bend Senior HS	Install new intercom system	\$0
110		Enlarge weight room	\$238,464
111	Bend Senior HS	Replace modulars with permanent	\$3.291.990
		classsrooms	¥-) -)
112	Bend Senior HS	Baseball field irrigation replacement	\$88.500
113	Bend Senior HS	Besurface track	\$230,000
114	Bend Senior HS	Add sidewalk at Emerson to 9th Street	\$29,081
			Ψ - 0,001
115	Bend Senior HS	Replace stadium poles and lights	\$265 500
116	Bend Senior HS	Add soccer field	\$663 750
110			φυσυ,/ ου
		BEND SENIOR HS TOTAL	\$10,591,396
117	LaPine HS	Remodel of existing science lab	\$1,328,400
118	LaPine HS	Construction of Field House	\$903,000
119	LaPine HS	Construct soccer field	\$238,950
120	LaPine HS	Upgrade hallways	\$56,724
121	LaPine HS	Replace worn carpet in 8 classrooms	\$42,232
		with VCT	. ,
122	LaPine HS	Replace windows that have broken	\$49.118
		seals	4 ,
123	LaPine HS	Resurface track, stablize asphalt edges	\$230,000
			+;
124	LaPine HS	Replace bleachers in main gvm	\$309.750
125	LaPine HS	Additional fencing baseball field	\$708 999
120		fencing add dugouts	φ/ 00,000
126	LaPine HS	Add DDC system to rest of building	\$209 195
107	LaPino HQ	Repair/repoyate asphalt	\$100 Q10
100	Lai IIIE FIO LaDino LIQ	Roplaco D-Wing roof	ψιζζ,ϑι3 ¢70 17⊑
120	Larine HO	Apphalt drive to epoceeion stand	φ/0,1/3 ΦΕΖ ΖΑΟ
129		Asphali unve to concession stand	Φ10,/40 Φ10,000
130		neplace cove base	\$18,908 \$54,450
131	LaPine HS	Upgrade HVAU ductWork	\$51,450
132	Lapine HS	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$88,678
		LA PINE HS TOTAL	\$4,494,239
			ψ1,104,200
133	Marshall HS	Replace asphalt paving as necessarv	\$10,436
134	Marshall HS	Remodel restrooms at older classroom	\$46.963
		wing	+,••••
135	Marshall HS	Beroof older classroom wing	\$118 000
136	Marshall HS	Benlace doors/windows in older	\$42 070
100		classroom wing	ψ 1 2,070
127	Marchall HS	Lingrade exterior lighting to CCL	¢8 820
107	Marchall UC	Add foncing and landscapping on west	40,000 402 004
130	IVIAI SI IAII MO	aide of compute	ფ უა,664
		side of campus	

ľ

			TOTAL	
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT	
		MARSHALL HS TOTAL	¢320 202	
		MARSHALL IS TOTAL	\$520,202	
139	Mountain View HS	Widen drive at stadium exit to allow left	\$36,399	
		turn lane onto 27th Street, Remaining		
		sidewalk replacement		
140	Mountain View HS	Finish west end of campus: add	\$811,250	
		tennis courts resurface existing courts		
		parking and landscaping		
141	Mountain View HS	Replace intercom, clocks and bell	\$0	
		systems		
142	Mountain View HS	Remodel foods room and second	\$639,566	
1/3	Mountain View HS	language areas	\$752 123	
140		remodel existing space for exercise	ψ / 52, 125	
		room		
144	Mountain View HS	Replace lighting connections (safety)	\$35,219	
145	Mountain View HS	Repair/renovate asphalt	\$122,583	
146	Mountain View HS	Replace west gym and weight room	\$79,208	
147	Mountain View HS	lights (SB 479) Benlace/renair exterior doors and	\$73 750	
147		hardware	φ/0,/00	
148	Mountain View HS	Finish fire sprinkler system	\$501,176	
149	Mountain View HS	Develop athletic field SW corner of site	\$826,950	
150	Maurataia Viau IIO		ф <u>д о</u> дс	
150	Mountain View HS	Move fire hydrant at baseball field	\$7,375 \$22,125	
152	Mountain View HS	Replace windows with broken seals	\$93.073	
153	Mountain View HS	Upgrade hall lockers	\$5,310	
154	Mountain View HS	Replace lockers in team rooms and	\$191,361	
		locker rooms		
155	Mountain View HS	Replace carpet in choir room	\$7,065	
155	Mountain View HS	Replace gym floor Beplace stadium poles and lights	\$208,956 \$238,500	
158	Mountain View HS	Replace track surface	\$1.881.250	
			••,•••,=••	
		MOUNTAIN VIEW HS TOTAL	\$6,533,235	
150	Summit HS	Expand shop area	\$78/ 120	
160	Summit HS	Seal auditorium solit face block	\$14 750	
161	Summit HS	Replace gym and wrestling room	\$123.015	
		lighting (SB 479)		
162	Summit HS	Construct field house, storage under	\$958,761	
100	0	grandstand	MA 475	
163 164	Summit HS	Aud chair rails Where needed	31,475 \$901 881	
104			ψυυτ,υυτ	
		SUMMIT HS TOTAL	\$2,787,025	
105	Distribution Oraton		¢00.017	
105	Distribution Center		₽८3,८17	
		ourtains		

JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL PROJECT	
166	Distribution Center	Expand freezer in warehouse and repair	\$92,100	
167	Distribution Center	Replace warehouse roof	\$368,750	
		DISTRIBUTION CENTER TOTAL	\$484,067	
168	Education Center	Mechanical, electrical, HVAC upgrade including minor architectural upgrades (Barrier Removal @ 10%)	\$13,912,786	
		EDUCATION CENTER TOTAL	\$13,912,786	
169	Maintenance Facility	Expand area along East side of	\$147,500	
170	Maintenance Facility	Vehicle and equipment hoist for mechanics bay	\$9,588	
171	Maintenance Facility	Upgrade overhead doors to automatic	\$8,776	
		MAINTENANCE FACILITY TOTAL	\$165,864	
172	Nutrition Services	Remodel La Pine HS production kitchen and service area	\$426,730	
173	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Bear Creek ES kitchen	\$124,335	
174	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Juniper ES kitchen	\$156,570	
175	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Kenwood ES Kitchen	\$133,545	
		NUTRITION SERVICES TOTAL	\$841,180	
176	Bend Transportation	Add two work bays to south side of shop to include two additional bus lifts, plumbing replacement and electrical	\$520,365	
177 178	Bend Transportation Bend Transportation	Install used oil heating system Provide permanent transportation administrative offices to include extra asphalt to parking area and finishing site lighting upgrade	\$18,060 \$1,697,583	
		BEND TRANSPORTATION YARD TOTAL	\$2,236,008	
179 180	La Pine Transportation La Pine Transportation	Install used oil heating system Build vehicle wash pad	\$18,060 \$42,038	
		LA PINE TRANSPORTATION YARD TOTAL	\$60,098	
181	District Wide	Technology Upgrades	\$8,100,000	

JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL PROJECT
182 183	District Wide District Wide	Drainage Repair to Support WFPC Land Acquisition (New Elementary Site)	\$1,000,000 \$3,750,000
		DISTRICT WIDE TOTAL	\$12,850,000
		TOTAL ALL PROJECTS	\$79,654,468

TOTAL

JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT
	A	SET PROTECTION - FACILITIES AND GROUNDS	
1	Bear Creek ES	Replace/repair all exterior siding and repaint	\$136,769
9	Buckingham ES	Replace driveway and parking asphalt	\$64,469
14	Elk Meadow ES	Repair/renovate north play field	\$331,685
16	Elk Meadow ES	Replace driveway and parking asphalt	\$39,041
19	Ensworth ES	Irrigate and landscape along north fence	\$180,907
26	Juniper FS	Beplace and repaint siding	\$175,680
27		Benlace asphalt paving at parking	\$283.474
30	Kenwood ES	Benlace tile throughout hallways	\$104 029
31	Kenwood ES	Replace nerking and playaround asphalt	\$536 587
22	Kenwood ES	Replace parking and playground asphan	φ330,307 ¢9,776
24	Kenwood ES	Replace idsuid exterior expires	φ0,770 Φ14 750
34		Replace and ebuild exterior awritings	\$14,750 \$14,750
37	Larine ES	Repair/renovate parking lot asphalt	\$14,414 \$100,000
44	Lava Ridge ES	Rain gutters and down spouls, drainage in courtyard	\$103,896
72	Cascade MS	Correct erosion at north side of track	\$125,014
/8	High Desert MS	Carpet replacement as needed, VCT in hallways	\$20,705
82	High Desert MS	Resurface track	\$130,000
84	High Desert MS	Repair/renovate asphalt	\$54,725
88	La Pine MS	Replace classroom floor coverings	\$400,000
89	La Pine MS	Replace cove base throughout school	\$30,533
90	Pilot Butte MS	Replace roofing system on B & D Buildings and locker room	\$441,025
91	Pilot Butte MS	Landscape upgrades	\$200,000
94	Pilot Butte MS	Replace floor covering as needed	\$21,230
95	Pilot Butte MS	Replace and repair siding as necessary	\$92,308
98	Pilot Butte MS	Resurface Track	\$130,000
104	Skyview MS	Resurface track and runways	\$130,000
105	Bend Senior HS	Paint exterior of building	\$221,250
113	Bend Senior HS	Resurface track	\$230,000
120	LaPine HS	I Ingrade hallways	\$56 724
121	LaPine HS	Beplace worn carpet in 8 classrooms with VCT	\$42 232
123	LaPine HS	Besurface track, stablize asphalt edges	\$230,000
123	Larine HS	Renair/renovate asphalt	\$122 Q12
120	LaPino HS	Replace D Wing roof	¢72,313
120	LaPine HS	Asphalt drive to concession stand	\$70,175
120	LaPine HS	Poplace cove bace	¢37,740
100	Maraball US	Replace cove base	\$10,900 \$10,426
100	Marahall HS	Replace aspiral paving as necessary	\$10,430 ¢110,000
100	Mountain View US	Refoul dider classicoliti wing	\$110,000 \$100,500
140		Repair/renovate asphalt	ΦT 005
155			
100	Nouritain View HS	neplace gylli lioor	¢∠U8,950
160		Seal auditorium split face block	\$14,750
163	Summit HS	Add chair rails where heeded	\$1,4/5
165	Distribution Center	Replace overnead doors and dock curtains	\$23,217
		TOTAL >>>	\$5,334,448

TOTAL

1.IOR :		PBOJECT TITLE	PROJECT
500			
		ENERGY SAVINGS - OPERATION EFFICIENCIES	
2	Bear Creek ES	Replace boiler system, update controls and ductwork	\$320,267
3	Bear Creek ES	Replace single pane windows	\$193,225
15	Elk Meadow ES	Convert HVAC controls to DDC	\$479,375
18	Elk Meadow ES	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8 (Energy Upgrade)	\$54,513
22	High Lakes ES	Convert lighting control panel to DDC	\$8,850
25	Juniper ES	Replace boiler system, update controls and ductwork	\$292,239
28	Juniper ES	Replace single pane windows	\$214,613
38	LaPine ES	Add DDC system to heating controls	\$479,375
39	LaPine ES	Upgrade exterior lighting to CCI	\$8,850
40	LaPine ES	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8 (Energy Upgrade)	\$54,513
46	Lava Ridge ES	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8 (Energy Upgrade)	\$54,513
47	Pine Ridge ES	Install Weather Trak Irrigation controllers	\$14,750
50	Pine Ridge ES	Lighting control to DDC	\$8,850
57	RE Jewell ES	Light control panel on DDC	\$8,850
59	Thompson ES	Replace boiler system, update controls, ductwork and plumbing in custodial room	\$734,159
60	Thompson ES	Replace all windows (energy upgrade)	\$354,553
61	Thompson ES	Replace exterior and gym doors	\$46,853
81	High Desert MS	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8 (Energy Upgrade)	\$54,513
108	Bend Senior HS	Replace exterior single pane windows in A, B & C Halls	\$370,225
112	Bend Senior HS	Baseball field irrigation replacement	\$88,500
122	LaPine HS	Replace windows that have broken seals	\$49,118
126	LaPine HS	Add DDC system to rest of building	\$209,195
136	Marshall HS	Replace doors/windows in older classroom wing	\$42,070
137	Marshall HS	Upgrade exterior lighting to CCI	\$8,850
152	Mountain View HS	S Replace windows with broken seals	\$93,073
			\$4 243 888

Г

INSTRUCTIONAL - DIRECT STUDENT IMPACT 4 Buckingham ES Replace removable walls with permanent walls \$236,000 5 Buckingham ES Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at prototypical office area - provide more storage \$73,278 6 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 1 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 1 Buckingham ES Replace gym flowr y computer lab \$12,430 2 Buckingham ES Replace acoustical panels in gym \$41,158 3 Elk Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$311,396 4 Eukowood ES New back stage curial \$117,867 5 Renovate basement batmooms \$117,867 6 Rewood ES New back stage curian office entry \$3,89,549 9 Pine Rifige ES Acoustical treatment in main office entry \$3,89,549 9 Pine Rifige ES Acoustical treatment in main office entry \$3,89,549 9 Pine Rifige ES Acoustical treatmentin main in activity room \$310,330	JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT
INSTRUCTIONAL - DIRECT STUDENT IMPACT 4 Buckingham ES Repide removable walls with permanent walls \$236,000 5 Buckingham ES Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at prototypical office area - provide more storage \$73,278 10 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 11 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 12 Buckingham ES Replace aroutical panels in gym \$41,518 13 Elk Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$31,968 14 Standow ES New back stage curtain \$117,867 15 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$12,268 16 Rejace rational transmoms in dalls and sinks \$221,787 17 RE Jewell ES Remodel and restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 17 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$43,864 17 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 17 Thome Rivers K-8 Kteed separate additional area for				
4 Buckingham ES Reproder man office to provide same spaces and uses at prototypical office area - provide more storage \$1,570,095 6 Buckingham ES Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at prototypical office area - provide more storage \$73,278 70 Buckingham ES Remodel restroms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 10 Buckingham ES Remodel restroms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 11 Buckingham ES Remodel restroms - including stalls and sinks \$12,430 12 Buckingham ES Replace acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 12 Kenwood ES Provide additional Storage \$31,396 24 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$32,860 25 Kenwood ES New back stage curian \$12,268 26 Kenwood ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 27 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 27 Re Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$12,263 28 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add stalf restroom \$131,930 29 Cascade MS			INSTRUCTIONAL - DIRECT STUDENT IMPACT	
5 Buckingham ES Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at spaces and uses and uses and uses at	4	Buckingham ES	Replace removable walls with permanent walls	\$236,000
Buckingham ES Replace gym floor \$73,278 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 Buckingham ES Soundproof library computer lab \$12,430 Buckingham ES Soundproof library computer lab \$41,518 Buckingham ES Rende acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 Buckingham ES Renovate basement bathrooms \$117,667 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$12,268 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$3,768,332 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,549 Pine Ridge ES Renodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 Stander ES Add kitchen sering area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 Thompson ES Modik then expansion \$322,940 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,255 Cascade MS Replace eutside baskeiball court \$77,967 Cascade MS Replace eutside baskeiball court \$77,967 Cascade MS Replace eutside baskeiball court \$77,967 La Pine MS </td <td>5</td> <td>Buckingham ES</td> <td>Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at</td> <td>\$1,570,095</td>	5	Buckingham ES	Remodel main office to provide same spaces and uses at	\$1,570,095
6 Buckingham ES Replace gym floor \$73,278 10 Buckingham ES Soundproof library computer lab \$12,430 11 Buckingham ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 12 Buckingham ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 13 Eik Meadow ES Renovate basement bathrooms \$117,867 14 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$12,268 15 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$33,768,332 14 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,549 15 RE Jewell ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,640 16 RE Jewell ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$310,930 17 Replace for Life Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$155,354 17 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 16 Thompson ES Add four classrooms, end value permanent \$22,940 17 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball cout \$77,967 17 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball cout \$77,967 17 Cascade MS Replace chail and PE lockers \$232,940 18 Bend Senior HS Replace chai			prototypical office area - provide more storage	
10 Buckingham ES Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks \$61,906 11 Buckingham ES Replace acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 12 Buckingham ES Replace acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 13 Elk Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 14 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$117,867 15 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$31,68,332 16 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$316,78,332 17 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$33,649 16 RE Jewell ES Remodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 17 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 17 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for calteria tables \$310,930 16 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$12,625,500 17 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$44,250 16 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 16 Cascade MS Replace outside basketba	6	Buckingham ES	Replace gym floor	\$73,278
11 Buckingham ES Soundproof library computer lab \$12,430 12 Buckingham ES Replace acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 13 Elk Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 14 Kenwood ES Renovate basement bathrooms \$12,268 15 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$33,768,332 16 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$33,768,332 17 Kenwood ES Replace cabined doors in classrooms \$339,549 18 Reidge ES Replace cabined doors in classrooms \$330,549 19 Pine Ridge ES Replace cabine gym and restroom location, Install \$\$43,864 10 Statistic rest storage albox gym and restroom location, Install \$\$43,864 10 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafteeria tables \$311,930 11 Thompson ES Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 12 Throm Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$12,228,800 12 Cascade MS Replace chail and PE lockers \$322,940 12 Cascade MS <	10	Buckingham ES	Remodel restrooms - including stalls and sinks	\$61,906
12 Buckingham ES Heplace acoustical panels in gym \$41,518 13 Eik Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 29 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$12,268 31 Eik Meadow ES New back stage curtain \$32,549 32 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,549 34 Lava Ridge ES Renodel all restrooms and hallways \$3,768,332 35 FR Jewell ES Renodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 36 Renves acoustical tife Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$165,354 37 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 36 Thompson ES Meed separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 37 Thome Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$144,250 38 Replace hall and PE lockers \$322,940 39 File API in MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 30 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 31 Skylvew MS Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms \$1,339	11	Buckingham ES	Soundproof library computer lab	\$12,430
13 Elk Meadow ES Provide additional Storage \$31,196 29 Kenwood ES New back stage curtain \$12,268 32 Lava Ridge ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$3,768,332 34 Lava Ridge ES Update overall classrooms \$33,549 49 Pine Ridge ES Acoustical treatment in main office entry \$9,860 51 RE Jewell ES Remodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 52 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 53 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$12,63,500 64 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 70 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 62 Cascade MS Replace chall and PE lockers \$352,673 71 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,5580 72 Cascade MS Replace hall lockers \$352,673 73 Cascade MS Replace hall lockers \$1,333,358 74 Cascade MS Replace nall ockers	12	Buckingham ES	Replace acoustical panels in gym	\$41,518
29 Kenwood ES Henovate basement bathrooms \$117,867 26 Kenwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$3,768,332 31 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$33,649 34 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$33,549 35 FE Jewell ES Rendel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 35 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 36 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 36 Thompson ES Meed separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 37 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$229,940 36 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 37 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,329,800 37 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$32,526,673 37 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 38 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$13,333 39 Pilot Butte MS	13	Elk Meadow ES	Provide additional Storage	\$31,196
32 Keinwood ES New back stage curain \$12,269 36 Keinwood ES Update overall classrooms and hallways \$3,768,332 43 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,549 9 Pine Ridge ES Acoustical treatment in main office entry \$9,860 17 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, install \$543,864 58 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 58 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$12,265 64 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 65 Cascade MS New bleachers and portable stage in main gym \$184,375 70 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$322,673 71 Cascade MS Replace hall ockers \$32,673 72 Cascade MS Replace hall lockers \$339,358 74 Dascade MS Replace hall lockers \$32,673 73 Cascade MS Replace hall lockers \$32,673 74 Cascade MS Replace hall lockers \$32,49,484 <	29	Kenwood ES	Renovate basement bathrooms	\$117,867
30 Netwood ES Oppose Overain classrooms in classrooms \$39,549 41 Lava Ridge ES Replace cabinet doors in classrooms \$39,549 52 RE Jewell ES Remodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 52 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install shower for Life Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$310,930 58 Thompson ES Uggrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$1253,354 64 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 70 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 71 La Pine MS Replace lal lockers \$191,529 72 Pilot Butte MS Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms \$13,39,358 76 Pilot Butte MS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$2238,400 710 Estaromodel restrooms \$23,103 <td< td=""><td>32</td><td>Kenwood ES</td><td>New back stage curtain</td><td>\$12,268</td></td<>	32	Kenwood ES	New back stage curtain	\$12,268
43 Eave Ridge ES Replace calute (abors in classion) \$39,349 44 Pine Ridge ES Acoustical treatment in main office entry \$9,860 51 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 52 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 54 Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 56 Thompson ES Need separate additional area for band \$11,263,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Replace nall and PE lockers \$352,673 70 Cascade MS Replace nall and PE lockers \$329,393 71 Cascade MS Replace nall ockers \$1,339,358 72 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$1,625,580 73 Filot Butte MS Replace nall lockers \$191,529 74 Balce Senior HS Replace nall lockers \$191,529 73 Stacid MS Replace modulars with permanent	30	Kenwood ES	Deplace overall classrooms and hallways	\$3,768,332 #20 E40
43 Fille Hoyel ES Acoustical identifierin in minde entry \$33,000 51 RE Jewell ES Remodel all restrooms including new stalls and sinks \$221,787 52 RE Jewell ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, Install \$543,864 shower for Life Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$1155,354 64 Thore Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$3352,673 70 Cascade MS Replace ball and PE lockers \$332,844 71 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$325,207 72 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$325,207 74 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 75 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$1,339,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$131,334 77 Gascade MS Replace hall lockers \$1,31,31,33,358	43	Lava Riuge ES	Acquisitional transmission office antru	\$39,549 \$0,960
51 RE Jeweil ES Teinode and status of the stroom location, install shower for Life Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$543,864 52 RE Jeweil ES Create storage above gym and restroom location, install shower for Life Skills program, Skylight in activity room \$543,864 58 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$155,354 64 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1263,500 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$\$44,250 69 Cascade MS Reblace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 70 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 71 Cascade MS Replace nall and PE lockers \$133,3358 79 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$143,33,358 79 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$12,33,358 79 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$232,400 71 Band Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art \$5,107,410 70 Bend Senior HS Replace m	49 51	PE Iowoll ES	Remodel all restrooms including now stalls and sinks	\$9,000 \$221 787
32 The bewein LS shower for Life Skilb gymanth testment totation, motation, motaten, motation, motation, motaten, motation, motation, m	52		Create storage above gym and restroom location. Install	φ221,707 \$513.861
Thompson ES Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables \$310,930 62 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$11263,500 64 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Add kitch classrooms, remove moulars \$2,329,800 70 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$332,673 71 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 72 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$329,940 73 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$744,484 93 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$11,529 94 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 95 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$131,324 96 Pilot Butte MS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$1,238,400 97 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$663,750 11	52		shower for Life Skille program. Skylight in activity room	φ040,004
305 Thompson ES Upgrade restrooms and add staff restroom \$15,354 62 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$1,263,500 64 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 65 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,329,800 70 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 71 Cascade MS Replace ball and PE lockers \$352,673 72 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 73 Ea Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$1,339,358 69 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$1,339,358 74 Datte MS Replace hall lockers \$131,3034 75 La Pine MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 76 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall nockers \$131,3034 76 Bend Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion \$238,464 711 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$663,750	58	Thompson ES	Add kitchen serving area, storage for cafeteria tables	\$310 030
4 Three Rivers K-8 Need separate additional area for band \$12,63,500 67 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS New bleachers and portable stage in main gym \$184,375 70 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 71 Cascade MS Replace nult and PE lockers \$352,673 72 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 73 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$1,339,358 74 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$191,529 75 La Pine MS Revice/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 701 Skyview MS Operable gym windows for natural cooling \$31,034 707 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 716 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 716 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 716 Bend Senior HS Replace mod	62	Thompson ES	Lingrade restrooms and add staff restroom	\$155,354
67 Three Rivers K-8 Kitchen expansion \$329,940 68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,29,800 74 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 77 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 78 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$14,339,358 94 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$13,33,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$15,293 91 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$238,464 91 Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 101 Enlarge weight room \$238,464 111 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,221,990 116 Bend Senior HS Repace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,221,990 118 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$663,750 118 LaPine HS	64	Three Rivers K-8	Need separate additional area for band	\$1 263 500
68 Cascade MS Remove accordion walls and make permanent \$44,250 69 Cascade MS New bleachers and portable stage in main gym \$184,375 70 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,329,800 74 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 77 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 78 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$14,339,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$13,39,358 97 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 101 Enlarge weight room \$228,464 111 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing \$42,89,00 117 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$663,750 118 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$228,950 12	67	Three Rivers K-8	Kitchen expansion	\$329,940
69 Cascade MS New bleachers and portable stage in main gym \$184,375 70 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,329,800 74 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 77 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 85 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$749,484 93 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$139,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 90 Pilot Butte MS Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 101 Skyview MS Operable gym windows for natural cooling \$31,034 107 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classroom wing \$46,963 117 LaPine HS Construction of Field House \$903,000 118 LaPine HS Remodel restrooms at older classroo	68	Cascade MS	Remove accordion walls and make permanent	\$44,250
70 Cascade MS Add four classrooms, remove modulars \$2,329,800 74 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 77 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 78 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$749,484 93 Pilot Butte MS Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms \$1,339,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 97 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 98 Pilot Butte MS Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 101 Skyview MS Operable gym windows for natural cooling \$31,034 107 Bend Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art \$5,107,410 100 Enlarge weight room \$238,464 \$663,750 111 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$663,750 112 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$238,950 124 Mountain View HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing \$46,963 140 Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language area	69	Cascade MS	New bleachers and portable stage in main gym	\$184.375
74 Cascade MS Replace hall and PE lockers \$352,673 77 Cascade MS Replace outside basketball court \$77,967 85 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$749,484 93 Pilot Butte MS Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms \$1,339,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$625,580 97 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 107 Bend Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion \$238,464 110 Enlarge weight room \$238,464 111 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$63,750 117 LaPine HS Construction of Field House \$903,000 118 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$238,950 <td< td=""><td>70</td><td>Cascade MS</td><td>Add four classrooms, remove modulars</td><td>\$2,329,800</td></td<>	70	Cascade MS	Add four classrooms, remove modulars	\$2,329,800
77Cascade MSReplace outside basketball court\$77,96785La Pine MSRemodel restrooms\$749,48493Pilot Butte MSCompletely remodel boys and girls locker rooms\$1,339,35896Pilot Butte MSRemodel restrooms\$625,58097Pilot Butte MSReplace hall lockers\$191,52999Pilot Butte MSReview/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room\$15,293101Skyview MSOperable gym windows for natural cooling\$31,034107Bend Senior HSSpecial Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion\$238,464111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$463,750117LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000118LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566144Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361149Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361	74	Cascade MS	Replace hall and PE lockers	\$352,673
85 La Pine MS Remodel restrooms \$749,484 93 Pilot Butte MS Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms \$1,339,358 96 Pilot Butte MS Remodel restrooms \$625,530 97 Pilot Butte MS Replace hall lockers \$191,529 99 Pilot Butte MS Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room \$15,293 101 Skyview MS Operable gym windows for natural cooling \$31,034 107 Bend Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art \$5,107,410 100 Enlarge weight room \$238,464 111 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$663,750 117 LaPine HS Remodel of existing science lab facilities \$1,328,400 118 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$238,950 124 Mountain View HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing \$46,963 140 Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room \$811,250 142 Mountain View HS Repla	77	Cascade MS	Replace outside basketball court	\$77,967
93Pilot Butte MS Pilot Butte MSCompletely remodel boys and girls locker rooms\$1,339,35896Pilot Butte MS Pilot Butte MSRemodel restrooms\$625,58097Pilot Butte MS Pilot Butte MSReplace hall lockers\$1191,52999Pilot Butte MS Pilot Butte MSReview/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room\$15,293101Skyview MS Derable gym windows for natural cooling Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion\$5,107,410110Enlarge weight room Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HS Add soccer fieldReplace modulars with permanent classrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HS Add soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HS Construction of Field House\$903,000118LaPine HS Construct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HS Marshall HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of 	85	La Pine MS	Remodel restrooms	\$749,484
96Pilot Butte MSRemodel restrooms\$625,58097Pilot Butte MSReplace hall lockers\$191,52999Pilot Butte MSReview/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room\$15,293101Skyview MSOperable gym windows for natural cooling\$31,034107Bend Senior HSSpecial Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art\$5,107,410100Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$22,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$22,125153Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,81,250155Summit HSExpand shop	93	Pilot Butte MS	Completely remodel boys and girls locker rooms	\$1,339,358
97Pilot Butte MSReplace hall lockers\$191,52999Pilot Butte MSReview/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room\$15,293101Skyview MSOperable gym windows for natural cooling\$31,034107Bend Senior HSSpecial Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art\$5,107,410110Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classsrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000118LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361155Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361156Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139155Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	96	Pilot Butte MS	Remodel restrooms	\$625,580
99Pilot Butte MS Skyview MSReview/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room\$15,293101Skyview MS Bend Senior HSOperable gym windows for natural cooling\$31,034107Bend Senior HSSpecial Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion\$5,107,410110Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classsrooms\$3,221,990116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566142Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$826,950149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSDevelop athletockers\$5,310154Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area	97	Pilot Butte MS	Replace hall lockers	\$191,529
101Skyview MS Bend Senior HSOperable gym windows for natural cooling\$31,034107Bend Senior HS Period Senior HSSpecial Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion\$5,107,410110Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classsrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HS Remodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400117LaPine HS LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HS Construction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HS Mountain View HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HS Mountain View HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566142Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Nove fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250155Summit HS Summit HS Construct field house, storage under grandstand\$764,139164Summit HS Construct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	99	Pilot Butte MS	Review/upgrade acoustic tiles in multipurpose room	\$15,293
107 Bend Senior HS Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion \$5,107,410 110 Enlarge weight room \$238,464 111 Bend Senior HS Replace modulars with permanent classrooms \$3,291,990 116 Bend Senior HS Add soccer field \$663,750 117 LaPine HS Remodel of existing science lab facilities \$1,328,400 118 LaPine HS Construction of Field House \$903,000 119 LaPine HS Construct soccer field \$238,950 134 Marshall HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing \$46,963 140 Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping \$639,566 142 Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing \$752,123 \$752,123 149 Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site \$826,950 151 Mountain View HS Nove fire hydrant at baseball field \$22,125 153 Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms \$191,361 154 Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms \$191,361	101	Skyview MS	Operable gym windows for natural cooling	\$31,034
110Enlarge weight room\$238,464111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classsrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSNove fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$1,381,250154Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,381,250155Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	107	Bend Senior HS	Special Education classroom remodel - D-5 & D-6 areas, Art room remodel/expansion	\$5,107,410
111Bend Senior HSReplace modulars with permanent classsrooms\$3,291,990116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566142Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSWD grade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$1191,361158Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	110		Enlarge weight room	\$238,464
116Bend Senior HSAdd soccer field\$663,750117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$639,566143Mountain View HSRemodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSUpgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$024,994	111	Bend Senior HS	Replace modulars with permanent classsrooms	\$3,291,990
117LaPine HSRemodel of existing science lab facilities\$1,328,400118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$811,250142Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional mucic instruction space\$004,994	116	Bend Senior HS	Add soccer field	\$663,750
118LaPine HSConstruction of Field House\$903,000119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$811,250142Mountain View HSRemodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSMove fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	117	LaPine HS	Remodel of existing science lab facilities	\$1,328,400
119LaPine HSConstruct soccer field\$238,950134Marshall HSRemodel restrooms at older classroom wing\$46,963140Mountain View HSFinish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$811,250142Mountain View HSRemodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HSReplace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HSDevelop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HSMove fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HSReplace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361154Mountain View HSReplace track surface\$1,881,250155Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$004,924	118	LaPine HS	Construction of Field House	\$903,000
 Marshall HS Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing \$46,963 Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas \$639,566 Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site \$826,950 Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field \$22,125 Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers \$5,310 Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms \$191,361 Mountain View HS Replace track surface \$1,881,250 Summit HS Construct field house, storage under grandstand \$958,761 Summit HS Additional music instruction space 	119	LaPine HS	Construct soccer field	\$238,950
140Mountain View HS Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping\$811,250142Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas space for exercise room\$639,566143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$826,950151Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms Summit HS Expand shop area\$1,881,250153Summit HS Construct field house, storage under grandstand Additional mucio instruction space\$784,139164Summit HS Summit HSAdditional mucio instruction space\$20,0404	134	Marshall HS	Remodel restrooms at older classroom wing	\$46,963
auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts, parking and landscaping142Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	140	Mountain View HS	Finish west end of campus: add security gate north of	\$811,250
142Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761			auditorium add tennis courts, resurface existing courts,	
142Mountain View HS Remodel foods room and second language areas\$639,566143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$004,924	1 1 0	M	parking and landscaping	\$000 500
143Mountain View HS Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing space for exercise room\$752,123149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$204,924	142	Mountain View HS	Remodel foods room and second language areas	\$639,566
149Mountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761	143	Mountain View HS	Replace upper balcony gym floor and remodel existing	\$752,123
149Nountain View HS Develop athletic field SW corner of site\$826,950151Mountain View HS Move fire hydrant at baseball field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$04,024	140	Mountain View UO	space for exercise room	\$000 050
151Mountain View HS love me hydrant at basebain field\$22,125153Mountain View HS Upgrade hall lockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$04,024	149	Mountain View HS	Develop atmetic field SW corner of site	Φ020,95U
153Mountain View HS opgrade namockers\$5,310154Mountain View HS Replace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$004,994	101	Mountain View HS	Indrade hall lockers	Φζζ, ΙζΟ Φς 010
154Mountain View HS Replace tookers in team fooms and locker fooms\$191,361158Mountain View HS Replace track surface\$1,881,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$004,924	153	Mountain View HS	Penlace lockers in team rooms and locker rooms	90,010 \$101 261
150Modulation view in Schepiace frace surface\$1,661,250159Summit HSExpand shop area\$784,139162Summit HSConstruct field house, storage under grandstand\$958,761164Summit HSAdditional music instruction space\$004,984	154	Mountain View HS	Replace track surface	φισι,υσι \$1 881 250
160 Summit HS Summit HS \$764,139 162 Summit HS Construct field house, storage under grandstand \$958,761 164 Summit HS Additional music instruction space \$004,984	150	Summit HS	Expand shop area	φ1,001,200 \$784 120
164 Summit HS Additional music instruction space	162	Summit HS	Construct field house storage under grandstand	\$958 761
	164	Summit HS	Additional music instruction space	\$904,884

Summit HS Additional music instruction space
 Distribution Center Expand freezer in warehouse and repair freezer floor
 Print Date: 4/20/2010

\$92,100

TOTAL

			TOTAL	
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT	
167	Distribution Center	r Replace warehouse roof	\$368,750	
169	Maintenance Facil	i Expand area along East side of compound and asphalt	\$147,500	
170	Maintenance Facil	i Vehicle and equipment hoist for mechanics bay	\$9,588	
171	Maintenance Facil	i Upgrade overhead doors to automatic	\$8,776	
172	Nutrition Services	Remodel La Pine HS production kitchen and service area	\$426,730	
173	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Bear Creek ES kitchen	\$124,335	
174	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Juniper ES kitchen	\$156,570	
175	Nutrition Services	Remodel/expansion of Kenwood ES Kitchen	\$133,545	
176	Bend Transportation	Add two work bays to south side of shop to include two additional bus lifts, plumbing replacement and electrical upgrade	\$520,365	
177	Bend Transportation	c Install used oil heating system	\$18,060	
178	Bend Transportation	Provide permanent transportation administrative offices to include extra asphalt to parking area and finishing site lighting upgrade	\$1,697,583	
179	La Pine Transport	e Install used oil heating system	\$18,060	
180	La Pine Transport	ɛBuild vehicle wash pad	\$42,038	
181	District Wide	Technology Upgrades	\$8,100,000	
183	District Wide	Land Acquisition (New Elementary Site)	\$3,750,000	
		TOTAL >>>	\$49,951,660	\$49,951,66

JOB # FACILITY

PROJECT TITLE

TOTAL PROJECT

Buckingham ES	Replace ovm lighting	\$10.075
Puckinghom EC	riepiace gym nghang	\$18,375
buckingnam ES	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$18,716
Elk Meadow ES	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$18,375
High Lakes ES	Repair/renovate east playground	\$18,253
High Lakes ES	Replace gym lights (SB479)	\$18,375
Juniper ES	Campus security fencing	\$33,294
Kenwood ES	Replace fence	\$63,668
LaPine ES	Replace gym lights (SB479)	\$18,375
Lava Ridge ES	Rebuild north play field	\$305,937
Lava Ridge ES	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$18,375
Pine Ridge ES	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$18,375
RE Jewell ES	Regrade north playgrounds	\$144,569
RE Jewell ES	Security fencing on north playground	\$60,401
RE Jewell ES	Add and replace exterior parking lot lights	\$76,700
RE Jewell ES	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$18,890
Thompson ES	Fire sprinkler building	\$74,250
Three Rivers K-8	Replace gym lighting (SB 479)	\$21,168
Three Rivers K-8	Replace T-12 light bulbs with T-8 (Energy Upgrade)	\$11,734
Cascade MS	Replace gym and cafeteria lights (SB 479)	\$61,950
Cascade MS	Finish fire sprinkler system	\$399,725
Cascade MS	Replace cafeteria table system	\$38,498
Cascade MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$88,806
High Desert MS	Replace cafeteria lights (SB 479)	\$20,213
High Desert MS	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$44,479
High Desert MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$38,498
La Pine MS	Extend front entry cover	\$162,250
La Pine MS	Add paving at rear of school, widen west drive	\$230,113
Pilot Butte MS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$92,185
Skyview MS	Parking lot reconfiguration (safety), repair/renovate asphalt	\$262,329
-	(including basketball court)	
Skyview MS	Fencing of fields	\$47,790
Skyview MS	Replace gym lighting (SB 479)	\$39,813
Bend Senior HS	Remove rocks in islands - replace with concrete	\$85,226
Bend Senior HS	Add sidewalk at Emerson to 9th Street	\$29,081
Bend Senior HS	Replace stadium poles and lights	\$265,500
LaPine HS	Replace bleachers in main gym	\$309,750
LaPine HS	Additional fencing, baseball field fencing, add dugouts	\$708,999
LaPine HS	Upgrade HVAC ductwork	\$51,450
LaPine HS	Replace gym lights (SB 479)	\$88,678
Marshall HS	Add fencing and landscaping on west side of campus	\$93,884
Mountain View HS	Widen drive at stadium exit to allow left turn lane onto 27th	\$36,399
	Street, Remaining sidewalk replacement	
Mountain View HS	Replace lighting connections (safety)	\$35,219
Mountain View HS	Replace west gym and weight room lights (SB 479)	\$79,208
Mountain View HS	Replace/repair exterior doors and hardware	\$73,750
Mountain View HS	Finish fire sprinkler system	\$501,176
Mountain View HS	Provide awning at SW gym exit	\$7,375
Mountain View HS	Replace stadium poles and lights	\$238,500
Summit HS	Replace gym and wrestling room lighting (SB 479)	\$123,015
	High Lakes ES Juniper ES Kenwood ES LaVa Ridge ES Lava Ridge ES Pine Ridge ES RE Jewell ES RE Jewell ES RE Jewell ES RE Jewell ES Thompson ES Three Rivers K-8 Three Rivers K-8 Cascade MS Cascade MS Cascade MS Cascade MS Cascade MS High Desert MS High Desert MS High Desert MS High Desert MS Skyview MS Skyview MS Skyview MS Skyview MS Bend Senior HS Bend Senior HS Bend Senior HS Bend Senior HS Bend Senior HS LaPine HS Mountain View HS Mountain View HS Mountain View HS Mountain View HS	High Lakes ESReplace gym lights (SB479)Juniper ESCampus security fencingKenwood ESReplace fenceLava Ridge ESReplace gym lights (SB479)Lava Ridge ESReplace gym lights (SB479)Pine Ridge ESReplace gym lights (SB 479)Pine Ridge ESReplace gym lights (SB 479)Pine Ridge ESReplace gym lights (SB 479)RE Jewell ESRegrade north playgroundsRE Jewell ESSecurity fencing on north playgroundRE Jewell ESAdd and replace exterior parking lot lightsRE Jewell ESUpgrade HVAC ductworkThompson ESFire sprinkler buildingThree Rivers K-8Replace gym lighting (SB 479)Cascade MSReplace gym lights (SB 479)Cascade MSReplace gym lights (SB 479)Cascade MSReplace gym lights (SB 479)Cascade MSReplace cafeteria table systemCascade MSReplace cafeteria lights (SB 479)High Desert MSReplace gym lights (SB 479)High Desert MSReplace gym lights (SB 479)High Desert MSUpgrade HVAC ductworkLa Pine MSAdd paving at rear of school, widen west drivePilot Butte MSUpgrade HVAC ductworkSkyview MSFencing of fieldsSkyview MSReplace gym lighting (SB 479)Bend Senior HSAdd jacing at rear of school, widen west drivePilot Butte MSUpgrade HVAC ductworkSkyview MSReplace gym lighting (SB 479)Bend Senior HSReplace gym lighting (SB 479)Bend Senior HSReplace

TOTAL >>> \$5,211,685 \$5,211,685

			TOTAL
JOB #	FACILITY	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT

		OTHER BOND PROJECTS	
23	Juniper ES	Replace phone system	\$0
109	Bend Senior HS	Install new intercom system	\$0
141	Mountain View HS	Replace intercom, clocks and bell systems	\$0
168	Education Center	Mechanical, electrical, HVAC upgrade including min architectural upgrades	or \$13,912,786
182	District Wide	Drainage Repair to Support WFPC	\$1,000,000
		TO	TAL >>> \$14,912,786

\$79,654,467.34 \$79,654,468.00 (\$0.66)





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Improvements to Schools: 2015-2020

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
Bear Creek Elementary	Add exterior lights in parking lot	\$35,000
Bear Creek Elementary	Add ADA door openers to (7) doors	\$50,000
Bear Creek Elementary	Complete landscaping on south and east	\$50 <i>,</i> 000
Bear Creek Elementary	Flood control drainage around exterior Bldg A	\$10,000
Bear Creek Elementary	Playground asphalt crack seal	\$18,000
Bear Creek Elementary	Replace roofing systems on C Bldg	\$75,000
Bear Creek Elementary	Replace exterior doors and hardware	\$15,000
	BEAR CREEK TOTAL	\$253,000
Buckingham Elementary	Repair plaster overhangs	\$30,000
Buckingham Elementary	Improve field with extra fill	\$15,000
Buckingham Elementary	Rebuild baseball diamonds, backstops, protective fence	\$20,000
Buckingham Elementary	Replace boilers with high efficiency boilers	\$85,000
Buckingham Elementary	Replace doors and hardware	\$15,000
Buckingham Elementary	Make exterior lighting controls to CCI	\$6,000
Buckingham Elementary	Replace AJAX water heater with high effic. Model	\$7,500
	BUCKINGHAM ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$178,500
Elk Meadow Elementary	Paint exterior doors	\$10,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Replace carpet in office area	\$35,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Clean ductwork	\$20,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Have fire alarm dial for itself	\$5 <i>,</i> 000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Replace hot water circ pumps	\$7,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Remove grass in SE alcove, add pavers/concrete	\$25,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Upgrade exterior lighting controls to CCI	\$6,000
Elk Meadow Elementary	Replace fire alarm panel	\$25,000
	ELK MEADOW ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$133,000
		1
Ensworth Elementary	Parking asphalt reseal	\$20,000
Ensworth Elementary	A/C for building	\$125 <i>,</i> 000
	ENSWORTH ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$145,000
High Lakes Elementary	Crack seal asphalt	\$20,000
High Lakes Elementary	Clean ductwork	\$26,000
High Lakes Elementary	Repair fire doors in corridors	\$8,000
	HIGH LAKES ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$54.000

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
Juniper Elementary	Replace carpet in library	\$10,000
Juniper Elementary	Repair or replace gym floor	\$65,000
Juniper Elementary	Add ADA door openers to 4 buildings	\$28,000
Juniper Elementary	Replace roof on Bldg B	\$65,000
Juniper Elementary	Replace roof on Bldg C	\$65,000
Juniper Elementary	Upgrade exterior lighting to CCI	\$6,000
Juniper Elementary	Replace doors and hardware	\$15,000
Juniper Elementary	Refurbish plumbing fixtures in classrooms	\$10,000
Juniper Elementary	Replace gym lights	\$15,000
Juniper Elementary	Seal playground asphalt	\$20,000
	JUNIPER ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$299,000
Kanwood Flomontory	Lower the chimpov height	¢50,000
Kenwood Elementary	Lower the chimney height	\$50,000 \$20,000
Kenwood Elementary	Add ADA door opports to (2) doors	\$20,000 \$14,000
Kenwood Elementary	Refurbish (roplace old plumbing fixtures both bldgs	\$14,000 \$10,000
Kenwood Elementary	Add socurity to both buildings	\$10,000
Kenwood Elementary	Poplace doors and hardware both bldgs	\$10,000
Kenwood Elementary	Replace library roof system	\$13,000
Kenwood Elementary	Re-roof gym	\$40,000
Kenwood Elementary	Re-roof main hldg	\$55,000
		\$33,000
	KENWOOD ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$279,000
La Pine Elementary	Clean ductwork	\$10,000
La Pine Elementary	Replace hot water circ pumps	\$7,000
La rine Liementary	Enlarge dumpster compound and auxiliary generator area	<i>Ţ</i> ,,0000
La Pine Flementary	directly west of school	\$8.000
La Pine Elementary	Parking lot asphalt patch and seal	\$20.000
La Pine Elementary	Add gutters and heat tape to existing system	\$20,000
	had gatters and near tape to existing system	<i>\$20,000</i>
	LA PINE ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$65,000
Lava Ridge Elementary	Paint exterior doors	\$30,000
Lava Ridge Elementary	Clean ductwork	\$20,000
Lava Ridge Elementary	Replace hot water circ pumps	\$7,000
Lava Ridge Elementary	Reseal asphalt	\$20,000
Lava Ridge Elementary	Concrete repair	\$10,000

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
	LAVA RIDGE ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$87,000
Pine Ridge Elementary	Clean ductwork	\$20,000
Pine Ridge Elementary	Seal asphalt	\$20,000
Pine Ridge Elementary	Reseal asphalt	\$20,000
Pine Ridge Elementary	Concrete repair	\$10,000
	PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$70,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Clean air ducts and heating coils	\$18,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Replace doors and hardware	\$15,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Replace domestic hot water circ system	\$8,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Relocate backstop an diamond to NW corner area	\$25,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Re-roof	\$85,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Asphalt repair/reseal	\$20,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Concrete repair	\$10,000
RE Jewell Elementary	Remove pump site, connect to city	\$25,000
	RE JEWELL ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$206.000
		,
Thompson Elementary	Replace cove base and add walk off mats at entry	\$6,000
Thompson Elementary	Add ADA openers to front and back doors	\$14,000
Thompson Elementary	New sinks & faucets and DR's in classrooms	\$5,000
Thompson Elementary	Re-roof classrooms	\$45,000
Thompson Elementary	Concrete repair	\$6,500
, ,	•	. ,
	THOMPSON ELEMENTARY TOTAL	\$76,500
Three Rivers School	Complete fence on east property boundary	\$15,000
Three Rivers School	Clean ductwork	\$15,000
Three Rivers School	Crack seal asphalt	\$15,000
	THREE RIVERS SCHOOL TOTAL	\$45,000
		. ,
Cascade Middle School	Window replacement	\$25 <i>,</i> 000
Cascade Middle School	Add ADA openers to (3) doors	\$15,000
Cascade Middle School	Replace intercom system	\$40,000
Cascade Middle School	Replace doors and hardware	\$65,000
Cascade Middle School	Upgrade exterior lighting to CCI	\$6,500
Cascade Middle School	Convert to high efficiency water heater	\$10,000
Cascade Middle School	Repair south soffits	\$15,000
		· 2

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
Cascade Middle School	New light fixtures in soffits	\$5,000
	CASCADE MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTAL	\$181,500
High Desert Middle Scho	Repair interior walls around windows in halls	\$12,000
High Desert Middle Scho	Peoplace and repair door bardware throughout school	\$12,000
High Desert Middle Scho	Locker repair and maintenance	\$00,000 \$8,000
High Desert Middle Scho	Renlace cafeteria tables	\$20,000
High Desert Middle Scho	Replace common entry lighting	\$7,000
High Desert Middle Scho	Preplace door closures	\$14.000
High Desert Middle Scho	Preplace (29) restroom stalls	\$30,000
		\$151.000
		JIJ1,000
La Pine Middle School	Asphalt replaced and repaired	\$25,000
La Pine Middle School	Replace roofing on mini-gym	\$55,000
La Pine Middle School	Replace main gym roofing system	\$95,000
La Pine Middle School	Add irrigation and sod to landscaping	\$21,500
La Pine Middle School	Clean ductwork	\$18,000
La Pine Middle School	Replace doors and hardware	\$10,000
La Pine Middle School	Plant trees/bushes in front of school	\$8,500
La Pine Middle School	Asphalt east service road between football field and gym	\$20,000
	LA PINE MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTAL	\$253,000
		6445 000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Replace gym roofing system	\$115,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Dopgrade fire alarm system to addressable dial for itself	\$80,000 \$20,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Neplace doors and nardware	\$20,000 \$2,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Concert to high efficiency water heater	\$8,000 \$18,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	New plumbing in all classrooms	\$18,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Paint entire exterior siding and concrete gym	\$230,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Patch and seal parking lot asphalt	\$18,000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	Security fencing	\$15.000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo) Window upgrades	\$210.000
Pilot Butte Middle Schoo	PFinish landscaping	\$100,000
	PILOT BUTTE MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTAL	\$944,000
Sky View Middle School	Replace kitchen VCT tile	\$25,000
Sky View Middle School	Carpet replacement	\$50,000

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
Sky View Middle School	Clean ductwork	\$20,000
Sky View Middle School	Replace gym lighting	\$40,000
Sky View Middle School	Exterior repair and paint	\$90,000
Sky View Middle School	Asphalt repair and seal	\$30,000
Sky View Middle School	Landscaping	\$20,000
	SKY VIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTAL	\$275,000
Bend Senior High School	Remove rock mound on east end of campus	\$50,000
Bend Senior High School	Replace carpets in mods, library, I-wing, Counseling	\$45,000
Bend Senior High School	Replace asbestos floor tile	\$250,000
Bend Senior High School	Add ADA to (10) doors	\$75,000
Bend Senior High School	Replace roofing above trophy hall (gym entrance)	\$35,000
Bend Senior High School	Repair broken fascia	\$25,000
Bend Senior High School	Replace doors and hardware	\$50,000
Bend Senior High School	Sewer CO extended up to floor level instead of tunnel	\$20,000
Bend Senior High School	Damaged metal roof @ gym	\$10,000
Bend Senior High School	Fabricate new lockdown gates for entrance/exit areas	\$15,000
Bend Senior High School	Finish NE corner of football stadium	\$15,000
Bend Senior High School	Upgrade track surface	\$1,000,000
Bend Senior High School	Add bleachers to softball and tennis area	\$50,000
Bend Senior High School	Drainage system repair and upgrade	\$1,000,000
	BEND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL	\$2,640,000
La Pine High School	Replace some locks and doors	\$35,000
La Pine High School	Improve play area east of football field	\$15,000
La Pine High School	Complete landscaping	\$40,000
La Pine High School	Landscape interior areas of football/bleachers area	\$30,000
La Pine High School	Increase parking	\$20,000
La Pine High School	Replace metal roofing	\$50,000
	LA PINE HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL	\$190,000
		405 000
Marshall High School	Landscape hillside west of buildings	\$25,000
		¢25,000
		\$25,000
Mt View High School	Popair bloachars wast gym	
Mt View High School	Repair pieduliers west gylli Replace concrete walks around school	200,000 625,000
Mt View High School	Daint stadium walks (ovtorior)	₹20,000 \$20,000
	raint staulum wans (extend)	\$50,000 r
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS 2015 - 2020

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
Mt. View High School	Add high efficiency boilers in West gym	\$85,000
Mt. View High School	New elevator controller	\$10,000
Mt. View High School	New domestic hot water circ system	\$60,000
0	Landscape with boulders, stacker block, irrigation, trees,	
Mt. View High School	bushes and wild grasses	\$50.000
Mt. View High School	Remodel interior of stadium	\$150.000
Mt. View High School	Baseball field renovation	\$210,000
		<i>\</i> 210,000
	MT. VIEW HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL	\$705,000
Summit High School	Carpet replacement	\$85,000
Summit High School	Upgrade exterior lighting on CCI	\$8,500
Summit High School	Seal asphalt	\$35.000
Summit High School	Roof replacement	\$250,000
Summit High School	Reseal exterior block	\$100,000
Summit High School	Exterior door replacement	\$35,000
Summit High School	Turf replacement	\$250,000
Summering i School	Turreplacement	\$250,000
	SUMMIT HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL	\$763,500
Administration Building	Remove asbestos floor tile and replace VCT 1st floor	\$40,000
Administration Building	Add ADA door openers	\$10,000
Administration Building	Replace asphalt on south side, crack seal north /east	\$20,000
Administration Building	Replace restroom stall dividers and fixtures	\$15,000
Administration Building	Add security system	\$8,000
Administration Building	Replace asphalt on north parking lot	\$55,000
Administration Building	Replace fence, add concrete mow strip in fence line-Troy Field	\$35,000
Administration Building	Replace underground irrigation system. Weather Track-Troy Fie	\$35.000
Administration Building	Stair repair/replace - Exterior Rockery Work	\$100.000
		<i>\</i> 200)000
	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING TOTAL	\$318,000
Maintenance Building	Add (2) additional vehicle bays to east side of Bldg 5	\$35,000
Maintenance Building	Asphalt repair/reseal	\$20,000
-		
	MAINTENANCE BUILDING TOTAL	\$55 <i>,</i> 000
Transportation Building	Add upstairs storage in shop (25x45)	\$25,000
Transportation Building	Build enclosed drive through vehicle wash	\$125,000
Transportation Building	Upgrade electrical service to shop	\$120,000

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS 2015 - 2020

		Project
Facility	Project Title	Estimated Amt
	TRANSPORTATION BUILDING TOTAL	\$270,000
La Pine Transportation	Add small vehicle lift	\$15,000
	LA PINE TRANSPORTATION TOTAL	\$15,000
Warehouse Warehouse	Patch and repair metal siding Repair/replace heating system	\$25,000 \$65,000
	WAREHOUSE TOTAL	\$90,000
District Wide	Two Elementary School Sites	\$8,000,000
	DISTRICT WIDE TOTAL	\$8,000,000
	TOTAL ALL PROJECTS	\$16,767,000





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Policy Summary

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

s & Ter Jule F

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

Requirements of ORS 195.110 and Approach to Implementation

Overview

ORS 195.110 requires large school districts, cities, and counties to plan for the future and coordinate with one another to assist school districts with obtaining land. The responsibilities for this coordination fall upon each of these entities. Districts are generally required to prepare a 10-year capital improvement plan for sites and facilities. Cities and counties are generally required to help the districts protect or obtain sites and through land use policies and development codes. In specific circumstances, cities and counties may deny applications for residential development if adequate school capacity is not available. The law includes mandates for each entity and delineates responsibilities.

The following is a summary of the law by entity (city, county, or district) to illustrate each of these mandates. An "X" indicates the entity responsible to carry out the requirement.

195.110	Simplified Requirements	City	County	District
(2)(a)	Include as an element of its comprehensive plan a school facility plan prepared by the district in consultation with the affected city of county	X ¹	X	
(2)(a)	Prepare a school facility plan consistent with the requirements of 195.110(5) in consultation with the affected city or county.			Х
(2)(b)	Initiate planning activities with a school district under ORS 195.020.	Х	Х	
(4)	Select a representative to meet with a representative from the city or county to accomplish the planning required by ORS 195.020, notify the city or county of the representative, meet twice a year, summarize the issues and proposed actions in writing.			X
(4)	Provide the facilities and set the times for planning activities and meet twice a year, summarize the issues and proposed actions in writing.	Х	Х	
(6)	If there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period covered by the school plan, the entities shall cooperate in identifying land for school facilities and take necessary actions, including but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, or adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary.	X	X	X

195.110	Simplified Requirements	City	County	District
(7)	The school facility plan shall provide for the integration of existing city or county land dedication requirements with the needs of the large school district.			Х
(8)(a)	Identify in the facilities plan the facility needs based on population growth projections and land use designations contained in the city or county comprehensive plan.			Х
(8)(b)	Update the school facility plan during periodic review or more frequently by mutual agreement.			Х
(9)(a)	In the school facility plan, the district school board of a large district may adopt objective criteria to be used by an affected city or county to determine whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development. Before adopting criteria, confer with the affected cities and counties.			Х
(9)(a)	After the district adopts objective criteria, an affected city or county shall accept those criteria as its own for purposes of evaluating applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment.	X	Х	
(9)(b)	Cities and counties shall provide notice to affected large school districts when considering a plan or land use regulation amendment that significantly impacts school capacity.	Х	Х	
(9)(b)	If the large school district requests, the city or county shall implement a coordinated process with the district to identify potential school sites and facilities to address the projected impacts.	Х	Х	Х
(11)	The capacity of a school facility is not the basis for a moratorium under 197.505 to 197.540.	Х	Х	
(12)	A school district does not have the power to declare a building moratorium.			Х
(13)	City or county may deny an application for residential development based on a lack of school capacity if: (a) the issue is raised by the school district; (b) the lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section; and (c) the city or county has considered options to address school capacity.	X	Х	X

The city of La Pine is not required to comply with these requirements because its population is less than 10 percent of the total population of the Bend-La Pine School District.

Critical Policy Related Considerations

A plain reading of the language exposes some potential inconsistencies and presents different courses of action (elective requirements). Decisions and interpretations must be made regarding the manner in which the district, city, and county should interpret this law in order to move forward with subsequent policy development and planning work. The following addresses some key provisions of the law subject to interpretation and requiring explicit discussion before moving ahead with the larger school facility planning project.

The role of the Technical Advisory Committee is to come to consensus and advise the School Board of their preferred policy choices. The School Board will take the TAC's position under advisement, but is not formally bound to the TAC's recommendation.

The key provisions of the law requiring interpretation are reproduced below followed by a discussion and options. Emphasis has been added in CAPS to key words and phrases of the law.

- 1. ORS 195.110(4) requires the city, county, and district to select representatives to "meet and confer" to "initiate planning activities with a school district to accomplish planning as required under ORS 195.020", and to "accomplish the planning required by OS 195.020". The city and county are to provide facilities, set times to meet, meet at least twice a year, unless all representatives agree in writing to another schedule, and make a written summary of proposed actions and the discussions. ORS 195.020 pertains mostly to coordination agreements between special districts providing urban services. While school districts do not typically enter into coordination agreements or provide urban services, ORS 195.020(4) outlines planning and coordination topics the district, city, and county are required to address through ORS 195.110. The planning activities to initiate and accomplish include how the three entities are involved in comprehensive planning, land use regulations, periodic review, the entities responsibilities and roles with respect to development approvals, real property, rights of way, and easements.
 - a. **Discussion:** Legal counsel and staff's view is that the district is not formally required to enter into an urban service agreement with the city and county, but to formally coordinate (twice a year) on the issues typically addressed through formal urban service provider agreements. This ongoing process should occur separately from the TAC process. These meetings provide opportunities to discuss policy and development related issues affecting the three entities. Staff recommends these formal meetings take place as soon as possible.

- 2. ORS 195.110(5)(a)(B) and (5)(b) regard site identification for schools. Section (a)(B), states the school facility plan must identify "desirable school sites" by the city/county/district. Section (5)(b) requires the school facility plan to "include and analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary".
 - a. **Discussion**: The school facility plan must clearly determine the sites required for the 10-year period. The language above is open to considerable interpretation as illustrated by the options described below. The TAC elected to use Option 2 to identify a number of sites that may be "desirable" and Option 4, allowing the District to use additional suitability criteria.
 - i. **Option 1**: Section (5)(a)(B) could be interpreted to mean the city/county/district must identify specific sites all agencies agree are desirable.
 - ii. Option 2: Section (5)(a)(B) could mean the two entities could agree a group of sites are generally considered desirable for schools. The assumption here is that the District would have the ability to select from a group of sites deemed "desirable" through the plan. This is the general approach used in past school siting studies.
 - iii. **Option 3**: Section (5)(b) could be read to literally to require the plan to consider "suitable" all land inside the new Bend UGB where schools are permitted or conditionally allowed as "suitable" for future schools.
 - iv. **Option 4**: Section (5)(b) could be read to allow the plan to specify additional "suitability criteria" for schools, including zoning. Staff believes this approach makes more practical sense, because sites well suited for schools have very specific characteristics such as their zoning designation, general location, size, shape, proximity to other uses and students, access, etc. The inventory of sites is not just the "old" UGB, but the newly expanded UGB which includes approximately 10,000 acres rural lands.
- 3. ORS 195.110(6) states "if a large school district determines there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period covered by the school facility plan, the city or county, or both, and the large school district SHALL COOPERATE in identifying land for school facilities AND TAKE NECESSARY ACTIONS, including but not limited to, adopting appropriate zoning, aggregating existing lots or parcels in separate ownership, or adding one or more sites designated for school facilities to an urban growth boundary..."
 - a. **Discussion**: First, all of the requirements of (6) are triggered "if the school district determines there is an inadequate supply of suitable land for school facilities for the 10-year period". If the district does not "determine" there is a deficiency, the requirements of (6) do not

apply. This part of the law requires cooperation and taking necessary specific actions. No timelines or penalties are established by law. No clear lines of responsibility are established (i.e. who adopts zoning, aggregates lots, adds sites to the UGB). It seems this requirement encourages, rather than mandates, specific actions. All of the actions listed are not fully within a city's or county's power to control the outcome. Each of the actions can be appealed or denied if they do not meet the city's/county's standards of approval. The TAC elected to use Option 3, described below.

- i. **Option 1**: Add specific language to each affected city's and county's comprehensive plan that duplicates the above language and let future court cases and specific circumstances define these issues more specifically.
- ii. Option 2: Add comprehensive plan policies with more specifics and details than the language in ORS 195.110(6). Specify if the city or county initiates the specific actions. Specify timelines for compliance. Broaden the range of potential actions. Specify each entities recourse if such actions are not successful.
- iii. **Option 3**: Do not add any specific policies to each affected city's and county's comprehensive plans. The ORS does not mandate these policies must be in place in order to complete a school facility plan, and the ORS still establishes a requirement for action on the part of the district/city/county.
- 4. ORS 195.110(7) states the "school facility plan SHALL PROVIDE for the INTEGRATION of existing city or county land dedication requirements with the needs of the large school district".
 - b. Discussion: The term "integration" is commonly thought of as to make one, bring together, or unify. "Land dedication requirements" are typically associated with city or county land use development codes to obtain land from private developers for streets, trails, or parks. Establishing land dedication methodologies and obtaining land through dedications is usually a contentious legal process. There is considerable case law pertaining to a wide variety of land dedication requirements with the needs of the large school district", not "land needs specified in the school facility plan". The TAC agreed Option 3 is the preferred interpretation of this provision.
 - i. **Option 1**: One interpretation of (7) is the school facility plan shall present one standard land dedication requirement to address the needs of the school district. Each city and county have radically different land dedication standards, so making one set of dedication requirements would be very difficult. A methodology linking "needs" of the district with "land dedication requirements" would require technical code

writing and legal analysis. Since land dedications are often contentious, this option would involve a considerable amount of research, writing, and legal analysis.

- ii. **Option 2**: Another way to interpret this language is for the school facility plan to specify (i.e. "provide") a single (i.e. "integrated") policy (i.e. "requirement") pertaining to land dedication requirements that generally address land needs for the school district. Specific land dedication requirements could then be tailored to each jurisdiction's unique development code. The school district may prefer a flexible and case-by-case land dedication policy statement rather than a single, rigid policy. The development code for each jurisdiction would need to be amended so residential developments like subdivisions, master plans, and plan/map amendments must demonstrate adequate capacity is present. If there is not adequate school capacity, the city/county may require dedication or payment in lieu of dedication in rough proportion to the impact of the development.
- iii. **Option 3**: Only "existing" standards are required to be integrated. If no standards exist in city or county codes, then no integration would be required. The focus of this approach integrates existing policies rather than creating new dedication policies.
- 5. OAR 195.110(9)(a) states "in the school facility plan, the district board of a large school district MAY ADOPT objective criteria to be used by an affected city or county to determine whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development." These criteria would be applied to applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment. If objective criteria are adopted the law specifies certain actions that must take place including coordination between the cities/counties/district, jurisdictions adopting the criteria adopted by the district. Section (13) states a "city or county may deny an application for residential development based on a lack of school capacity if: (a) the issue is raised by the district; (b) the lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section; and (c) the city or county has considered options to address school capacity.
 - c. **Discussion**: The approaches in (9)(a) are elective. The objective criteria referenced in (9)(a) are specifically used to "evaluate applications for a comprehensive plan amendment or for a residential land use regulation amendment", not to approve or deny an application. However, it may be inferred that a city or county could deny an application once an evaluation demonstrates inadequate capacity at a school. These applications are made by private developers and usually involve "up zoning". The district may choose to use objective criteria or not to determine if adequate

capacity exists due to a zone change or code amendment. There is not a clear linkage between the "objective criteria" and denying an application as indicated in section (13). In fact, section (13) specifies how an application would be denied and does not state that "objective criteria" are used in the determination of capacity, only "the lack of school capacity is based on a school facility plan formally adopted under this section". It is also not clear what measures in (c) constitute that a city/county has "considered options to address school capacity." The TAC recommends Option 3 described below.

- i. **Option 1**: The board may choose to not adopt "objective criteria" to be used by the city/county to determine if adequate capacity exists. The district could rely solely on forming cooperative agreements with land owners for sites versus using the threat to oppose and recommend denying an application.
- ii. **Option 2**: Another alternative to not adopting criteria is for affected cities and the county to adopt policies and land use codes that require residential developments to provide land for schools consistent with the school facility plan. If the school facility plan is completed by the district per 195.110 requirements and adopted by the city/county, then it appears an application for residential development could still be denied if the requirements of (13)(a)(b)(c) are met. In this case, if the district called for a school in a particular location and could demonstrate there is a lack of capacity and no other reasonable options for a site exist, then the city or county could still deny the land use application. In other words, objective criteria are not required in order for a city or county to deny a land use decision if the district meets the obligations under section (13), the school facility plan is adopted by the city and county, and the plan illustrates a need for a new school on the subject property.
- iii. **Option 3**: Adopt "objective criteria" with the school facility plan. The school board would adopt "objective criteria"; these would be adopted by the city/county, and presumably used to evaluate comprehensive plan amendments or residential land use regulation amendments. Adopting these criteria are not enough, since the requirements of (13) must still be met to deny an application for a residential development. There are potential issues with respect to developing the methodology to calculate capacity, the city administering the methodology, and adopting the criteria.
- iv. **Option 4**: Adopt "objective criteria" as a separate work task not part of the school facility plan. It is clear that districts are not required to develop the criteria to meet the requirements

for a school facility plan. A district could decide to finish the plan without the criteria, develop these independently, amend the plan, and work with the city/county to complete the criteria adoption process.

TAC and Staff Recommended Approach

ORS 195.110 as written establishes a fairly complex set of steps of analysis and policy adoption to obtain land for schools in a somewhat adversarial manner. The process enables a city or county to determine if adequate capacity exists (through an objective process adopted by the District), and then for cities/counties to potentially deny residential development applications based on a lack of capacity. Practically, this establishes a threat to developers unwilling to work with school districts seeking to obtain land for schools. The law also requires school facility plans to integrate existing land dedication requirements to presumably help cities, counties, and districts implement a uniform land dedication strategy for schools.

The process promoted by ORS 195.110 is not the only approach to help a school district obtain necessary lands, and may create unnecessary friction between school districts, cities, counties, and land owners/developers. One concern is a district forcing a city or county to adopt complex "objective criteria" if a city or county does not agree with, or desire to use, "objective criteria" to evaluate applications. Another concern is that land owners or developers contesting land dedications for schools will very likely challenge any methodology to determine capacity. "Objective criteria" established under ORS 195.110(9)(a) are not a "silver bullet", and may not be any better than other methods of determining a need for land for schools.

There may be a simpler and more collaborative approach enabling the District to meet the requirements of ORS 195.110, yet obtain needed facilities in difficult situations. The steps involved are:

- 1. Begin a city/county/district coordination effort to implement the planning requirements of ORS 195.020 as an ongoing coordination effort to promote cooperation and coordination between these agencies.
- 2. Complete a school facility plan with the required elements in 195.110(5) and meet the administrative and coordination requirements.
 - a. The school facility plan must specifically determine desirable and suitable sites for new schools needed within a 10-year period. The TAC would determine suitability criteria used to identify "desirable" and "suitable" sites. One suitability criterion must be included to identify current zoning designations allowing schools as permitted or conditional uses.
- 3. Each city/county adopts the school facility plan per ORS 195.110(2)(a). with language similar to the following:

- a. "The 2010 Bend-La Pine School Sites and Facilities Plan, as amended, determines the need for land for schools consistent with ORS 195.110. This plan is adopted as an exhibit to this (insert name of jurisdiction's plan). This plan shall be used as a basis to evaluate the impacts of comprehensive plan amendments, subdivisions, master plans, and other residential developments on needed land for the District's schools. Such developments shall demonstrate adequate land for schools is available consistent with the 2010 Bend-La Pine School Sites and Facilities Plan."
- 4. The District would adopt "objective criteria" to evaluate amendments to comprehensive plans and residential land use regulations. Each city/county would then use the "objective criteria" to evaluate such amendments. Each jurisdiction would most likely add plan and code language to implement the District's objective criteria.
- 5. The 2010 Sites and Facilities Plan would not include land dedication requirements since these are not currently implemented by the applicable jurisdictions, and would be difficult to establish and adopt.

This approach satisfies the requirements of 195.110(2)(a), (5), (6), (7), completes section (9), and enables the city and county to deny applications as allowed by section (13) if the conditions are met and if the District actively opposes a residential development. The issue of land dedications is not addressed because no existing land dedication requirements exist and would be problematic to implement. The District's adoption of "objective criteria" moves the discussion of school capacity into the land use arena at an early stage to set up any further discussions related to specific developments that may trigger capacity shortages. The adoption of "objective criteria" is independent of the requirements of section (13), which still provide a city and county with the authority to deny an application for residential development if conditions are met.

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET PO BOX 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us

CC:

TO:BEND-LA PINE SCHOOLS 2010 SITES AND FACILITIES TACFROM:BRIAN RANKIN, SENIOR PLANNER; SHARON SMITH, COUNSELSUBJECT:OBJECTIVE CRITERIA TO DETERMINE SCHOOL CAPACITYDATE:4/19/2010

ORS 195.110(9)(a) allows the District to adopt "objective criteria" used to determine "whether adequate capacity exists to accommodate projected development" resulting from a comprehensive plan amendment or residential land use regulation amendment. These amendments are land use decisions that may affect the number of students generated by future development. The "objective criteria" would be used by the City of Bend and Deschutes County to determine the impacts on school capacity from comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment such as re-zones, urban expansion, or changes to land use regulations. Currently, the city and county do not explicitly consider impacts on schools as part of their review and land use approval process; although the District may raise these issues in public testimony.

Project staff, the TAC, and District's legal counsel agreed to develop and add objective criteria to the District's school facility plan. This is an important tool for the District and governing bodies to use to determine impacts to school capacity. There is no pressing need for facilities in the short-term requiring the objective criteria be used in the near future. However, implementing and testing the approach described below will help the District, City of Bend, and Deschutes County improve and modify the approach if necessary before significant school-capacity related issues may arise in the future.

The following describes the objective criteria to be used to determine if there is adequate capacity to accommodate comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendments. The steps are as follows:

- 1. Estimate the impact of the comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment on student enrollment:
 - a. As part of its ongoing facilities planning, BLPSD undertakes detailed population and enrollment research for the District. The District's facility plans are based on enrollment projections for the time period between 2010-2030 in Table A, from the March 2010 *Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-11 to 2030-31* by Charles Rynerson, Vivian Siu, west, and Richard Lycan of Portland State University. Table 10, page 20 illustrates the number of students generated by housing type and level. Estimates of student generation by housing type and jurisdiction in Table 10 will be used to calculate the anticipated number of elementary, middle, and high school students to be generated from the comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment based on the average density allowed.
- 2. Determine the location and attendance areas affected by the comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment:
 - a. This is based on the adopted attendance boundary at the time of application of the projected development. These boundaries are show in Exhibit A.

- 3. Determine the baseline enrollment of schools affected by the comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment:
 - a. BLPSD determines actual enrollment as of October 1st each year and reports this enrollment to the State of Oregon Department of Education. Enrollment on this date by year will be used as the baseline for enrollment by year as part of the capacity analysis.
- 4. Determine the capacity of each school:
 - a. Bend-La Pine School District ("BLPSD") has determined the architectural design capacity for each school based on Table 1.
- 5. Estimate if the impact of the proposed comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment results in existing schools exceeding their capacity:
 - a. The baseline enrollment by school is used from step three.
 - b. Additional students from the comprehensive plan or residential land use regulation amendment is calculated based on step one.
 - c. If the number of students in steps 5a. plus 5b. exceeds the design capacity of the affected schools in step four, then there will not be adequate capacity to accommodate the projected development.

Table 1: Design Capacities for Schools in Bend-La Pine School District

Existing and Anticipated Elementary Schools	2010 Capacity
Amity Creek at Thompson	150
Bear Creek	575
Buckingham	575
Ensworth	285
Elk Meadow	575
Highland at Kenwood	375
High Lakes	575
Jewell	575
Juniper	560
La Pine Elementary (KG-4 program in 575 building without prorating)	575
Lava Ridge	575
Miller (new)	575
Pine Ridge	575
Ponderosa (new)	575
Three Rivers with addition (KG-8 program in 575 building prorated)	447
West Side Village at Kingston with addition (KG-8 program in 285 building prorated)	190
La Pine II (on-line Fall of 2010)	285
Total District-wide Capacity	8.042
	- , -
Existing and Anticipated Middle Schools	2010 Capacity
Cascade	800
High Desert	800
Pilot Butte (with addition)	900
La Pine (5-8 program in 550 building without prorating)	550
Sky View	800
Three Rivers with addition (KG-8 program in 575 building prorated)	128
West Side Village at Kingston with addition (KG-8 program in 285 building prorated)	95
Total District-wide Capacity	4,073
Eviating and Antiainated Lligh Cabaala	2010 Canadity
Existing and Anticipated High Schools	2010 Capacity
Bend (with addition)	1,650
Marshall	200
Nountain view (addition)	1,550
	1,500
La Pine (with new addition 4 class)	650
Total District-wide Capacity	5,550
Other Programs	2010 Capacity
REALMS (lease available space Pilot Butte, looking for alternate space)	67
OYCP (youth challenge program is full)	140
Second Chance (Districts out of education center, off line)	30
Other Programs (juveniles locked up for the state)	143
Total District-wide Enrollment	380
Assumed middle-school aged students in "Other Programs"	80
Assumed high-school aged students in "Other Programs"	300
	000
Total District Capacity at All Levels (including Other Programs)	18,045

Exhibit A: School Attendance Area Boundaries















EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET PO Box 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us	To:	BLPS SITES AND FACILITIES TAC
	FROM:	BRIAN RANKIN
	SUBJECT:	SITE ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE
	DATE:	4/12/2010
	CC:	

This memorandum summarizes the approach used to decide the number, type, and location of new schools needed within the Bend-La Pine School District between 2010 and 2030. The result of this memorandum is a detailed site acquisition and construction schedule implementing the recommendations from the project TAC. The Recommended Approach to Identifying New Sites for Schools memorandum details the approach to select ideal areas for new schools. The topics covered in this memorandum were presented to and approved by the TAC on February 11th, 18th, and 25th 2010.

District-wide Need for New Schools

The need for new schools is based on predicted enrollment and the capacity of existing schools. This analysis was completed after the TAC concluded that changes in schedules/school year are not suitable solutions to add significant capacity, and that current school and site size parameters used by the District are appropriate. Table A from the March 2010 PRC enrollment study contains enrollment forecasts by grade level used in the following tables and analysis. The design capacity of all of the existing schools was determined and used in the following tables and analysis. The design capacity of each school is a function of school policy and the physical design and capacity of each school.

Determining exactly when a new school needs to be opened requires determining when overcrowding will be unacceptable for a variety of reasons. Reasons include reaching a maximum occupancy from a building design standpoint, safety concerns, operational and schedule constraints, school policies on class size and school size, and most importantly delivering quality educational programs. District and planning staff have historically used the following rules of thumb to estimate when a new school needs to be opened:

- A new elementary school needs to be opened when all elementary schools are at full capacity plus approximately 300 additional District-wide elementary school students.
- 2. A new middle school needs to be opened when all middle schools are at full capacity plus approximately 400 additional District-wide middle school students.
- 3. A new high school needs to be opened when all high schools are at full capacity plus approximately 900 additional District-wide high school students.

Tables 1-4 analyze existing District-wide capacity and expected enrollment, and resulting surplus or need for new school capacity by level. The need for new schools is based on the design capacity of the prototypical school program used by the District: 575-student elementary schools, 800-student middle schools, and 1,500-student high schools. Students enrolled in programs not requiring physical space in the District's schools were subtracted from expected enrollment because they effectively create more capacity within the District.

Table 1: Enrollment and Capacity Years 2009-2014

School Level\School Year	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015	
	Enrollment	Surplus										
Elementary Schools (Grades KG-5)	7,002	1.8	7,080	1.7	7,159	1.5	7,290	1.3	7,406	1.1	7,576	0.8
Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	3,663	0.6	3,653	0.6	3,644	0.6	3,627	0.7	3,712	0.6	3,819	0.4
High Schools (Grades 9-12)	5,233	0.4	5,158	0.5	5,212	0.4	5,249	0.4	5,266	0.4	5,328	0.3
Total	15,898	NA	15,891	NA	16,015	NA	16,166	NA	16,384	NA	16,723	NA

Table 2: Enrollment and Capacity Years 2015-2020

School Level\School Year	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019		2019-2020		2020-2021	
	Enrollment	Surplus	Enrollment	Surplus	Enrollment	Need/Surplus	Enrollment	Need/Surplus	Enrollment	Need	Enrollment	Need
Elementary Schools (Grades KG-5)	7,752	0.5	7,936	0.2	8,126	-0.1	8,349	-0.5	8,588	-0.9	8,760	-1.2
Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	3,959	0.2	4,061	0.1	4,156	0.0	4,229	-0.1	4,289	-0.2	4,356	-0.3
High Schools (Grades 9-12)	5,356	0.3	5,445	0.3	5,601	0.2	5,746	0.1	5,927	-0.1	6,063	-0.1
Total	17,067	NA	17,442	NA	17,883	NA	18,324	NA	18,804	NA	19,179	NA

Table 3: Enrollment and Capacity Years 2021-2025

School Level\School Year	2021-2022		2022-2023		2023-2024		2024-2025		2025-2026	
	Enrollment	Need								
Elementary Schools (Grades KG-5)	8,934	-1.6	9,103	-1.8	9,265	-2.1	9,424	-2.4	9,588	-2.7
Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	4,460	-0.4	4,585	-0.5	4,686	-0.7	4,783	-0.8	4,876	-0.9
High Schools (Grades 9-12)	6,148	-0.2	6,220	-0.2	6,328	-0.3	6,438	-0.4	6,585	-0.5
Total	19,542	NA	19,908	NA	20,279	NA	20,645	NA	21,049	NA

Table 4: Enrollment and Capacity Years 2026-2030

School Level\School Year	2026-2027		2027-2028		2028-2029		2029-2030		2030-2031	
	Enrollment	Need								
Elementary Schools (Grades KG-5)	9,753	-3.0	9,914	-3.3	10,076	-3.5	10,241	-3.8	10,409	-4.1
Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	4,963	-1.0	5,055	-1.1	5,149	-1.2	5,239	-1.4	5,322	-1.5
High Schools (Grades 9-12)	6,754	-0.6	6,892	-0.7	7,024	-0.8	7,156	-0.9	7,284	-1.0
Total	21,470	NA	21,861	NA	22,249	NA	22,636	NA	23,015	NA

Notes:

1) Enrollment estimates from Rynerson, Siu, Lycan, and West. Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010 to 2030-2031, Portland State University. March, 2010.

2) Values in the "Surplus" & "Need" columns represent numbers of schools based on prototypical school capacities (575 elementary, 800 middle, 1,500 high school),

considering additional capacity for 380 students in "Other Programs" not housed in District facilities (80 in middle school, and 300 in high school).

3) Yellow indicates the year a new elementary school needs to be open to relieve a shortage of capacity. Need is triggered when half an elementary school is needed (i.e. -0.5, -1.5, etc.).

4) Blue indicates the year a new middle school needs to be open to relieve a shortage of capacity. Need is triggered when half a middle school is needed (i.e. -0.5, -1.5).

5) Green indicates the year a new high school needs to be open to relieve a shortage of capacity. Need is triggered when more than half of a high school is needed (-0.6).

Consistency Between 2010 School Facility Plan and Comprehensive Plans

ORS 195.110(8)(a) requires the School Facility Plan to be consistent with the "population growth projections and land use designations contained in the city or county comprehensive plan". Estimates of population growth, housing growth, the location and intensity of residential development are all elements of each city's and county's comprehensive planning and impact decisions on the need and location of new school facilities.

The Bend-La Pine Schools 2010 School Facility Plan is consistent with the most recent adopted City of Bend General Plan, La Pine Comprehensive Plan, and Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan. The consistency requirement presents a significant challenge to the TAC and District because the City of Bend and Deschutes County recently adopted ordinances expanding the Bend Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The expansion proposes to convert approximately 8,500 acres adjacent to the Bend City Limits from predominantly rural to urban uses. However, these ordinances are not "Acknowledged" (or approved and finalized) by the State of Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission, and will be revised in the coming years. The District is required to rely upon major decisions by the city and county for its own facility planning efforts that will be significantly modified. The TAC recommends the District revisit mid to long-term findings of the 2010 School Facility Plan with future planning efforts when the Bend UGB expansion is Acknowledged.

The City of Bend's adopted UGB expansion will directly impact the number and location of new schools needed in the planning period. However, as discussed by the PRC enrollment study, short-term District-wide needs for new schools driven by a new enrollment forecasts is based mostly on factors in place today (i.e. birth rates, death rates, in-migration).

The City's recent work has also benefited the District by making valuable information available for use in the 2010 School Facility Plan. The City's work makes assumptions about how residential lands within the current Bend City Limits will develop, inventories land supplies, predicts infill and redevelopment, and anticipates numbers of new dwelling units inside the City Limits of Bend and outside in the UGB expansion. The 2010 School Facility Plan does not use all of this information, but is consistent with the major assumptions regarding population growth and land use designations in the City's adopted General Plan and UGB expansion proposal.

The following information adopted by the City of Bend in its General Plan or as Findings supporting the UGB expansion proposal was also used in the 2010 School Facility Plan:

- Deschutes County Coordinated Population Forecast (DCCPF) adopted by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners in September 2004 – This forecast is used by Deschutes County and Bend to establish long-range population forecasts. The population forecasts for the incorporated Bend area and unincorporated portions of Deschutes County inside the Bend-La Pine School District were incorporated into the PRC enrollment forecast. The Bend element of the coordinated forecast was used by the City of Bend to determine the number of dwellings that will be constructed, and land utilized, to meet the needs of the forecasted population. The City's UGB expansion proposal is also consistent with the coordinated population forecast.
- 2. March 2008 Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) for the City of Bend This work product was used in three ways:
 - Create a map of vacant and redevelopable lands This database was generated in a Geographic Information System so maps of vacant and redevelopable lands could be used to identify potential areas for new school sites. See Recommended Approach to Identifying New Sites for Schools memorandum.

- 2. As the basis of a build-out scenario for the City of Bend and new Bend UGB expansion area This analysis calculates how many students by school level will likely reside in the City of Bend once all the raw vacant residential land (minus public rights-of-way), redevelopable land, platted and vacant lots inside subdivisions, and proposed new lots in subdivisions are fully developed according to the same assumptions contained in the Bend UGB expansion. The same analysis was done for the proposed UGB expansion area to predict how many schools will be needed there.
- 3. As the focus of the GeoBlade internet mapping project The City of Bend GIS Coordinator created an on-line GIS mapping application for the project which references the 2008 BLI and other data maintained by Deschutes County and the City of Bend.

City of Bend and Bend UGB Expansion Area Build-out Analysis

The District-wide analysis in Tables 1-4 illustrates approximately four new prototypical elementary, two middle, and one high school will be needed in the District by year 2030 to provide adequate capacity for enrollment growth. This conclusion is based on District-wide enrollment forecasts from PRC and the capacity of existing schools, but does not provide any indication where the need will manifest. The build-out analysis described below estimates the number of schools needed in the Bend area based on a simple housing-based model. This model is consistent with the data, assumptions, and methodology used by the City of Bend to estimate the number of housing units that will be developed inside the current city limits, and be developed in the proposed UGB expansion. The model uses estimates of housing growth from the adopted Bend UGB and applies students per household ratios from the recent PRC study. The PRC enrollment study and build-out analysis are not intended to be inter-related and coordinated to a high degree, but used to provide a range of likely outcomes affecting the District.

Tables 5 and 6 apply assumptions used in the adopted Bend General Plan and UGB expansion and PRC's estimated student generation rates per dwelling unit type to calculate the number of students by level at build-out of the City of Bend (see Findings for Bend UGB Expansion January 2009 for discussion of assumptions). Build-out is when nearly all available residential land is developed and is expected to take place by approximately year 2025. The number of new units per plan designation and through redevelopment of the Central Area and along Transit Corridors is estimated. At full build-out, the analysis predicts as many as 1,802 new elementary, 751 new middle, and 947 new high school students will be present in the City of Bend. If unoccupied second homes serving as seasonal, investment, or vacation homes are developed at the rate expected by the city (approximately 18% of all new units), then only 1,477 new elementary, 616 new middle, and 799 new high school students will be present at build-out. This analysis does not consider the existing capacity to serve new students, which is considered at a later point in this analysis.

General Plan Designations	RL^1	RS ¹	RM ²	RH ²	Central Area ²	Transit Corridors ²	Totals	Total reduced by 18% 4
Total New Units ³	163	7,458	2,177	261	500	600	11,159	
New K-5 Students	31	1,417	218	26	50	60	1,802	1,477
New 6-8 Students	13	597	87	10	20	24	751	616
New 9-12 Students	16	746	131	16	30	36	974	799
Total BLPS Students at Build-out ⁴	60	2,759	435	52	100	120	3,527	2,892

Table 5: Existing Bend City Limits Residential Land Capacity and Student Generation Analysis

Notes:

¹ = K-5 at 0.19, 6-8 at 0.08, 9-12 at 0.1 BLPS Students per Housing Unit, page 20 of Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2030.

² = K-5 at 0.1, 6-8 at 0.04, 9-12 at 0.06 BLPS Students per Housing Unit, page 20 of Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2030.

³ = Total Units per Designation from City of Bend UGB Expansion Housing Needs Analysis, 2008, consistent with adopted General Plan and UGB expansion. Total Units includes new units from vacant land, platted lots in subdivisions, approved lots in subdivisions, and redevelopment. The assumption is that RL and RS

dwelling units will be single-family and RM, RH, Central Area, and Transit Corridor dwelling units will be attached due to density requirements and development patterns.

⁴ = Students generation is likely an over-estimate since no unoccupied second homes are considered above (city estimates 18% of units are unoccupied second homes).

	Detached Units	Attached Units	Total Units	New K-5 Students ¹	New 6-8 Students ²	New 9-12 Students ³
General Plan Designation of RS	2,800	97	2,896	542	228	286
General Plan Designation of RM	790	1,121	1,911	262	108	146
General Plan Designation of RH	0	715	715	72	29	43
Totals	3,589	1,933	5,522	875	364	475

Table 6: Proposed Bend UGB Expansion Area Land Capacity and Student Generation Analysis

Notes:

¹ = K-5 at 0.19 for detached, 0.10 for attached BLPS Students per Housing Unit, page 20 of Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2030.

² = 6-8 at 0.08 for detached, 0.04 for attached BLPS Students per Housing Unit, page 20 of Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2030.

³ = 9-12 at 0.10 for detached, 0.06 for attached BLPS Students per Housing Unit, page 20 of Bend-La Pine School District Population and Enrollment Forecasts 2010-2030. Analysis predicts 1,714 new K-12 BLPS students in expansion area, but does not account for students from 3,000 second home units (units are expected to be unoccupied). Table 6 performs the same analysis for the proposed Bend UGB expansion area by General Plan designations and unit type. This analysis suggests as many as 875 new elementary, 364 new middle, and 475 new high school students will be present in the UGB expansion area. These estimates are not reduced by 18 percent to account for unoccupied second and vacation homes because this has been factored into the number of units in Table 6.

Quadrants	NW	SW	NE	SE	Totals	Total reduced by 18% ¹
New K-5 Students	528	214	419	641	1,802	1,478
New 6-8 Students	222	88	175	267	752	617
New 9-12 Students	282	120	227	347	976	800
Students at Build-out	1,032	422	821	1,255	3,530	2,895

Table 7 transforms the analysis in Table 5 into quadrants shown in Figure 1 (on following page). These quadrants address major pedestrian barriers such as the Deschutes River, Bend Parkway, 3rd Street, and Highway 20. New student totals in Table 7 match totals in Table 5. Table 7 shows the southeast and northwest quadrants have the greatest potential to generate new students.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 calculate the difference between the number of new students by quadrant from Table 7 and the amount of school capacity currently available by quadrant. This assumes the school attendance area boundaries would be entirely within each of the respective quadrants described in Figure 1. This is a necessary step in the

NW Quadrant Elementary Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Westside Village	0		
High Lakes	25		
Highland	11		
WE Miller	103		
Quadrant tota	ls 139	528	-389
SW Quadrant Elementary Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Amity Creek	0		
Pine Ridge	70		
Elk Meadow	10		
Quadrant tota	ls 80	214	-134
SE Quadrant Elementary Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
RE Jewell	0		
Bear Creek	112		
Quadrant tota	ls 112	641	-529
NE Quadrant Elementary Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Lava Ridge	54		
Ponderosa	34		
Ensworth	48		
Buckingham	91		
Juniper	19		
Quadrant tota	ls 246	419	-173
City-wide Summary	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Elementary School Totals	577	1,802	-1,225

Table 8: City of Bend Quadrant Based Build-out and Capacity Analysis for Elementary Schools

Note: Does not consider La Pine, Three Rivers, or new students outside City of Bend.



analysis in order to standardize an area to estimate both student generation and existing capacity to serve the new students. The estimated school attendance area boundaries may be desirable and achievable since the quadrants are remarkably similar, but smaller than current school attendance boundaries. This approach does not address the students attending schools inside the City of Bend living outside the city limits, and

should therefore be considered conservative.

Table 8 presents the quadrant build-out and capacity analysis for elementary schools in the City of Bend. The information in Table 8 suggests the following:

- 1. Once build-out of the City of Bend occurs and all existing schools are at full capacity, approximately two new 600-student elementary schools, or similar amount of new capacity with smaller schools, will be required. The southeast and northwest quadrants have the greatest need for additional new elementary school capacity. The southeast may experience enough growth to expect up to 529 students after all existing capacity in the quadrant is used. The northwest quadrant may have a capacity shortage of 389 students at build-out.
- 2. TAC recommendations on the type and location of new elementary schools:
 - a. Southeast The TAC recommends acquiring two new 15-acre sites for two new 300-student schools (half of a full 600-student prototypical design) to meet the need in the southeast. One site would ideally be west of the railroad tracks and one east of the railroad tracks. The first priority is the site west of the tracks, but the siting decision should be influenced by the location of large residential developments. The second site may be inside the current city limits or developed on land owned by the District at High Desert Middle School if the area is included in the Bend UGB expansion.
 - i. The first new elementary school site should be purchased in the next five years to guarantee enough time is available for construction and opening by 2018. In the worst case with rapid growth and lack of a second suitable site in the southeast, the 300-student elementary could be expanded to 600 students to provide the needed capacity by 2018.
 - ii. The need for the second site in the southeast should be reexamined in 2015/2016 once the UGB is finalized. If High Desert Middle School and the surrounding Urban Area Reserve land are included in the Bend UGB then vacant land at High Desert Middle School can be the second southeast elementary site. If not, the need for additional capacity at build-out will likely remain, and the railroad tracks present such a pedestrian barrier that the second site should be located east of the railroad tracks. Ideally, an option securing the second site would be in place so the second site could be purchased in 2016 followed immediately with construction of the second 300-student school in the southeast.
 - iii. In both cases, the recommendation is for two new 300-student schools developed as half of a full prototypical school versus the small school model similar to Ensworth. The TAC felt strongly that a half of a full prototype can easily be expanded if need be, yet retains the small school environment preferred by the TAC. The most obvious additional cost to this approach is the additional cost to purchase six to seven acres. However, the TAC felt it makes sense to purchase land for future needs when land costs are lower.
 - b. Northwest The TAC recommends a similar approach for the northwest quadrant, except only one site is needed by build-out in approximately 15 years. The TAC is not recommending purchasing the new 15-acre site in the next five years, but encouraging the District to obtain an option to purchase in the next five years, and conduct facility planning work in 2015/2016 to confirm the need. The TAC was ambivalent regarding the estimated number of students predicted in this quadrant. However, the general consensus was at least a 300-student elementary would be warranted at build-out, but depending on a number

of re-development projects such as the Demolition Dump, Robinson Pit, COCC campus, and shifts in the housing market attracting more younger families to the quadrant, potentially more students could be present in this quadrant. The lack of adequate sites inside the Bend City Limits and desire for a walkable, accessible, site encouraged the TAC to recommend acquiring a 15-acre site, but constructing the smaller school.

- c. Flexibility During A Time of Uncertainty – The TAC's approach is generally conservative because of the uncertainty facing the community. Note aggressive site acquisition is not recommended and that half versus full prototypical elementary schools are recommended. This is due to the recession, uncertainty regarding future growth, and uncertainty regarding the Bend UGB expansion. However, the TAC's recommendations are scaleable. Additional capacity needs at build-out beyond what is described above could be met by expanding any one of the 300-student elementary schools to the full prototypical size of 600students. This would require modifying school attendance area boundaries, but does not require acquiring another school site and building another school. This approach also counts on two new schools being built in the UGB expansion area to serve the northwest and northeast areas towards the end of the planning period, which would allow more sensible school boundaries to be formed to serve the needs of students in the northeast and southwest quadrants.
- d. Bend UGB Expansion Area Table 6 illustrates more than one full elementary school will be needed in the expansion area (likely a conservative estimate of need). The TAC believes two additional 600-student schools in years 2025 and 2028 would most likely be sited in the proposed Bend UGB expansion area. One new school would be placed in the northwest, and one new school in the northeast expansion areas. These recommendations will be revised, and there is no urgency to acquire these sites since the need occurs later in the planning horizon and the Bend UGB expansion is not final.

Table 9 contains the quadrant build-out analysis and capacity analysis for middle schools in the City of Bend. The information in Table 9 suggests the following:

- 1. There will be a need for nearly half of a new middle school from students living in the southeast quadrant (267-student capacity shortfall) at build-out. The northeast quadrant will experience new growth, but has the most school capacity to accommodate the growth.
- 2. TAC recommendations on the type and location of new middle schools:
 - a. **Southeast Middle School** The TAC observed the capacity shortfall in the southeast combined with the presence of a District-owned site to recommend siting the next middle school in the southeast region. The fringe of the quadrant is served by High Desert Middle School, so the new site will provide capacity to developing neighborhoods in a more centralized and accessible location.
 - b. Second Middle School Since the need for a new middle school is not expected to materialize until approximately 2022, this recommendation will be reviewed again before funding design and construction of the school (see Table 4). The TAC did not specify specific recommendations for a new school site for the second middle school illustrated in the site acquisition and construction schedule, but not illustrated in Table 9. The TAC felt that because this need occurs at the very end of the 20-year planning period and the need will be evaluated in multiple facility planning projects, a specific recommendation is not warranted at this time.

Tuble 5. Only of Bena Quadrant Bas	Sea Dana-Out and Oupdenty Analy		
NW Quadrant Middle Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Cascade Middle School	0		
Westside Village	61		
Quadrant totals	61	222	-161
SE Quadrant Middle Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
High Desert Middle School	0	267	-267
NE Quadrant Middle Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Sky View Middle	119		
Pilot Butte	290		
Quadrant totals	409	175	234
SW Quadrant Middle Schools	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
No school in area	0	88	-88
City-wide Summary	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Middle School Totals	470	752	-282

Table 9:	City of Bend	Quadrant Base	d Build-out and	Capacity	y Anal	ysis for	Middle Schools
----------	--------------	---------------	-----------------	----------	--------	----------	----------------

Note: Does not consider La Pine, Three Rivers, or new students outside City of Bend.

Table 10 presents the quadrant build-out and capacity analysis for high schools. The information in Table 10 suggests the following:

- The southeast will generate more students needing additional high school capacity than other quadrants at build-out. The data suggests that nearly half of a new high school will be needed based on new students living in the City of Bend. Table 2 illustrates another 475 high school students (conservatively) would be living in the Bend UGB expansion area. Together, these suggest two thirds of a new high school can be filled with students from just the City of Bend and Bend UGB expansion areas.
- 2. TAC recommendations on high school location:
 - a. **Southeast High School** The TAC observed the capacity shortfall in the southeast combined with the presence of a District-owned site to recommend siting the next 1,500-student high school in the southeast region. No funding should be included in the next bond measure.
 - b. Since the need for a new high school does materialize until approximately 2026, the TAC recommends additional review before funding design and construction of the school.

High Schools			
NW Quadrant High School	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Summit	150	282	-132
SW Quadrant High School	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
No school in area	0	120	-120
SE Quadrant High School	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Bend High	85	347	-262
NE Quadrant High School	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
Mountain View	138	227	-89
City-wide Summary	2009/2010 Remaining Capacity	New Students at Build-out	Difference
High School Totals	373	976	-603

Table 10: Cit	ty of Bend Quadrant	Based Build-out and Cap	pacity Analys	sis for High Schools
---------------	---------------------	-------------------------	---------------	----------------------

Note: Does not consider Marshall, La Pine, Three Rivers, or new students outside City of Bend.

Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule

ORS 195.110(5)(G) requires school facility plans include site acquisition schedules and programs. The following explains the District's 20-year site acquisition and construction schedule approved by the project Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

The timing of site acquisition and design and construction are factors to consider when determining a site acquisition and construction schedule. Site acquisition is a time consuming process that requires the District to negotiate with numerous land owners, often in concert with a developer's master planning efforts. Successful site acquisition requires building relationships and takes years to accomplish. Over the past fifteen years Bend-La Pine School District School Siting Studies and District policy have had great success acquiring new school sites approximately five years before the school is opened. Given the District has proposed bond measures for new schools, sites, and improvements on a five year cycle, new sites have historically been purchased one bond measure (or five years) before they need to be opened. This allows the District adequate time to secure funding and negotiate land acquisition.

Typically, new elementary schools take two years, middle schools two-an-a-half years and high schools three years to design and construct before they are opened. Using a ten-year time period as an example, if a school needs to be opened in year seven, then the site should be acquired (and funds made available through passing a bond measure) in year two, design and construction would begin in year five, and the school opened in year seven. This allows the District approximately two or three years to acquire the site before design and construction begin. This approach has been used successfully in the past and the 2010 Sites and Facilities Committee agrees the approach should continue to be used.

Figures 2-4 present a general site acquisition and construction schedule in a graphic form based on the need determination from Tables 1-4 and approach described above. The numbers in the tables refer to actions needing to take place in the years indicated. Actions are described in the text following the table.

Figures 2-4 also consider the needs for site acquisition, design and construction, and opening a new school within three main time frames of concern:

1. Years 2010-2015 where site acquisition, design and construction, and school opening must be "Needs Included in Bond" – Needs for site acquisition that take

place in this time frame should me included in a bond measure so needed capacity can be constructed on time to meet anticipated capacity shortfalls.

- 2. Years 2010-2020 where site acquisition, design and construction, and school opening are included in the "Time Period for Ten-year CIP" ORS 195.110 requires the District to have a ten-year CIP, so needs falling within this time period are included in the CIP. Note that the TAC recommends needs beyond 2015 be re-evaluated in year 2015 to account for the uncertainty inherent in enrollment projections taking place in years five through twenty. This approach will keep the ten-year CIP more accurate over time by considering updated enrollment forecasts and a new capacity analysis on a five-year schedule.
- 3. Years 2020-2030 are subject to even more uncertainty so the TAC recommends "New school and site needs evaluated by future planning projects every five years" – The District commonly examines a 20-year need for new facilities to understand a likely magnitude of need. These findings help the TAC locate schools to meet short-term needs in the context of long-term school locations. The practical result of this approach allowed the TAC to focus on identifying the best locations for schools needed within ten years and general areas for schools beyond ten years with the assumption that future studies will pinpoint exact locations for new school sites when more accurate information is available (i.e. the final location of the proposed Bend UGB, zoning designations, available utilities, etc.).

Figure 2: Elementary School Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule

			·	Time P	eriod fo	or ten-v	/ear Cll	P —												
Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Acquire Site			1			4				7			10							
Design and Construct						2			5				8			11				
Open New School								3		Į	6			Ţ	9			12		
	N	leeds I	ncluded	d in Bor	nd ——		Ν	lew sch	nool and	l site ne	eds ev	aluated	l by futu	ire plan	ning pr	ojects e	every fiv	ve vear	s.	

Description of actions for elementary school site acquisition and construction schedule:

- Acquire a 15-acre site for a new elementary in the southeast quadrant, preferably west of the railroad, and secure and option to purchase a second 15acre site east of the railroad in southeast quadrant inside the Bend City Limits. Secure an option for a 15-acre elementary school site in the northwest quadrant, but do not purchase either optioned site unless alternate funding or acquisition strategy is available.
- 2. In 2015/2016 start the next School Facility Plan to evaluate the following recommended actions and actions described in 3-12 below:
 - a. Design and build two new 300-student elementary schools in the southeast; one on the newly acquired site and the second on the site with an option, or develop the second 300-student school on a developable portion of the High Desert Middle School site.
 - b. If it appears additional capacity is required, convert the most appropriate 300-student elementary to a 600-student elementary at any one of the three new school sites described in actions 2 and 4 before year 2021.
- 3. Open the schools from action 2 by 2018.
- 4. Acquire 15-acre site for 300-student elementary school in the northwest quadrant (see action 1).
- 5. Start design and construction of school in action 4.
- 6. Open new northwest elementary school described in action 4.
- 7. Acquire 15-acre site or option for school site in the northeast Bend UGB expansion area, depending on proposed developments and annexations. School would be a 600-student elementary school.
- 8. Start design and construction of school in action 7.

- 9. Open new northwest or northeast elementary school.
- 10. Acquire 15-acre site or option for school site in northwest Bend UGB expansion area, depending on proposed developments and annexations. School would be a 600-student elementary school.
- 11. Start design and construction of school in action 10.
- 12. Open new northwest or northeast elementary school.

Figure 3: Middle School Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule

			— 1	Time Po	eriod fo	or ten-y	ear CIF	>												
Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Acquire Site							1								4					
Design and Construct						2					5									
Open New School												3								6
	N	leeds Ir	ncluded	l in Bon	id ——		Ν	lew sch	ool and	d site ne	eds ev	aluated	l by futu	ire plan	ining pr	ojects e	every fiv	/e years	S.	

Description of actions for middle school site acquisition and construction schedule:

- School Facility Planning in year 2015/2016 should re-evaluate TAC recommendation to site new middle school on District-owned site adjacent to R.E. Jewell Elementary.
- 2. Design and begin construction of new middle school.
- 3. Open new middle school.
- 4. Acquire new site for additional middle school. Note: the 2010 School Facility Plan does not identify a preferred location or site for this school since the location will likely be in the final expanded Bend UGB.
- 5. Design and begin construction of middle school in action 4.
- 6. Open middle school described in action 4.

Figure 4: High School Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule

			1	Time Po	eriod fo	or ten-y	ear Cll	P												
Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Acquire Site											1									
Design and Construct													2							
Open New School																3				
	N	leeds l	ncludec	l in Bon	d —		N	lew sch	ool and	d site ne	eds ev	aluated	l by futu	ire plan	ining pr	ojects e	every fiv	ve year	s.	

Description of actions for high school site acquisition and construction schedule:

- School Facility Planning in year 2015/2016 should re-evaluate TAC recommendation to site new middle school on District-owned site in southeast guadrant of Bend.
- 2. Design and begin construction of new high school.
- 3. Open new high school.

School Sites

An additional memorandum explains the approach the TAC recommends for selecting specific school sites referenced in the site acquisition and construction schedule. The TAC recommends identifying specific areas containing multiple potential sites for schools versus specific sites. Specific areas are described as a graphic "planning circle" or "potential school site circle" shown on a map containing a number of vacant and redevelopable sites. Site evaluation criteria were generated by the TAC for the District to use before acquiring a new site.





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Board Charge to Technical Advisory Committee Members

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page
Summary School Sites and Facilities 2010 Planning Process John M. Rexford, Deputy Superintendent

Issue Statement

Bend-La Pine Schools regularly plans to provide appropriate educational facilities for students in its communities. The latest update of the Long Range Sites and Facilities Plan was completed in the December of 2005. This plan included a 20-year school siting study for the Bend urban area, as well as the Sunriver and La Pine planning areas. This plan served as the basis for development of the current capital construction program. Continuing community growth, ongoing impact of public usage and deferred maintenance cause the need for an update of the plan. In addition, recent changes to ORS 195.110 require coordinated planning for schools in districts exceeding 2,500 students. Plans consistent with the new requirements are due to be completed by December 31, 2009.

Recommendation

Implement a community-based school planning process to update the plan.

Goals and Process

Mission Statement: The committee shall review all school sites and facilities and make recommendation to the School Board to meet immediate and future educational and related needs of students in the school district.

An updated Long Range Sites and Facilities Plan, consistent with ORS 195.110, shall be delivered to the School Board for review and approval no later than December 8, 2009.

Topics and/or areas of review may include:

Updated enrollment projections Educational program needs Demographic changes and growth patterns Current and future distribution of student enrollment Future needs of existing schools Equity needs at existing schools Future needs for new facilities Site acquisition schedules and programs for future facilities Highest and best use of existing land holdings Deferred maintenance at existing facilities Other facility upgrades or changes Ten-year capital improvement plans Financial plans to meet school facility needs Other needs as determined by the committee

The Facilities Committee

The facilities committee of 18-20 persons should be made up of a diverse representation of the school community. A lay community member should chair the committee with facilitation assistance from staff. The committee may organize with sub-committees as needed and as desired. The committee shall assemble, as it deems necessary to meet deadlines described above. The committee shall be provided background materials describing legal issues related to school facilities, planning, capital construction and bond funding. In addition, information describing current strategic and operational planning efforts shall be provided to the committee.

Public Input

In addition to public participation in the committee and the potential use of a survey data, the committee should create ample opportunity for public input into the process.

Status

Staff is in the process of developing a work plan for a process to commence in early May. Volunteers will be solicited for participation in the facilities committee. If any board members are interested in participating in the process, please let us know.





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Aerial Photographs of School Sites

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

Built-Out School Sites

Amity Creek at Thompson Elementary: capacity 150 on 1.4 acres



Bend Senior High School: capacity 1,650 on 29 acres



Buckingham Elementary: capacity 575 on 21 acres



Bus Yard on 6 acres



Elk Meadow Elementary: capacity 575 on 14 acres



Ensworth Elementary: capacity 285 on 10 acres



High Lakes Elementary: capacity 575 on 17 acres



Highland at Kenwood Elementary: capacity 375 on 4 acres



Lava Ridge Elementary (capacity 575) and Sky View Middle (capacity 800) on 34 acres



Marshall High: capacity 200 on 5 acres



Miller Elementary: capacity 575 on 15 acres



Pine Ridge Elementary: capacity 575 on 12 acres



Ponderosa Elementary: capacity 575 on 15 acres



Distribution Center South of Bend Senior High



Summit High: capacity 1,500 on 45 acres





Three Rivers Elementary: capacity (KG-8) 575 on 15 acres



West Side Village at Kingston Elementary: capacity (KG-8) 285 on 4 acres

Sites with Multi-use Opportunities

Administrative Building and Troy Field





Bear Creek Elementary: capacity 575 on 35 acres

Cascade Middle: capacity 800 on 29 acres



High Desert Middle: capacity 800 on 76 acres



Juniper Elementary (capacity 560 on 28 acres) Pilot Butte Middle (capacity 900 on 32 acres)



La Pine Elementary (capacity KG-4 is 575), Middle (capacity 5-8 is 550), High (capacity 650) on 78 acres



3610 Future field area

Mountain View High: capacity 1,500 on 35 acres

Northwest Vacant: 32 acres





Jewell Elementary (and vacant site): capacity 575 on 42 acres

Southeast High School Site: 50 acres







EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Tax Rate Chart

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page







EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Approach to New Sites with Maps

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET PO BOX 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us To:BEND-LA PINE SCHOOLS 2010 SITES AND FACILITIES TACFROM:BRIAN RANKIN, SENIOR PLANNERSUBJECT:APPROACH TO IDENTIFYING NEW SITES FOR SCHOOLSDATE:4/15/2010CC:CC:

This memorandum outlines the TAC's recommended approach to identify ideal areas for new school sites, meet the legal obligations of ORS 195.110, and address the unique planning context in the District. A summary of this approach is as follows:

- Identify approximately how many schools by level will be required over the next 20 years (see 4/12/2010 Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule Memorandum).
- Collect and present information in electronic and hard copy maps that is useful to identify areas with ideal school sites.
- Use the information to qualitatively assess and identify areas where new schools should be located.
- Create siting "circles" on maps that target areas for potential school sites.

A Review of Legal Requirements

The following are excerpts from ORS 195.110 pertaining to new school sites. Text has been underlined to draw attention to key phrases which are further interpreted and operationalized.

ORS 195.110

(5)(a) The school facility plan must cover a period of at least <u>10 years</u> and must <u>include</u>, <u>but need not be limited to</u>, the following elements:

(B) Identification by the city or county and by the large school district of <u>desirable school</u> <u>sites</u>

(5)(b) Based on the elements described in paragraph (a) of this subsection and applicable laws and rules, the school facility plan must also include an analysis of the land required for the 10-year period covered by the plan that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary.

Approach (previously approved by the TAC)

The following is an outline including text of ORS 195.110 in quotes followed by a discussion of how the requirement is met.

- 1. "Identify land required for the 10-year period"
 - a. The plan specifies how many sites (by level) are needed within a twenty-year time frame. Draft District-wide enrollment projections for years 2009/2010 through 2030/2031. See the 4/12/2010 Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule memorandum for specific details that are summarized below.
 - i. Elementary Schools:
- The TAC recommends acquiring two new 15-acre sites for two new 300-student schools (half of a 600-student prototypical design) to meet the need in the southeast. One site would ideally be west of the railroad tracks and one east of the railroad tracks. The first priority is the site west of the tracks, but the siting decision should be influenced by the location of large residential developments. The second site may be inside the current city limits or developed on land owned by the District at High Desert Middle School if the area is included in the Bend UGB expansion.
- The TAC recommends a similar approach for the northwest quadrant, except only one site is needed and should be acquired in 2016.
- The TAC believes two additional 600-student schools to be opened in years 2025 and 2028 would most likely be sited in the proposed Bend UGB expansion area. One new school would be placed in the northwest, and one new school in the northeast expansion areas. These recommendations will be revised since the need occurs later in the planning horizon and the Bend UGB expansion is not final.
- ii. Middle and high schools This same housing based enrollment forecast suggests there will be enough new students in the current city limits of Bend to justify siting the middle school (25 acres) and high school (50 acres) in the current city limits of Bend. The TAC recommends both of these new schools be located on two Districtowned sites in the southeast of Bend.
- 2. "Identify land required...that is suitable, as a permitted or conditional use, for school facilities inside the urban growth boundary" and also "desirable school sites".
 - a. "Suitable" is defined by law as land where schools are allowed as permitted or conditional uses.
 - i. The map series showing areas for potential school sites and vacant and redevelopable lands only show lands where schools are a permitted or conditional use. Schools are not allowed in industrial zones so these lands are not included as potential school sites. In addition, the map series shows the proposed UGB expansion area Framework Plan designations. Sites with a Special Site or Industrial designation would not allow schools and should not be considered potential school sites. The General Plan map for La Pine shows the only school site required in the planning period zoned Public Facility.
 - b. Areas containing "desirable school sites" are identified based on a qualitative analysis considering site characteristics illustrated through a series of maps and analysis contained in the 4/12/2010 Site Acquisition and Construction memorandum. The GeoBlade web-based map application also provides the information detailed below. The District has copies of the maps used in the project as well as a copy of the GeoBlade map application. The TAC relied upon hard-copy maps with the information below:
 - i. Development status of parcels Parcels that are redevelopable, have minor improvements, or are vacant based on recent land inventories used for the Bend UGB expansion are shown. Only parcels where schools are permitted outright or conditionally were considered.
 - ii. Pedestrian access This map is based on a 2006 inventory of sidewalks, existing and proposed bike lanes, existing and proposed pathways and trails (2009) in Bend city limits. Ideally, identifying sites along collectors with bike lanes and sidewalks will enable the District to

tie into these systems at the time of site development. Using the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Systems Plan Map will helped the TAC identify sites along planned bike and pedestrian routes.

- iii. Appropriate size Maps show parcels classified by size.
- Utilities The following narrative based on interviews with City of Bend staff illustrate areas with more or less capacity for new development. The following replaces a formal "cost to serve" map, since no such map exists for the current UGB.
- v. Tom Hickman, Assistant Public Works Director, states there are a number of issues to consider regarding the City's sewer and sewer systems. City of Bend staff members from the Transportation Engineering Division were interviewed regarding transportation issues.
 - Sewer There are widespread capacity constraints in the city's existing sewer collection system and sewer treatment facility. In the ten-year time frame, there should be additional treatment plant capacity and a new southeast sewer interceptor to serve the southeast area of Bend. Serving this area is one of the top priorities for the City of Bend and is reflected in the city's adopted Capital Improvement Plan. Assuming the UGB expansion is acknowledged, the northeast UGB expansion area is likely to receive sewer service sooner than other expansion areas because it is closest to the treatment plant and proposed sewer plant interceptor. Other areas in the city limits of Bend to the west, north, and southwest all currently face a lack of sewer capacity, but may have additional capacity in ten years.
 - Water In the ten-year time frame, the availability of water service is not a major limiting factor. The City of Bend and Avion Water appear to have sufficient capacity to serve new developments. However, it is likely that site development will require localized system upgrades.
 - Transportation Generally, core facilities along the state transportation system will require upgrades throughout the Highway 97 and Highway 20 corridors during the 20-year planning period. Developing in the north and east of Bend near state highways and busy collector and arterial roadways are most likely to trigger the need for major intersection improvements. Areas in the southeast are less likely to require major improvements. Sites with access to a greater number of local roadways off the state's network will tend to result in fewer major transportation improvements. Any new school will likely require improvements to the local road network surrounding the site and potentially major intersections serving the new school.
- vi. Access points Maps show existing streets and the Transportation Systems Plan map for future road alignments and classifications. Information describing trip volumes and speed data is provided where available in the GeoBlade application, but not in hard-copy maps.
- vii. Topography and Areas of Special Interest (ASI) This information is present on the City's zoning maps.
- viii. Zoning General Plan, zoning, and Framework Plan designations are used to illustrate where schools are a permitted or conditional use and anticipate potential future incompatible uses.
- ix. Shape of site Parcels are shown on the map.

- x. Physical barriers Features such as canals, railroads, arterial streets and rivers are shown on the maps and through aerial photographs.
- xi. Existing parks Public parks are shown on the map.
- xii. Places of interest The Deschutes County GIS layer showing fire and police stations, meeting halls, churches, public offices, and schools is shown on the map.
- xiii. School service buffers Buffers of 1/4, 1/2, and 1 mile surrounding existing schools wee shown on maps provided to the TAC to illustrate gaps in the distribution of schools.
- xiv. Aerial photograph A detailed 2004 and less detailed 2008 aerial photograph for Bend are shown.

Due to time constraints and the lack of availability of data, not all of the map data requested by the TAC is available. The following summarizes information that the TAC requested, but is not available.

- 1. Consider common ownership of parcels in conjunction with size This is available for each parcel, but a map combining common ownerships was not created.
- 2. DEQ contaminated sites This information is not available in a format readily compatible with the City's GIS. DEQ records are researched during Environmental Assessments (EAs) prior to purchasing and developing a site.
- 3. Site acquisition costs The database includes the Real Market Value of each parcel. This information is included in the parcel database, but not specifically mapped.
- 4. Old Surface Mines Current surface mines are shown on the zoning map, but staff did not research old surface mines due to a lack of readily available information on the subject.
- 5. Partnership potential with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District A map is not available at this time, but the City's Framework Plan includes acreage needs by park type for each quadrant of the City of Bend.

Ideal Areas for New Schools

The TAC applied following general principles to create "planning circles" specifying where new schools should be located. Additional site specific recommendations are also made by quadrant and school level.

- 1. Create an equitable arrangement or distribution of school facilities based on the location of existing schools and under-served areas and the quadrant-based build-out capacity analysis The quadrant based capacity analysis illustrates the approximate number of schools that will be needed by general vicinity in the Bend UGB. The results of this analysis focused attention on the areas within Bend where future needs are anticipated. The TAC referenced maps with concentric circles of a quarter, half, and one mile radii around existing schools to approximate convenient walking distance (quarter mile), identify pedestrian barriers, and visualize service gaps (see Figures 8-10). The TAC attempted to place new school sites within convenient walking distance of residential areas, while respecting pedestrian barriers and anticipated capacity needs in the area. Schools also provide a wealth of amenities such as open space, play equipment, role as a community and cultural center, field space, and more. The TAC felt a distribution versus concentration of school sites improves the entire community's access to these amenities.
- 2. Locate new schools in areas where new residential growth is expected This approach enables new schools to be located where the most students are generated,

where schools can be integrated into a development's master plan, and where land is more available. In the District, new housing typically generates the most and youngest students, so it follows to site schools in locations where students are expected to live. Many older neighborhoods are aging in place, and are devoid of younger students. The appearance of a good redevelopment or infill opportunities must be carefully weighed against the existing and predicted number of students living in close proximity to the school site. Also, the short- and long-term development potential in the immediate area and surrounding area is of concern. The TAC selected school locations in the southeast and northwest in part because of supplies of remaining residential land and the strong likelihood that new residential areas will be located in these areas once the Bend UGB is finalized.

- 3. Identify ideal areas for potential school sites versus specific sites Past school siting projects identified and ranked specific sites to be acquired by the District. Not only did this alert the private market of a willing buyer, but many opportunities were lost due to development. The TAC agreed that identifying areas containing multiple opportunities was preferred to address these two issues. Figures 1-6 present the ideal areas for new schools to implement the specific siting recommendations in the Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule. The areas are purposeful and specific, and generally include a number of sites that would be ideal for future schools. The maps representing the TAC's new school site recommendations are described below. Figures 1 and 2 show all the proposed areas for new elementary, middle, and high schools. Figures 3-6 provide more detailed maps of each area. Figure 7 is the La Pine Comprehensive Plan map showing the new La Pine elementary school location and zoning.
 - a. Figure 1: Bend Urban Area Proposed Elementary Site Locations
 - b. Figure 2: Bend Urban Area Proposed Middle and High School Sites
 - c. Figure 3: Bend Southeast Quadrant Proposed Elementary Site Location
 - d. Figure 4: Bend Northwest Quadrant Proposed Elementary Site Location
 - e. Figure 5: Bend UGB Expansion Northwest Area Proposed Elementary Site Location
 - f. Figure 6: Bend UGB Expansion Northeast Area Proposed Elementary Site Location
 - g. Figure 7: La Pine General Plan (depicting existing school site and zoning)
- 4. Create site evaluation criteria for the District to apply when deciding between competing sites Site criteria have been used successfully in the past and the TAC agreed the District should continue to use these to secure new sites within areas for potential school sites identified by the TAC and shown in the Figures 1- 6. The following site criteria were used in the 2005 Sites and Facilities Plan the TAC agreed these are still appropriate to use today:
 - a. All School Sites:
 - i. High student densities
 - ii. Good walking access
 - iii. Relatively flat topography
 - iv. Appropriate size (8-10 for small elementary, 15 for prototypical elementary, 25 for middle school, and 40 acres for a high school)
 - v. Low cost for water, sewer, and sidewalk extensions
 - vi. At least two vehicular access points
 - vii. Low site acquisition costs
 - viii. Partnership potential with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District
 - ix. Zoning allows schools
 - x. Shape of site promotes efficient use of the space

- b. Elementary Schools Only:
 - i. Few busy roads around school
 - ii. Few physical barriers such as canals, railroads, or arterial streets
 - iii. Located in residential zones
 - iv. Adjacent to park or future park where possible
- c. Middle School Only:
 - i. Ready access to bicycle trails or bicycle lanes
 - ii. Near sports field
- d. High School Only:
 - i. Good access to main transportation system
 - ii. Feasibility for community events
 - iii. Near commercial, convenience commercial, or industrial park zones
 - iv. Co-development potential for sports facility
 - v. Site minimizes the negative impacts of field lights on neighboring properties
- 5. Select locations with adequate infrastructure Schools generate significant impacts on public infrastructure such as sewer, water, and transportation systems. The TAC evaluated the availability of capacity in these systems in very general terms.

Discussion of TAC Siting Recommendations

Elementary Schools – The following topics were discussed by the TAC as ideal areas for potential school sites were developed. Figure 1 shows all of the recommended locations for new schools needed in the planning period. Specific recommendations and more detail pertaining to each area identified as containing potential new school sites is found in the Site Acquisition and Construction Schedule.

- La Pine (Figure 7) Based on the current capacity and expected slower growth
 rates in the District, the new elementary school in La Pine should provide sufficient
 capacity in the short term. Specific attendance area enrollment forecasts should be
 developed by PSU in the next School Facility Plan to pinpoint areas of expected
 growth within the District. The current elementary school site identified in Figure 7 is
 sufficient to meet the anticipated needs in short term, but long-term site needs should
 be evaluated in the next facility planning project.
- 2. Southeast Bend (Figure 3) This area is likely to see dramatic changes in the next 20-years, and these changes will have dramatic impacts on the District. The southeast area of Bend has the most vacant residential acreage, the greatest potential for new development, and least amount of available school capacity in the future. Development potential is currently constrained by the lack of municipal sewer service, but the city's Capital Improvement Plan details projects to provide sewer service to the area within less than ten years. Large vacant land holdings are in a handful of ownerships and would support the integration of a school into a master planned community. Together, these conditions suggest a great deal of variability and extremes in the future need for school capacity. On one hand, a single major project could require new school construction. On the other hand, if a small number of developers hold out and do not propose any new projects, no new schools may be needed for over a decade.

The area will also be enhanced with improvements to Murphy Road and Reed Market Roads. The Burlington Northern Railroad is a major pedestrian barrier. Other transportation systems are available including trail systems, bike lanes, and road network with planned extensions and infill. Bend Parks and Metro Recreation District has also identified the area as having needs for neighborhood and community parks. These factors lead the TAC to recommend a conservative but scalable approach to providing capacity. This has translated into the need for potentially two new 15-acre elementary sites. The two sites would be sited within the circle in Figure 3. The TAC recommends acquiring one site west of the railroad tracks, and another east of the railroad tracks. If the Bend UGB is expanded in the vicinity, developing a new elementary school at High Desert Middle School may be feasible.

3. Northwest Bend (Figure 4) – The build-out analysis demonstrates approximately 380 additional students may be located within the current city limits in this quadrant. The TAC recommends the District pursue an option to acquire a 15-acre site for a 300-student elementary, but to wait until 2015/2016 to re-evaluate this recommendation before funding any site acquisition and construction. Once the City's UGB proposal is complete, a more detailed strategy can be formulated for the northwest.

A major concern for the TAC was the lack of adequately sized suitable vacant sites in this quadrant. A number of redevelopment and co-siting opportunities may present themselves such as portions of the Deschutes County Demolition Dump on native and undisturbed soil, co-siting or land swaps with the Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District maintenance building, redevelopment of the Robinson pit, land swaps involving the District's vacant acreage near Shevlin Park, and potentially partnering with COCC. Figure 4 was drawn to include these and other siting opportunities.

4. Outer Northwest and Northeast Locations in the Bend UGB Expansion Area – Two new general locations were identified for new schools in the expansion area. These recommendations are for schools much later in the planning period and will be re-evaluated by future planning studies. The locations depicted in Figures 5 and 6 were selected in areas that are mostly residential, avoid new commercial and industrial centers, and are currently lacking schools.

Middle and High Schools – The following are topics discussed by the TAC as ideal areas for new schools were developed.

 Southeast Site (Figure 2) – The selected locations for the new middle and high schools on the District-owned sites in the southeast were natural choices for the TAC. The area will have relatively high needs for new capacity at these school levels, and these types of schools are generally lacking from the vicinity and quadrant. The TAC did not identify any compelling reasons to select alternative locations for these new schools. One major concern is the lack of sewer in the southeast, but the city's CIP suggests these areas will have sewer service before the new middle and high schools will constructed.

Figure 1: Bend Urban Area Proposed Elementary Site Locations



Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools

- ★ Elementary School
- Middle School ☆
- ★ High School

Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size





Lands Inventory data updated February, 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that Lands do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM. Redevelopable lands are residentially designated that meet the following criteria: 0.5 acres or greater, land value greater than improvement value, and can accommodate



Ν

Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable twice the number of dwelling units that currently exist on the lot.

Figure 2: Bend Urban Area Proposed Middle and High School Sites



Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools

Elementary School ☆





Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size





Bend-La Pine School District Properties





- Proposed Urban Growth Boundary (Dec 2008)
 - Bend City Limit

Vacant or Redevelopable Properties w/ Pending Land Use

Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable $\,N$ Lands Inventory data updated February 2008. Aerial acquired July 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM. Redevelopable lands are residentially designated that meet the following greater than improvement value, and can accommodate twice the number of dwelling units that currently exist on the lot.





Figure 3: Bend Southeast Quadrant Proposed Elementary Site Location





Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools

- ☆ **Elementary School**
- ☆ Middle School
- ★ High School

Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size





Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable $\,N$ Lands Inventory data updated February, 2008. Aerial acquired July 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM. Redevelopable lands are residentially designated that meet the following greater than improvement value, and can accommodate twice the number of dwelling units that currently exist on the lot.



Vacant or Redevelopable Properties w/ Pending Land Use



Figure 4: Bend Northwest Quadrant Proposed Elementary Site Location



Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools

- ☆ Elementary School
- ☆ Middle School
- ★ High School

Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size



Potential School Sites Bend-La Pine School District Properties Parks Proposed Urban Growth Boundary (Dec 2008) Bend City Limit

- Public Lands (City, County, State, Federal, COID)
- Existing Urban Growth Boundary

Vacant or Redevelopable Properties w/ Pending Land Use

Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable $\,N$ Lands Inventory data updated February 2008. Aerial acquired July 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM. Redevelopable lands are residentially designated that meet the following criteria: 0.5 acres or greater, land value greater than improvement value, and can accommodate twice the number of dwelling units that currently exist on the lot.





Figure 5: Bend UGB Expansion Northwest Area Proposed Elementary Site Location



Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools



- ☆ Middle School
- ★ High School
- Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size





Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable Lands Inventory data updated February, 2008. Aerial acquired July 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM. lands are residentially designated that meet criteria: 0.5 acres or greater, land value improvement value, and can accommodate Redevelopable the following greater than twice the number of dwelling units that currently exist on the lot.

> 0.125 0.25 0.5 Miles

Ν

Vacant or Redevelopable Properties w/ Pending Land Use



Figure 6: Bend UGB Expansion Northeast Area Proposed Elementary Site Location



Bend LaPine School District - 2010 Sites & Facilities Study Vacant & Redevelopable Lands

Existing Schools

- ☆ Elementary School
- ☆ Middle School
- High School ★

Buildable Lands Inventory (Feb 2008) Vacant & Redevelopable Lands Inside Existing UGB by Size





Map prepared by City of Bend (INSCMI), April 14, 2010. Buildable $\,N$ Lands Inventory data updated February 2008. Aerial acquired July 2008. Vacant/redevelopable lands shown on this map are those that do NOT have a Comprehensive Plan designation of IG, IL, IP, or SM.



Vacant or Redevelopable Properties w/ Pending Land Use

Figure 7: La Pine General Plan (depicting existing school site and zoning)



Figure 8: Existing Elementary School Buffer

Elementary School Buffer (1 mile)



This map is for reference purposes only. Information was derived from City of Bend and Deschutes County GIS records. Care was taken in the creation of this map, but it is provided "AS IS." Please contact the City of Bend to verify map information and to report any errors.

1.250 miles

Figure 9: Existing Middle School Buffer

Middle School Buffer (1 mile)



This map is for reference purposes only. Information was derived from City of Bend and Deschutes County GIS records. Care was taken in the creation of this map, but it is provided "AS IS." Please contact the City of Bend to verify map information and to report any errors.

1.250 miles

Figure 10: Existing High School Buffer



This map is for reference purposes only. Information was derived from City of Bend and Deschutes County GIS records. Care was taken in the creation of this map, but it is provided "AS IS." Please contact the City of Bend to verify map information and to report any errors.

1.250 miles





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Funding Mechanisms

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET PO BOX 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us TO:BLPS SITES AND FACILITIES TACFROM:JOHN REXFORD, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENTSUBJECT:FUNDING MECHANISMSDATE:4/19/2010CC:CC:

Potential Funding Mechanisms for School Construction

A variety of funding mechanisms for new school construction and capital improvements were reviewed. This review identified funding mechanisms not currently used, as well as some not legally available to school districts at this time. Of the potential funding mechanisms described below, the committee explored in depth the use of Construction Excise Tax to meet a portion of its facility needs. However, the committee did not recommend its use at this time, and it recognized that local general obligation bonds will continue to be the primary funding option for capital construction.

The Committee reviewed the potential funding mechanisms for capital improvements and new school construction briefly described below.

Bond Measures and Tax Levy - These are tax authorities granted by voters for specific purposes. These are currently used by school districts in Oregon to fund new school construction and renovation.

General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds are guaranteed by a voter approved property tax levy. With a G.O. bond, a jurisdiction gets voter approval to sell bonds. The bonds and interest are then repaid by a special additional property tax. Bonds can be sold over a year or more, and then repaid over a longer period, usually twenty years. These property taxes do not count against the Measure 5 and 50 limits. A double majority is required to approve bonds except in May or November elections. Bond proceeds may only be used for construction and other capital expenses. Bonds are the primary mechanism currently used by school districts in Oregon to fund new school construction and renovation. Bonds spread the cost of school construction on a broad population, including all property owners in the district. However, a major drawback is timeliness. A community often needs to see overcrowding before supporting bonds for new construction, and the long lead time involved in school facility development can lead to delays in opening schools in time to meet enrollment demands.

Bend-La Pine has been highly successful in the development and passage of G.O. bonds. Since 1991, the district has passed 4 of 5 bond measure elections, totaling almost \$270 million in value. These bond issues supported the construction of 13 new schools, as well as numerous additions and renovations at existing schools. In the two most recent bond issues, the district has worked to manage current and future tax rates to repay bonded indebtedness. Current tax rates are targeted for a goal of \$1.64 per thousand dollars of assessed valuation, while future rates are structured to reduce in time to allow future debt with no increase in tax rate.

Local Option Levies – Voters may act to approve a special purpose tax increase, for a limited period, and for a defined amount of money. The money would then be collected with property taxes and distributed to the taxing jurisdiction. Levies are attractive because the funds raised can be used for any purpose, which voters approve. A levy option in Oregon would be limited by Constitutional limits imposed by Measures 5 and 50. A double majority is required to approve the levy except in May or November elections. The total dollar amount of levies plus general government taxes cannot exceed \$10 per \$1,000 of real market value of a property. If the total exceeds the limits, levies are proportionately reduced, or "compressed".

The most recent estimates for a local option based on an assessment of \$1 per thousand of taxable assessed value indicate a rough estimate of a potential \$5-7 million per year. The Bend-La Pine experience with local option elections has been unsuccessful. Local option levies failed in 2000 and twice in 2004.

Construction Excise Tax – In 2007, the Oregon Legislature granted school districts the authority to pass a local Construction Excise Tax to help cover the cost of improving school facilities. The legislation allows school districts to charge a per-square-foot rate on new construction within school district boundaries, including remodels that add square footage. Public projects, schools, affordable housing, hospitals, and churches are exempt from paying the tax. The rate is capped at \$1.00 per square foot for residential development, and \$0.50 per square foot for non-residential development, and the cap is adjusted annually for inflation.

The money raised by this tool must be used for capital improvements. The definition of capital improvements is broader than for a bond, and it includes buying land, constructing or improving schools, buying or installing furnishings, designing improvements, or paying debt service on a bond. The money may not be used for deferred maintenance or operating expenses.

Recent estimates for Bend-La Pine of potential revenue from this source range from \$2-8 million annually. A discussion estimate of \$4 million annually represents 20% of ongoing capital construction needs of the school district. Given this order of magnitude, a Construction Excise Tax may be best suited for smaller renovation projects and/or land acquisition.

On a positive note, a CET could be an equitable way for growth to pay for its impacts on the District while reducing the financial impacts on long-time residents. However, a CET available to partially fund new schools could reduce support for new construction through general obligation bonds and levies. This could be especially harmful because a CET would not raise enough money to fund necessary new school construction. On the other hand, a CET could pay a noticeable portion and reduce the amount of future bond measures, thus making them more attractive to voters. The school board declined to move forward with a CET in 2008 based on concerns about undue impact on a struggling development community.

The Committee recommends the District rely primarily on general obligation bonds to fund new school construction and capital improvements. The committee recognized some shortcomings of this funding source, but there are few reliable options available to the District given the anticipated enrollment growth and need for new facilities.

The Committee also recognized the risks of developing new funding sources that could mistakenly establish a public expectation that general obligation bonds are no longer necessary. For this reason and based on the current economic conditions the Committee recommends the District defer considering implementation of a Construction Excise Tax

to assist in the support of acquisition, construction and renovation of district facilities until a later date.

The Committee was not interested in pursuing the following funding options.

System Development Charges - A System Development Charge (SDC) is a fee on new construction for the purposes of building new capital improvements for additional capacity. This charge is used by municipalities in Oregon to fund construction of new roads, water and wastewater treatment facilities, and parks. Currently, Oregon law does not permit using SDCs for school construction. Establishing an SDC requires a jurisdiction to create and adopt a capital improvement plan, SDC methodology demonstrating the linkage between the facility needs and new growth (reasonable relationship), and must fairly and proportionately charge for the new growth.

Current SDC's for a single-family residence in the City of Bend total approximately \$16,000. With building permit and other fees, the total costs for a house reach approximately \$23,000. Based on our current experience, a fully funded school SDC would likely exceed \$25,000.

Real Estate Transfer Fee (RETF) - Real estate transfer fees (RETF) are fees on real estate transactions such as property sales and refinancing. This is potentially an ongoing and permanent source of funding and is flexible because it could be used for services, operations, and capital construction. The fee raises more revenues when more transactions take place.

Tax Increment Financing - Funds are generated by designating an area (Urban Renewal District), establishing a base line of assessed value within the district, and making additional tax revenues generated by appreciation within the district available for projects within the district. This approach uses existing funding sources and is not a new tax. The funding can only be used within the district from which it was generated. School districts do not currently have the authority to establish Urban Renewal Districts.

Primary source of funding descriptions in this section: http://www.cdnportland.org/ahn_funding_sources.html





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Alternatives to New School Construction

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections

New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page

MEMORANDUM

710 WALL STREET PO BOX 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us	To:	BLPS SITES AND FACILITIES TAC
	FROM:	JOHN REXFORD
	SUBJECT:	ALTERNATIVES TO NEW SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
	DATE:	4/19/2010
	CC:	

ORS 195.110 mandates certain elements of a school facility plan. One of these mandates is an "analysis of alternatives to new school construction and major renovation and measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites." Detailed requirements of the "analysis" are not included in the law. The following represents the District's analysis of alternatives to new school construction and major renovation, as well as measures to increase the efficient use of school sites. Another memorandum addresses multi-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites.

Year 'Round Schools

Year 'round education is an alternative schedule for learning that is implemented in a variety of ways. Students attending a year 'round school go to the same types of classes and generally receive the same amount of instruction as a traditional nine and one-half month calendar. The year 'round calendar is organized into instructional blocks and vacation periods that are evenly distributed across an entire calendar year.

Multi-track

Additional space is created for existing school facilities through the implementation of multi-track year 'round school schedules. The student body is divided into several groups referred to as tracks. The instructional and vacation periods of each track are staggered so that at least one track is on vacation at all times. This plan is often used in overcrowded schools. Depending on the calendar selected and the student body size, from 20-33 percent of the students are always on vacation. An overview of the advantages and disadvantages of year 'round schools follows:

Educational Impacts

Pro:

- Increased attendance
- Improved student performance
- Reduced stress-students and staff
- Improved retention
- Allows for student "catch up" if necessary

Con:

- Administrative staff impacts
- Multi-track classroom relocation impacts

- Increased special education delivery costs
- Loss of some personal enrichment possibilities during summer/scheduling difficulties
- Interference with scheduled performing arts, athletics and other activities

Financial Impacts

Pro:

- Economy of scale
- Cost savings in long-run
- Efficient use of instructional materials
- Reduces incremental staff costs
- Reduced student absenteeism
- Social economic benefits such as reduced vandalism, trouble making, child care
- Deferred capital construction costs

Con:

- Intersession remediation costs
- A/C renovation costs
- Increased utility costs
- More administrative and office costs
- Increased maintenance, transportation costs
- Increased contracting costs
- Food service impacts
- Storage expenses
- Promotion costs
- Student employment
- Training/start-up costs
- Curriculum revision costs

In 1997, a 20-member committee was appointed by the Board of Directors to study alternative school schedules in lieu of new school construction. An analysis of financial impacts quickly became more complex than could be accommodated by the committee itself. Stephen Greer & Associates, Certified Public Accountants, were engaged by the district to estimate costs and savings related to a conversion to multi-track year 'round education as an alternative to building additional schools required for a traditional schedule. Their findings were included in the Committee's conclusion. After reviewing the research and financial analysis, the Committee concluded that despite many potential education albenefits, the financial impacts of a multi-track year 'round education schedule do not provide a suitable alternative to additional school construction. In his analysis dated February 14, 1997, Stephen Greer states:

"Adopting year 'round education does not appear to be a viable solution to overcrowding, at this time:

- The implementation in years one and two consume more cash than would be saved.
- The funding formulas do not provide additional revenue to cover these costs.
- The construction costs mitigated would be paid over a 20 year bond period.

Therefore, the cash flow impact of building new facilities is significantly softened when compared to the increased operating costs.

"It appears year 'round education is not a clear winner financially. The mitigated construction costs would be substantial. However, net cash flow savings is measured by comparing the annual debt service averted against the incremental operating costs. These savings do not appear dramatic in this analysis."

Single Track

However, there is substantial documentation of educational benefits associated with "single-track" year 'round education schedules in elementary schools. This schedule simply reorganizes the current traditional school calendar to eliminate the longer summer break by replacing it with four shorter breaks throughout the calendar year. Cited benefits included increase in academic performance, decrease in behavioral problems, reduction in stress-related visits to school nurses, and more timely and effective remediation. There is no increase in functional capacity under a single-track system.

The previous committee strongly encouraged the School Board of Directors to support appropriate voluntary pilot programs, which may be developed by an individual elementary school or neighborhood. Such a pilot program was seen as increasing the opportunity for parental choice within the school district. Any such proposal should be developed subject to appropriate board policy and district procedure to ensure comprehensive and thoughtful analysis.

Since the original study, the fundamental structure of the Oregon School Funding mechanism has not changed. In fact, funding levels for operations have declined in real dollars per student since then, further reinforcing the prior committee's inflation adjusted conclusion. All else being equal, the significant increases in operation and maintenance costs would require budget reductions in other programs.

Current efforts to modify the calendar have focused on increasing the number of instructional days. Schedules at elementary, middle and high schools are now 173, 174, and 176 days respectively. In addition, 4, 3, and 1 conference days are also provided at the respective levels. These counts reflect an increase of almost 10 instructional days at high school and 6 instructional days at middle and elementary schools from 10 years ago. Future funding efforts may be pursued through a local option levy to extend the school year 10-20 days, thus, the ability to implement a multi-track year 'round calendar would be completely eliminated.

Double Shift

Another method of increasing capacity of existing school facilities is through double shifting of students in the same facility. Briefly described, the student body is divided into two halves, or shifts. One shift attends in the morning and another attends in the afternoon. Typically, this schedule reduces the hours attended each day in order to complete both shifts by late afternoon or early evening.

Often, double shifting is used to meet the needs of a rapidly growing district while new facilities were being completed. Traditional double shifting is almost exclusively now used only after catastrophic loss of facilities, such as fire or earthquake. Its impact on instructional hours and delivery make it unacceptable as an alternative to new construction.

Night School

At the high school level, night schools have been developed to serve students seeking an alternative daily schedule. These operations typically start after the regular school day and extend late into the evening. Based on the experience of these programs, up to 20 percent of the student body may be served in this method. Increasing utilization under this strategy could potentially increase the effective capacity of each of the high schools by up to 20 percent. This increase would be contingent on the successful expansion of "night school" programs.

Recommendations

Based on the research and analysis presented, the TAC found most of the alternative schedules and calendars unworkable as alternatives to well-planned capital construction. Year 'round schools were discussed at length. The educational pros and cons were reviewed, and committee members agreed that with the current school funding mechanisms, multi-track year 'round scheduling is not a viable alternative to new school capacity. The committee did support the potential of offering a "second" shift of classes ("night school") as a form of alternative learning schedule for high school students. To the extent that strategy reduces the need for future high school capacity, the need for the next high school may be marginally delayed. The committee also supports the District's efforts to extend the school year as long as possible within the state school-funding framework.





EDUCATING THRIVING CITIZENS

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Multi-story and Multipurpose Use of School Sites

Project Home Page Enrollment Projections New Schools, Sites & Construction Schedule

Ten-year CIP and Financial Plan Alternatives & Multipurpose Use Technical Resources BLPS Home Page
Μ Е MORAN D U Μ

710 WALL STREET PO BOX 431 BEND, OR 97709 [541] 388-5505 TEL [541] 388-5519 FAX www.ci.bend.or.us	To:	BLPS SITES AND FACILITIES TAC
	FROM:	BRIAN RANKIN, SENIOR PLANNER; RON BARBER, ARCHITECT
	SUBJECT:	MEASURES TO INCREASE EFFICIENT USE OF SCHOOL SITES
	DATE:	4/19/2010
	CC:	

The following discussion meets the requirements of ORS 195.110(5)(a)(E)(ii). These provisions of the law require a school facility plan to include "an analysis of measures to increase the efficient use of school sites including, but not limited to, multiple-story buildings and multipurpose use of sites." The main purpose is to determine if it is feasible and beneficial to redevelop existing school sites to reduce the need for major new construction projects with the use of multiple-story buildings, or if other redevelopment opportunities exist. Secondarily, the discussion can be used to determine if the District's school designs and program are inefficient and need improving. The following illustrates a direct connection between district policies and educational programs, legal requirements, and the physical form of buildings and sites.

Background

Designing sites and constructing educational facilities is a complicated, multi-disciplined task. Not only does the site have to be designed to meet the District's educational policies, numerous agencies and codes are involved in the design. The following is a partial list of code and agencies and codes that dictate specific site requirements:

- Zoning Codes (height, size, location, design) Local governments (city or county)
- Building Codes – State agency and local governments (city or county)
- Environmental Quality Codes State agency (Department of Environmental • Quality)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA accessibility requirements) and Federal • codes - Federal agency and local government (city or county)
- Fire Codes (fire circulation, fire protection) State agency and local governments • (city or county) or local special district.
- Solar Access Codes (setbacks) Local governments (city or county) ٠
- Site Drainage requirements (drainage swales) State agencies (DEQ) and local governments (city or county)
- Safety Guidelines State agencies (Oregon OSHA and local governments (city or county)
- Local recreational agency requirements Special district (Park departments)

Satisfying the mandates of the above agencies and codes dictates a great deal about the size and the development of all educational facility sites. The District strives to accommodate all requirements of site development while meeting the District's educational needs and policies.

District policies on school size, athletics, music, vocational, and other programs requiring specialized facilities are a major determinant on school and site size. School districts

may have different policies, but ultimately, each district is responsible for designing an educational program that meets the needs of its unique community.

The Bend-La Pine School District currently operates under school size guidelines generally larger than that identified in current published research and identified best practices. In the Bend-La Pine Schools, generally elementary schools should not exceed 600 students; middle school should not exceed 800 students: and high schools should not exceed 1,500 students. Current research typically identifies 3-400 students, 500 students, and 7-800 students to be ideal at elementary, middle and high schools respectively. In that District facilities exceed these ideal guidelines, adding additional stories (and capacity) to existing sites would be contrary to development of safe learning environments conducive to learning.

Lessons Learned from Recent School Design and Construction

In the early 1990's, the Bend-La Pine School District embarked on a process to program, plan and design educational facilities that made efficient use of proposed sites of future schools. In terms of school site development, the District identified the following components of a school site that needed to be studied in terms of meeting the District's educational specifications:

- School Building foot print (single level & multi-level)
- Access Drives and Circulation Automobile, Bus, Delivery, Emergency and Fire Access
 - The District considers site circulation safety critical for the safety of students, teachers and the public. Therefore, the District's guidelines require automobile traffic and bus circulation to be separated, usually with two separate entries into the site. Similarly, deliveries and other routine maintenance traffic are also kept separate for automobile traffic, such as drop-off, pick-up and short term parking.
 - The District also strives to design sites that allow students access to outdoor play areas (fields and hard surfaced areas) without crossing vehicular traffic access locations. Student safety is one of the District's top priorities.
- Parking Short Term and Long Term (staff)
 - The District's parking strategies for each site are based on site safety and community usage. Long term parking (generally used by staff) is designed to be separated from routine daily vehicular traffic. This separation reduces potential conflicts between bus circulation and parent's access in and out of the site at critical times. Similarly, short term parking is generally located in the front of the schools, and provides for a safe route into the building.
 - Local zoning agencies establish minimum parking requirements. The District has discovered that providing the "minimum" parking required by zoning ordinances does not meet the District's guidelines in terms of "function" and relationships with surrounding neighborhoods. In order to reduce parking "off-site" (on adjacent streets), additional parking is provided on each school site. As a result of this District guideline, the District is able to accommodate most parking on the school site (not in the neighborhood streets), and provide adequate parking for special events at the site (Holiday events, athletic events, etc.)
- Hardscape Play Areas

- Hard surfaced play areas are strategically located on school sites to allow for excellent supervision. This is particularly true for the elementary school sites. Student safety is of utmost importance, while providing the students with many options for safe play (wall ball, basketball, etc.).
- Play Fields
 - The District believes outdoor play is important to students, and the District's guidelines strive to provide "options" in terms of the type of "play" that is possible on the play fields. Fields are designed to allow for activities such as softball and soccer and other events requiring large, open spaces.
 - The District's guidelines establish a "partnering" with other local agencies in an effort to achieve a community wide, multi-use of the play fields. For instance, the District and Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District share outdoor play areas for numerous community events and athletic leagues. The District's "partnering" has achieved a tremendous success and community wide benefits.
- Pedestrian Circulation (sidewalks)
 - Hard surfaced circulation routes (sidewalks) are critical in central Oregon's climate (snow and ice). The District provides safe, easy to transverse pedestrian routes in and around each school facility. Easy and safe accesses are provided from the pubic right-of-ways into covered entries. Sidewalks are designed to meet accessibility (ADA) requirements, which are most cases requires additional lengths of sidewalks, ramps and landing areas.
- Outdoor Play Equipment
 - Play equipment for students is designed and located on the site to allow for recreational opportunities, and at the same time to allow for the students safety and supervision. Play equipment is generally located near classrooms to prevent students from crossing vehicular circulation while moving into the play area. All outdoor play equipment is designed within an outdoor play area and meets safety guidelines for such issues as "fall protection".
- Site Drainage Swales
 - Drainage swales are required by the State (DEQ) and local planning agencies. There appears to be a trend suggesting drainage swales will take up an increasing amount of area as swales replace dry wells. In addition to potential future requirements, the amount of area required for swales is dictated by the type of soil found in central Oregon. The District expects school sites will require more and more land to accommodate site drainage requirements in the future.
- Landscape Buffer Areas (adjacent to residential areas)(Natural)
 - Natural buffer areas on the perimeter of a school site help to achieve the District's goals of blending into, and becoming a part of, residential neighborhoods. Adequate buffering helps to prevent light pollution, noise and reduce the visual size of the school buildings. At LEED certified sites,

the natural buffer areas also achieve many sustainability benefits (water reduction, natural wild life, etc.)

- Outdoor Plaza / Teaching Areas
 - Easily accessible and secured outdoor teaching areas (Plazas) that are adjacent to classrooms offer unique teaching opportunities to the educators. Areas for outdoor teaching stations are typically planned for in the overall site design, and the educators consider them an extension of the classroom. Teaching opportunities include such activities as large art projects, gardening, theater and science projects.
- Zoning Setbacks and Right-of-ways (ROW)
 - Site development and required site size for the District's school facilities always need to take into account setback and right-of-ways that will be required by the local planning and building agencies. Depending on the location of the proposed site, setbacks and right-of-ways can require a considerable amount of area. Set backs in conjunction with natural landscape buffers provides the community with a well designed and planned "streetscape" that enhances the overall livability of the community. The City also requires the District consider providing facilities to access public transportation including transit or bus stops in conjunction with site planning.

By analyzing the key site component listed above, percentages of total site areas, along with required square footages, could be assigned to each site component. In order to satisfy the District's educational specifications and programs, a minimum amount of area was determined. For instance, the following components and percentages of a total site area required for the District's 600 student prototypical elementary schools are as follows:

Site Component	% of Total	Square Ft.	Notes
Zoning Setbacks ROW	1.25%	8,168	Required by Agencies
Building Footprint	9.75%	63,707	Required by Programs
Access Drives/	18.00%	117,612	Separated Bus & Auto Access
Fire / Bus			
Parking Areas	8.00%	52,272	126 Autos
Landscape	10.00%	65,340	Around Building & Parking
Areas			Areas
Non-Landscape	2.00%	13,068	Natural Areas / Buffers
Areas			
Hardscape	5.00%	32,670	
Play Areas			
Sidewalk /	4.00%	26,136	Includes Outdoor Teaching
Outdoor Areas			Areas
Drainage	5.00%	32,670	Varies due to type of soil
Swales			
Play Fields / Softball	37.00%	241,758	Required by Programs
Soccer			
Totals	100.00%	653,400	Approximately 15 Acres

Site Development Example: Elementary School

Although middle schools and high schools require additional Outdoor Play Areas, such as Athletic Fields and Track, the same basic percentages of a total site development generally parallel the elementary school above.

Discussion on Two Story School Designs

The use of multi-story secondary school buildings was re-implemented by the District in 1993 with the opening of High Desert Middle School. All secondary school construction since then has included multi-story design.

While the District's full-size prototype elementary school design is single-story, its in-fill elementary prototype (Ensworth) is multi-story. Other elementary schools such as Kingston and Kenwood also use multi-story designs. In order to provide elementary schools on smaller, infill sites, the District has developed a smaller, 300 student prototypical elementary school design. This smaller school can be situated on as little as seven acres while maintaining the District's programs. In order to achieve the District's required programs, a two level design scheme is being utilized. Where the District experiences high needs for smaller schools and does not have access to larger sites, smaller school sites are used. However, where capacity needs are anticipated to increase over time, larger sites and schools provide more capacity and flexibility.

In considering a two story design scheme to reduce site size, note that the building footprint accounts for less than 10% of the total site requirements. Utilizing a two story design scheme (by making classroom wings two levels) would reduce the building footprint only 3% or less. Although the footprint could be reduced, all of the other site components would remain approximately the same. Generally, a two story elementary school for 600 students would reduce the required site size by less than one acre in order to maintain the District's guidelines for educational programs.

Other considerations taken into account by the District for a two story design scheme for the District's schools are:

- Neighborhood Scale: generally, school facilities are located in residential neighborhoods. Higher structures, such as two level school facilities, are out of scale with the surrounding residences. A single level school facility "fits in" the neighborhoods better and is generally more supported by the surrounding neighbors. The TAC did find two story buildings were appropriate in a residential setting, but buildings of more than two or three stories would generally be considered out of scale with the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
- Zoning Ordinances limit heights of buildings in residential neighborhoods. Although Zoning Variances are sometimes possible, the District attempts to support the neighborhood scale and heights.

<u>Conclusion</u>: In order to provide the community the educational programs set forth by the District's Educational Specifications, a significant reduction in overall site size is generally not achievable without sacrificing essential educational programs or compromising student health and safety. Although the foot print of the building can be reduced by a two level design scheme, other site components are somewhat fixed, and the overall reduction would be less than one acre. The District's use of a smaller prototypical design for 300 students on seven acres is an example of how the District's building program utilizes multi-story buildings and smaller sites.

Redevelopment of Existing Single-story Schools with Two-story Schools

The District has spent a considerable amount of time and effort to study the feasibility of adding capacity to the District's existing school facilities without adding additional site area. Successes can be pointed to, such as Kingston Elementary School and Marshall High School. In general, the following knowledge is a result of the District's studies on many of the existing school facilities:

- Adding capacity to an existing site is many times in direct conflict with the District's policies. Examples include school enrollment size and class size, and offering a variety of athletic programs requiring field space. This is true if capacity is achieved by a single level expansion or a vertical expansion.
- Generally, most of the District's older school facilities are not designed to be expanded vertically. Many building codes, seismic codes and fire codes become a serious challenge for vertical expansions of existing facilities. As a result, expanding existing school facilities vertically becomes a costly endeavor and is most often determined not feasible within available funds. Due to scheduling, it generally is not possible to completely demolish an older school and build a newer school without a severely impacting the educational process.
- Adding capacity to an existing school facility (vertical or horizontal expansion) will cause the existing infrastructure to breakdown at some point. Critical infrastructure can be such items as food preparation areas, toilet rooms, water capacity, sewer capacity, electrical services, library size and cafeteria size. Many times, the expansion of the critical infrastructure areas can be very costly and hard to achieve within available funds.
- Adding capacity to an existing school facility many times compromises safety on the site and within the building. At some point, student circulation, automobile circulation and bus circulation come into conflict. Similarly, supervision becomes compromised as student capacity increases and demands on the common areas increases.

<u>Conclusion</u>: With the exception of a few existing school facility sites, the District has determined adding capacity (either vertically or horizontally) begins to compromise the District's policies on school size, site safety, or ability to offer other necessary programs. In essence, most existing built schools and sites are optimized to provide the necessary programs and meet the District's school size guidelines on their current sites. Demolishing relatively new structures to expand vertically in the case of single-story buildings is inefficient and will also result in schools that exceed the District's school size guidelines.

Reuse and Multiple Use of School Sites

The District has historically opted to jointly plan and locate a variety of programs on the same or adjacent sites. In particular, coordinated planning efforts have been undertaken with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District for decades. In the Bend area, ten schools are co-developed or jointly located with local or community parks. Three District campuses include multiple schools, including La Pine Elementary/Middle/High Campus, Pilot Butte/Juniper and Lava Ridge/Sky View. Future school locations are currently planned for both the High Desert and R.E. Jewell. The majority of Bend-area elementary schools and middle schools are either co-developed with parks or other schools.

The TAC reviewed aerial photographs of existing sites and facilities to determine potential opportunities for reuse and multiple uses of existing built and vacant sites. The aerial photographs used by the committee are part of the summary report. The following recommendations represent ideas the District may want to consider for future re-use, but are in no way binding on the District. The TAC would like to convey the following ideas for reuse, but understands that each idea may not be technically, legally, or financially feasible.

After review and discussion, the TAC found the following sites to have the least capacity for significant re-use and expansion. These sites were generally considered "built out" and at their highest and best use for the foreseeable future. This determination does not suggest smaller enhancements and additions are not possible on these sites. Sites and schools considered mostly built out include:

- 1. Amity Creek at Thompson
- 2. Bend Senior High
- 3. Yew Lane Bus Yard
- 4. Elk Meadow
- 5. Ensworth Elementary
- 6. High Lakes Elementary
- 7. Highland at Kenwood Elementary
- 8. Lava Ridge Elementary and Sky View Middle School
- 9. Marshall High School
- 10. Miller Elementary
- 11. Pine Ridge Elementary
- 12. Ponderosa Elementary
- 13. Distribution Center south of Bend Senior High School
- 14. Summit High School
- 15. Three Rivers Elementary
- 16. West Side Village at Kingston Elementary

Other sites offer greater opportunities for re-use or multiple uses because additional vacant space is available. In some cases, the District owns large vacant parcels. In other cases, portions of sites are vacant and may be used for expansion, recreational uses, or as listed below.

The committee discussed a few ideas that may apply to all sites. The feasibility would be based on additional discussion between the District and other interested parties.

- 1. Consider partnerships with Housing Works or other affordable housing providers to provide land for affordable housing projects for District employees or the broader market. As a large land holder with sites committed to long-term use in residential areas, some areas on school sites may be used for small residential development projects.
- 2. Consider other partnerships with complementary organizations such as churches, entertainment, or other public facilities such as libraries, offices, etc. that require on-site parking provide by the school, or off-hours use of the facilities (weekends/evenings).
- 3. Consider affordable rents for other community uses.

The following are site specific recommendations for re-use by school:

 Bear Creek – Consider adding a new field area and parking area on the existing site. New parking could be located as shown in the aerial photograph or on the south side of the bus loop. Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District is planning on relocating the Ponderosa Skate Park. There are small areas on the site for future uses and the District should be receptive to multi-use opportunities as they arise.

- Buckingham Consider working with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District on a 2nd access point to Skyline Park. This may involve sharing an existing access on the District property and extending a new access through the rocky sloped area to the southeast.
- 3. Cascade Middle School There are two areas with opportunities for multi-use: 1) an approximately 3.4 acre rectangular area on the northwest; and 2) a triangular shaped 3.5-acre area on the southern portion of the site. The triangular shaped area has moderate topography and large ponderosa trees which may limit future redevelopment opportunities. The TAC discussed a number of ideas for this site. First, there could be a need for a secondary access to the east to reduce traffic impacts on the current access and parking area. The exact alignment and feasibility would need to be researched further. Other niche recreational opportunities such as a Nordic skate ski oval, or cyclocross course would be very unique recreational assets to an urban area. Generally, the skate ski oval would need to be on fairly level ground, but the cyclocross track could be built on the southern portion of the site with topography. Both of these opportunities would likely require cooperation with Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District or other supporting organizations.
- 4. High Desert Middle School- The 76-acre site has five areas, each with it's own potential for re-use: 1) northern triangular-shaped tip; 2) nine acres between the triangle tip and existing school site; 3) 17-acre site south of the existing school, west of the gas pipeline; 4) gas pipeline area on the southeastern portion of the site. The northern portion of the site has been slated for commercial use in the updated Bend General Plan's Framework Plan. This area could be sold to a private developer for this use with a financial benefit to the District. The nine acres directly south could be used for a small alternative high school site. The 17-acre site is appropriate for a future prototypical elementary site. The gas pipeline area could be used for a community park through cooperation of purchase by Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District. This area may be use for surface parking as well. The restrictions on the property related to the gas pipeline must be fully researched before any re-use takes place. Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District has identified needs neighborhood and community parks in the vicinity and may consider acquiring or co-developing portions of the site to satisfy this demand.
- 5. Juniper Elementary Approximately 17 acres of severely steep sloped area on the flank of Pilot Butte could be used as trade stock for another property acquisition. It is unlikely a private developer would purchase the land due to the lack of development potential. However, unique recreational activities requiring steep slopes such as downhill mountain biking or zip lines may be feasible, albeit remote opportunities.
- 6. La Pine Elementary/Middle/High School Eight acres in the north part of the site across from the northern access provides room for expansion or other community use. There has been discussion regarding a potential lease to Deschutes Childhood Foundation, or use by the La Pine Parks and Recreation District for a mix of recreational uses such as open space or an aquatic center.
- 7. Mountain View High School A vacant area on the southern portion of the site may be useful as a sports field.
- 8. Northwest Vacant Site The District owns approximately 32 acres of fairly steep sloped land perched to the east above Shevlin Park. The TAC discussed creating a view shed protection area on the steep slopes facing the park to preserve the relatively natural view from the park and potentially benefit the watershed. It is doubtful there is enough land full prototypical elementary, but certainly enough for a small "Ensworth" model elementary on the non-constrained portion of the site. However, this would not be warranted until the surrounding area develops with residential uses. This site is included in the recent UGB expansion and is slated for future urban development, so future use

as a school may be appropriate if the final acknowledged UGB includes this area for urbanization. Until the UGB is acknowledged, it is premature to assume this site is appropriate as a future school site.

- 9. R.E. Jewell Elementary The vacant 25-acre site to the west of the current school is suitable for a future middle school site.
- 10. Southeast High School Site The vacant 50-acre site south of Jewell Elementary is a good candidate for a future high school.
- 11. Troy field The 0.8 acre site currently used as a multi-purpose field in the heart of downtown Bend. It is a unique open space currently used as athletic fields and for events. The District has received proposals from private developers seeking to acquire the site and its sale may financially benefit the District. On the other hand, there may be lasting benefits to the public to keep the site in public use. Despite the lack of recent progress on the Heritage Square project, the TAC believes the concept is still viable and would be a great asset to Bend. Troy Field is a central component of this development concept. Therefore, the TAC recommends partnering agencies such as the Deschutes County Library District, City of Bend, Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District, Chamber of Commerce, and larger community should be engaged and consulted with before the District sells the property for a use inconsistent with the Heritage Square concept.