

School Siting Overview

**CITY OF LAS CRUCES/
LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SCHOOL
JOINT WORK SESSION**

**June 5, 2012
1:00 p.m.
City of Las Cruces**

Public School Facilities Authority Handout Index Sheet

- A. Resources for School District-Local Government Planning Collaboration
- B. School District and Local Government Planning: Overview of How Other States Approach the Issue
- C. Issues Related to School District Planning
- D. Site Selection Checklist & Adequacy Planning Guide Site Size

A. Resources for School District-Local Government Planning Collaboration

June 5th, 2012

The information provided below contains links and information on programs and organizations that provide various viewpoints on local government and school district collaboration. The PSCOC, PSFA, or its employees do not necessary endorse the viewpoints, products, or publications accessed through the sites. We provide the links and information for your convenience in reviewing the body of research that exists on the topic.

ORGANIZATIONS/WEBSITES/DATA

- **Center for Cities and Schools:**
<http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/index.html>
Interdisciplinary organization that bridges the Graduate School of Education, College of Environmental Design, and Department of City and Regional Planning at UC-Berkley. The Center's mission is to educate leaders in both city government and school district on common issues. The Center's aim is to align schools, housing, land use in order to cultivate cross-sector policy making.
- **Environmental Protection Agency Smart Growth and Schools**
<http://www.epa.gov/dced/schools.htm>
Provides several studies, publications, and resources on school's impact on the built environment from a Smart Growth perspective.
- **International City/County Management Association:**
http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge_network/documents/kn/Document/102003/Local_GovernmentSchool_District_Collaboration_Sample_Documents
Collects case studies, documents and samples of school district/local government comprehensive plan integration and sample agreements for joint use
- **University of Michigan-Dearborn Institute of Local Governance – Municipal – School District Collaboration:** <http://www.casl.umd.umich.edu/385201/>
Provides technical assistance to local governments and school districts who wish to collaborate on service delivery.
- **National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities Community Use of Schools:**
http://www.ncef.org/rl/joint_use.cfm

Provides links to several resources, publications, policies, articles, and case studies on community use of public schools and joint use opportunities. Offers links to other related issues like Smart Growth and Schools, School Facility Master Planning, Historic Preservation, School Siting, etc...

- **Smart Growth Schools**<http://www.smartgrowthschools.org/>
Provides information on linking the principles of Smart Growth to school planning by providing a Smart Growth Schools Report Card, a listserv, links, and seminars/workshops
- **Safe Routes to Schools Partnership:** <http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/home>
National network made up of organizations, government agencies, and professional groups that set goals, share best practices, secure funding, and provide education to the agencies that implement the Safe Routes to School program.
- **National Center for Safe Routes to Schools:** <http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/about-us>
The National Center for SRTS assists states and communities in enabling and encouraging children to safely walk and bike to school. The National Center serves as a clearing house for the Federal Safe Routes to School Program.
- **New Mexico Safe Routes to School:**
www.nmsaferoutes.com
Provides information to the State of NM SRTS program including a link to the newsletter, information on how to apply, and NMSRTS handbook.
- **National Trust for Historic Preservation/Community Centered Schools:**
<http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/historic-schools/>
Advocates retaining existing schools already located in existing neighborhoods or building new schools that can function as true community centers.
- **The Center for Green Schools:**
<http://www.centerforgreenschools.org/welcome.aspx>
Engages educators on creating sustainable learning environments and work with state and local governments to draft policies, and provide training to primary, secondary, and post secondary learning institutions, particularly those considered under-resourced.
- **21st Century School Fund:**
<http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/default.asp>
Advocacy organization that works around the Country and Washington DC to improve the nation's public school infrastructure. It seeks out innovative ways to

engage in public involvement, creative financing options, and establishing private public partnerships. It provides technical assistance and shares its research with school districts throughout the country.

- **Building Educational Success Together (BEST):**

<http://www.bestfacilities.org/best-home/default.asp>

Data and information sharing initiative led by the 21st Century School Fund that compiles news, publications, ideas, and discussion on urban school issues on one site.

National Clearing House for Educational Facilities:

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

National Institute of Building Sciences program that serves as a data and information source for early childhood, elementary, secondary, and post secondary educational facilities.

STATE OFFICES OF PLANNING (many of these state offices facilitate local government/school district planning)

- State of Maryland Department of Planning: <http://www.mdp.state.md.us/>
- State of Hawaii Office of Planning: <http://hawaii.gov/dbedt/op/>
- State of New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning: <http://www.nh.gov/oep/>
- Maine State Planning Office: <http://www.maine.gov/spo/>
- State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research: <http://www.opr.ca.gov/>
- State of Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination: <http://www.stateplanning.delaware.gov/>
- State of Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development <http://www.lcd.state.or.us/>

NOTABLE PUBLICATIONS (many of the links above also have links to several of these publications)

- *Smart Growth, Community Planning, and School Construction*. Maryland Department of Planning: <http://www.mdp.state.md.us/PDF/OurProducts/Publications/ModelsGuidelines/mg27.pdf>
- *Local Governments and Schools: A Community Oriented Approach*. International City/County Management Association http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge_network/documents/kn/Document/5753/Local Governments and Schools A CommunityOriented Approach

- *Intergovernmental Collaboration and School Facility Siting (Facilitation Collaboration Among School Boards and Local Governments in North Carolina)*. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Department of Urban and Regional Studies
<http://curs.unc.edu/pubschools.htm>

- *Commentary: Public Schools as Public Infrastructure: Roles for Planning Researchers*, Jeffrey Vincent, Center for Cities and Schools
http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/reports/Vincent_2006_JPER_Public_School_Infra.pdf

Partnerships for Joint Use: Expanding the Use of Public School Infrastructure to Benefit Students and Community – A Research Report

Jeffrey Vincent, Center for Cities and Schools

http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/reports/Partnerships_JU_Aug2010.pdf

- *Why Can't Johnny Walk to School; Historic Neighborhood Schools in the Age of Sprawl*, Constance Beaumont with Elizabeth Pianca, National Trust for Historic Preservation

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

- *Helping Johnny Walk to School: Policy Recommendations for Removing Barriers to Community Center Schools*, Renee Kuhlman, National Trust for Historic Preservation
<http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/historic-schools/helping-johnny-walk-to-school/helping-johnny-walk-to-school.pdf>

- *Oregon School Siting Handbook*, Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program (Joint program of the Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development)

<http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/TGM/docs/schoolsitinghandbook.pdf?ga=t>

Joint Use Cost Calculator for School Facilities, Center for Cities and Schools and the 21st Century School Fund

<http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/publications.asp>

Tool that helps a school district to 1.) Determine the true cost of ownership over all of its facilities and 2.) develop a fee structure for community use, based on the real cost of ownership. The calculator fully identifies the elements of school district facility costs, calculates a per square foot cost of ownership and proposes various scenarios for cost recovery, so school districts can knowingly subsidize broader community use, or secure the other public or private funds needed to support intensive community use. The calculator is available as an excel file available for free download.

Creating Communities of Learning: Schools and Smart Growth in New Jersey
<http://www.nj.gov/state/planning/docs/learning040104.pdf>

Contains information and case studies on trends in New Jersey where school development supported smart growth principles.

POTENTIAL CASE STUDIES

- **Charlotte-Mecklenburg Task Force on Joint Use** – Task Force to address joint use and the savings that it can generate and to ensure that capital project decisions are not made unrelated to each other. Task Force Members include the Charlotte City Council, Mecklenburg County, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, CPCC College Board, and Charlotte Library Commission
- **Casper, Wyoming** – City Manager and staff researched school siting and how it impacts local planning and development. Through this research, the City presented goals associated with school development and approached the school district for greater collaboration. The City is now heavily involved in school site selection and in enhancing existing neighborhood school sites (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) .
- **Lincoln, California** – School board and City work together to meet the City’s goal of 40% open space by co-locating school sites with parks. The school district and City have agreements in place to share park and school facilities. The school district opens school buildings to the public after hours for community events, recreation, continuing education, and library (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) .
- **Stonington, Connecticut** – Town and School leaders have resolved lack of coordination by establishing a Town/Board Building Committee that studies enrollment trends, school renovation/expansion needs, and suitable locations for new facilities that are in harmony with the Town’s development goals (http://www.stonington-ct.gov/Pages/StoningtonCT_BComm/schbldgcomm) (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008).
- **University of Michigan – Dearborn Institute for Local Government** provides technical assistance and facilitation for local governments and their school districts on developing greater collaboration. Specifically, the Institute assists bringing all parties to the table and in crafting agreements.

- **University of North Carolina Center for Urban and Regional Studies** convened a School Siting Summit on May 3rd, 2006 with over 30 municipal, county, and school officials from four counties. The Center published the proceedings of the Summit in a document entitled “Intergovernmental Collaboration and School Facility Planning”, August 2006 (The Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
- **Las Cruces Hillrise Elementary School Safe Routes to School Pilot Project** – After adopting its Regional Transportation Plan in 2005, the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) developed a District and regional wide Safe Routes to School Program for schools in the Las Cruces Public School District. The MPO organized a steering committee to initiate a project at Hillrise Elementary School. After assessing the area, the committee recommended a redesign of the street in front of the school and initiating improvements. The effort took close coordination between the MPO, District, and City of Las Cruces (New Mexico Safe Routes to School Program).
- **Seattle Washington Parks and Recreation Department/Seattle Public Schools Joint Use/Co-location Policy** – Joint policies that mandate schools and parks be co-located and that facilities are available to the general public (Seattle Parks and Recreation Department and Seattle Public School District No.1, An Agreement for the Joint Use of Facilities between the Seattle Public School District No. 1 and Seattle Parks and Recreation Department, 2005-2010).
- **Durham County, North Carolina** – The County incorporated a School element in its comprehensive plan with goals for efficient school siting and greater collaboration (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) (Durham City-County Planning Department, Durham Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 11 Schools Element, 2009).
- **APS School Facility Fees** – Developers and home builders paying a per unit fee to the Albuquerque Public Schools through the City of Albuquerque’s development review process. The money is used to help construct and maintain new square footage. The City of Albuquerque Environmental Planning Commission also includes the Albuquerque Public School District in its review of zone change, site plan, and master plan requests.
- **Saddlebrook Joint Facility/Omaha Nebraska** – Nebraska’s first elementary school, community center, and public library in one facility. The Omaha Public School District, Omaha Public Library, and Omaha Parks and Recreation Department were each considering new-stand alone facilities in the northwest part of the City. They met and saw the benefits of merged missions and embarked on this facility. View

the facility at the following:

<http://www.ops.org/elementary/saddlebrook/HOME/tabid/36/Default.aspx>

- Estimated construction cost - \$16 Million
(www.reedconstructiondata.com @
[http://www.reedconstructiondata.com/building-
types/library/nebraska/projects/1000614799/](http://www.reedconstructiondata.com/building-types/library/nebraska/projects/1000614799/))
- 110,056 GSF (Omaha Public Schools)
- Allows the District to promote a curriculum of lifelong learning and physical fitness through the inclusion of all three facilities (CEFPI @ <http://www.cefpi.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=4644>)

B. SCHOOL DISTRICT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING: OVERVIEW OF HOW OTHER STATES APPROACH THE ISSUE

July 2011

Introduction

The information contained within this summary is for informational purposes only and not endorsed by the Public School Capital Outlay Council or the Public School Facilities Authority. The aim of the following information is to provide PSFA Planning Advisory Group members an overview of efforts in other states to bridge local government and school district planning.

The summary table below provides an overview of the mechanisms each state uses to accomplish coordination, be they mandates, incentives, or guidance/encouragement. Details follow for each state listed in the table. While many states encourage school district/local government planning, the states listed below are those with formal legislation, policies, or tools in place.

Summary Table

State	Legislative Mandate or Policy	Incentive	Guidance or Encouragement
Colorado	•		
Florida*	•		
Maryland	•		•
Maine			•
New Hampshire	•		
New York		•	
Oregon	•		•
Rhode Island	•		
South Carolina**			•

* Revised in 2011 with many former elements repealed.

**Encourages coordination but does not prohibit school district from moving forward even if its plans conflict with municipal or county goals.

Source: State Websites and National Trust for Historic Preservation, State Policies for School Construction and Renovation: Seen Through A Community Preservation Lens: A Report by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, May 2003).

State of Colorado

Section 22-32-124 of the Colorado Revised Statutes requires that the Board of Education for school districts consult with the planning commission or local government body to determine whether new school sites conform to adopted comprehensive plan wherever feasible but it does not limit the school board from making a final determination on the site. The District must also submit a site plan to the planning commission or local government body and the local government can request a public hearing regarding any new school sites (*Miche's Legal Resources/Colorado - <http://www.michie.com/colorado/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm>*)

State of Florida

In 2005, the Florida State Legislature enacted legislation (Chapter 2005-290, Laws of Florida), which, as part of a comprehensive growth management program, required local governments and their school boards to adopt school concurrency systems. The legislation puts a focus on collaboration in areas where coordination is most critical including demographics/projections, infrastructure provision, and planning/funding future facilities to meet growth. Chapter 2005-290 makes concurrency mandatory and failure to meet the requirements of the law, could result in penalties for local governments and school districts. Specifically, the law requires the following (Florida Department of Community Affairs):

- Update existing public school interlocal agreements and the Intergovernmental Coordination Element to include coordinated procedures for implementing concurrency.
- Adoption of a Public Schools Facilities Element into the local government comprehensive plan.
- Adoption of a level-of-service standards to establish maximum permissible school utilization rates relative to capacity, and include these level of service standards in an amended Capital Improvements Element of the comprehensive plan and in the updated interlocal agreement.
- Establish a financially feasible Public School Capital Facilities Program and include the program in an amended Capital Improvements Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Establish proportionate-share mitigation methodology and options to be included in the Public School Facilities Element and the interlocal agreement.
- Establish public school concurrency service area to define the geographic boundaries of school concurrency, and include the Concurrency Service Areas in the updated interlocal agreement and in the supporting data and analysis for the comprehensive plan.

During the 2011 Legislative Session, the Florida Legislature streamlined its growth management laws and largely returned control for local planning back to the local governments. Before, the State's Department of Community Affairs had responsibility to review comprehensive plan amendments and large scale developments. Developers no longer have to show a "need" for new residential development before he/she builds a project. The legislative reforms also eliminated the concurrency requirements for schools, parks, and recreational facilities. Local governments have the option of keeping concurrency albeit in less restrictive guidelines that ease financial burdens on developers. For example, developers will not be held accountable for infrastructure improvements in areas that are already impacted by heavy traffic or demand for public services (*Peter Guinta, June 29, 2011, St. Augustine Record, Kevin Bouffard, The Ledger, June 22, 2011, WMFE radio, June 10, 2011*).

State of Maryland

The State of Maryland Planning Department uses its role on the Maryland Interagency Committee on School Construction (IAC) to craft and advance policies that encourage local jurisdictions to:

- Construct and rehabilitate neighborhood schools;
- Promote shared community uses;
- Utilize public infrastructure wisely;
- Preserve historic schools and education related landmarks
- Promote health, walkable communities;
- Reduce traffic demand and air emissions related to motor vehicle usage
- Reduce sprawl
- Promote policies that link school construction growth directly to smart growth, community revitalization, and sustainable development goals.

The Maryland Planning Department advocates these policies in order to implement the overarching goal of achieving Smart Growth Principles and sustainable communities (Maryland Department of Planning).

State of Maine

The Maine State Planning Office works closely with the State Board of Education to coordinate planning and land use decisions between school districts and local governments. The State Board of Education requires Districts to work with the State Planning Office in decisions regarding new school sites. The State Planning Office and State Education Department jointly published *The ABC's of School Site Selection* (No longer in print) and encourages school districts to (Maine State Planning Office):

- Avoid school sprawl
- Consider school renovations or expansions in central locations when possible

- Select school sites that are already served by infrastructure, roads, utilities, and other essential services
- Analyze school sites for proximity to village centers and established neighborhoods

State of New Hampshire

In January 2010, the New Hampshire House passed Senate Bill 59 (which the Senate passed in the Spring of 2009). The bill has three key elements (*Helping Johnny Walk to School: Removing Barriers to Community Centered Schools, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2010*):

- It requires school districts to investigate all feasible options when deciding whether to renovate versus replacing an existing school. Investigating all feasible options means that the district must have public hearings, consult with municipal boards, and other governmental agencies.
- It limits additional land acquisition for school renovation projects to only that needed for ensuring safe flow of traffic.
- It requires plans for construction or renovation of schools to comply with the state's comprehensive plan and Smart Growth Principals that have been incorporated into the New Hampshire State statues through legislation.

In addition the bill requires the District to seek input from intergovernmental boards and commissions when seeking school construction projects and to review a municipality's comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance to ensure compliance (*New Hampshire Municipal Association, Government Affairs Division, Final Legislative Bulletin, 2010, accessed via world wide web, http://www.nhlgc.org/attachments/nhma/FinalLegBulletin_10.pdf*)

State of New Jersey

The State of New Jersey Planning Office has published the state wide plan, which contains policies calling for collaborative planning between several governmental entities including school districts. The State Planning Office has also published a document entitled "Creating Communities of Learning: Schools and Smart Growth in New Jersey" that promotes smart growth principles integrated with school planning (State of New Jersey Planning Office).

In 2002, the State established the "School Renaissance Zone" Program, which provided developers incentives to revitalize neighborhoods surrounding schools (*State Policies for School Construction and Renovation, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2003*). This program does not appear to be active.

State of New York

The State of New York administers the Local Government Efficiency Grant Program, which provides grants and technical assistance to local governments to share local services and improve fiscal and operational efficiency. The State has provided grants and assistance to local governments who then engage their school districts in sharing certain services such as shared maintenance garages for school and city fleets, school district consolidation, and joint long-range land use/infrastructure planning. The State's goal for this program is that through providing grants for shared services and collaborative planning, larger savings can be made for the taxpayer as local governmental entities eliminate unnecessary or duplicative services (New York Department of State, Local Governmental Services).

State of Oregon

Chapter 195, Section 195.110 of the Oregon State Statutes requires local government/large district school district planning coordination. The law defines a large school district as those with enrollments of 2,500 students and over. For counties or municipalities who have a large school district within its boundaries, the law requires the following (Oregon Department of Land Conservation):

The School District's facility master plan must be included in the municipality and/or county comprehensive plan as an element.

The large school district must have a representative who engages the city or county to confer on planning activities. The laws states that joint planning meetings must take place twice a year at a minimum but representatives can agree on another schedule.

The school district facility plan must cover a 10-year period and must include:

- Enrollment projections
- Identification of all desirable future school sites
- Description of physical improvements needed in the existing schools
- Financial plans to meet school facility improvements and additions
- Analysis of alternatives to new school construction and major renovations
- Strategy to increase the efficient use of school sites including shared use, multiple story-school buildings, and joint use agreements
- Site acquisition schedules and strategies

The city or county must notify the large school district when considering a plan or land use regulation amendment

The city or county can deny development applications based on school district issues such as lack of capacity.

The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development Commission, with assistance from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation staff, oversees Chapter 195.110 to ensure compliance. Lack of compliance is tied to funding and plan approval.

State of Rhode Island

The State of Rhode Island Department of Education requires school districts to include a Smart Growth analysis in its “Necessity of School Construction” application for plan approval. In this analysis, it must state how this project promotes Smart Growth goals, where feasible. In addition, a local government designee, as directed by the local governing board, must sign the application (Rhode Island Department of Education).

State of South Carolina

Section 6-29-540 of the South Carolina Code of Statutes requires that prior to constructing a public building, the applicant agency (including school districts) consult with the local planning commission and comprehensive plan. However, if the planning commission finds that a new school site does not conform to the community’s development goals, it cannot prohibit the school district from moving ahead with the site as long as the school district publicly states why the site is advantageous (South Carolina Code of Laws).

Individual Municipalities or County Examples

Casper Wyoming – City Manager and staff researched school siting and how it impacts local planning and development. Through this research, the City presented goals associated with school development and approached the school district for greater collaboration. The City is now heavily involved in school site selection and in enhancing existing neighborhood school sites (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) .

Lincoln California – School board and City work together to meet the City’s goal of 40% open space by co-locating school sites with parks. The school district and City have agreements in place to share park and school facilities. The school district opens school buildings to the public after hours for community events, recreation, continuing education, and library(ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) .

Durham County, North Carolina – The County incorporated a School element in its comprehensive plan with goals for efficient school siting and greater collaboration (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008) (Durham City-County Planning Department, Durham Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 11 Schools Element, 2009).

Stonington, Connecticut – Town and School leaders have resolved lack of coordination by establishing a Town/Board Building Committee that studies enrollment trends, school renovation/expansion needs, and suitable locations for new facilities that are in harmony with the Town’s development goals (http://www.stonington-ct.gov/Pages/StoningtonCT_BComm/schbldgcomm) (ICMA Press, IQ Report, Local Governments and Schools: A Community-Orientated Approach, 2008).

University of Michigan – Dearborn Institute for Local Government provides technical assistance and facilitation for local governments and their school districts on developing greater collaboration. Specifically, the Institute assists bringing all parties to the table and in crafting agreements.

University of North Carolina Center for Urban and Regional Studies convened a School Siting Summit on May 3rd, 2006 with over 30 municipal, county, and school officials from four counties. The Center published the proceedings of the Summit in a document entitled “Intergovernmental Collaboration and School Facility Planning”, August 2006 (The Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).

C. Issues Related to School District Planning

6/4/12

I. Issue Statement: All levels of government have services to provide such as parks, community centers, libraries, schools, roads, and water/sewer infrastructure. At the same time, the nation is in the midst of a significant global economic crisis in which money for capital projects is at a premium and voters are becoming hesitant to approve general obligation bonds. As a result, government must respond to this situation by finding alternative ways to deliver services with dwindling resources. Collaborative planning among several governmental entities is one way to address issues common to all jurisdictions. For the purpose of this write-up, the term local government refers to tribal, municipal, and county government.

II. How Schools fit within community, regional, transportation, and facility planning

A. Land Use

1. Site selection
 - a. suburban sites
 - b. infill and small sites
 - c. infrastructure needs (roads, water/wastewater lines)
 - d. property tax implications
2. Available tools
 - a. comprehensive plans and lower ranking plans
 - b. zoning/subdivision
 - c. school district facilities master plan
 - d. GIS data
3. Critical partnerships
 - a. local government planner
 - b. development community (planners, architects/designers, engineers, home builders, developers)
 - c. local government public works
 - d. school district
 - e. neighborhood associations
 - f. users – students/faculty/parents

B. Urban/Community Design

1. Safe pedestrian access (bicycles and walking)/Complete streets
2. Pedestrian activity and impact on public health
3. ADA accessibility
4. Community/neighborhood revitalization
 - a. closing schools

- b. historic preservation
- c. adaptive reuse of closed schools
- 5. Critical partnerships
 - a. safe Routes to School Program
 - b. neighborhood associations
 - c. local government public works department/traffic engineering/transportation engineers
 - d. public health professionals
 - e. development community (planners, architects/designers, engineers, home builders, developers)
 - f. school district
 - g. users – students/faculty/parents

C. Transportation

- 1. School bus transportation
 - a. routes
 - b. coordination of schedules
 - c. bussing to new school sites
 - d. fleet management (fuel, parts, labor, man hours)
- 2. Coordination with local transit (if available)
- 3. Road construction/maintenance
- 4. Parent drop-off/pick up
- 5. Vehicle Miles Traveled
- 6. Traffic Demand Management and Forecasting
- 7. Critical partnerships
 - a. local government public works department/traffic engineering/transportation engineers
 - b. regional/metropolitan Planning Organization
 - c. local government planner
 - d. school district
 - e. state transportation department
 - f. capital improvement program
 - g. development community (planners, architects/designers, engineers, home builders, developers)

D. Facility Planning

- 1. Joint/Shared facilities or services
 - a. libraries
 - b. community centers
 - c. school libraries/gyms/fields/classrooms/cafeteria
 - d. public park/playground/playing fields
 - e. theaters
 - f. maintenance shop/facilities (fleets)
- 2. Facility management

- a. memorandums of understanding
- b. joint use agreements
- c. operational funding
- d. hours of use
- e. coordination with special use groups
- f. asset management and preventative maintenance
- 3. Critical partnerships
 - a. public library board
 - b. local government parks and recreation department
 - c. local government planner
 - d. school district
 - e. special interest groups (users of facilities – senior groups, special needs users, continuing education providers)
 - f. facility maintenance staff from all levels of government
 - g. students/faculty/parents
 - h. capital improvements program

E. Demographics/socioeconomics

- 1. Community growth patterns
- 2. Student enrollment patterns/location
- 3. Building permit locations
- 4. Zoning
- 5. Available tools
 - a. GIS
 - b. data sharing agreements
- 6. Critical partnerships
 - a. local government planner/demographer
 - b. school district
 - c. development community (planners, architects/designers, engineers, home builders, developers)

APPENDIX C

Site Selection Criteria			
Site Name:	Site:		Date:
Area:			
Location	Yes	No	Comments
Is it within the attendance area?			
Is adjacent land use compatible?			
Is it centrally located to avoid extensive transporting and to minimize student travel distance?			
Is it compatible with current and probable future zoning regulations?			
Is it close to libraries, parks, museums and other community services?			
Is there available fire and police protection, including fire lines?			
Is there favorable orientation to wind and natural light?			
Is the site close to other schools?			
Are there known or potential significant environmental concerns impacting site habitat (e.g., fish-bearing streams, unique flora or fauna)?			
Are there heritage/archaeological artifacts of known or potential historical/archaeological significance?			
Is there existing or proposed zoning/land use designation which prevents development as school site?			
Is there known or anticipated unsuitable development on adjacent properties?			
Is there convenient potential for joint-use opportunities?			
Is there existing trash and garbage disposal service conveniently available to the site?			
Is there proximity to available housing?			
Adjacencies			
Is it properlydistanced from roadways with high volumes of traffic?			
Is it farther than 1,500 feet away from railway tracks?			
Is it farther than two miles away from an airport runway?			
Is it free from the existing paths of high voltage lines?			
Is it free from the existing paths of high-pressure lines (gas*, sewer or water lines)? *Contact the PRC Pipeline Safety Division for more info			

Are there safe and convenient routes for students to walk and bicycle to school? (Use NM Safe Routes to School neighborhood assessment forms available at www.nmshtd.state.nm.us).			
Is the site free of contaminants/toxics in soil or ground water, such as from landfills, dumps, chemical plants, refineries, fuel tanks, nuclear power plants or agricultural use of pesticides or fertilizer, etc.?			
Is far from high-decibel noise sources?			
Is it far from open-pit mining?			
Is it far from a fault zone or active fault?			
Is it outside a dam inundation area or a 100-year flood plain?			
Is it relatively free of social hazards in the neighborhood, such as high incidence of crime and drug or alcohol abuse?			
Are air quality levels acceptable?			
Can school regulate access by unwanted visitors?			
Soils			
Is the site far from faults or fault traces?			
Is there stable subsurface and bearing capacity?			
Is it free of the danger of slides or liquefaction?			
Is there adequate percolation for septic system and drainage?			
Is there an adequate water table water level?			
Is existing land fill reasonably well compacted? Note: A geological hazard report must be conducted to determine soil and seismic conditions			
Is the site free from hazardous materials?			
Accessibility			
Is public transportation available?			
Are there safe, convenient routes for all users (students, staff, parents and visitors) to walk and bicycle to the site? (Use NM Safe Routes to School neighborhood assessment forms available at www.nmshtd.state.nm.us).			
Does it have easy community access for shared use?			
Is adjacent traffic reasonable?			
Can buses get in and out easily?			
Can emergency vehicles get in and out easily?			
Is the site free from nearby off-site obstacles such as crossings on major streets and intersections, narrow or winding streets, or heavy traffic			

patterns?			
Is the site clear from natural obstacles such as grades or gullies?			
Is there reasonable freeway access for bus transportation without the site being adjacent to the freeway?			

Environment	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site free from sources of noise that may impede the instructional process?			
Is the site free from air, water and soil pollution?			
Is the site free from smoke, dust, odors and pesticide spray?			
Does the site provide aesthetic off-site and on-site views?			
Is the site environment compatible with the educational program?			
Are there places for outdoor education?			
Is there natural vegetation?			
Topography			
Can the site be drained properly?			
Can grading be performed easily and economically?			
Can vehicles easily negotiate the terrain?			
Are there flat areas for playing fields?			
Is the site free of rock ledges or outcroppings?			
Is it below the maximum site slope of 2-4% over minimum of 50% of site for ease of design and access?			
Size and Shape			
Is the net acreage consistent with intended use?			
Is the length-to-width ratio below 2:1?			
Is there sufficient open play area and open space?			
Is there potential for expansion for future needs?			
Is there area for adequate and separate bus loading and parking?			
Is there adequate space for bus loading and separate parent drop-off / pick-up areas?			
Does the site shape facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access?			
Utilities			
Is there availability of water, electricity, gas, and sewer?*			
Is there the feasibility of bringing utilities to site at a			

reasonable cost?			
Are there no restrictions on rights of way?			
*Contact State Fire Marshal for requirements for fire suppression water needs and site approval			
Availability			
Is the property on the market for sale?			
Are title clearance issues non-existent or resolved?			
Is condemnation of property unnecessary?			
Is it free of site easements or restrictions?			
Cost			
	Yes	No	Comments
Are anticipated costs for purchase of property, severance damages, relocation of residents and business, and legal fees reasonable?			
Are estimated costs for site preparation, including drainage, parking, driveways, removal of existing buildings and grading reasonable?			
Are the estimates for any long-time site maintenance costs reasonable?			
Is the site free of need for toxic cleanup beyond the owner's obligation?			
Is the site free of any extensive need for environmental mitigation?			
Does the site location minimize the need for long-distance transportation of students to and from the site and the associated costs?			
Public Acceptance			
Is there public acceptance public acceptance of the proposed site?			
Is the city or county planning commission receptive to the location of the site?			
Is the site free from prime agriculture or industrial use zoning designations?			
Is the site free of a negative environmental impact report?			
Is there coordination of the proposed school location with future community plans?			

A. SCHOOL SITE

Adequacy Requirements

Two sections of the *New Mexico State Adequacy Standards* separately address minimum requirements for school sites and site development. The following **Section 6.27.30.10 NMAC** pertains to school site size and general minimum requirements in site development:

<p>6.27.30.10 SCHOOL SITE. A school site shall be of sufficient size to accommodate safe access, parking, drainage and security. Additionally, the site shall be provided with an adequate source of water and appropriate means of effluent disposal.</p> <p>A. Safe access. A school site shall be configured for safe and controlled access that separates pedestrian from vehicular traffic. If buses are used to transport students then separate bus loading/unloading areas shall be provided wherever possible. Dedicated student drop-off and pickup areas shall be provided for safe use by student passengers arriving or departing by automobile.</p> <p>B. Parking. A school site shall include a maintainable surfaced area that is stable, firm and slip resistant and is large enough to accommodate 1.5 parking spaces /staff FTE and one student space /four high school students. If this standard is not met, alternative parking may be approved after the sufficiency of parking at the site is reviewed by the council using the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) availability of street parking around the school;(2) availability of any nearby parking lots;(3) availability of public transit;(4) number of staff who drive to work on a daily basis; and(5) average number of visitors on a daily basis. <p>C. Drainage. A school site shall be configured such that runoff does not undermine the structural integrity of the school buildings located on the site or create flooding, ponding or erosion resulting in a threat to health, safety or welfare.</p> <p>D. Security.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) All schools shall have safe and secure site fencing or other barriers with accommodations for safe passage through openings to protect students from the hazards of traffic, railroad tracks, steep slopes, animal nuisance, and to discourage unauthorized access to the campus. This standard is met if the entire school is fenced or walled. If this standard is not met, alternative security may be approved after the sufficiency of security at the site is reviewed by the council using the following criteria:<ol style="list-style-type: none">(a) amount of vehicular traffic near the school site;(b) existence of hazardous or natural barriers on or near the school site;(c) amount of animal nuisance or unique conditions near the school site;(d) visibility of the play/physical education area; and(e) site lighting, as required to meet safe, normal access conditions.(2) For schools which include students below grade 6, a fenced or walled play/physical education area shall be provided. <p>[6.27.30.10 NMAC - N, 9/1/02; A, 12/14/07]</p>

Best Practices – Site (Section 6.27.30.10 NMAC)

Consider the following when selecting or developing a site:

- In practice, site size may be reduced significantly for urban schools, and other small schools requiring creative solutions in site development, facility utilization and building design and still remain educationally viable.
- Considerations determining the ability to properly and economically develop a school site are covered in detail in Appendix C in this document.