



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Skip Rotticci, Chair
Colliers International
Tim Baugus, Vice-Chair
Skanska
Renee Loveland, Secretary
Gerding Edlen
Bruce Murray, Treasurer
Chicago Public Schools (retired)
Steve Anderson
P&C Construction
Alex Banks
Apollo Solutions Group
Jay Bloom
Bloom Anew
Jeff Condit
Miller Nash LLP
Melissa Crossman
Interface Engineering
Sue Densmore
Densmore Communications
Joshua Dodson
Day CPM
Carol Duncan
General Sheet Metal
Mark Fisher
StanCorp Mortgage Investors
Louis Fontenot, Jr.
Trammell Crow
Joyce Hendstrand
Reynolds SD (retired)
Arnie Hollander
Hollander Project Mgmt.
Keith Knight
Oregon Electric
Dr. Phil Long
Medford School District
Leo MacLeod
Mainspring Marketing
Tony Magliano
Portland Public Schools
Su Midghall
DHM Research
Chris Miller
Alliant Systems
David Oh
Intel
Scott Rogers
Intermountain ESD
Barbara Rommel
David Douglas SD (retired)
Paul Schlesinger
Schlesinger Cos.
Sarah Schoening
Schoening Group Inc.
Michael Schrader
Orrick
Diane Shiner
Mahlum Architects
Larry Sitz
Emerick Construction
Christina Skellenger
McKinstry
Kenneth Troyer
Hydro-Temp Mechanical
Peter White
Johnson Controls
Dennis Whitehouse
North Wasco SD
Susan Wold
Heery
Jeana Woolley
JM Woolley & Assoc.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ruth Scott

May 13, 2014

SB 540 Task Force
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street NE, Salem Oregon 97310

Chair Donahue & Task Force Members,

We appreciate the opportunity to comment to the Task Force on the Oregon Department of Education's draft **School Facilities Database Proposal**.

The goal of a statewide database as mandated by SB 540 is to facilitate district prioritization, statewide collaboration and increased equity of facility conditions.

A statewide database can provide a broad overview and create the context needed for the establishment of a baseline of facility conditions in Oregon schools. Once there is an understanding of the estimated level of need across the state, Oregon will be well-positioned to set facility priorities, establish local, state and federal funding priorities, develop an incremental approach, and create budgets. The database should also provide districts with the ability to do benchmark comparisons to other districts across the state aiding in communication with their constituents. As one of the school district leaders on the Center's Board recently stated, "Data should be both the starting and end point of any facilities program and funding."

Overall, our comment would be that ODE's initial proposal outlines a very generalized set of data that is insufficient to fulfill the goals for the database just outlines or as set out by the Task Force. The Task Force's draft report notes in Item #4(d)(3) that the database should be useable for "analyzing, planning and prioritizing capital improvement needs by districts and the state."

We believe the following additional baseline data points should be included in order to meet the Task Force's objectives:

- Health and safety – fire systems (indication of fire alarm or sprinkler system) and security measures (which could be described with a 1 – 4 rating).

- Energy usage – at a minimum, the most recent Energy Usage Index (EUI) should be included, and preferably an indication of fuel types used (gas/propane, electricity, other fuel). Also, schools should indicate whether or not they are eligible for SB 1149 funding.
- Water usage.
- Demographic data – at minimum should include grade levels, enrollment and preferably diversity and FRL, or equivalent.
- Technology – include indication of dial-up, DSL, fiber, speed/capacity and WiFi.
- Capital Improvements - ODE items #16 and #17 should be replaced by basic bond information from the last up to 30 years including year, amount, and remaining indebtedness. This data is readily available whereas the data recommended by ODE would require an extensive amount of work from small and large districts alike and be onerous to collect. Perhaps that level of detailed data could be requested for any school for which matching funds are requested.

School district facility professional's time is enormously stretched these days. The additional data outlined above is publicly available. Including this basic data would allow an appropriate analysis of need, planning and prioritizing as outlined by the Task Force.

Finally, it is unclear whether ODE wishes to recreate the wheel in creating a new database versus purchasing the data at the same rate as Metro did and well within the budgetary limitations of SB 540. Metro has shown the Task Force how useful the data was for them; we believe the data would be equally useful for ODE. Likewise, purchasing existing data would allow the database to exist immediately, and time is of the essence. On a similar note, it's unclear to us if ODE has seriously considered Metro's School Atlas GIS-based comparative analysis software, which was demonstrated to the Task Force previously. Nine of the more prominent districts in the state have indicated interest in the tool.

We strongly urge the Task Force to recommend to ODE enter into negotiations with both CISF and Metro and bring their recommendations for database content and management system to the Task Force.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your attention to these recommendations, and stand ready to assist you further as requested.

Respectfully,



Renee Loveland
Gerding Edlen
CISF Board & Co-Chair, Research Committee

CISF Data Points from 2005 - 2013 Inventory

Summary of Data Points Included in CISF Database, Along With % of Total Scho

Key:

Recommended Basic Data by CISF Research and Standards Committee

Data from Oregon Department of Education (existing database)

The CISF database is a compilation of data from numerous sources, all of which use different tags to identify schools. Many of these tags are not meaningful outside of that context or are duplicated. This is a partial list. These are the data points that are relevant and useful.

<u>Basic Data (99%)</u>	<u>Seismic (98%)</u>
Source: Dept. of Ed.	Source: DOGAMI ("Drive-By" Assessments)
ODE School Identification	Type of Construction
School District	Collapse Potential (low, medium, high, very high)
Location Code	Seismic Rating*
School Name	Number of Stories
Facility	Seismicity Zone
Location	Primary Structural Type
ESD Name	Secondary Structural Type
Grade Range	Tertiary Structural Type
2012-13 Enrollment	Soil Type
State House District	Year Built/Age
State Senate District	Total Building Area
	Poor Condition, Primary Structure? - yes/no
	Falling Hazard, Primary Structure? - yes/no
	Comments w/ sources & links
	 *PPS preferred a different seismic rating (good, fair, poor) and this was then applied by CISF to all districts across the State, such that all districts now have both the Dogami collapse potential and this seismic rating

CISF Data Points from 2005 - 2013 Inventory

ols For Which This Data is Included

erent tags that have been cross-referenced to accurately
licative across databases; therefore, what is below is a

Technology (62%)

Source: CISF (Extrapolated From Capital Construction Info.)

Tech Upgrades (2000-2005)? Yes/No

Tech Upgrades (2006-2012)? Yes/No

Note: The specific type of upgrade is not known.

Demographics (100%)

Source: Dept. of Ed., CISF

Free/Reduced Lunch %

Meets/Exceeds % (Math, Reading)

Minority %

Annual Daily Membership Enrollment

Dropout Percent

District Student Count

State Student Count

Density (# Students/sf)

CISF Data Points from 2005 - 2013 Inventory

<u>Safety (94%)</u>	<u>Operating & Maintenance (95%)</u>	<u>Energy (96%)</u>
Source: PACE	Source: CISF, Dept. of Energy	Source: Dept. of Energy
Quake Coverage? (Y/N)	Square Footage	Energy Usage Index
Property Value	Cost/sf	Energy Usage Index Year
Contents Value	Cost/Student	Utility Name
Flood Coverage	Annual Report Sq Ft	Electric Use & Cost
% Auto Sprinklered	Annual Report Operating Hours	Gas Use & Cost
Flood Zone? Y/N	Labor Costs	Diesel Use & Cost
Appraisal Date	Equipment/Material Repair Costs	Cost per kWh
Fire Alarm	Maintenance Contracts Costs	Cost Per Therm
Fire Protection Certification	Custodial Costs	Total Annual Energy Cost
Security Alarm	Phone Costs	Exterior Lighting
Condition of Building Envelope	Total Maintenance/Repair/Refuse Cost	HVAC
Severity of Damage Rating		Interior Lighting
Estimated Building Damage (in an Event)		Domestic Hot Water

CISF Data Points from 2005 - 2013 Inventory

<u>Energy (cont.)</u>	<u>Energy (cont.)</u>
Non-SB 1149 Schools, Based on Energy Cool Audits Conducted Thru Cool Schools Initiative	SB 1149 Schools, Based on Energy Audits Conducted Between 2002 - 2011
Annual Energy Costs as Shown in Column M Plus Investments Needed in Specific Areas: Interior Lighting Windows Insulation Building Controls Hot Water	<div style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Energy Efficiency Measure Description</div> For Each Measure: Electricity (kWh) Estimated Units, Dollars and Demand (kW) Saved Natural Gas (Therms) Estimated Units & Dollars Saved Diesel (Gal) Estimated Units and Dollars Saved Propane (Gal) Estimated Units and Dollars Saved # 5 Oil (Gal) Estimated Units and Dollars Saved
<div style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"> Energy Efficiency Measure Name Implementation Cost Incentive Amount Savings Amount Simple Payback Total Energy Cost Post-Improvements Value of Energy Efficiency Measures </div>	<div style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"> Estimated Cost Estimated Avoided Costs Estimated Measure Life Estimated Average Payback Estimated Simple Payback Total Estimated Dollars Saved </div>
	For Package of Proposed Measures: <div style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"> Total # Projects, Value, and Average Payback </div>

CISF Data Points from 2005 - 2013 Inventory

Identified Capital Needs (88%)**

Source: Dept. of Energy, CISF/McGraw Hill

Measure Description
Measure Cost
Incentives
Savings
in kWh, Therms and MMBTU
Value of Energy Efficiency Measures
Estimated Avoided Costs
Estimated Average Payback
Projects, Value, Average Payback

**These represent identified energy projects only based on the audits for SB 1149 schools and non-SB 1149 audits; therefore, this data is a compilation from the data in Columns O and Q for ease of reference. Specific seismic and technology upgrades have yet to be identified.

School Capital Construction Projects Completed (45%***)

Source: State Treasurer, CISF/McGraw Hill

Capital Expenditures, (1995-2005) & (2005-2013) datasets
Value
Details
School District Outstanding Bond Debt
Total Outstanding
Maturity Date
Last Bond Approved
Amount & Purpose
Type of Work & Square Area Covered

*** Not all districts have done capital work in this timeframe.