Schools and Sustainable Development

Undoing Educational Inequity through the Built Environment

New Partners for Smart Growth
Marisa Raya, Regional Planner
Association of Bay Area Governments
Blueprint for a Sustainable Region: CA Senate Bill 375 (2008)

- Landmark legislation for California on land use, transportation and environmental planning, connecting housing and greenhouse gas reduction

- Creates a new regional planning framework, but also legitimizes past local and regional efforts to promote infill and urban development
Climate Change Policy = Housing Policy

1. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from driving in the Bay Area by 15% by 2035
2. House the region’s population at all income levels without displacing current residents
Regional Goal

- Complete Communities with quality services and amenities
- Improved public health outcomes
- Sustainable transportation system
- Public agency alignment around outcomes

School Impact

- Schools drive location and access to opportunity
- Move to increase walking and biking
- 12% of trips are school-based
- 35% of state budget goes to education
PDAs: Priority Development Areas

Locally-nominated areas for sustainable development supported by planning and capital grants

- Existing Communities
- Near Transit
- Planned for more housing

- Most potential for transformation
- Where we want future residents to live
**Challenges to School Collaboration: “Yield by Product Type”**

### Average Student Yield 1999-2007 in Emery Unified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Rate Units</th>
<th>Affordable to Moderate Income</th>
<th>Affordable to Low or Very Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums/THs</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums/Lofts</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td><strong>0.007</strong></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Small Apt Complexes</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Large Apt Complexes</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td><strong>0.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developments that are 100% Affordable</td>
<td>no units</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Units (Houses)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplexes</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourplexes</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality Housing</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>no units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*small sample size*

Source: Lapkoff and Gobalet Demographic Research for Emeryville Unified
PDA School Assessment

1. Quality
2. Physical Access
3. Public/Private
4. Collaboration
PDA School Assessment

1. Quality
2. Physical Access
3. Public/Private
4. Collaboration
PDA School Assessment

1. Quality

2. Physical Access

3. Public/Private

4. Collaboration
School Quality: Characteristics and Performance

1. Student Characteristics
2. School Performance
3. (Staff Characteristics)
4. School Characteristics
3 Categories of Public Schools

- In PDA
- In PDA Buffer (1/2 mile)
- Not In PDA
11% of Bay Area public schools are in PDAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public School Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bay Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In PDA</td>
<td>In PDA Buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Middle Schools include those classified as Intermediate Schools and Junior High Schools by CDE.
**Other includes Adult Education Centers, Alternative Schools of Choice, Continuation High Schools, County Community, District Community Day Schools, Juvenile Court Schools, K-12, Opportunity Schools, Preschools, ROC/ROP, and Special Educational Schools.
PDA schools enroll more students who live in poverty

Average School-Level Percent of Bay Area Public School Students who Qualify for Free/Reduced Lunch Program 2009-2010

9-County Bay Area Average = 44%
School demographic profiles vary across the region

Average School-Level Percent of Student Ethnicity
2009-2010

*Other includes: Two or More and Non-Reported
PDAs have a higher percentage of charter schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public School Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bay Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In PDA</td>
<td>In PDA Buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Schools</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Charter</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average school size has declined
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# Physical Access - Transit

Planned PDA Transit service that stops within a ¼ mile walk of a public school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average AM and PM Headways</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>#PDAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Headway &gt;1 min and &lt; 20 min</td>
<td>Great/Good</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Headway &gt;20 min and &lt; 40 min</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Headway &gt;40 min and &lt; 60 min</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Headway &gt; 60 min</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct transit from PDA stops within 1/4 mile of a Public School</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PDAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Access - Walkability

- Used GIS to analyze what % of residential or mixed-use land was within ½ mile of a school.
- 50% of planned PDAs have at least one school within a half-mile walk of most residential or mixed-use neighborhoods
- 12 Planned PDAs do not have a school within a half-mile walk of residential or mixed-use neighborhoods

100%  <2%

SF-Mission Bay  Pittsburg  Fairfield  Vacaville
San Ramon  Dublin  Pleasant Hill  Palo Alto  Cotati
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Public and Private

- Total Private Schools (2008): 735
- Total Public Schools (2009): 1839
- 1.14 Million K-12 age children in the 9 Counties
  - 13.5% are in Private Schools.
Private Schools: PDA City Comparison

- Private school attendance in San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties is double that of other counties (SF highest at 25%)
- Correlated with median income as well as assignment policy
- Private school enrollment has decreased everywhere since 2001
- 78% of private schools have religious affiliation
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Collaboration: PDA Assessment
Survey findings

1. 48 out of 73 survey respondents are collaborating with their School District (66%)

2. 39 out of 73 survey respondents have Joint use of City and School facilities (53%)

3. 3 Districts reported closures or potential closures (out of a 22% response rate.)

4. Only 11% of Planned PDAs responded to the question about non-neighborhood based assignment policy

5. A few cities and schools are coordinating transit services and planning input.
Progress Thus Far

• Frame for connecting schools and regional sustainability

• School indicators and “Neighborhoods of Opportunity” concept for Advisory Groups

• Some district interest – Oakland Unified currently assessing closures and future needs – while other districts, such as San Jose, continue to struggle over impact fees

• Next steps?