

I feel sure I will be back in the Chamber before we finish on this amendment to speak again. But we have a great opportunity here. The amendment is the responsible thing to do. There may be efforts to distract us, and there are of course legitimate concerns as well, but let us keep our eyes on the ball. If you are for the balanced budget amendment, you should vote for the balanced budget amendment, rather than finding excuses to oppose. There will not be any place to hide this time. The American people will know who is for it and who is against it when we take the vote in a few days.

Mr. President, in view of the fact there are others on the floor waiting to speak, I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 333 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his graciousness. I guess because we are on the same side on this particular issue it makes it a little easier, and it is a delight to have a chance to work in a bipartisan fashion on behalf of the balanced budget amendment.

THE CONDITION OF AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today to present the results of a very important study that has been conducted by the General Accounting Office on the condition of America's schools and to highlight the merits of the Education Infrastructure Act.

Mr. President, this report by the GAO, entitled "School Facilities—Condition of America's Schools," was issued yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire report by the GAO be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. General Accounting Office]

SCHOOL FACILITIES—CONDITION OF AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

February 1, 1995.

Hon. Carol Moseley-Braun,
Hon. Edward M. Kennedy,
Hon. Claiborne Pell,
Hon. Paul Simon,
Hon. Paul Wellstone,
U.S. Senate.

The nation has invested hundreds of billions of dollars in school infrastructure to create an environment where children can be properly educated and prepared for the future. Almost exclusively a state and local responsibility, this infrastructure requires maintenance and capital investment. However, public concern is growing that while laws require children to attend school, some

school buildings may be unsafe or even harmful to children's health. Recently, for example, a federal judge would not allow the schools in our nation's capital to open on time until thousands of life-threatening fire code violations were corrected. Similarly, noncompliance with asbestos requirements kept over 1000 New York City schools closed for the first 11 days of the 1993 school year. Although such situations may be well-publicized, little information exists documenting the extent to which the nation's schools may lack the appropriate facilities to educate their students.

Widely quoted studies¹ conducted in recent years report that school facilities are in poor condition. While these studies documented some problems and provided much anecdotal information, they had different methodological problems limiting their usefulness. Further, the Department of Education has not assessed the condition of the nation's school facilities since 1965. Accordingly, you requested that we conduct a study that could be used as a basis for determining the condition of the nation's school facilities.

In response to your request and subsequent discussions with your office, this report presents national information on (1) the amount of funding that the nation's public elementary and secondary schools report needing to improve inadequate facilities and (2) the overall physical condition and prevalence of schools that need major repairs. Another report is forthcoming shortly that will report the location of and other demographic analyses for schools that need major repairs. These reports are the first in a series responding to your request.²

RESULTS IN BRIEF

Based on estimates by school officials in a national sample of schools, we project that the nation's schools need about \$112 billion³ to repair or upgrade America's multibillion⁴ dollar investment in facilities to good overall condition.⁵ Of this, \$11 billion (10 percent) is needed over the next 3 years to comply with federal mandates that require schools to make all programs accessible to all students and to remove or correct hazardous substances such as asbestos, lead in water or paint, materials in underground storage tanks (UST), radon, or meet other requirements.

About two-thirds of America's schools reported that all buildings were in at least overall adequate condition, at most needing only some preventive maintenance or corrective repair. However, about 14 million students attend the remaining one-third of schools that reported needing extensive repair or replacement of one or more buildings.⁶ These schools are distributed nationwide. Also, problems with major building features, such as plumbing, are widespread even among those schools reported in at least adequate condition. Almost 60 percent of America's schools reported at least one major building feature in disrepair, needing to be extensively repaired, overhauled, or replaced. Most of these schools had multiple problems. In addition, about half reported at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition in their schools, such as poor ventilation, heating or lighting problems, or poor physical security. Most of these schools also had multiple unsatisfactory environmental conditions. Some district officials we spoke to told us that a major factor in the declining physical condition of the nation's schools has been decisions by school districts to defer vital maintenance and repair expenditures from year to year due to lack of funds.

BACKGROUND

Elementary and secondary education, the nation's largest public enterprise, is con-

ducted in over 80,000 schools in about 15,000 districts. America's public schools serve over 42 million students. About 70 percent of schools serve 27 million elementary students; 24 percent serve 13.8 million secondary students; and 6 percent serve 1.2 million students in combined elementary and secondary and other schools.

America's traditional one-room school houses have been replaced by larger facilities that may have more than one building. Comprising classroom, administrative, and other areas like gymnasiums and auditoriums, a school may have an original building, any number of permanent additions to that building, and a variety of temporary buildings—each constructed at different times. Buildings that have been well maintained and renovated at periodic intervals have a useful life equivalent to a new building.

A number of state courts as well as the Congress have recognized that a high-quality learning environment is essential to educating the nation's children. Crucial to establishing that learning environment is that children attend school in decent facilities. "Decent facilities" was specifically defined by one court as those that are " * * * structurally safe, contain fire safety measures, sufficient exits, an adequate and safe water supply, an adequate sewage disposal system, sufficient and sanitary toilet facilities and plumbing fixtures, adequate storage, adequate light, be in good repair and attractively painted as well as contain acoustics for noise control. . . ." ⁷ More recently, the Congress passed the Education Infrastructure Act of 1984,⁸ in which it stated that "improving the quality of public elementary and secondary schools will help our Nation meet the National Education Goals."⁹ Despite these efforts, studies and media reports on school facilities since 1965 indicate that many public elementary and secondary schools are in substandard condition and need major repairs due to leaking roofs, plumbing problems, inadequate heating systems, or other system failures.

Although localities generally finance construction and repair, with states playing a variety of roles,¹⁰ federal programs have monies to help localities offset the impact of federal activities, such as Impact Aid,¹¹ improving accessibility for the disabled, and managing hazardous materials. However, these programs do not totally offset all costs. For example, prior GAO work found that federal assistance provided for asbestos management under the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act of 1984 did not meet the needs of all affected schools. From 1988 through 1991, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received 1,746 qualified applications totaling \$599 million but only awarded \$157 million to 586 school districts it considered to have the worst asbestos problems. EPA was aware of the shortfall in federal assistance but believed that state and local governments should bear these costs.¹²

Because of the perception that federal programs—as well as current state and local financing mechanisms—did not begin to address the serious facilities needs of many of America's schools, the Congress passed the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994. The Congress then appropriated \$100 million for grants to schools for repair, renovation, alteration, or construction.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

To determine the amount of funding needed to improve inadequate facilities and the overall physical condition and prevalence of schools that need major repairs, we surveyed a national sample of schools and augmented

¹Footnotes at end of article.

the survey with visits to selected school districts. We used various experts to advise us on the design and analysis of this project. (See app. III for a list of advisers.)

We sent the survey to a nationally representative stratified random sample of about 10,000 schools in over 5,000 school districts. The sample was designed for the Department of Education's 1994 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), which is sponsored by the National Center for Educational Statistics.

We asked about (1) the physical condition of buildings and major building features, such as roofs; framing, floors, and foundations; exterior walls and interior finishes; plumbing; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); and electric power; (2) the status of environmental conditions, such as lighting, heating, and ventilation; (3) the amount districts and schools had spent in the last 3 years or plan to spend in the next 3 years due to federal mandates that require managing or correcting hazardous materials problems and providing access to all programs for all students; and (4) an estimate of the total cost of needed repairs, renovations, and modernizations to put all buildings in good overall condition. (See app. IV for a copy of the questionnaire.)

We directed the survey to those officials who are most knowledgeable about facilities—such as facilities directors and other central office administrators of the districts that housed our sampled school buildings. Our analyses are based on responses from 78 percent of the schools sampled. Analyses of non-respondent characteristics showed them to be similar to respondents. Findings from the survey have been statistically adjusted (weighted) to produce nationally representative estimates. All of the data are self-reported, and we did not independently verify their accuracy. See the forthcoming report on location and demographic analyses of schools in need of major repair for a detailed description of our data collection methods and analysis techniques, confidence intervals and the like.

In addition, we visited 41 schools in 10 selected school districts varying in location, size, and minority composition. During these visits, we observed facility conditions and interviewed district and local school officials to obtain information on facilities assessment, maintenance programs, resources, and barriers encountered in reaching facility goals. (See app. I for profiles on the districts visited.)

We conducted this study from April 1994 to December 1994 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

Schools Report Needing Billions to Improve Facilities

On the basis of our survey results, we estimate that the nation's schools need \$112 billion to complete all repairs, renovations, and modernizations required to restore facilities to good overall condition and to comply with federal mandates. (See fig. 1.) This amount includes \$65 billion—about \$2.8 million per school—needed by one-third of schools for which one or more entire building needs major repairs or replacement. Another 40 percent of schools (those in adequate or better condition) reported needing \$36 billion—\$1.2 million per school—to repair or replace one or more building features,¹³ such as the plumbing or roof or to make other corrective repairs.

[Figure 1 not reproduced in the RECORD.]

Almost two-thirds of the schools reported needing \$11 billion—an average of \$2 million per school—to comply with Federal mandates over the next 3 years. Of this amount, about \$6 billion (55 percent) is needed by

schools to make programs accessible to all students while about \$5 billion (45 percent) is needed to correct or remove hazardous substances such as asbestos, lead in water or paint, materials contained in USTs, radon, or meet other requirements.

This \$11 billion is in addition to the \$3.8 billion reported spent by three-quarters of all schools in the last 3 years to comply with Federal mandates. Of the money schools reported that they spent to comply with Federal mandates, \$2.3 billion (60 percent) went to correct or remove hazardous substances—primarily asbestos—while \$1.5 billion (40 percent) to make all programs accessible to all students.

[Figure 2 not reproduced in the RECORD.]

District officials we spoke with reported that they must also comply with many State and local mandates. For example, one urban district reported how Federal, State, and local regulations govern many of the same areas such as hazardous materials management and some aspects of indoor air quality. In addition, officials cited numerous State health and sanitation codes, State safety inspections for building features, as well as city zoning ordinances, local building codes, and historic preservation regulations. By 1992, the enormity of the requirements as well as decades of capital needs underfunding have resulted in only the 2 newest of their 123 schools complying with all current codes.

The district further described how these regulations and the accompanying cost could apply to the installation of air conditioning. For example, air conditioning could be installed in a building for \$500,000. However, this may also require an additional \$100,000 in fire alarm/smoke detection and emergency lighting systems as well as \$250,000 in architectural modifications for code compliance. Additionally, the location of outside chillers may be regulated by zoning and historic preservation ordinances.

In our visits to selected districts, officials from major urban areas reported needing billions to put their schools into good overall condition. (See table 1.)

TABLE 1.—MAJOR URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPORT NEEDING BILLIONS TO BRING SCHOOLS INTO GOOD OVERALL CONDITION

| (Dollars in billions) | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Urban school district | Amount needed |
| New York City | \$7.8 |
| Chicago | 2.9 |
| Washington, DC | 0.5 |
| New Orleans | 0.5 |

Two-Thirds of Schools Adequate but Millions of Students Must Attend Other One-Third

School officials reported that two-thirds of the Nation's schools are in adequate (or better) condition, at most needing only some preventive maintenance or corrective repair. However, about 14 million students must attend the remaining one-third (25,000 schools), in which at least one building is in need of extensive repair or replacement. Even more students, 28 million, attend schools nationwide that need one or more building feature extensively repaired, overhauled, or replaced or that contain an environmentally unsatisfactory condition,¹⁴ such as poor ventilation. (See tables 2 and 3.) These schools are distributed nationwide.

TABLE 2.—MILLIONS OF STUDENTS ATTEND SCHOOLS WITH LESS-THAN-ADEQUATE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

| Building feature | Number of schools | Estimate of students affected |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Roofs | 21,100 | 11,916,000 |
| Framing, floors, foundations | 13,900 | 7,247,000 |

TABLE 2.—MILLIONS OF STUDENTS ATTEND SCHOOLS WITH LESS-THAN-ADEQUATE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS—Continued

| Building feature | Number of schools | Estimate of students affected |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Exterior walls, finishes, windows, doors | 20,500 | 11,524,000 |
| Interior finishes, trims | 18,600 | 10,408,000 |
| Plumbing | 23,100 | 12,254,000 |
| Heating, ventilation, air conditioning | 28,100 | 15,456,000 |
| Electrical power | 20,500 | 11,033,000 |
| Electrical lighting | 19,500 | 10,837,000 |
| Life safety codes | 14,500 | 7,630,000 |

Note. See appendix IV for survey question.

Ranges for building or building feature condition were excellent, good, adequate, fair, poor, or replace. A building or building feature was considered in less-than-adequate condition if fair, poor, or replace was indicated.

TABLE 3.—MILLIONS OF STUDENTS ATTEND SCHOOLS WITH UNSATISFACTORY ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

| Environmental condition | Number of schools | Number of students affected |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Lighting | 12,200 | 6,682,000 |
| Heating | 15,000 | 7,888,000 |
| Ventilation | 21,100 | 11,559,000 |
| Indoor air quality | 15,000 | 8,353,000 |
| Acoustics for noise control | 21,900 | 11,044,000 |
| Physical security | 18,900 | 10,638,000 |

Note. See appendix IV for survey question.

Physical Condition

Specifically, about one-third of both elementary and secondary schools reported at least one entire building—original, addition, or temporary—in need of extensive repairs or replacement. About 60 percent (including some schools in adequate condition) reported that at least one building feature needed extensive repair, overhauling, or replacement; and three-quarters of those schools needed multiple features repaired. Features most frequently reported in need of such repairs were HVAC; plumbing; roofs; exterior walls, finishes, windows, and doors; electrical power; electrical lighting; and interior finishes and trims. (See fig. 4 and pictures in app. II.) Further, while 41 percent of all schools reported unsatisfactory energy efficiency, 73 percent of those schools with exterior walls, windows, and doors and 64 percent of those with roofs in need of major repair reported unsatisfactory energy efficiency. These unrepaired features not only reduce energy efficiency but may also have an adverse environmental effect on students.

As one Chicago elementary school principal told us, "Heat escapes through holes in the roof; the windows leak (the ones that are not boarded up) and let in cold air in the winter so that children must wear coats to class."

In New Orleans, the damage from Formosan termites has deteriorated the structure of many schools. In one elementary school, they even ate the books on the library shelves as well as the shelves themselves. (See app. II.) This, in combination with a leaking roof and rusted window wall, caused so much damage that a large portion of the 30-year-old school has been condemned. The whole school is projected to be closed in 1 year.

At a Montgomery County, Alabama, elementary school, a ceiling weakened by leaking water collapsed 40 minutes after the children left for the day.

Water damage from an old (original) boiler steam heating system at a 60-year-old junior high school in Washington, D.C., has caused such wall deterioration that an entire wing has been condemned and locked off from use. Steam damage is also causing lead-based wall paint to peel.

Raw sewage backs up on the front lawn of a Montgomery County, Alabama, junior high due to defective plumbing.

A New York City high school built around the turn of the century has served as a stable, fire house, factory, and office building. The school is overcrowded with 580 students, far exceeding the building's 400 student capacity. The building has little ventilation (no vents or blowers), despite many inside classrooms, and the windows cannot be opened, which makes the school unbearably hot in the summer. In the winter, heating depends on a fireman's stoking the coal furnace by hand.

In Ramona, California, where overcrowding is considered a problem, one elementary school is comprised entirely of portable buildings. It had neither a cafeteria nor auditorium and used a single relocatable room as a library, computer lab, music room, and art room.

Last year, during a windstorm in Raymond, Washington, the original windows of an elementary school built in 1925 were blown out, leaving shards of glass stuck in the floor. The children happened to be at the other end of the room. This wooden school is considered a fire hazard, and although hallways and staircases can act as chimneys for smoke and fire, there is only one external exit on the second floor.

In rural Grandview, Washington, overcrowded facilities are a problem. At one middle school, the original building was meant to house 450 students. Two additions and three portables have been added to accommodate 700 students. The school has seven staggered lunch periods. The portables have no lockers nor bathrooms and are cold in the winter and hot in the spring/summer.

In a high school in Chicago, the classroom floors are in terrible condition. Not only are floors buckling, so much tile is loose that students cannot walk in all parts of the school. The stairs are in poor condition and have been cited for safety violations. An outside door has been chained for 3 years to prevent students from falling on broken outside steps. Peeling paint has been cited as a fire hazard. Heating problems result in some rooms having no heat while other rooms are too warm. Leaks in the science lab caused by plumbing problems prevent the classes from doing experiments. Guards patrol the outside doors, and all students and visitors must walk through metal detectors before entering the school.

During our school visits, we found wide disparities between schools in the best or even average condition and schools in the worst condition, and these schools were sometimes in the same district.

Environmental Conditions

About 50 percent of the schools reported at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition; while 33 percent reported multiple unsatisfactory conditions. Of those, half reported four to six unsatisfactory conditions. Those conditions most frequently reported to be unsatisfactory were acoustics for noise control, ventilation, and physical security. (See fig. 5.) Additionally, three-quarters of schools responding had already spent funds during the last 3 years on requirements to remove or correct hazardous substances such as asbestos (57 percent), lead in water or paint (25 percent), materials in USTs such as fuel oil (17 percent), radon (18 percent), or other requirements (9 percent). Still two-thirds must spend funds in the next 3 years to comply with these same requirements— asbestos (45 percent), lead (18 percent), UST (12 percent), radon (12 percent), or other requirements (8 percent).

We saw numerous examples of unsatisfactory environmental conditions during our school visits:

In the Pomona, California, school district, the student body has increased 37 percent

over the last 10 years. Some schools must have five staggered lunch periods to accommodate all students. As a result of overcrowding, in one elementary school, students are housed in temporary buildings installed in 1948 that are unattractive, termite ridden, dark, and underequipped with electrical outlets. The temporary buildings get very hot as well as very cold at times because of poor insulation.

A Raymond, Washington, high school—a three-story structure with walls of unreinforced concrete with roof and floor not adequately secured to the walls that may not withstand earthquakes—contains steam pipes that are not only extremely noisy but provide too little or too much heat from room to room.

In Richmond, Virginia, schools in the district close early in September and May because the heat combined with poor ventilation and no air conditioning creates health problems for students and teachers, especially those with asthma.

A Chicago elementary school, built in 1893 and not painted for many years, had walls and ceilings with chipping and peeling lead-based paint, contains asbestos and has several boarded-up windows. Some rooms have inadequate lighting due to antiquated lighting fixtures that are no longer manufactured, so bulbs could not be replaced when burned out. One section of the school has been condemned due to structural problems. However, the auditorium and gym in this area are still used. The school was scheduled for closure in 1972 but remained open due to community opposition to the closure with promises of renovation by the district.

Insufficient Funds Contribute to Declining Physical Conditions

District officials we spoke to attributed the declining physical condition of America's schools primarily to insufficient funds, resulting in decisions to defer maintenance and repair¹⁵ expenditures from year to year. This has a domino effect. Deferred maintenance speeds up the deterioration of buildings, and costs escalate accordingly, further eroding the nation's multibillion dollar investment in school facilities. For example, in many schools we visited, unrepaired leaking roofs caused wall and floor damage that now must also be repaired. New York school officials told us that, while a typical roof repair is \$600, a full roof replacement costs \$300,000, and painting and plastering 10 rooms on a top floor that has been damaged by water infiltration costs \$67,500 plus \$4,500 to replace damaged floor tiles. In other words, for every \$1 not invested, the system falls another \$620 behind. In addition, unrepaired roofs cause energy costs to increase as heat escapes through holes, further depleting already limited funds. Further, due to lack of routine maintenance in the Chicago district, many schools have not been painted since they were painted 20 years ago with lead-based paint.

In an elementary school in New York City, repair problems had not been addressed since the school was built 20 years ago. Problems that could have been addressed relatively inexpensively years ago have now caused major problems such as sewage leaking into the first grade classrooms, a leaking roof that is structurally unsound, and crumbling walls.

Similarly, in Chicago, we visited an elementary school whose roof, the principal told us, had needed replacement for 20 years. Because it had only been superficially patched, rather than replaced, the persistent water damage had caused floors to buckle and plaster on the walls and ceilings to crumble. It had also flooded parts of the electric wiring system. One teacher in this

school would not turn on her lights during rainstorms for fear of electrical shock; in another classroom the public address system had been rendered unusable. Buckets had to be placed on the top floor of the school to catch the rain.

Some district officials we spoke with reported that they had difficulty raising money for needed repairs and renovation due to an anti-tax sentiment among voters resulting in the failure of bond issues as well as passage of property tax limitations. About one in three districts reported that they have had an average of two bond issues fail in the past 10 years. Further, school officials told us that often bond proceeds are far less than needed for repairs. For example, in Pomona, California, a \$62.5 million bond issue was submitted to the voters after a survey indicated that the \$200 million needed for repairs would be rejected. At the time of our survey, 6 percent of districts had a bond issue before the electorate. However, as one survey respondent commented, "the current public attitudes about the economy and education are generally so negative that passing a bond referendum is a fantasy." Other states have reduced school funding by passing property tax limitations. One survey respondent reported, "The state's contribution to local schools has dropped by 40 percent over the last few years * * *." According to another survey respondent, "This is a 1913 building which many of the taxpaying citizens feel was good enough for them * * * it is looked at as a monument in the community. Unless some form of outside funding is arranged, the citizens may never volunteer to replace this building since it will require raising their taxes."

Further, districts reported a lack of control over some spending priorities as they must fund a large portion of federal mandates for managing or correcting hazardous materials as well as making all programs accessible to all students. A recurring theme in comments from survey respondents was that "Unfunded federal and state mandates are one of the prime causes of lack of funds for replacing worn-out heating and cooling equipment, roofs, etc. * * *." Another survey respondent stated, "The ADA requirements were a major reason we had to replace two older schools. These costs, when added to other costs for renovations and modifications, resulted in overall costs for repairs, which exceeded the costs for new facilities." On the other hand, Chicago school officials told us that due to limited funds and the cost of installing one elevator being \$150,000, very few schools are able to provide program access to all students.

In looking at the uses of bond proceeds in the districts, the average amount of the most recently passed bond issue was \$7 million. While about 3 percent was provided for federal mandates, 54 percent was provided for school construction and 38 percent for repairing, renovating, and modernizing schools. The remaining 5 percent was spent for purchases of computers and telecommunications equipment.

Districts also said that they must sometimes divert funds initially planned for facilities maintenance and repair to purchase additional facilities due to overcrowding. This has resulted from both demographic and mandated changes. For example, additional funds were required for construction and purchase of portables due to large immigrant influxes as well as population shifts in districts or climbing enrollment due to overall population increases. Further, some mandated school programs, such as special education, require additional space for low pupil-teacher ratios.

One survey respondent described the competing demands on limited funds as follows:

"Our school facilities are not energy efficient or wired for modern technology. Our floor tile is worn out and the furniture is in poor shape. Our taxpayers don't want to put any more in schools. Our teachers want better pay. Our students and parents want more programs and technology. HELP!!!"

Building Age—By Itself—Is Not Significant

While some studies cite building age as a major factor contributing to deteriorating conditions, older buildings often have a more sound infrastructure than newer buildings. Buildings built in the early years of this century—or before—frequently were built for a life span of 50 to 100 years while more modern buildings, particularly those built after 1970, were designed to have a life span of only 20 to 30 years. A study of English school facilities found that the schools built during the 1960s and 1970s were built quickly and cheaply and have caused continuing maintenance problems.¹⁶ As one survey respondent commented, "the buildings in this district are approximately 20 years old, but the exterior siding was inferior from the beginning * * * it has deteriorated and ruptured extensively. * * *" A principal in Chicago stated about her 1970s building, "our most pressing problem is that the school is crumbling down around us * * *. From the beginning, this building has had serious roof problems. Water leaks throughout the building from the roof and from the walls. Pools of water collect in the floors of the classrooms. One wall has buckled and is held in place with a steel stake. The windows leak and let cold air in * * *." According to some school officials, the misperception about the age factor has been reinforced because older buildings are sometimes not maintained but allowed to deteriorate until replaced.

Three schools we visited in Chicago presented a good example of the difficulty of using age to define condition. All three were built between 1926 and 1930 and had the same design and basic structure. Today, their condition could not be more different. One school had been allowed to deteriorate (had received no renovation since the 1970s) until it reached a point where local school officials classified it as among those schools in the worst physical condition. The second school had received some recent renovation because of community complaints about its condition and was classified as a typical school for the school district. The third school had been well maintained throughout the years, and now school officials classified it as a school in the best physical condition. (See pictures contrasting the three schools in fig. 6.)

[Figure 6 not reproduced in Record.]

CONCLUSIONS

Two-thirds of America's schools report that they are in adequate (or better) overall condition. Still, many of these schools need to repair or replace one or more building feature, manage or correct hazardous materials, or make all programs accessible to all students. Other schools have more serious problems. About 14 million students are required to attend the remaining one-third of schools that have one or more entire buildings in less-than-adequate condition, needing extensive repair or replacement. These schools are distributed nationwide.

Our survey results indicate that to complete all repairs, renovations, or modernizations needed to put school buildings into good overall condition and comply with federal mandates would require a projected investment of \$112 billion. Continuing to delay maintenance and repairs will defer some of these costs but will also lead to the need for greater expenditures as conditions deteriorate, further eroding the nation's multibillion dollar investment in school infrastruc-

ture. In addition, if maintenance continues to be deferred, a large proportion of schools that are in only adequate condition and need preventive maintenance or corrective repair will soon deteriorate to less-than-adequate condition.

As one survey respondent observed, "It is very difficult to get local communities to accept this burden (facilities construction/renovation). Our district, one of the wealthiest in the state, barely passed a bare bones budget to renovate. It must be a national crisis."

AGENCY COMMENTS

We spoke with Department of Education officials at the National Center for Educational Statistics who reviewed a draft of this report and found the report well done and generally approved of the approach. In addition, staff from the Office of the Undersecretary provided us with technical comments that we incorporated into our report. They did not comment, however, on our methodology, reserving judgment for the detailed technical appendix in our forthcoming report.

Copies of this report are also being sent to appropriate House and Senate committees and all members, the Secretary of Education, and other interested parties.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Eleanor L. Johnson, Assistant Director, who may be reached at (202) 512-7209. A list of major contributors to this report can be found in appendix VII.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA G. MORRA,
Director, Education and Employment Issues.

APPENDIX I

DISTRICT PROFILES

We visited 41 schools in 10 selected school districts that varied by location, size, and ethnic composition. During these visits, we observed facility conditions and interviewed district and local school officials to get information on facilities assessment, maintenance programs, resources, and barriers encountered in reaching facilities goals. We asked officials to show us examples of "best," "typical," and "worst" schools and verified the reliability of these designations with others. In some small districts, we visited all schools.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Overview

TABLE I.1.—CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

| | |
|---|--|
| Enrollment | 400,000. |
| Number of schools | 553. |
| Racial composition | 56 percent black. 30 percent Hispanic. 14 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 67 percent. |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs ¹⁷ . | 2.9 billion. |

Chicago is a large urban district whose school officials rated their school facilities, overall, as in fair to poor condition. Widespread disparities exist, however, between schools in the best and worst condition. About 15 percent of the schools were built before 1900, and over half are more than 50 years old. Slightly more than 25 percent were built during the fifties and sixties to handle the baby boom, and 20 percent were built during the last 25 years. However, a number of the newer structures are temporary buildings or "demountables" (large sections of prefabricated frames put together on a cement slab). These buildings now show major structural damage, and the seams of the buildings are splitting apart. Permanent buildings also have structural damage. For example, we visited two schools that had chained exit doors to prevent students from

either being hit by debris from a cracking exterior brick wall—in a "typical" Chicago school—or falling on collapsing front steps—in a "worst" school.

Schools in the worst condition need new exterior building envelopes (roofs, tuck pointing, windows, and doors), have asbestos or lead-based paint, suffer ceiling and floor problems from leaky roofs, and need to replace outdated electrical and plumbing systems. Schools in the best condition tend to be newer, need few or no repairs, have a more flexible space design, contain electrical systems capable of housing new technology, have air conditioning, and offer brightly colored walls and low ceilings. However, condition does not depend on age alone; three schools we visited typifying best, worst, and typical were all over 60 years old.

Officials report that their biggest facility issues are deferred maintenance and overcrowding. They say that a shortage of funds, caused by a lack of taxpayer support, hinders the district from either upgrading or maintaining its facilities. About 30 to 40 percent of needed repairs have been deferred from year to year for decades with priority given to repairs that ensure student safety. Additionally, some federal mandates—particularly lead and asbestos removal abatement programs—have caused major expenditures as most schools built between 1920 and 1979 contain asbestos, and all schools were painted with lead paint before 1980.

Overcrowding began in the seventies with a great increase in the Hispanic population. However, in some instances, individual schools may be overcrowded, while neighboring schools remain underenrolled. One official told us that this is due in part to the problems caused by gang "turf" and the threat of extreme violence or even death to individuals who wander into "enemy" territory. School officials are reluctant to reassign students if the receiving schools are in territory controlled by a different gang than that of the overcrowded school the children presently attend.

Facilities Financing

Officials estimate that they need \$2.9 billion to put schools in good overall condition. While the primary source of school funding is local property taxes, smaller amounts of state and federal funds are also used. Although the 1994 school facilities budget is \$270 million (10 percent of the total education budget), only about \$50 million is used for maintenance and repair. To obtain funds for building and renovating, the district relies on bonds, we were told, as politicians hesitate to ask anti-tax voters for even a minimal increase in taxes.

GRANDVIEW, WASHINGTON

Overview

TABLE I.2.—GRANDVIEW, WASHINGTON

| | |
|--|---|
| Enrollment | 2,800. |
| Number of schools | 5. |
| Racial composition | 67 percent Hispanic. 32 percent white. 1 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 65 percent. |
| Type | Small town, rural. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs. | \$24.5 million. |

This small agricultural town in rural Washington has five schools. While the high school, built in 1978, is in excellent condition, the other four schools, built between 1936 and 1957, need to be totally renovated or replaced over the next 10-20 years. In addition, a student population increasing annually at about 4 percent since 1986 has resulted in overcrowding. Although Grandview's middle school was built to house 475 students, current enrollment stands at about

700. One elementary school designed for 375 students now has 464. Another crowded elementary school converted the gymnasium into two classrooms. The district currently has 14 portable classrooms in use and anticipates needing 4 more in the next 3 years.

Facilities Financing

Grandview schools have an annual budget of \$13.5 million, about 2 percent of which goes for maintenance. They receive funding from local tax levies and from the state and general apportionment of about \$4,000 per student. They are also eligible for state equalization funding contingent on passing their levy. New construction and renovation are funded by bond issues and state funding assistance contingent on passing the bond issue. An \$11 million bond issue to build a new middle school to alleviate crowding failed in February 1994 and again in the fall of 1994.

Funding problems include public resistance to raising taxes and decreased state assistance due to a reduction in the timber sales on the public lands that support school construction funding.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA

Overview

TABLE I.3.—MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA

| | |
|--|--|
| Enrollment | 35,000. |
| Number of schools | 54. |
| Racial composition | 45 percent black. 55 percent white. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 58 percent. |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs. | \$150 million. |

Many of Montgomery County school facilities are old but are generally in fair condition. However, approximately 10 percent of the schools need to be replaced. In the last 20 years, about 8 schools were built. The oldest building is a portion of an elementary school built in 1904.

Schools built during the early 1900's are not air conditioned and need new roofs. At one elementary school we visited, a ceiling recently collapsed just 40 minutes after the children left for the day. Some schools have had students in "temporary" buildings for years. In addition, many repairs and renovations are needed to maintain schools, accommodate overcrowding and comply with federal mandates.

Overcrowding problems have resulted in the use of 284 portable buildings to house students. In the 1980's, Montgomery County's student population increased, creating the need for new elementary populations at some schools through voluntary student movement, through a minority to majority transfer process. This process allowed minority students to attend any school in the county with a more than 50-percent majority of white students. Primarily, we were told, minority students chose to attend schools on the east side of town because the school facilities were better equipped and nicer. To provide adequate instructional space for the influx of children at the east side schools, portable rooms were added.

Facilities Financing

Lack of money prohibits the district from making needed facilities repairs. The operations and maintenance budget has dropped 10 percent in the past 3 to 4 years. The current facilities budget is \$1 million of a \$6 million total education budget. The district has no capital improvement budget. On June 28, 1994, voters defeated a local tax referendum for bond money the county had planned to use to remove all portable buildings, make all needed repairs and renovations and build new schools located so that

children from the west side of town would not have to travel so far for better school accommodations.

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

Overview

TABLE I.4.—NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

| | |
|---|--|
| Enrollment | 85,000. |
| Number of schools | 124. |
| Racial composition | 90 percent black. 10 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch | 85 percent. |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs | \$500 million. |

New Orleans' public schools are rotting away. Suffering from years of neglect due to lack of funds for repair and maintenance, New Orleans students attend schools suffering from hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of uncorrected water and termite damage. Fire code violations are so numerous that school officials told us, "We don't count them—we weigh them."

Most of the buildings have no air conditioning, though the average morning relative humidity in New Orleans is 87 percent. One high school recently had an electrical fire that started in the 80-year-old timbers in the roof. No one was hurt but the students were sent to other buildings for the rest of the year. An elementary school, built in 1964, was condemned and closed in 1994 due to water and termite damage.

Facilities Financing

New Orleans uses local property taxes and federal asbestos loans to upgrade its buildings. The district has submitted five bond issues to the voters in the last 20 years, for a total of \$175 million, but only two of the bond issues have passed. The school facilities annual budget in 1994 is \$6 million or 2 percent of the total education budget. This has decreased in the past 10 years from \$9 million (4 percent of the education budget).

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Overview

TABLE I.5.—NEW YORK, NEW YORK

| | |
|--|--|
| Enrollment | 700,000. |
| Number of schools | 1,229. |
| Racial composition | 38 percent black. 36 percent Hispanic. 19 percent white. 7 percent Asian. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch | 64 percent. |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs .. | \$7.8 billion. |

New York has extremely diverse school facilities—while conditions are generally bad, some schools are models for 21st century learning. The "best" school we saw—a \$151 million state-of-the-art science high school—was only blocks away from an example of the "worst"—another high school in a 100-year-old building that had served as a stable, fire house, factory, and office building. This high school's elevators do not work, its interior classrooms have no windows, it has little ventilation and no air conditioning, and its heating depends on a fireman's stoking the coal furnace by hand.

Overcrowding and generally poor condition of the school buildings—many over 100-years-old and in need of major renovation and repair—are New York's main facilities problems. Since the fiscal crisis in the 1970s, maintenance and repair of the city's school buildings have been largely neglected. Twenty years of neglect compound problems that could have been corrected much more cheaply had they been corrected earlier. As the city seeks the funds for repairing leaking roofs, plumbing problems that cause sewage to seep into elementary school classrooms,

and ceilings that have caved in, its school enrollment is dramatically increasing. After losing more than 10 percent of its population in the sixties, a vast migration of non-English speaking residents in the last 3 years has resulted in overcrowding in 50 percent of New York's schools. One school is operating at over 250 percent of capacity. Because classrooms are unavailable while under repair, in some cases improvements are postponed.

Facilities Financing

The New York City schools' maintenance, repair, and capital improvement budget is approved annually by the city council. While the state provides some loan forgiveness, the city is largely responsible for all of the costs.

Each school is allocated a maintenance and repair budget based solely on square footage. As a result, schools—even new schools—frequently cannot repair problems as they arise, which often leads to costly repairs in the future. In 1988, the estimated cost of upgrading, modernizing, and expanding the school system by the year 2000 was over \$17 billion. The total capital backlog at that time was over \$5 billion. The capital plan for fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1994 was funded at \$4.3 billion: barely 20 percent of the amount requested.

POMONA, CALIFORNIA

Overview

TABLE I.6.—POMONA, CALIFORNIA

| | |
|--|--|
| Enrollment | 29,000. |
| Number of schools | 35. |
| Racial composition | 67 percent Hispanic. 13 percent black. 12 percent white. 8 percent Asian-Pacific. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 70 percent. |
| Type | Suburban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs. | \$200 million. |

Although district officials generally describe their school facilities overall as "adequate to fair," some individual schools are excellent while others have severe problems. The oldest school was built in 1932. The worst schools were built in the mid-1950s to early 1960s and face many repair problems—poor plumbing, ventilation, lighting, leaking roofs, and crumbling walls. In contrast, one new school that opened last fall is state-of-the-art. Only three schools have been built in the last 20 years.

Like many school districts in California, Pomona's biggest facilities issue is overcrowding. Because the student body has increased 37 percent in the last 10 years, the district relies on what school officials call "God-awful" portables—bungalows that are ugly, not air conditioned, termite-ridden, dark, and have too few electrical outlets. The portables generally provide sufficient classroom space but leave schools suffering from a severe lack of common-use areas and space for student movement. For example, some schools have to schedule five lunch periods to handle overcrowded campuses.

Facilities financing

In 1991 the district passed a \$62.5 million bond measure—significantly short of the \$200 million it says it needs to put its schools in good overall condition. Officials attribute their facilities' financial problems to state cutbacks, the passage of Proposition 13 in 1979, which greatly reduced local tax revenues, and unfunded federal mandates that drain the district's budget. As a result, the district must function without enough facilities staff and continue to defer maintenance and repair while using temporary "band-aid" measures. However, the passage of Pomona's 1991 bond measure and two 1992 state bond measures increased the district's capital improvement budget to \$14 million or about 16

percent of the district's \$85 million education budget. Pomona's maintenance and repair budget is usually about 2 percent of the education budget.

RAMONA, CALIFORNIA

Overview

TABLE I.7.—RAMONA, CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|---|
| Enrollment | 6,500. |
| Number of schools | 9. |
| Racial composition | 78 percent white. 18 percent Hispanic. 4 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch | 35 percent. |
| Type | Small town, rural. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs | \$4 million. |

Ramona is a small but growing rural community in central San Diego County. Four of its nine schools are more than 25 years old; its oldest was built over 50 years ago. Although Ramona's oldest schools tend to be well constructed, they suffer from seriously deteriorating wiring and plumbing and inadequate or nonexistent heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and communications systems. The school district also suffers from the lack of an adequate, stable funding source that would allow it to modernize and expand its facilities. Consequently, most of Ramona's schools are underbuilt and must rely on portables for overcrowding. One elementary school we visited was comprised of only portables, with no cafeteria nor auditorium. One portable served as a library, computer lab, music room, and art room. In contrast, two new schools were built in the last 5 years that are bright, have flexible space and are wired for the latest technology. The portables are difficult to maintain, and repair costs are higher in the long run than if real additions had been built in the first place. The most common repair needs in Ramona's schools are roofs, signal systems (alarms, bells, and intercoms), and paving.

Facilities financing

Officials attribute its facilities' funding problems to the community's inability to pass a bond issue—two attempts in the past 8 years have failed—their small rural district's competitive disadvantage in applying for state funds, and the state's emphasis on building new schools rather than retrofitting.

The district's facilities budget varies each year but comprises (1) a new building program that uses matching state funds, (2) a routine maintenance budget that is about 2 percent of the district's \$30 million education budget (\$600,000), and (3) a deferred maintenance budget that is 0.5 percent of the education budget (\$150,000) and is supposed to be matched by the state but rarely is in full.

RAYMOND, WASHINGTON

Overview

TABLE I.8.—RAYMOND, WASHINGTON

| | |
|--|---|
| Enrollment | 760. |
| Number of schools | 3. |
| Racial composition | 69 percent white. 21 percent Asian. 5 percent Hispanic. 5 percent Native American. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch | 50 percent. |
| Type | Small town, rural. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs .. | \$14 million. |

Raymond is a western Washington town that has not recovered from the timber industry downturn of the early 1980s. The town and student populations have declined, and the demographics have changed dramatically. All three Raymond schools are old and two may be unsafe. The high school was built in 1925. It is a three-story structure of unreinforced concrete that may not safely withstand the possible earthquakes in the

area. In addition, the building's systems are old and inadequate. Steam pipes are noisy and provide too little or too much heat from room to room. One 1924 elementary school is built of wood—a potential fire hazard—and will be closed in 2 years. A third school was built during the 1950s and will receive a major remodeling and new addition next year.

Facilities financing

Raymond recently passed its first bond issue since the 1950s to fund the remodeling of and addition for an elementary school. A bond issue proposed in 1990 to build a new facility for grades kindergarten to 12 failed. The public does not want to spend money on school maintenance and construction, and the tax base is too low to raise adequate funding. According to the school superintendent, the Columbia Tower (a Seattle skyscraper) has a higher assessed value than the entire district of Raymond. The district's budget is \$4 million, which is made up of local levies and state funding. Over the next 2 years, they will ask for a levy increase of \$75,000, specifically for needed repairs.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

Overview

TABLE I.9.—RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

| | |
|--|--|
| Enrollment | 28,000 |
| Number of schools | 58. |
| Racial composition | 88 percent black. 12 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 68 percent |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs. | \$100 million. |

Renovation presents the biggest facility issue for the Richmond schools. Their 58 buildings are visually appealing yet old-fashioned compared with 21st century learning standards. Many, if not most, of the district's renovation needs are due to the buildings' age: The average building was built around the time of World War II. Ninety percent of the buildings lack central air conditioning; many schools close early in September and May/June because the heat and poor ventilation creates breathing problems for the children.

In the past 20 years, 20 schools have been closed; only 2 new schools have opened.

Facilities financing

Richmond is a poor city: the average family income is \$17,700. The facilities director says he usually asks for \$18 million but only gets \$3 million and about 3 percent of the education budget for maintenance. He says city planners and voters view the buildings as architectural landmarks and think of them in terms of 1950s standards of learning. Also, the money he would have used for renovations has been spent on meeting "federal codes."

The district has tried twice to get the state to match funds for deferred maintenance but was rejected each time. New construction gets funded through bond issues.

WASHINGTON, DC

Overview

TABLE I.10.—WASHINGTON, DC

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Enrollment | 85,000. |
| Number of schools | 164. |
| Racial composition | 95 percent black. 5 percent other. |
| Students on free or reduced lunch ... | 62 percent. |
| Type | Urban. |
| Minimum estimated to make all repairs. | \$460 million. |

With a capacity of 140,000 students, many of Washington's school facilities are old and underused. Only 22 schools of 164—mainly el-

ementary—have been built in the last 20 years. According to the district's facilities manager, the average age of Washington's schools is 50 years. While structurally sound, these older buildings house old—sometimes original—systems, such as the heating and air conditioning or electrical systems, which have major repair problems.

Washington schools have many urgent repair needs, according to the district facilities manager. Old boiler systems have steam leakages causing such infrastructure erosion that whole school wings have been condemned and cordoned off; leaky roofs are causing ceilings to crumble on teachers' and students' desks; fire doors are warped and stick. In addition, the district was under court order to fix the most serious of an estimated \$90 million worth of fire code violations by the start of the 1994-95 school year. These violations included locked or blocked exit doors, defective or missing fire doors, broken alarms, malfunctioning boilers, and unsafe electrical systems. Many of the schools also lack air conditioning and are so poorly insulated that children must wear coats to keep warm in winter weather.

Facilities financing

From the school district's total operating and capital budget of about \$552 million in fiscal year 1994, about \$100 million (18 percent) was allocated to school maintenance and capital improvement. Of this, approximately \$25 million (including salaries) goes to the district's facilities office, with the balance given directly to the schools for their on-site maintenance and operations. The building maintenance budget has declined from about 18 percent to 14 percent of the total school budget in the past 10 years.

Funds for school maintenance and repair and capital improvements come from the District of Columbia's general budget, over which the Congress has authority. Until 1985, the District's capital improvement program was financed only through money borrowed from the U.S. Treasury. After 1985, the District was given authority to sell general obligation bonds in the capital markets. From 1985 through 1994, the schools received \$314 million to finance capital improvements: \$232 million through general obligation bond issuances, \$59 million borrowed from the U.S. Treasury, and \$23 million from District tax revenue.

[Appendix II not reproduced in the RECORD.]

APPENDIX III

PROJECT ADVISERS

The following individuals advised this report either by (a) serving on our expert panel on January 31, 1994; (b) helping with the development of our questionnaire; or (c) reviewing a draft report.

Allen C. Abend,^{abc} Chief, School Facilities Branch, Maryland State Department of Education.

Phillip T. Chen,^b Construction Technician, Division of Construction, Department of Facilities Management, Board of Education of Montgomery County (Maryland).

Greg Coleman,^{ab} Capital Asset Management Administrator, Office of Infrastructure Support Services, U.S. Department of Energy.

Laurel Cornish,^a Director of Facilities, U.S. Department of Education, Impact Aid, School Facilities Branch.

(Mr.) Vivian A. D'Souza,^b Acting Director, Division of Maintenance, Department of Facilities Management, Board of Education of Montgomery County (Maryland).

Kenneth J. Ducote,^{bc} Director, Department of Facility Planning, New Orleans Public Schools.

Robert Feild,^a Director, Committee on Architecture for Education, American Institute of Architects.

William Fowler,^{abc} Education Statistician, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Lawrence Friedman,^{bc} Associate Director, Regional Policy Information Center, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Thomas E. Glass,^b Professor, Department of Leadership and Educational Policy Studies, Northern Illinois University.

Terence C. Golden,^a Chairman, Bailey Realty.

Thomas Grooms,^a Program Manager, Federal Design Office, National Endowment for the Arts.

Shirley J. Hansen,^a President, Hansen Associates.

Alton C. Halavin,^b Assistant Superintendent for Facilities Services, Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax County, Virginia.

Bruce Hunter,^b Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators.

Eddie L. King,^b Auditor, Inspector General, Department of Education.

Andrew Lemer,^a President Matrix Group, Inc.

William H. McAfee III,^b Facilities Manager, Division of Facilities Management, District of Columbia Public Schools.

Roger Scott,^{bc} Program Director, Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Richard L. Siegel,^a (Former) Director of Facilities Services, Smithsonian Institution.

Lisa J. Walker,^a Executive Director, Education Writers Association.

Tony J. Wall,^{bc} Executive Director/CEO, The Council of Educational Facilities Planners International.

William M. Wilder,^b Director, Department of Facilities Management, Board of Education of Montgomery County (Maryland).

APPENDIX IV

GAO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

DEAR SURVEY RESPONDENT: The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) has been asked by the United States Congress to obtain information about school facilities, such as physical condition and capacity. While several limited studies have been done recently, no comprehensive national study of school facilities has been done in 30 years.

The Congress needs this information to shape the details of federal policy, such as funding for the School Infrastructure Act of 1994. All responses are confidential. We will report your data only in statistical summaries so that individuals cannot be identified.

This questionnaire should be answered by district level personnel who are very familiar with the school facilities in this district. You may wish to consult with other district level personnel or with school level personnel, such as principals, in answering some questions.

We are conducting this study with only a sample of randomly selected schools, so the data on your school(s) is very important because it represents many other schools. Please respond even if the schools selected are new. If you have questions about the survey, please call Ms. Ella Cleveland (202) 512-7066 or Ms. Edna Saltzman (313) 256-8109.

Mail your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within 2 weeks to: Ms. Ella Cleveland, U.S. General Accounting Office, NGB, Suite 650, 441 G St., NW, Washington, DC 20548.

Thank you for your cooperation in this very important effort.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA G. MORRA,
Director, Education and Employment.

SECTION I.—DISTRICT INFORMATION

1. What would probably be the total cost of all repairs/renovations/modernizations required to put all of this district's schools in good overall condition? Give your best estimate. If all of this district's schools are already in good (or better) overall condition, enter zero.

Overall condition includes both physical condition and the ability of the schools to meet the functional requirements of instructional programs. Good condition means that only routine maintenance or minor repair is required.

\$ _____ .00
2. On which of the sources listed below is this estimate based? Circle ALL that apply. Does not apply—all schools already in good (or better) overall condition _____ 0

Sources
Facilities inspection(s)/assessment(s) performed within the last three years by licensed professionals _____ 1
Repair/renovation/modernization work already being performed and/or contracted for _____ 2
Capital improvement/facilities master plan or schedule _____ 3
My best professional judgment _____ 4
Opinions of other district administrators _____ 5
Other (specify: _____) _____ 6

3. During the last 3 years, how much money has been spent in this district on the federal mandates listed below? Include money spent in 1993-1994. If exact amounts are not readily available, give your best estimate. Enter zero if none. Circle "1" if spending was not needed.

| Federal mandates | Spending not needed | Amount spent |
|---|---------------------|--------------|
| Accessibility for student with disabilities _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Managing/correcting: | | |
| Asbestos _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Lead in water/paint _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs) _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Radon _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Other (specify: _____) _____ | 1 | \$ _____ .00 |

4. How much money will probably need to be spent in this district during the next 3 years on these federal mandates? If exact amounts are not readily available, give your best estimate. If spending will not be needed, circle "1." If unknown, circle "2."

| Federal mandates | Spending will not be needed | Amount unknown | Probably needed |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Accessibility for students with disabilities _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Managing/correcting: | | | |
| Asbestos _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Lead in water/paint _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs) _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Radon _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Other (specify: _____) _____ | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |

5. Are these spending needs for federal mandates included in your answer to question 1? Circle one for each mandate listed.

| Federal mandates | Does not apply— not needed/ unknown | Yes— included | No—not included |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------|
| Accessibility for students with disabilities _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Managing/correcting: | | | |
| Asbestos _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Lead in water/paint _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Radon _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other (specify: _____) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |

6. In what year was a bond issue most recently passed for this district? Enter the last two digits of the year.

19 _____.
7. What was the total amount of this most recently passed bond issue?

\$ _____ .00
8. How much money did this most recently passed bond issue provide for the items listed below? Enter zero if none.

| Items | Amount Provided |
|---|-----------------|
| Construction of new schools _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Repair/renovation/modernization of existing schools _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Asbestos removal _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Removal of Underground Storage Tank (USTs) _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Removal of other environmental conditions _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Purchase of computers _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Purchase of telecommunications equipment _____ | \$ _____ .00 |
| Access for students with disabilities _____ | \$ _____ .00 |

9. During the last 10 years, how many bond issues have failed to pass?

_____ bond issues failed to pass

10. Do you currently have a bond issue before the electorate? Circle one.

Yes.....1

No.....2

SECTION II.—SCHOOL INFORMATION

This section asks about the first school shown on the Instruction Sheet enclosed with this survey.

1. Name of school: Please enter the name of the first school shown on the Instruction Sheet.

School's survey identification number: Please enter the survey identification number of the first school shown on the instruction sheet.

2. If any of the following statements are true for this school, please circle the number of the appropriate answer. Circle all that apply.

This school teaches only postsecondary (beyond grade 12) or adult education students _____ 1
This school is no longer in operation _____ 2
This school is a private school, not a public school _____ 3
This institution or organization is not a school _____ 4

3. Which of the following grades did this school offer around the first of October, 1993: Circle all that apply.

Grade 1 _____ 1
Grade 2 _____ 2
Grade 3 _____ 3
Grade 4 _____ 4
Grade 5 _____ 5
Grade 6 _____ 6
Grade 7 _____ 7
Grade 8 _____ 8
Grade 9 _____ 9
Grade 10 _____ 10
Grade 11 _____ 11
Grade 12 _____ 12
Pre-kindergarten _____ 13
Ungraded (including upgraded special education students) _____ 15

Stop! If you marked any of the above statements go to the next school information section.

4. What was the total number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students enrolled in this school around the first of October 1993?

total FTE students

5. Does this school house any of its students in instructional facilities located off of its site, such as rented space in another school, church, etc.? Circle one.

Yes...1

No...2----> go to question 8

6. How many of this school's Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students are housed in off-site instructional facilities?

_____ FTE students housed off-site

7. How many total square feet of off-site instructional facilities does this school have? If exact measurements are not readily available, give your best estimate.

total square feet off-site _____

8. How many original buildings, attached and/or detached permanent additions to the original buildings, and temporary buildings does this school have on-site? If this school does not have any permanent additions or any temporary buildings on-site, enter zero for these categories.

On-Site Buildings—Number _____

Original buildings—_____

Attached and/or detached permanent additions to original buildings—_____

Temporary buildings—_____

9. How many total square feet do the original buildings, the attached and/or detached permanent additions, and the temporary buildings have? If exact measurements are not readily available, give your best estimate. If this school does not have any permanent additions or any temporary buildings on-site, enter zero for these categories.

On-Site Buildings—Total Square Feet _____

Original buildings—_____

Attached and/or detached permanent additions to original buildings—_____

Temporary buildings—_____

10. What is the overall condition of the original buildings, the attached and/or detached permanent additions, and the temporary buildings? Refer to the rating scale shown below, and circle one for each category of building. If this school does not have any permanent additions or any temporary buildings onsite, circle "0."

Overall condition includes both physical condition and the ability of the buildings to meet the functional requirements of instructional programs.

Rating Scale

Excellent: new or easily restorable to "like new" condition; only minimal routine maintenance required.

Good: only routine maintenance or minor repair required.

Adequate: some preventive maintenance and/or corrective repair required.

Fair: fails to meet code and functional requirement in some cases; failure(s) are inconvenient; extensive corrective maintenance and repair required.

Poor: consistent substandard performance; failure(s) and disruptive and costly; fails most code and functional requirements; requires constant attention, renovation, or replacement. Major corrective repair or overhaul required.

Replace: Non-operational or significantly substantial performance. Replacement required.

| On-site buildings | School does not have | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Fair | Poor | Replace |
|--|----------------------|-----------|------|----------|------|------|---------|
| Original buildings | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Attached and/or detached permanent additions to original buildings | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Temporary buildings | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

11. What would probably be the total cost of all repairs/renovations/modernizations required to put this school's on-site buildings in good overall condition? Give your best estimate. If this school's on-site buildings are already in good (or better) overall condition, enter zero.

\$ _____ .00

12. On which of the sources listed below is this estimate based? Circle ALL that apply. Does not apply—already in good (or better) overall condition _____

Sources

| Facilities | inspection(s)/assessments(s) performed within the last three years by licensed professionals | |
|--|--|---|
| Repair/renovation/modernization work already being performed and/or contracted for | | 1 |
| Capital improvement/facilities master plan or schedule | | 2 |
| My best professional judgment | | 3 |
| Opinions of other district administrators | | 4 |
| Other (specify: _____) | | 5 |
| | | 6 |

13. During the last 3 years, how much money has been spent on the federal mandates listed below for this school's on-site buildings? Include money spent in 1993-1994. If exact amounts are not readily available, give your best estimate. Enter zero if none. Circle "1" if spending was not needed.

Federal mandates—spending not needed

| Accessability for students with disabilities—1 | Amount spent |
|--|--------------|
| Managing/correcting: | |
| Asbestos—1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Lead in water/paint—1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs)—1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Radon—1 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Other (specify: _____)—1 | \$ _____ .00 |

14. How much money will probably need to be spent during the next 3 years on these federal mandates for this school's on-site buildings? If exact amounts are not readily available, give your best estimate. If spending will not be needed, circle "1." If unknown, circle "2."

| Federal mandates | Spending will not be needed | Unknown | Amount probably needed |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|
| Accessability for students with disabilities | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Managing/correcting: | | | |
| Asbestos | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Lead in water/paint | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs) | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Radon | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |
| Other (specify: _____) | 1 | 2 | \$ _____ .00 |

15. Are these spending needs for federal mandates included in your answer to question 11? Circle one for each mandate listed.

| Federal mandates | Does not apply—Not needed/unknown | Yes—Included | No—Not included |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Accessability for students with disabilities | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Managing/correcting: | | | |
| Asbestos | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Lead in water/paint | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Underground storage tanks (USTs) ... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Radon | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Other (specify: _____) | 1 | 2 | 3 |

16. Overall, what is the physical condition of each of the building features listed below for this school's on-site buildings? Refer to the rating scale shown below, and circle one for EACH building feature listed.

Rating Scale

Excellent: new or easily restorable to "like new" condition; only minimal routine maintenance required.

Good: only routine maintenance or minor repair required.

Adequate: some preventive maintenance and/or corrective repair required.

Fair: fails to meet code or functional requirement in some cases; failure(s) are inconvenient; extensive corrective maintenance and repair required.

Poor: consistent substandard performance; failure(s) are disruptive and costly; fails

most code and functional requirements; requires constant attention, renovation, or replacement. Major corrective repair or overhaul required.

Replace: Non-operational or significantly substandard performance. Replacement required.

| Building feature | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Fair | Poor | Replace |
|---|-----------|------|----------|------|------|---------|
| Roofs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Framing, floors, foundations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Exterior walls finishes, windows, doors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Interior finishes, trims | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Plumbing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Heating, ventilation, air conditioning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Electrical power | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Electrical lighting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Life safety codes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

17. Do this school's on-site buildings have sufficient capability in each of the communications technology elements listed below to meet the functional requirements of modern educational technology? Circle one for EACH element listed.

| Technology elements | Very sufficient | Moderately sufficient | Somewhat sufficient | Not sufficient |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Computers for instructional use | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Computer printers for instructional use | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Computer networks for instructional use | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Modems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Telephone lines for modems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Telephones in instructional areas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Television sets | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Laser disk players/VCRs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Conduits/raceways for computer/network cables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Fiber optic cable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Electrical wiring for computers/communications technology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Electrical power for computers/communications technology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

18. How many computers for instructional use does this school have? Include computers at both on-site buildings and off-site instructional facilities.

19. How well do this school's on-site buildings meet the functional requirement of the activities listed below? Circle one for EACH activity listed.

| Activity | Very well | Moderately well | Somewhat well | Not well at all |
|---|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Small group instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Large group (50 or more students) instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Storage of alternative student assessment materials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Display of alternative student assessment materials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Parent support activities, such as tutoring, planning, making materials, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Social/Health Care Services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Teachers' planning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Private areas for student counseling and testing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Laboratory science | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Library/Media Center | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Day care | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Before/after school care | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

20. How satisfactory or unsatisfactory is each of the following environmental factors in this school's on-site buildings? Circle one for each factor listed.

| Environmental factor | Very satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory |
|--|-------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Lighting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Heating | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Ventilation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Indoor air quality | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Acoustics for noise control | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Flexibility of instructional space (e.g., expandability, convertability, adaptability) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Energy efficiency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| Environmental factor | Very satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Physical security of buildings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

21. Does this school have air conditioning in classrooms, administrative offices, and/or other areas? Circle ALL that apply.

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Yes, in classrooms | 1 |
| Yes, in administrative offices | 2 |
| Yes, in other areas | 3 |
| No, no air conditioning in this school at all | 4 (go to question 23) |

22. How satisfactory or unsatisfactory is the air conditioning in classrooms, administrative offices, and/or other areas? Circle one for each category listed.

| | Very satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Air conditioning in: | | | | |
| Classrooms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Administrative offices | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Other areas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

23. Does this school participate in the National School Lunch Program? Circle one.

| | |
|-----|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |

24. Regardless of whether this school participates in the National School Lunch Program, around the first of October, 1993, were any students in this school eligible for the program? Circle one.

| | |
|------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 (go to question 27) |
| Don't know | 3 (go to question 27) |

25. Around the first of October, 1993, how many applicants in this school were approved for the National School Lunch Program? Enter zero if none.

26. Around the first of October, 1993, how many students in this school received free or reduced lunches through the National School Lunch Program? Enter zero if none.

27. How many students in this school were absent on the most recent school day? If none were absent, please enter zero.

| | |
|---|---|
| 28. What type of school is this? Circle one. | |
| Regular elementary or secondary | 1 |
| Elementary or secondary with special program emphasis—for example, science/math school, performing arts high school, talented/gifted school, foreign language immersion school, etc. | 2 |
| Special education—primarily serves students with disabilities | 3 |
| Vocational/technical—primarily serves students being trained for occupations | 4 |
| Alternative—offers a curriculum designed to provide alternative or nontraditional education; does not specifically fall into the categories of regular, special education, or vocational school | 5 |

29. Does this school offer a magnet program? Circle one.

| | |
|-----|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |

If this is the last school listed on your instruction sheet, please go directly to the last page of this questionnaire.

COMMENTS

Do you have any comments you would like to make about school facilities? Circle one.

Yes 1—Please use the space below.

No 2

APPENDIX V

DATA POINTS FOR REPORT FIGURES

Tables in this appendix provide data for the figures in the report.

TABLE V.1.—DATA FOR FIGURE 1: SCHOOL OFFICIALS REPORT BILLIONS NEEDED FOR REPAIRS AND TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL MANDATES IN THE NEXT 3 YEARS

| Amount needed to | All schools |
|--|-------------------|
| Make all repairs required to put schools in good overall condition | \$101,200,000,000 |
| Provide accessibility for disabled students | 5,183,407,780 |
| Manage/correct asbestos | 2,395,445,006 |
| Manage/correct lead in water and paint | 386,647,141 |
| Manage/correct underground storage tanks | 303,004,301 |
| Manage/correct radon | 31,521,318 |
| Manage/correct other requirements | 2,380,065,108 |

TABLE V.2.—DATA FOR FIGURE 2: AMOUNT SCHOOLS REPORTED SPENDING OVER THE LAST 3 YEARS AND NEED IN THE NEXT 3 YEARS TO FULFILL FEDERAL MANDATES

| Federal mandate | Reported spent in the last 3 years | Reported needed in the next 3 years |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accessibility for students with disabilities | \$1,519,755,380 | \$5,183,407,780 |
| Manage/correct asbestos | 1,728,277,353 | 2,395,445,006 |
| Manage/correct other requirements | 200,885,750 | 2,380,065,108 |
| Manage/correct lead in water/pipes | 46,241,652 | 386,647,141 |
| Manage/correct underground storage tanks | 302,014,949 | 303,004,301 |
| Manage/correct radon | 13,854,263 | 31,521,318 |

TABLE V.3.—DATA FOR FIGURE 3: PERCENT OF BUILDINGS REPORTED IN LESS-THAN-ADEQUATE OVERALL CONDITION

| Type of building | Percentage of less-than-adequate buildings |
|--|--|
| Temporary buildings | 27.9 |
| Original buildings | 26.2 |
| Attached and/or detached permanent additions to original buildings | 17.9 |

TABLE V.4.—DATA FOR FIGURE 4: BUILDING REPAIRS REPORTED NEEDED IN AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

| Type of building | Percentage of schools reporting less-than-adequate building features |
|--|--|
| HVAC | 36.4 |
| Plumbing | 29.8 |
| Roofs | 27.3 |
| Exterior walls, finishes, windows, doors | 26.6 |
| Electrical power | 26.4 |
| Electrical lighting | 25.4 |
| Interior finishes, trims | 24.1 |
| Life safety codes | 19.0 |
| Framing, floors, foundations | 17.9 |

TABLE V.5.—DATA FOR FIGURE 5: PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS REPORTING UNSATISFACTORY OR VERY UNSATISFACTORY ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

| Type of environmental condition | Percentage of schools reporting less-than-adequate environmental conditions |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Acoustics for noise control | 28.1 |
| Ventilation | 27.1 |
| Physical security of buildings | 24.2 |
| Indoor air quality | 19.2 |
| Heating | 18.9 |
| Lighting | 15.6 |

MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS

Eleanor L. Johnson, Assistant Director, (202) 512-7209.

Edna M. Saltzman, Project Manager, (313) 256-8109.

D. Catherine Baltzell, Supervisory Social Science Analyst.

Ella F. Cleveland, Subproject Manager.

Harry M. Conley III, Statistician.

Nancy Kintner-Meyer, Evaluator.

Steven R. Machlin, Statistician.

Deborah L. McCormick, Senior Social Science Analyst.

Sara J. Peth, Technical Information Specialist.

William G. Sievert, Technical Advisor.

Kathleen Ward, Technical Advisor.

FOOTNOTES

¹Education Writers Association, "Wolves at the Schoolhouse Door: An Investigation of the Condition of Public School Buildings" (Washington, D.C.: 1989); American Association of School Administrators, "Schoolhouse in the Red: A Guidebook for Cutting Our Losses" (Arlington, VA.: 1992).

²Subsequent reports will address (1) the capability of schools to meet education reform goals and the needs of 21st century education, (2) state role in school facilities, and (3) the relationship of facility conditions to select school and staffing data.

³Sampling error is ± 6.61 percent.

⁴No complete national data has been compiled for current replacement value of school buildings. Researchers have used the \$422 billion estimate made by the Education Writers Association in "Wolves at the Schoolhouse Door."

⁵"Good" condition means that only routine maintenance or minor repair is required. "Overall" condition includes both physical condition and the ability of the schools to meet the functional requirements of instructional programs.

⁶Any one school may have more than one building.

⁷*Pauley v. Kelly*, No. 75-C1268 (Kanawha County Cir. Ct., W. Va., May 1982).

⁸The Education Infrastructure Act of 1994 was introduced by Senator Carol Moseley-Braun and was passed as part of Improving America's Schools Act (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994).

⁹The National Education Goals are set forth in Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-227, March 31, 1994). The goals concern (1) school readiness; (2) school completion; (3) student achievement and citizenship; (4) teacher education and professional development; (5) math and science achievement; (6) adult literacy and lifelong learning; (7) safe, disciplined, and alcohol- and drug-free schools; and (8) parental participation.

¹⁰"School Construction Specification and Financing, National Survey Data 1994," MGT of America, Inc., prepared for Hawaii's State Department of Education (Tallahassee, Fla.: 1994). See also our forthcoming report on state role in school facilities.

¹¹The Impact Aid program is administered by the Department of Education and provided \$12 million in fiscal year 1994 for constructing and renovating schools in districts that educate "federally connected" children, such as those whose parents live and/or work on military installations and Indian reservations.

¹²"Toxic Substances: Information on Costs and Financial Aid to Schools to Control Asbestos" GAO/RCED-92-57FS, Jan. 15, 1992).

¹³Building features include roofs; framing, floors, and foundations; exterior walls, finishes, windows, and doors; interior finishes and trims; plumbing, heating, ventilation, air conditioning; electrical power; electrical lighting; and life safety codes.

¹⁴Environmental factors include lighting, heating, ventilation, indoor air quality, acoustics for noise control, energy efficiency, and physical security of buildings. Although flexibility of instructional space is included as an environmental factor in our questionnaire (see app. IV), we are not addressing those issues in this report. They will be addressed in a forthcoming report.

¹⁵We are referring to maintenance as the upkeep of property and equipment while repair is work to restore damaged or worn-out property to a normal operating condition.

¹⁶"Repair and Maintenance of School Buildings," (National Audit Office, Report by the Controller and Auditor General, London, England, Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed July 25, 1991).

¹⁷We asked district officials what would probably be the total cost of all repairs and renovations required to put all of the district's schools in good overall condition.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the GAO staff for their exhaustive work in an area that Senator HARKIN and I have recognized as a critical issue of readiness for educational excellence in this country. And that is what I call the dirty little secret of the condition of America's schools.

The GAO report makes it clear what the American people already know: our schools are deteriorating and we need to fix them. Infrastructure investment

is just another way of saying the obvious; that we need to reverse the decades-long habit of trying to ignore the decay while we struggle to eke out money for programs. We have delayed maintenance for too long in too many schools and now the results of that neglect are unmistakable. The chickens, literally, have come home to roost.

Some 14 million children, Mr. President, attend schools that are reported needing extensive repair or replacement. These schools are distributed nationwide. Recent research has concluded that facilities in poor condition may contribute to students' poor performance. It is inherently unfair to hold youngsters to nationwide standards for achievement if they do not have an equal opportunity to learn. It is frightening that major repair and renovation needs exist in fully a third of the 80,000 schools in our country and that over 60 percent of that number reported at least one major feature in disrepair, needing extensive overhaul if not replacement. Most schools reported multiple problems of this nature.

These are not just cosmetic concerns. And I would like my staff to put up some pictures.

This is a series of pictures showing classroom conditions. You will notice that this science lab looks like it has been the victim of a failed science experiment. But can you imagine our youngsters trying to study the sciences and be competitive in this world economy trying to learn in facilities like that.

Here is one with peeling lead-based paint; burned out lights; unrepaired fire damage. Here is one: Water damage caused buckling floors and missing tiles; more water damage; termites eating out the school library shelves. Here is a basement in a school in Chicago. Here is one of peeling lead-based paint and burned out lights, which is not replaceable. But the irony of it, Mr. President, is the little sign here on the blackboard that says "academic success." It is hard to think that someone can achieve academic success in a setting like this.

These are not just cosmetic concerns. When we speak of major repair needs, we are referring to conditions that are unsafe or even harmful to children's health. The GAO report estimates that the Nation's schools need \$112 billion to repair and upgrade America's investment in school facilities to bring them to good overall condition. Just to comply with the Federal mandates to remove asbestos, or lead paint, or radon and pesticides and hazardous materials is estimated to require \$11 billion. We are courting disaster if we fail to recognize that these capital needs relate directly to the health and safety of our children in the environment second in importance only to the home.

For example, some 7 million children attended schools with life safety code violations, some 11 million in schools with electrical problems, 15 million in schools with heating and air quality

problems, and 12 million with plumbing problems; 11.9 million children attend schools with leaky roofs, and 7 million with hazardous floors. We have allowed the deterioration to continue to a point that the courts are beginning to step in, as was done here in the Nation's Capitol and in New York, to require that life-threatening conditions be rectified. Sometimes, as in a recent student strike in Chicago, the children take matters in their own hands.

The Education Infrastructure Act is a small, first step toward putting Federal support where the needs are. It is included in Goals 2000, and was appropriated last year at the \$100 million level. I hope we will have the support of the President to keep this money in the budget, and to increase the appropriation this year. Time is not on our side, deferred investment will just make it more, not less expensive to correct. I hope to have the support required to give this initiative the priority it deserves.

I first became aware of the problems facing our Nation's education infrastructure while serving in the Illinois House of Representatives. Throughout my 2½ terms in office, I visited school districts across the State and witnessed the deteriorating condition of public school facilities in both urban and rural districts alike.

Yet, it was not until I began working on education legislation in the U.S. Senate, that I learned that the Federal Government had not collected data on the condition of our Nation's public school facilities since 1965.

Knowing that my efforts to improve our Nation's education infrastructure would be limited by insufficient data, I sent a letter to the General Accounting Office last year, which was cosigned by Senators KENNEDY, PELL, SIMON, and WELLSTONE, requesting a comprehensive, nationwide study on the condition of our Nation's public school facilities.

In responding to my request, the General Accounting Office surveyed a random sample of our Nation's 15,000 school districts and 80,000 public schools from April to December 1994. GAO staff members also visited 41 schools in 10 school districts across the country to supplement their quantitative data with personal observations.

Based on responses from 7.8 percent of the schools sampled, GAO concluded that our Nation's public schools need \$112 billion to restore their facilities to good overall condition—including \$6 billion to make programs accessible to all students and \$5 billion to correct or remove hazardous substances.

More specifically, GAO found that out of the 42 million public school students in the United States: 14 million or 33 percent of all students attend schools that need to extensively repair or replace one or more buildings; 59 percent attend schools that need to repair or replace one or more building features; and 52 percent attend schools that have at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition.

As I said, we are not speaking of cosmetic concerns. We are referring to conditions that are unsafe or even harmful to the safety and well being of our children.

According to the GAO report, this situation is one that is pervasive, it is widespread, and runs the gamut in terms of conditions. I would like my staff to take this set of pictures down and put up the one regarding plumbing conditions and the like.

Mr. President, I am going to digress for a moment while my staff displays the next set of pictures. I have a teenage son. If anything, the youngsters know this. This is not a surprise to any of the pages sitting here. They know of some school in the community from which they come that has this kind of problem. It is a widespread problem. It is a nationwide problem. It is an urban as well as rural problem. These pictures are from urban school districts specifically.

Here is a toilet used to redirect sewage from a broken pipe in the wall here in Washington, DC—our Nation's Capital. This is the kind of infrastructure disrepair that youngsters must try to learn in on a daily basis. Can you imagine the activities in the classroom right next-door to this bathroom?

This next picture is of a home economics sink—small wonder you could not do very well in home economics, if that is the kind of conditions in which you have to work.

Mr. President, in addition to these plumbing concerns, I would also like you to take an opportunity to look at some of the external problems. Young people do not cause the fascia to crack or the structural damage. Here is one of a front door which is a life and safety violation. The front door is chained so the students cannot be injured by the holes in the crumbling front steps of this particular school.

This picture shows structural damage which I can see in the brickwork, in the fascia. Again, a function of the failure to invest in repairs and maintenance over time. This picture is of a 30-year-old portable classroom in New Orleans that was built to last for 10 years. It was designed to be temporary. A portable classroom that was designed to be temporary. It is still there and that is the condition in which it is—coming apart at the seams. This picture shows a demountable classroom held in place by a steel plate and the wall, of course, is crumbling under the windows.

Mr. President, 7 million students attend schools with life safety code violations; 11 million attend schools with electrical problems; 15 million attend schools with heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning problems; 12 million attend schools with plumbing problems; and 11.9 million students attend schools with leaky roofs.

Mr. President, in preparing their report, GAO staff members traveled

across the country to examine public school facilities in America's urban communities and found that: In New York City, A \$151 million state-of-the-art science high school is only blocks away from another high school housed in a 100-year-old building which has served as a stable, fire house, factory, and office building; this school's elevators do not work, its interior classrooms have no windows, its ventilation system needs major repairs, and its heating depends on a fireman's stoking the coal furnace by hand. In Chicago, a leaking roof at one elementary school caused floors to buckle and plaster on the walls and ceilings to crumble; since the leaking roof also flooded parts of the electric wiring system, one teacher would not turn on her lights during rainstorms for fear of electric shock—or fire. In Washington, DC, water damage from an old steam-heating system at a 60-year-old junior high school has caused so much wall deterioration that an entire wing has been condemned; steam damage is also causing lead-based wall paint to peel. And, in New Orleans, most of the school buildings have no air-conditioning although the average morning relative humidity in New Orleans is 87 percent; Formosan termites have also deteriorated the structure of many schools; in one elementary school, ants ate books on shelves as well as the shelves themselves.

GAO staff members also visited public school facilities in America's rural communities and found similar problems.

In Raymond, WA, one elementary school is made of wood, a potential fire hazard, and the 70-year-old high school is made of unreinforced concrete that probably can not withstand earthquakes.

In Ramona, CA, one elementary school is comprised solely of portable classrooms with no cafeteria or auditorium; one portable room serves as a library, computer lab, music room, and art room. and, in Grandview, WA, the middle school, which was built to house 475 students, currently enrolls 700, while the elementary school designed for 375, now enrolls 464 students.

At this point I would also like to raise the issue of school overcrowding, because, this issue also causes facilities to become inadequate. So you have damage as we see here in these pictures exacerbated by just the numbers of children that are crowding into inadequate facilities.

Mr. President, the American system of public education has historically given local school boards primary responsibility for maintaining our Nation's education infrastructure.

For a long time, local school boards were able to meet that responsibility. However, the ability of local school boards to continue to meet that responsibility has steadily declined, in large part because of escalating costs in the operating budget.

To build schools, local school boards rely on local property taxes. And, as we

all know, school boards in every State in the country are finding it increasingly difficult to support their instructional programs, much less their school facilities, with local property taxes.

Local property taxes are an inadequate source of funding for public education because they make the quality of public education dependent on the local property wealth.

Two districts in Illinois illustrate the gross disparities created by our current school financing system.

In 1990, the owner of a \$100,000 home in a prosperous community paid \$2,103 in local property taxes. This community spent an average of \$10,085 per child in its public schools. On the other hand, the owner of a \$100,000 home in a low- and moderate-income community paid \$4,139 in local property taxes, almost twice as much, but was only able to spend \$3,483 per child in its public schools—less than one-third of the money the more prosperous community was spending, and for a host of reasons that goes to local schools.

In their responses to the GAO survey, school officials reported that they have difficulty raising money for needed repairs and renovation, in large part, because of the demands of their operating budgets as well as an antitax sentiment among voters resulting in the failure of bond issues.

In other words the local property tax is an inadequate, inelastic base for funding schools generally, but it has the particularly Draconian effect with regard to infrastructure and facilities because the school districts do not want to have to go back to the taxpayers in order to meet these kinds of repairs.

In fact, 33 percent of school districts reported that they have had an average of two bond issues fail in the past 10 years and that bond proceeds are often much less than needed for repairs. For example, GAO found that: In Montgomery, AL, voters defeated a local tax referendum to remove all portable buildings and build new schools on June 28, 1994; and, in Pomona, CA, a \$62.5 million bond issue was submitted to the voters after a survey indicated that the \$200 million needed for repairs would be rejected by the voters.

In short, one survey respondent commented that:

The current public attitudes about the economy and education are generally so negative that passing a bond referendum is a fantasy.

Mr. President, the Federal Government, as well as most States, continue to force local school districts to rely increasingly on local property taxes for public education, in general, and for school repair and construction projects, in particular.

In Illinois, for example, the local share of public education funding increased from 48 percent during the 1980-81 school year to 58 percent during the 1992-93 school year, while the State share fell from 43 to 34 percent during this same period.

So what we see is a continuing shifting of the burden to the local property taxpayer, and the local property taxpayer is not able to go any further to meet this need.

At the same time, State support for the repair, renovation, alternation, and construction of public school facilities has fallen even more dramatically in Illinois—one of 23 State that provides little or no funding for school facilities projects.

Although the Illinois General Assembly created the Capital Assistance Program in the early 1970's to help local school districts finance school repair and construction projects, support for this program has diminished rapidly.

During fiscal years 1985 through 1990, the State of Illinois appropriated only \$18 million for local school repair and construction projects, and then only on an individual direct-grant basis.

I point out also that the last time this issue even was reviewed at a State level in our State was in 1987 when the Illinois Board of Education that our rural districts alone needed over \$500 million to restore their facilities to good overall conditions. The GAO report found that Chicago public schools need \$2.9 billion.

Mr. President, the Federal Government must accept a share of the blame for failing to provide our Nation's children with school environments which are conducive to learning.

In just the last decade alone, the Federal Government's share of public education funding has dropped from 9.8 to 6.1 percent.

That could make a lot of difference when it comes to providing an environment in which young people can learn.

The Federal Government has historically addressed the problems facing our Nation's public schools by passing important legislation including: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act of 1986; and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. While these laws have laudable goals, they have the effect of passing on even greater costs to already overburdened school districts.

The GAO report states clearly that these mandates alone, account for \$11 billion of the \$112 billion needed to fix our schools.

Last year, Congress passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act which President Clinton signed into law on March 31, 1994. I supported this legislation because it promises to create a coherent, national framework for education reform founded on the national education goals.

Since one essential building block of reform is better school facilities, I am pleased that Goals 2000 includes an amendment I introduced that directs the national education standards and improvement council to develop voluntary national opportunity-to-learn

standards which address the condition of school facilities.

Nonetheless, I firmly believe that it is inherently unfair to expect our children to meet national performance standards if they do not have an equal opportunity to learn.

That is why I introduced the Education Infrastructure Act last April. This legislation, which was included in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA], is specifically designed to help local school districts ensure the health and safety of students through the repair, renovation, alteration, and construction of school facilities.

With the help of my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], I was able to include \$100 million in the 1995 Department of Education budget for the education infrastructure program. While this appropriation level represents a drop in the bucket in terms of our Nation's education infrastructure needs, it is significant, nonetheless, because it is the first drop.

The Education Infrastructure Act requires the Secretary of Education to award funds to school districts with at least 15 percent child poverty rates and urgent repair and renovation needs.

This legislation further targets program funds by requiring the Secretary to award funds among eligible school districts on the basis of:

The number or percentages of children in poverty;

The extent to which they lack the fiscal capacity to undertake the project without Federal assistance;

The threat the physical condition of the plant poses to the safety and well-being of students; and

The age of the facility to be replaced.

Mr. President, the Education Infrastructure Act does not infringe upon local control over public education in any way. Rather, it seeks to supplement, augment, and assist local efforts to support education in the least intrusive way possible by helping local school boards support the repair, renovation, alteration, and construction of our Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities.

Mr. President, the Education Infrastructure Act will help our children learn by providing an environment conducive to learning. In her research at Georgetown University, Maureen Edwards found that students in poor school facilities can be expected to fall 5.5 percentage points below those in schools in fair condition and 11 percentage points below those in schools in excellent condition.

For all of these reasons, the Education Infrastructure Act was enthusiastically endorsed by the National PTA, the National Education Association, the National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the Council of Great City Schools, the National Committee for adequate School Housing, the City University of New York, the AFL-CIO Building and Trades Commis-

sion, the Military Impacted Schools Association, the American Library Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators, ASPIRA, the Council of Education Facilities Planners International, and the American Federation of School Administrators.

Mr. President, I have taken the time today to highlight the results of the GAO report as well as the merits of the Education Infrastructure Act because Republican Members of Congress are currently preparing legislation that would rescind the \$100 million appropriated for the Education Infrastructure Act in 1995.

Needless to say, I am vehemently opposed to any proposal that would force Congress to take this giant leap backward. In my view, it would be unconscionable for Congress to withdraw funding for the Education Infrastructure Act—especially now given the results of the GAO report.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks by urging my colleagues to read the "Condition of America's Schools" report for themselves and to join me in working to secure funding for the Education Infrastructure Act in 1995 and 1996.

Rather, I believe that President Clinton should include at least \$200 million for the Education Infrastructure Program in his fiscal year 1996 budget request and that Congress should meet this request.

By providing this needed and long overdue support, we will begin to address our failure to adequately engage Federal resources in behalf of preparing our children for competition in this global economy and securing the future of our Democratic institutions. This is not our children's interest; this is in our national interest.

Mr. SHELBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, we are involved here in a truly historic debate. The proposed balanced budget amendment will decide the fate of America for years to come. Our decision will dictate whether our children and grandchildren will live free and prosper from the fruits of their labor or, on the other hand, live in a Third World economy subservient to the economic leaders of other industrialized nations in the world.

Debtors are never free to choose. They are never free to choose. They are only subject to the dominion of their creditors. We all know this.

Interest payments on the national debt now are expected to be \$310 billion this year. Interest payments on the national debt are expected to be \$310 billion. Think of it. That comes out to be

about \$4,600 per family, or 52 percent of all individual income taxes collected in America this year. The national debt itself is over \$4.75 trillion, going on \$5 trillion. Gross domestic product is only about \$6.5 trillion.

Combined, these numbers produce a debt-to-GDP ratio of 73 percent. As the debt continues to grow, so inevitably does the tax burden on the American people. Granted, Mr. President, we have gotten away with debt in the past, but the time to pay the bill is rapidly approaching. The global markets are beginning to experience a capital crunch. European economies are expanding and picking up steam. Southeast Asian markets are booming. Japan is calling on its reserves to rebuild infrastructure after the earthquake.

In short, Mr. President, demand for capital is simply growing faster than can be supplied and, as a result, investors are being more selective about which markets they place their money in, as they should be.

A very clear and primary concern of financial markets is a nation's poor economic policies and its debt structure. I submit here today that the lack of budget discipline we display here in the United States is not highly regarded among any investor in the world. Our current account stood at \$104 billion in 1993. This means we either sold \$104 billion in assets to foreign entities, borrowed \$104 billion from foreign entities, or a combination of the two.

Although a current account deficit in and of itself is not a bad thing, the accumulation of persistent current account deficits, over time, leads to a great big external debt. These deficits identify a systematic shortfall of savings below investment, due to an expansion of consumption relative to income. The implication is that we borrow to finance current consumption expenditures that have no effect on economic growth or future income in this country. In other words, the Government is borrowing abroad to finance an excess of expenditures over income. We are living beyond our means.

Projections of higher current account deficits run well into the foreseeable future. The former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Paul Volcker, for whom we all have great respect, has warned of the current account deficit addiction, as he calls it.

He said:

*** we simply cannot afford to become addicted to drawing on increasing amounts of foreign savings to help finance our internal economy. Part of our domestic industry—that part dependent on exports, or competing with imports—would be sacrificed. The stability of the dollar and of our domestic financial markets would become hostage to events abroad. If recovery is to proceed elsewhere, as we want, other countries will increasingly need their own savings. Although we do not know when, the process eventually would break down.

Those are not my words. They are the words of Dr. Volcker. We cannot,