DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 572 EF 005 028

AUTHOR McCall, H. Carl
TITLE School Facilities: Condition, Problems and Solutions.
INSTITUTION New York State Office of the Comptroller, Albany.
PUB DATE 1997-10-00
NOTE 75p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of the State Comptroller, Public Information Office, A.E. Smith State Office Building, Albany, NY 12236.
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Facilities Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Facility Planning; *School Buildings; *School Maintenance; State Programs; State Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes some of the recent reports on school building needs and describes the initiatives in New York State's budget designed to address them. It also describes the environment in which school building and maintenance decisions are made, with particular attention to factors discouraging or impeding successful stratregies for school constrictuion and maintenance. Drawing upon this analysis and the results of audits, the report includes recommendations for improving the system. Some recommendations for meeting the needs in school building and maintenance include better enforcement of existing regular requirements, correcting the problems with aid formulas, reforming the existing annual inspections in school buildings, improved capital planning, mandated relief actions to decrease the cost of school construction and rehabilitation, and better reporting of facility conditions. Detailed tables list the average age of buildings, 1996 to 1997 enrollment, 10-year capital spending, and other information on each school district. (RJM)

School Facilities

Conditions, Problems and Solutions

October 1997

H. Carl McCall
State Comptroller

State of New York
Office of the State Comptroller
Office of Fiscal Research & Policy Analysis
Albany, New York 12236

Additional copies of this report
may be obtained from:

Office of the State Comptroller
Public Information Office
A. E. Smith State Office Building
Albany, New York 12236

(518) 474-4015

Or, from the State Comptroller's web page:

http://www.osc.state.ny.us

To help reduce printing costs, please notify the Office of Fiscal Research and Policy Analysis at (518) 474-4481 if you wish to have your name removed from our mailing list, or if your address has changed.

To the People of the State of New York:

It is well known that there are desperate school building needs in districts all across the State, including dilapidated buildings, outdated facilities and overcrowded classrooms. This crisis was brought on by an aging building stock and decades of "deferred maintenance" — the technical euphemism for basically failing to maintain our buildings. On top of this, we are in the midst of an enrollment boom that is creating a need for additional classroom space in school districts across the State.

Three initiatives in the 1997-98 state budget are intended to address this problem: enrichments in the building aid formula, new funding for maintenance and minor rehabilitation, and the $2.4 billion School Facilities Bond Act. This report describes school facilities issues and suggests ways we can build, maintain buildings, and plan more effectively.

Although most New Yorkers are aware of the current conditions, the forces that brought us to this point are less well known. For example, funding for school building needs, especially maintenance, tends to have a low priority in school budget development. Additionally, there is a built-in fiscal incentive for school districts to avoid prudent maintenance expenditures, and instead to let physical structures deteriorate until replacement is the only real option. State aid reimbursement is provided explicitly for capital expenditures at a generous rate, whereas it is not for routine maintenance. My audit reports have identified a number of other problems, including a lack of adequate data on school building and maintenance needs, and a regulatory system that fails to effectively ensure proper maintenance procedures. There is also a need for reform of some of the cumbersome regulations currently inhibiting efficient building and environmental remediation practices.

Providing additional funding is one part of a solution, but we must also correct the underlying problems that brought us to this point. To do this, I believe we need to change the system under which the building and maintenance of schools takes place by strengthening enforcement of existing requirements, ensuring that adequate information is available on facilities needs, and making other changes. If we allow a continuing pattern of maintenance deferral to exist, eventually we will end up right back where we are today.

We have allowed our school facilities to degenerate to a crisis situation. The message sent to children forced to attend school in shabby, overcrowded buildings is that we neither care very much about, nor expect very much from them. In this environment, I believe that an emergency response is necessary. I hope the information presented in this report is helpful to voters in reaching their own conclusions on the School Facilities Bond Act, and in describing the other vital issues surrounding school facilities.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary & Recommendations

This report summarizes some of the recent reports on school building needs and describes the initiatives in this year's budget designed to address them. It also describes the environment in which school building and maintenance decisions are made, with particular attention to factors discouraging or impeding successful strategies for school construction and maintenance. Drawing upon this analysis and the results of audits, the report includes recommendations for improving the system.

Conditions and Trends

A recent federal study found that in New York State 90 percent of schools report a need to upgrade or repair buildings to bring them to a good overall condition. The State Education Department estimates that meeting current capital program needs, just to bring facilities to adequate conditions, would require $15 billion statewide over a five-year period, including $7.5 billion for schools outside of New York City and an equivalent need for the same period in the City.

Like most other states, New York does not have as good data on the physical conditions and needs of its schools as it ideally should. However, the data that do exist give more than ample cause for alarm, and other sources place the total needs at much higher levels than the State Education Department's estimate. There is widespread agreement that the needs exceed the current financial capabilities of school districts, and a series of reports have documented poor conditions in school buildings across the State (an appendix provides a bibliography).

The current enrollment boom is also placing pressure on school facilities, as will the early childhood education initiatives in this year's budget. Enrollment has increased every year since 1990, and it is projected to continue to do so well into the next century. The substantial majority of school districts in every region of the State are now coping with significant enrollment pressures.

Underlying Problems in the System

Decisions about how to maintain and repair school buildings are made at the local level, but they are made within a regulatory and financial environment governed by state law, regulation and procedures. School districts are confronted by continuing fiscal pressures and competing demands, and the school budget process is driven by interests that often do not recognize the importance of physical plant and maintenance issues.

School districts also have financing options and state aid incentives that can make capital repairs much more attractive than spending money for maintenance. Reimbursement is received for funds spent on capital projects through building aid (at an average rate of 67 percent), whereas it is not for maintenance spending. Although maintenance is cost-effective in the long run, the state aid differential makes it less so, when viewed solely from the school district's perspective.

Additionally, superintendents stay within a school district for only four to five years on average, and the length of tenure for school board members is similar. Deferring maintenance may

actually be an effective strategy for limiting tax increases during such a period. This short-term effectiveness, however, is more than undone by (and is in sharp contrast to) the true impact of deferred maintenance — which is to greatly increase costs over the long term.

This Year's Budget Initiatives

The 1997-98 state budget included three initiatives to provide additional funding for school facilities in 1998-99 and beyond:

Building Aid Enrichment — for new projects, changes in the building aid formula will recognize varying regional costs and will also increase the effective reimbursement rate for virtually all school districts by 10 percent. The combined effect of these changes will increase aid by $28 million in 1998-99 and $170 million after four years, because the cost grows as new building projects begin each year. Regionally adjusted cost allowances had been recommended by the Comptroller and the State Board of Regents.

Minor Maintenance Aid — a popular aid program of several years ago was reinstated. This program will provide $50 million in aid each year to school districts statewide, beginning in the 1998-99 school year, and increasing to $80 million in 2001-02, although the legislation is silent as to whether the program will continue beyond then. The aid amounts going to New York City are explicitly described in the legislation, and funds will be apportioned to other school districts through a formula based on the relative age of facilities and the long-term enrollment growth trends.

The legislation includes a maintenance of effort provision designed to prevent school districts from using any of the new funding to supplant local funds for repair programs (a criticism of the earlier program). Although it will spur additional maintenance, the new aid program will not remove the existing fiscal incentive for capital repairs over routine maintenance, because unlike building aid, minor maintenance aid is not a reimbursement-based formula that generates additional aid for each additional dollar spent.

The School Facilities Bond Act — if approved by the voters in November, will provide $2.4 billion to finance public school facility improvements to address health and safety needs, expand physical capacity, enhance accessibility for the disabled, remedy emergency situations, provide environmental remediation, and support educational technology.

Unfortunately, the bond act was not accompanied by implementing legislation to describe how the funds would be allocated among the permitted uses, or among school districts.

The bond act is General Obligation (or G.O.) debt, subject to approval by the voters. G.O. debt is the best way to incur debt, because it does not bypass the State Constitution, as does backdoor borrowing issued by public authorities, and it also generally carries a lower interest cost.

Recommendations for Reform

The basic conclusion of this report is that — in addition to taking action to meet the critical needs which have accumulated — substantial changes must be made in the underlying system in which school building and maintenance decisions are made, because the system itself tends to encourage deferred maintenance and, eventually, greater capital expenditures.

Following is a summary of the report's key recommendations for change. Many of these suggestions are general in nature, either because they require additional study or development, or expertise beyond that available within the Office of the State Comptroller.

- ✓ The current organizational and fiscal incentives leading to maintenance deferral should be countered by a combination of better enforcement of existing regulatory requirements, and improved statewide and local capital planning and reporting.

- ✓ Aid formulas are not a good means of making local budgetary allocations. The provision of additional aid for maintenance may be a helpful temporary measure, but the longer term solution to improper and deferred maintenance issues must go beyond providing more aid.

- ✓ The existing required annual inspections in school buildings — even when effectively carried out — focus on major structural problems or fire and safety issues. They do not effectively ensure that school buildings are properly maintained. More study on this issue is needed.

- ✓ Capital planning in school districts and statewide can be improved through effective implementation of the Capital Assets Preservation Plan (CAPP) program, and the application of proven-effective methods such as value engineering and life-cycle cost analysis.

- ✓ Mandate relief actions to decrease the cost of school construction and rehabilitation should be considered, including state rules governing asbestos remediation and the Wicks law.

- ✓ Better reporting of facility conditions, and the utilization of performance measures could provide enhanced accountability and improve conditions and efficiency of maintenance and construction expenditures. The State Education Department's planned addition of information on school facilities to school report cards is a step in the right direction.

The School Facilities Problem

It would seem a simple matter of common sense that schools should be well maintained and that facilities should be replaced and expanded when necessary. Although no one would argue with this basic proposition, in the real world limited funding and competing needs combine in a manner that often means this goal is not achieved.

Those responsible for setting priorities in school districts are confronted by continuing fiscal pressures on annual operating budgets and there are of course numerous competing demands on resources that are more directly linked to instruction than facilities. Proponents of sound maintenance practices and adequate facilities funding often find themselves without strong allies in the school budget process, which is understandably driven by academic interests and by persons more familiar with classroom issues than physical plant requirements.

What is sometimes lost in these larger budget discussions, however, is that the condition of a school has a direct impact on student achievement. The commonplace belief that students learn better in an environment that is pleasant, safe and free of health hazards is supported by a growing body of scholarly literature.[1] For example, students do better on standardized achievement tests when they attend schools that are in sound condition, and less well on the same tests in schools with substandard conditions.

But students learn more than academic lessons in school settings. They also develop less measurable, but more lasting impressions and associations that are the basis of individual character. The setting for educational attainment shapes the same kind of behaviors and expectations that are required for professional success in business.[2] When schools are poorly maintained, and students are placed in a substandard environment, their expectations and behavior are negatively affected.

Problems Nationwide

Inadequate attention to school conditions is a national problem that has been documented in a series of reports. For example, according to the General Accounting Office (GAO) it would cost approximately $112 billion to bring all of the nation's 80,000 schools to a state of "good overall condition." Other professional observers have placed the figure at over $400 billion. One third of the nations schools are in need of extensive repairs, 60 percent have at least one major building feature in disrepair and half suffer at least one environmental problem.

---

[1] *A Statewide Study of Student Achievement and Behavior and School Building Condition,* Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Dr. Carol S. Cash, Virginia Beach Public Schools and Dr. Denny Van Berkum, North Dakota State University, Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting, Council of Educational Facility Planners, International, September 19, 1995.

[2] *Designing Places for Learning,* Meek, Anne, ed., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: The Council of Educational Facility Planners, 1995.

The GAO report also found unmet needs related to computers and learning technologies. Over half the nation's schools reported insufficient phone lines for modems and almost half reported inadequate electrical wiring for computers and communications technology.

Trends in New York State are Alarming

The GAO study found that in New York State 90 percent of schools report a need to upgrade or repair buildings to good overall condition.[3] While much of the need for new construction and repair of schools exists in the State's urban areas, it is also true that suburban and rural school districts are facing a growing problem as their school buildings age and as maintenance needs go unaddressed.

New York, like most other states, is hindered by a lack of comprehensive data on the physical conditions and needs of its schools. For this reason, the GAO study cited above had to be based entirely on survey data. In fact, all of the research and analysis relating to the capital needs of schools is based on professional estimates, but often from limited samples. Unfortunately, the State does not now have an adequate planning system for these needs (see the section on Comptroller's Audits). Nonetheless, those data that do exist give ample cause for alarm.

Older Buildings

The stock of school buildings in New York State is becoming increasingly old. The table below shows the average age of schools by region, based on State Education Department data on facility size and age.[4]

Average Age of School Buildings in New York State

New York City	**57 years**
Big Four Cities	**55 years**
Rural Counties	**48 years**
Small Cities	**44 years**
Suburbs	**43 years**

[3] *School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State,* United States General Accounting Office, June, 1996, GAO/HEHS-96-148.

[4] With the exception of New York City, this is the data which will be used to apportion the minor maintenance aid beginning in 1998-99; district-by-district listings for this data, as well as projected aid apportionments are provided in an appendix.

Although the State's five largest school districts (New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers) have perhaps the oldest structures, there is not that much difference between them and the rest of the State in this regard. What is most significant about this data is the observation that average building age in every area of the State is close to fifty years (some are slightly above, some are slightly below). The fifty-year mark is a typical long-term planning standard for the useful life of a school. This single figure, of course, does not tell the whole story. For example, many schools built in the 1920's and 30's that have been well-maintained and updated when necessary are still excellent learning facilities today. Conversely, many of the buildings built during the 1960's and 70's were constructed with materials and methods that result in a substantially shorter useful life.

Data from the State Education Department show a statewide decline in new construction over the past three decades. The largest period of school expansion took place during the 1950's and 1960's — mostly in suburban communities — when inexpensive and rapid methods of construction produced schools with an anticipated life of only 30 years.

Growing Enrollments

The current enrollment boom being experienced in most school districts is placing additional pressure on school facilities, although other factors are certainly involved. School enrollment in New York State grew rapidly in the 1960's and early 1970's with the baby boom generation, peaking at about 3.5 million, and then declined through the remainder of that decade and throughout the 1980's. This long-term decline reversed just as the 1990's began, and just as the impact of a national recession was placing extreme pressure on state and local budgets. Statewide, enrollment has increased every year since 1990, and it is projected to continue to do so well into the next century.

Enrollment Trends: 1989-90 to 1996-97

(Source: State Education Department)

Region	# of School Districts	1996-97 Enrollment	Change Since 1989-90		Growing School Districts		
			Net Increase	Percent Change	#	Share of Districts	Average Increase
Statewide	683	2,789,908	276,882	11.0%	548	80%	9.0%
New York City	1	1,052,313	134,302	14.6%	1	100%	14.6%
Big Four Cities	4	128,707	13,939	12.1%	4	100%	14.8%
Small Cities	57	252,684	13,267	5.5%	43	75%	5.4%
Upstate Suburbs	271	619,629	57,949	10.3%	226	83%	10.2%
Downstate Suburbs	169	534,840	48,720	10.0%	155	92%	15.7%
Rural Counties	181	201,735	8,705	4.5%	119	66%	6.0%

As the data above demonstrate, the substantial majority of school districts in every region of the State are experiencing significant enrollment increases. Statewide, the overall increase in enrollment in the 1990's was 276,882 — an 11 percent increase — and 548 school districts experienced net increases (80 percent of all districts). Although the increases were slightly higher in the large cities, rapid growth is also occurring in other areas, particularly the suburbs. New York City and the other big four cities experienced an average percentage increase of over 14 percent, but in the downstate suburban districts, the increases in enrollment were even higher: 15.7 percent among those districts that gained enrollment, representing 92 percent of the districts in that region. Upstate suburban districts that gained enrollment gained an average of 10.2 percent.

In addition to the projected growth needs, the current system is already strained. For example, unacceptable levels of school overcrowding exist in New York City, with especially high concentrations at the elementary and high school levels. The New York City Comptroller projects that these conditions will get worse in the coming years without an effective strategy to combat the problem.[5] Overcrowding is also occurring in school districts throughout the State, although unfortunately, no statewide comprehensive data exist to describe this issue.

Beyond simple enrollment growth, the changes that have occurred in educational programs since the 1950's and 60's have resulted in the need for additional facilities. A school, for example, that adequately served 1,000 students in 1960 may be crowded with 800 today. This has occurred because of the immense growth in special education, remedial education and other new educational requirements, all of which drive the need for additional classroom space. This year's early childhood initiatives, including full-day kindergarten, universal prekindergarten and class size reduction will likewise all drive additional space needs.

Unmet Capital Needs and Maintenance Given Short Shrift

All buildings require good regular maintenance, and as facilities age they require upgrading. A steady program of regular maintenance can extend the useful life of a school facility far beyond the 50 year life cycle commonly used in facility planning. However, at this point in time, schools statewide are not starting from a point of good condition.

Several estimates have been made in the last few years of the amount of resources that it would take simply to bring schools into a state of overall good repair. The State Education Department has estimated that meeting current capital program needs for schools outside New York

---

[5] *Overcrowding in New York City Public Schools: Where Do We GO From Here?*, City of New York Office of the Comptroller, Office of Policy Management, January 1995.

City would cost approximately $7.5 billion over a five year period, and that New York City's need for the same period is roughly equivalent,[6] for a total need of $15 billion.

A series of reports have been produced documenting school facilities problems (see the bibliography in Appendix I), and this report is not intended to repeat or supplement the detailed information on problems in individual school districts available in those reports. However, there is widespread agreement that the needs exceed the current financial capabilities of school districts, and there is ample evidence of this, and of sometimes shocking conditions in individual schools to be found in those reports.

Over the past twenty years, very few school districts in the State, and none of the larger cities, have been able to consistently maintain financial support sufficient to carry out effective maintenance and capital repair programs. Despite an increased commitment to capital spending in many districts, it is unlikely that sustained commitments will be developed to meet needs in the future.[7]

Instead of routine maintenance, the practice of "deferred maintenance" has been prevalent throughout the State.[8] This technical term simply means that maintenance problems are deferred, or not done, often until systems degenerate to a level that is eligible for funding under more costly capital improvement and rehabilitation programs.

Failure to adequately maintain school properties results in shabby facilities not conducive to learning at least, and physically dangerous at worst. For example, inadequate maintenance can cause indoor environmental problems such as poor air quality threatening students and staff.

Poor conditions related to cleanliness and upkeep are generally difficult to regulate, because those inspections that are required are geared toward new construction or structural problems. The annual structural review required in all school districts, for example, would not register any problems even if deplorable maintenance conditions existed, such as graffiti, litter strewn halls, peeling paint or cracked plaster.

---

[6]New York City's capital program funds substantially less than this need in that period. Its ten-year capital program allocates $12.6 billion for school buildings: 57 percent for rehabilitation and modernization, 29 percent for additional instructional space, and half of the remaining 14 percent for computer-related projects.

[7] In New York City, for example, the Board of Education's Ten Year Facilities Needs Assessment Plan for 1994-2003 identified a need of $25 billion. Current capital plan projections for the City have identified spending totals of $2.9 billion for fiscal years 1995-1999. For a discussion of the relationship between capital needs and historic and projected levels of spending in the five major districts in New York State see: *School Buildings in Crisis,* Conference of Big 5 Schools, May 1996.

[8] *Report of the Commission On School Facilities and Maintenance Reform,* Harold O. Levy, Chairman, June 1995.

Relationship Between Facilities and Educational Reform

While trying to meet the need for enough seats in a building that is up to code and environmentally safe seems at times a difficult enough obstacle, the suitability of the State's educational facilities in relation to educational reform is also in serious question.

Nearly two-thirds of the State's schools rate unsatisfactory in terms of space flexibility. As school enrollments rise and fall, technology changes and educational programs become more varied, the flexible use of space has taken on an increasing relevance. According to the GAO study, New York State ranks near the bottom of the nation's schools with regard to the adaptability of space in existing facilities.[9]

The GAO also found that in the critical area of technological capacity, New York State's schools have considerable needs. Significant investments are needed to equip schools with fiber optic cables, modems, local networks, modern electronic power connections, and audiovisual equipment. Twenty percent of the State's schools (940 facilities with 540,000 children) are insufficiently equipped with basic computers and printers. Recent activities and aid programs in this area may be helping to alleviate these conditions.

Technology Funding and the Federal "E-Rate"

A new federal program included in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires that schools, libraries and rural health care providers be offered discounted rates for telecommunications services, including charges for internet access. This program is often referred to as the federal "E-Rate" program.

The program will provide $2.25 billion nationally per year in discounts to schools and libraries. The discounts are available for telephone services for use in classrooms, digital phone lines used to connect to information services, and paging services. Wiring and other equipment and services needed to install networks are also discounted, but personal computers and modems are not eligible.

The federal program includes features that require careful allocation of funds to take full advantage of the discounts.

- Discounts will be allocated on a first-come, first-served basis, with no specific allocations to states or regions. School districts will thus have to move quickly to ensure that they receive funds. Once $2 billion has been allocated, the remaining $250 million will be distributed to economically disadvantaged areas. (Note, however, that the Federal Communications Commission is currently considering changing the allocation method).

---

[9] *School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State,* United States General Accounting Office, June, 1996, GAO/HEHS-96-148.

- The discounts will be provided on a sliding scale based on the percentage of students in each school district eligible for assistance through the federal school lunch program. The smallest discount, 20 percent, will be provided to schools with less that one percent of students eligible for school lunch. The maximum discount is 90 percent for schools with greater than 75 percent of students eligible for school lunch.

In order to apply, each school district will have to provide a description of the services it is seeking, an inventory and assessment of its current technology, and an overall technology plan. This plan must be approved by the State Education Department.

The exclusion of personal computers and modems from funding is a serious limitation in the federal plan. While the equipment and services required for installing state-of-the-art computer networks are costly, they are only a small component of the total cost of purchasing modern computers and software. A new network providing internet access will be severely limited in utility if modern computers and software are not available.

For maximum benefit from the federal E-Rate program, therefore, school districts may have to invest significant amounts, either from their own resources, or from state funds. Several changes in the 1997-98 state budget will help provide funding for these initiatives.

- Education Technology Aid: A new reimbursement aid formula was added to provide funding for acquisition and maintenance of education technology (including software). This program was created to dovetail with the new federal program and existing state aid programs. Technology expenses will be reimbursed based on an aid ratio calculation, with statewide reimbursements limited to maximum amounts: $9 million in 1998-99; $25 million in 1999-2000; $57 million in 2000-01; and, $91 million in 2001-02.

- Computer Hardware and Software aid: These existing aid categories were significantly increased, with the changes phasing in from 1997-98 through 2001-02. The per pupil aid ceiling for software purchase will increase from $4 to $23.98; the hardware ceiling will increase from $8 to $32.35.

- One of the permitted purposes specified in the authorizing legislation for the School Facilities Bond Act is to support capital projects related to educational technology in public school facilities. Although these funds could not be used for computer or software purchases, they might be used to construct computer labs or to update wiring, for example, so as to assist school districts in taking advantage of the federal E-Rate program.

Description of Existing System

All decisions about how to maintain and repair school buildings are made at the local level. These decisions include how much funding to devote to routine maintenance, when and how to build new school buildings or expand, renovate, or make repairs to existing ones. The decisions are made locally by school boards and school district managers, but they are made within a complex regulatory and financial environment, most of which is governed by state law, regulation and procedures. There are many ways in which this system influences local decisions and results, and many areas for improvement.

It is important in this discussion to distinguish between regular maintenance and repair, and capital improvements. Described at its simplest, maintenance activities are undertaken to maintain physical structures, whereas capital expenditures are made to build, expand or replace structures. Maintenance activities include servicing a boiler, painting walls or tarring a roof. Capital improvements include building a new school, replacing a boiler or a roof. The distinction between the two is not always so easy to make, however, and some capital projects are essentially nothing more than many major maintenance and repair projects lumped together.

Although maintenance is necessary to keep facilities in good condition, it is often viewed unfavorably within the school budget process. This occurs because maintenance expenditures do not do anything "up front" to improve the perceived quality of educational programs. This relatively simple dynamic is important to understand, and it is similar to those that take place for any person or institution evaluating priorities.

A Homeowner's Example

No homeowner enjoys spending money on maintenance, but it is necessary to keep one's home in good condition. Servicing a furnace, sealing a driveway or repairing a roof does not improve one's standard of living, but homeowners undertake these activities because the consequences of not doing so are much worse. A furnace that is regularly serviced will last much longer, as will a roof or a driveway. Replacing any of these items is very expensive, and undertaking necessary maintenance is thus the more attractive course.

This relatively simple dynamic is important to understand because the same motivations exist in school systems, although with some very important differences. For example, school districts have financing options and state aid incentives that make capital repairs more attractive than spending money for maintenance.

Prudent homeowners maintain their property because it costs them less in the long run. But if, as an example, there were subsidized government loans for furnace replacement, many more people might forgo regular maintenance. A homeowner that knew she would have to spend her own money for maintenance, but could replace any systems that failed using a long-term loan with the government picking up more than half of the cost, might make a very different decision about maintenance. If that same homeowner were only planning to be in her home for a short-term period, perhaps three or four years, there would be even more reason to defer spending money on maintenance.

School budget decisions are made through a process that is most likely to emphasize academic concerns, and often maintenance activities are seen as an unimportant component of a budget by persons more keenly attuned to teachers, class offerings and instructional materials. But perhaps even more important is that school districts have financing options and state aid incentives that make capital repairs much more attractive than spending money for maintenance. As described in the finance section below, school districts receive additional aid for funds spent on capital projects, whereas they do not for maintenance spending.

Proper maintenance is cost-effective in the long run, but the state aid differential makes it less so, when viewed solely from the school district's perspective. For school district board members and managers, of course, there are many other aspects to building and maintenance choices, but it is nevertheless a complex version of this simple dynamic which has helped to drive the current school facilities crisis. It is the cumulative impact of a great many decisions made in the short-term, and with short-term fiscal consequences in mind, that has resulted in putting off repairs, or "deferred maintenance" in our school systems.

Finance System

Generally, construction and renovation projects undertaken by school districts are financed partially by state aid.[10] School districts have the option to finance capital construction projects through borrowed funds, and they also receive state reimbursement for building costs, including debt service costs when the project is financed through borrowing. Conversely, school district maintenance expenditures generally are not explicitly reimbursed by state aid formulas[11] and thus must usually be paid for entirely out of current local funds.

This situation provides a counter-productive fiscal incentive to school districts: if maintenance is deferred and equipment or structures degenerate, the district can borrow funds for their repair or replacement and also receive state aid payments reimbursing those expenditures.

Regular maintenance can greatly extend the service life of structures or equipment (e.g., boilers), and is thus a very cost-effective practice, when compared against letting a system or structure degenerate to the point of needing replacement. However, from the school district's standpoint, given the aid incentive, the overall cost-effectiveness of maintenance spending may be effectively nullified because high proportions of aid can be received for replacement, but not for maintenance. School district officials have stated that they sometimes delay maintenance work to

[10]The average reimbursement rate for approved building expenses is 67%; see the discussion of the building aid formula below.

[11]Maintenance expenditures are included in school district operating expenditures, which factor into various state aid formulas, but the formula reimbursement rates and diluted impact of these formulas (owing to the use of very lagged data and the transition adjustment cap) generally reduces the aid impact of maintenance expenditures to almost nothing.

be included in broader capital projects, so that it would be eligible for state building aid reimbursement.[12]

This counter-productive fiscal incentive may be particularly powerful given the fact that the period of tenure for superintendents and school board members is often shorter than the period necessary for good maintenance procedures to have a positive financial impact. For example, most superintendents stay within a school district for only four to five years, and the average length of tenure for school board members is similar.[13] Deferring maintenance may actually be an effective strategy for limiting tax increases within a four to six year time horizon. This short-term effectiveness, however, is more than undone by (and is in sharp contrast to) the true impact of deferred maintenance — which is to greatly increase costs over the long term. The current facilities crisis can ultimately be traced to the cumulative impact of decades of short-term decision-making.

Approval of Projects

Bond issuances for capital projects, and the establishment of capital reserve funds in school districts outside of the big five cities must be approved by referendum, although capital expenditures may be made from current revenues without voter approval. Energy performance contracts are another method of making capital improvements that does not require voter approval (see below). In the big five city school districts the situation is quite different. Voter approval is not required for capital spending, but the school boards in those cities are "fiscally dependent" upon the city governments. This means that the city governments, as opposed to the boards of education or the Chancellor, effectively can control, or at least limit, the amount of funding available, both for operating expenses and capital improvements. The problem is that municipal budgets have priorities driven by a number of needs in addition to school facilities issues, including police, fire, sanitation, transportation, health, and social services, and this dynamic has over time resulted in inadequate funding for the capital needs of the public schools in the large cities.

Building Aid

State funding is primarily available through the building aid formula, which is one of the most long-standing of the current panoply of formulas aiding school districts. Unlike most other aid categories, the basic structure of this formula is essentially the same as it was when enacted in the 1960's, following the recommendations of the Diefendorf Committee, although there have been modifications. This formula, described very broadly, reimburses school building expenses at a rate which varies depending upon district wealth; the rate is higher for poorer districts and lower for the

[12]See State Comptroller's Audit Report 93-S-89.

[13]National data show the average length of tenure for school board members as being less than three years; in New York State, respondents to a recent school boards survey on average had a longer period of tenure.

more wealthy. In the 1997-98 school year an estimated $775 million will be provided to school districts statewide through building aid.

Building aid is available for expenses incurred in construction of new buildings, additions, alterations or modernizations of existing space, purchase of buildings, and for lease and installment purchase payments under certain circumstances. The formula reimburses both debt service payments (principal and interest) and capital expenditures made from current revenues or capital reserve funds. Aid on debt service and lease payments is generally paid on a current year basis, whereas aid for capital expenditures from reserves or budget appropriations is paid on a lagged basis.

To be eligible for aid, school district plans and specifications must be approved by the Facilities Planning Unit of the State Education Department (SED), which also computes a maximum cost allowance for each project, based on the pupil capacity of the building and various average cost calculations; projects are only aided up to this maximum.

The aid formula applies an aid ratio to approved building expense, which includes both debt service and current expense, within the limitation of the SED cost allowance computations. The aid ratio is the state share for building expenses, and is computed based on district property wealth per pupil in comparison to the state average. For an average wealth district, this computation provides an aid ratio of 49 percent; for a district of half the average wealth, the ratio is 75 percent; and for a district with wealth twice the state average wealth or more, the ratio declines to zero (and no aid would be provided).

Recent Changes to Limit State Aid Liabilities

Building aid has historically been a large factor in school aid "bumps" or aid estimate increases because school districts often make unplanned capital expenditures and certain types of expenditures are reimbursed on a current year basis. A number of changes have been made in recent years to address these issues:

Under changes enacted in 1995-96, for newly issued debt, including bond anticipation notes (BANs), current year aid is paid only to the extent that these expenses are reported to SED by November 15 of the *previous* year; any debt service unreported by that time is aided in the following year. This is known as a "date-certain" provision, and similar provisions have now been extended to other categories of school aid.

In 1996-97, strict limitations were placed upon the circumstances under which BANs expenses can be aided. Another change enacted in 1996-97 specifies that to be eligible for aid, debt service payments would have to be at least the length of a minimum period of amortization. For long-term borrowing, these minimum periods are 15 years for new construction or 10 years for reconstruction, rehabilitation or improvement of existing facilities. If debt obligations are issued for less than the minimum period, aid is calculated based on an assumed amortization schedule.

As noted in a previous report, the minimum amortization period change was intended to help limit unexpected increases in building aid liability, but it would also have the effect of discouraging school districts from paying off debt quickly. This effect has indeed occurred: the issuance of long-term bonds is up sharply this year, and there is a corresponding decrease in short-term debt issuances. (See: "N.Y. Schools' Seesaw: Bond Issuance Up, Notes Down," The Bond Buyer, August 25, 1997)

Since the early 1980's school districts have been allowed a choice of using their aid ratio as computed for the current school year, or the aid ratio used in any previous school year (going back to 1981-82). This provision was added so that districts could rely on a steady percentage of state reimbursement for building projects funded over many years, since property wealth, enrollments and thus aid ratios would otherwise vary. The cumulative impact of this provision over many years, however, has been to greatly increase the reimbursement offered, and many districts are receiving reimbursement rates substantially above those they would receive based on a current measure of need. In 1997-98 the average building aid reimbursement ratio is 67 percent. Only 95 school districts use an aid ratio computed based on current wealth (less than 14 percent of all districts), and the overall effect of the aid ratio choice provision is to add $108 million to building aid payments.

Energy Performance Contracts

Independent of the normal requirements for capital projects, school districts can use "energy performance contracts" to install, maintain or manage energy systems or equipment to improve the energy efficiency or produce energy in exchange for a portion of the energy savings or revenues.

In 1994 the Energy Law was changed to authorize school districts and other governmental entities to enter into energy performance contracts. The rationale behind this change was to encourage energy conservation projects by removing impediments to their progress and allowing for the application of innovative practices used in the private sector. Energy performance contractors are intended to provide management resources, technical expertise and funding to install equipment and carry out other energy-saving measures in exchange for a portion of the savings produced.

The 1994 legislation provided that energy performance contracts could be awarded through a written request for proposals (RFP), in lieu of bidding, and school districts would be exempt from normal voter approval requirements for this purpose. The normal requirements of General Municipal Law for lease purchases were also lifted.

The Comptroller's audit 96-J-2, *State Education Department, School District Energy Conservation Activities*, found that school districts have entered into arrangements that may not be in their best interest or are inconsistent with the intent of energy performance contracts. Areas of concern noted in the audit include:

- Savings to school districts were being calculated after the receipt of building aid, and thus projects that did not save money on a total cost basis were being carried out;
- Non-energy related improvements were included in performance contracts;
- There was a lack of good data available in selecting energy performance contractors;
- Contractor proposals did not identify the scope of work so that different proposals are not comparable;

- Maintenance and monitoring charges were not adequately identified in proposals; and,
- Higher interest rates than the districts could obtain through other means were used for financing.

In this year's budget legislation, many of the concerns reported in the audit were addressed. The amendments apply to school districts and require the Commissioner of Education to establish regulations in consultation with the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. The regulations will:

- Ensure that eligibility for performance contracts will be determined exclusive of state building aid;
- List appropriate types of projects that can qualify as energy performance contracts;
- Describe an approval process to review the type and scope of work and require that detailed breakdown of energy savings be provided for the contract's duration;
- Implement a process to ensure that districts obtain the lowest cost financing possible; and,
- Provide that maintenance and monitoring charges be included separately in the contract in a clear and conspicuous manner.

Regulation and Mandate Relief Issues

School districts must not only meet basic building standards, they also must comply with a number of additional regulatory requirements related to environmental, health and public access mandates, including the Americans with Disabilities Act, asbestos abatement and environmental regulations related to indoor air quality, electromagnetic fields, hazardous materials, lead, pesticides and radon.[14] The planning process for school facilities must therefore address complex issues in regulatory interpretation and their impact on local construction costs. A study of the issue in the big five city school districts found that approximately $3 billion was needed in order to meet federal and state mandates in these areas.[15]

Mandate relief actions that would decrease the cost of school construction and rehabilitation should be considered either as part of implementing legislation for the School Facilities Bond Act (if passed) or in conjunction with the 1998-99 budget. Two requirements often cited by the New York State School Boards Association and other groups as being especially onerous are asbestos

---

[14] *Environmental Quality of Schools,* Report to the New York State Board of Regents, 1994.

[15] *School Buildings in Crisis*, Conference of Big 5 School Districts, May 1996.

remediation requirements and the Wicks law. Measures to loosen the scope of these mandates should be considered to maximize the limited funds that are available for school facilities.

A number of requirements related to asbestos abatement activities are widely held to be needlessly inefficient, costly or even unwise from a health and safety perspective. Requirements related to the removal of floor tile and roofing materials containing asbestos in particular have been identified as adding to the cost of rehabilitation work. Several proposals have been introduced in the legislature that would change the manner in which these projects are carried out.

Under the Wicks Law school districts (as well as most other state and local government entities) are required to award at least three separate contracts for construction projects valued at over $50,000. The law requires separate plans, bids and contracts for (i) heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, (ii) electrical work; and (iii) plumbing. Each school district must thus coordinate the work of these contractors, a difficult task for small districts with only occasional construction. For some districts, the inability to effectively manage the various contractors may lead to cost overruns and delayed completion of projects. But even in large districts Wicks can drive inefficiencies; for example, the New York City School Construction Authority was given an exemption from the Wicks Law, and the authority has reported substantial savings from the exemption.

Wicks reforms that should be considered include raising the $50,000 threshold, which has been in place for decades; or exempting small school districts with limited resources and experience in construction. If these reforms are adopted, it may be necessary to provide protections to the specialty subcontractors who currently work and are paid directly by school districts to ensure that they are treated fairly by general contractors.

Another approach to help school districts, particularly small districts, deal with construction costs is to provide them with access to pooled financing and construction management services from the Dormitory Authority or another governmental construction agency, for building and educational technology projects.

On the other side of the issue, there is evidence that current standards and procedures are not always being adequately met, and that there is therefore a need for greater attention to enforcing existing regulations. Comptroller's audits have found that required inspections may not always take place and that existing planning requirements are not being met, so there is room for improved enforcement of existing requirements.

There may also be a need for expanding regulation in some areas and more study of this issue is needed. The annual inspections currently required in school buildings — even when effectively carried out — focus on major structural problems or fire and safety issues. They do not adequately ensure that school buildings are properly maintained. The deplorable conditions currently found in many schools, in and of themselves, indicate that improvements are necessary. It has been suggested, for example, that each school district be required to have a written preventive maintenance policy or plan.

Another area that should be reviewed is the current method of approving and allowing expenditures from capital reserve funds. It is often difficult to obtain voter approval within a school district for the establishment of these funds. If these funds were easier to establish and utilize, many school districts would take advantage of them; districts would thus be better able to do regular maintenance and repair work on a timely basis and would be better prepared to handle unforseen problems. It has also been proposed that school districts be *required* to establish capital maintenance reserves for new projects.

Description of Legislative Action in 1997-98 Budget

In response to the current facilities crisis, the 1997-98 budget provided enhancements in building aid, reinstated a program to explicitly aid minor maintenance expenditures, and enacted legislation placing the School Facilities Bond Act on the ballot this November.

Impact of Building Aid Enrichments and Minor Maintenance Aid

(In millions of dollars for school year)

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Building Aid Enrichment	28	45	114	170
Minor Maintenance Aid	50	50	50	80
Total	$78	$95	$164	$250

Source: Executive and State Education Department estimates.

Building Aid Enrichment

For building projects locally approved after July 1, 1998, changes in the building aid formula will recognize varying regional costs in the calculation of maximum cost allowances and will increase the effective reimbursement rate for virtually all school districts by 10 percent. As shown in the chart above, these changes are expected to increase aid by $170 million after four years; the impact occurs in a phased manner, as more and more building projects benefit from regionally adjusted cost allowances and receive additional aid through the reimbursement changes.[16]

The use of regionally appropriate cost allowances is a long-standing issue, and this change follows the recommendations from the Board of Regents, the State Comptroller and the Executive. The current formula uses a single, statewide average cost approach, which ignores well-known differences in regional construction costs, most of which are driven by wage-rate differentials. The new regional calculations will be based on county-level wage data, possibly aggregated in multi-county regions (the details are to be prescribed in SED regulations).

The additional 10 percent reimbursement in building aid for new projects reflects a dramatic increase in reimbursement rates. Every school district will be guaranteed a reimbursement rate of at least 10 percent, as opposed to the current formula, which has no minimum aid ratio (and under which 44 school districts are completely ineligible for aid). The current law provision that no aid ratio will exceed a maximum of 95 percent will apply to the additional percentage. For regular building aid, no school district is currently hitting the maximum, although with the additional percentage, 92 school districts will be capped.

[16]The longer term impact of the changes may be even higher. For example, if all of the approved building expenses being aided in the 1997-98 school year were eligible for the additional apportionment, it alone would drive an additional $120 million in aid.

Minor Maintenance Aid

The "extraordinary school capital needs" program originally enacted in 1994-95 was reinstated in this year's budget under a new name: "minor maintenance aid." In the original program $62 million was provided under the assumption that it would be spent over a two-year period — the aid amounts outlined in the budget legislation therefore represent somewhat of an increased program level. The legislation is silent as to whether the program will continue beyond the 2001-02 school year (in which the total amount of aid is to increase from $50 million to $80 million).

New York City will receive $33.3 million annually from 1998-99 until 2000-01, and $53 million in 2001-02. For school districts outside of New York City, $16.7 million will be provided annually from 1998-99 until 2000-01, and $26.7 million in 2001-02. The aid amounts going to New York City are explicitly described in the legislation, and funds will be apportioned to other school districts through a formula based on the relative age of facilities and the long-term enrollment growth trends in each school district. An appendix to this report shows the background data and aid allocations by school district.

The legislation also includes a maintenance of effort provision which specifies that if a school district uses any of the new funding to supplant local funds for repair programs (as measured against its 1997-98 school year budget), it will have its aid apportionment reduced by an equal amount. This provision responds to the criticism of the earlier program that in many school districts the additional funding was not used to increase maintenance and repair activities, but merely replaced planned local funding for these activities.

The intent behind the minor maintenance program is clear — the additional funding is meant to spur additional maintenance activities in local school districts, based on an assumption that schools are not currently devoting enough funding to these activities. The problem with such an allocation formula, however, is that it may itself spur inefficient behavior, or cause mistaken impressions in local school districts.

For example, although they are generally perceived to be very few in number, there are school districts in the State that have been doing a good job on maintenance, and that have facilities fully up to standards. In these school districts, providing additional funds with the directive that they be spent on additional maintenance will spur inefficient behavior. However, it would also be unfair to deny funding to districts that have no maintenance deficiencies, because if aid is provided only for (or in proportion to) existing maintenance deficiencies, it would be rewarding past irresponsible management.

On the other side of the issue, many school districts may perceive that if they simply spend the additional funding on maintenance, that they are doing the right thing. This impression, however, would not be correct. The minor maintenance formula is based on aggregate level data on facilities age and enrollment, and cannot possibly reflect the myriad conditions in each district that impact maintenance issues. Determinations on an issue like this would depend on how much a district was

spending, how well have facilities been kept up, what sort of materials were used in the original construction, and so forth.

State aid formulas, in other words, even if well-constructed, are not a good means of making local budgetary allocations. The longer term solution to improper and deferred maintenance issues therefore cannot be exclusively to provide more aid. There must also be regulatory reform, better reporting requirements so that the underlying conditions are better known, and better enforcement of existing health and safety standards.

It should also be understood that the provision of minor maintenance aid *does not* remove the existing fiscal incentive for capital repairs over routine maintenance. The new aid will certainly help, and will increase spending overall for maintenance through its maintenance of effort provision, but it does not provide a dynamic incentive for districts to spend more on maintenance beyond the new aid. The key difference is that minor maintenance aid is not a reimbursement formula — school districts will not get additional funding for every additional dollar they spend on maintenance. In comparison, through building aid they will continue to get additional aid for every additional dollar of approved capital expenditures.

The School Facilities Bond Act

This year's budget legislation included a $2.4 billion bond referendum to finance school facility improvements. This bond act, however, was not accompanied by implementing legislation to describe how the funds would be allocated among the permitted uses, or among school districts. The legislation which places the Act on the November ballot does specify the general purposes for which proceeds may be used:

Capital projects in public school facilities to:

- Address serious health and safety needs;
- Expand physical capacity in school facilities;
- Enhance accessibility for individuals with disabilities;
- Remediate emergency situations;
- Provide environmental remediation; and,
- Support educational technology.

As described in a report from the New York City Independent Budget Office, the method in which the Act has been authorized effectively separates the question of whether to borrow for these purposes, from the equally important question of how to apportion the funds if the borrowing

occurs.[17] Voters will be involved in the former question but not the latter, and they are being asked to approve the borrowing without being informed on how the funds will be distributed among purposes or school districts.

The School Facilities Bond Act[18] represents General Obligation (G.O.) debt, which is subject to approval by the voters. G.O. debt is the best means for financing when debt is going to be used, because it does not bypass the State Constitution, as does backdoor borrowing issued by public authorities, and it also generally carries a lower interest cost.

Because it lacks implementing language at this time, the manner in which the bond act funding will interrelate with other funding mechanisms cannot be fully evaluated. It is not known, for example, whether any local match will be required. However, the legislation's stated purpose is to provide for "*critical* projects related to construction, expansion and modernization of public school facilities" (emphasis added). Thus, it is implicit that these funds are intended to be provided *in addition to* regular funding streams, and the proposal has most often been linked to the crisis nature of the situation. In school districts where capital proposals might otherwise not receive funding, the bond act proceeds could help to bridge the gap between needs and resources. Criticism of the proposal as failing to rationally mesh with existing aid programs, must be considered in relevance to the critical nature of the needs.[19]

---

[17] *Voter's Choice: The School Facility Health and Safety Bond Act of 1997*, NYC Independent Budget Office, October 1997.

[18] The actual "short title" of the bond act, as contained in the legislation is "The School Facility Health and Safety Bond Act of 1997" — but inasmuch as this is not the shortest of titles, and also somewhat of a misnomer as to purpose (because the legislation contains no weighting among the six purposes, of which health and safety is only one), this report has used a further shortened title.

[19] Such criticism, moreover, seems particularly weak when viewed in the overall context of the current school finance system (i.e., a complex amalgamation of unintelligible formula components many of which offer counter-productive and conflicting incentives). Any uncertainty in the details as to how this new funding will blend with the existing building aid program pales in comparison to the overall morass. At least both building programs are designed to encourage and support necessary construction, renovation and repairs — elsewhere in the school aid formulas the incentives offered are actually in conflict with one another.

Comptroller's Audits: A More Cost-Effective and Accountable System

In a number of audit reports, the Comptroller has made key recommendations on how to obtain and maintain quality school buildings in a cost-effective manner. Some of these reflect procedures that are already required in law, but are not being effectively used (for example, the Capital Assets Preservation Plan, or CAPP). Other recommendations are not yet required, but can save money, such as value engineering. Still others could improve accountability by providing better information on conditions and performance. These components should all be utilized as part of school building programs, and they are even more important given the influx of additional funds contemplated in this year's budget legislation.

This section discusses the Comptroller's audits as they relate to school facilities. Since many of the audits are related, the description is functional, and a summary description of each individual audit reports follows the functional discussion. Audit reports in the discussion below are often referenced by their numbers; their titles are provided in the following section.

Improving Maintenance, Capital Planning and Implementation

Better Maintenance

A major cause of the poor condition of many school buildings has been the failure to properly maintain them by many school districts. The failure to have a good preventive maintenance program and to make routine repairs in a timely manner results in ever increasing needs for capital project work, which costs taxpayers much more in the long run.

A 1994 audit (93-S-89) reported that none of the school districts surveyed had a formal preventive maintenance program that included all of the components prescribed by the State Education Department in their CAPP* manual (*Capital Assets Preservation Plan, see discussion below). That audit also found that many school districts routinely deferred maintenance projects and those deferrals resulted in higher costs to the districts.

A February 1995 audit (A-18-93) found that tardiness in completing maintenance work has contributed to the deterioration of the physical conditions in New York City's schools. This report also found that the Division of School Facilities did not take timely action to resolve violations issued by the New York City Fire Department and Department of Buildings. The preventive maintenance work (e.g., elevator inspections) and maintenance work (e.g., panic bars on exit doors) could have an impact on the health and safety of students and employees.

Better Capital Planning and Implementation

Even with a good preventive maintenance and repair programs there will be a continual need for capital project work on the over 8,000 school buildings in New York State, and to build new

buildings. A good long-range capital planning process is needed to ensure that this work is accomplished in the most cost-effective manner at both the district and state levels.

The Capital Assets Preservation Plan (CAPP), as described in section 3602 of the Education Law, requires school districts to develop comprehensive long-term plans to maintain and preserve their capital assets. The intentions behind this program are laudable — to ensure that school districts *and* the state government have adequate information on school capital needs. Unfortunately, although enacted in 1987, this program has still not been implemented in a satisfactory manner. An improved CAPP process along with other enhancements would provide a cost-effective planning process.

The Comptroller's audit report 93-S-89, *The State Education Department, Oversight of Districts' Programs to Maintain and Preserve School Buildings,* reported that the CAPP system has not been fully utilized and study 96-D-4, *State Education Department, Facilities Planning Unit,* reported that there are methodologies that could be used to make capital projects more cost effective.

The Law requires the Commissioner of Education to develop a five-year CAPP plan for all public school facilities. This plan must include a statewide capital assets inventory and a report on public school instructional building conditions. The report should include cost estimates for construction of new buildings, additions or reconstruction and repairs, maintenance and energy conservation. In Report 93-S-89, the auditors found that most districts had *not* developed inventories and long-term plans that complied with the Education Law. As a result, SED did not have the information for a statewide inventory and report. In addition, the report found that the consultant contractor hired by SED had not completed 12 of the 29 tasks required under the contract, including helping SED to obtain five-year plan data from the school districts and developing the first five-year report to the Legislature.

Study 96-D-4 reported that there are three proven methodologies which can be used to improve the cost-effectiveness of school building capital projects. These methodologies are:

- Value engineering: this is a formal method of analyzing a project's functions to identify and evaluate alternatives for providing these functions in the most cost-effective manner, without sacrificing quality. According to historical results of using value engineering in construction, the cost reduction usually ranges from 5 percent to 20 percent; it was found that such savings could reduce state aid payments by $10 to $41 million a year.

- Life cycle cost analysis: this refers to assessing different alternatives for designing a facility, taking into account the cost of building, operating and maintaining the facility over its entire economic life.

- Standardized plans: this represents a way to reduce design and construction costs. Under this approach buildings could be evaluated statewide for construction, program use and operating cost-effectiveness. The most effective plans could then be widely replicated.

These methodologies need to be considered in both the long-range capital plans and individual project plans to ensure that the limited resources of the school districts and the State are maximized in obtaining adequate school facilities for all children.

Generally for each capital project, school districts contract with an architectural firm to design the project and, based on the design documents, contract with construction firms to build the new buildings, additions or reconstruction and repair work. To ensure that projects are implemented properly and at the best possible price school districts need to use a competitive contracting process that obtains qualified contractors and they also need to ensure that the work is adequately inspected. Three of the Comptroller's recent audits have found problems with contracting practices in New York City and inspection of construction work throughout the State.

In Report 96-N-5, the auditors found that the School Construction Authority (SCA) did not adequately pre-qualify or re-qualify firms before they received contracts and did not enforce its existing controls over the hiring of subcontractors. Also, the SCA did not adhere to its award procedures for 3 of 11 design and construction management contracts reviewed. In addition, the SCA did not consistently evaluate completed work or measure customers satisfaction with completed work. Officials at 66 percent of schools responding to the audit survey believed that excessive maintenance or repairs were required to correct conditions resulting from poor construction.

In Report 93-S-30, *State Education Department Oversight of School District Construction Projects,* the auditors found shortcomings in oversight. At the building projects visited, there was no evidence that all required inspections of foundations, structures, and plumbing and mechanical systems had been done. At one project visit, district officials pointed out construction deficiencies that should have been identified by proper inspections. Construction supervision was also found to not always be sufficient or adequate. For example, architects generally visited project sites only once every two weeks.

In Report A-11-93, the auditors found poor project management coordination at the School Construction Authority. Also, the School Construction Authority did not have an adequate project data base to account for all projects and to track project progress.

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators are a valuable tool for accountability and management of any program. Currently there is no performance measurement system in place for the school capital program, and having such a measurement system in place would help to timely identify and correct problems; this is especially important if the Bond Act passes, and there is a large infusion of new funds. Two audit reports have been issued on the need for using performance measurements in the capital construction area (95-D-28 and 94-S-24). Although elementary, middle and secondary schools were not covered in these audits, the concepts would apply to all types of capital construction work. The inclusion of facilities information on school building report cards, as planned by the State Education Department, is a positive step taking place in this area.

Summary Descriptions of Audit Reports

Following are summary descriptions of audits and studies from the Office of the State Comptroller on issues related to school facilities. Except as noted (*), full copies of these reports are available at the State Comptroller's Internet homepage (http://www.osc.state.ny.us).

State Education Department:

Facilities Planning Unit **(96-D-4)** — Generally, construction projects undertaken by school districts are financed in part by State aid. This aid must be approved by SED's Facilities Planning Unit, which also reviews the detailed building plans for projects outside New York City to ensure that the plans comply with the State Building Code. Audit examined the procedures used by the Unit and found that while they did provide assurance that building plans complied with the Building Code, they were not intended to provide assurance that the plans were cost-effective. Several methods were identified that could be used to provide such assurance, including value engineering and life-cycle cost analysis. The audit also evaluated an Executive proposal to transfer to local governments the Unit's existing responsibilities for reviewing school plans and concluded that this proposal would not be cost-effective. The annual costs that would be incurred by local governments in performing these responsibilities ($3.4 million) would far exceed the annual costs incurred by the Unit ($700,000).

Oversight of Districts' Programs to Maintain and Preserve School Buildings **(93-S-89)*** — School districts are required to prepare plans assessing the maintenance, repairs and modernization needed by their buildings. SED's administration of this planning effort outside New York City was examined, and it was found that improvements were needed. Plans developed by the school districts were found to be inadequate, and needed maintenance projects were often deferred. When maintenance is deferred, facilities can be damaged and the eventual cost of repair is increased. Deferred maintenance is encouraged by the State's school aid formula, as capital costs are reimbursed at a high rate and maintenance costs are not.

Oversight of School District Construction Projects **(93-S-30)*** — School districts may receive state aid for the construction or rehabilitation of facilities. SED is responsible for ensuring that the facilities funded by the aid are constructed in a safe and cost-effective manner. The audit found that the construction projects were not always supervised and inspected as required, and in some cases, new facilities were occupied before a certificate of occupancy was granted. It was also found that some districts received more State aid than they were due. Several improvements in SED procedures were recommended for monitoring and reimbursing school district construction projects.

School District Energy Conservation Activities **(96-J-2)** — This audit examined the actions taken by SED and the school districts to reduce energy costs. The audit found that most school districts had made some effort toward energy conservation and SED had provided assistance to the districts in their efforts. However, if certain improvements were made, energy costs could be further reduced. For example, SED did not formally monitor energy conservation activities at the school districts, even though it maintains data about the districts that could be used to develop indicators of energy

efficiency. The audit also found that many school districts did not monitor their energy use, had not had energy audits in the prior five years, and did not participate in available energy conservation programs. The audit further noted that school districts may be more likely to make energy saving improvements if SED established a revolving fund to pay for such improvements; the districts could repay the fund from the resulting energy savings. It also noted that certain actions could be taken to better protect the interests of school districts that hire companies to reduce their energy costs.

NYC Board of Education and School Construction Authority:

Improvements Needed in Construction Contracting Practices **(96-N-5)** -- The School Construction Authority (SCA) is responsible for the design and construction of elementary and secondary public schools in New York City. The procedures used by the SCA to award and monitor construction contracts were examined. To ensure that construction work is performed by competent and reputable contractors, SCA staff are required to investigate contractors' backgrounds and past performance before they are allowed to bid for contracts, and are required to approve any subcontractors before they begin work. However, the audit found that some contractors were awarded contracts, even though their background and past performance were not completely investigated, and many subcontractors began work before they were approved by the Authority. It was also found that proper competitive bidding practices were not always followed and procedures intended to prevent excessive contract payments were not always followed. In addition, when officials at schools where the SCA had supervised work were surveyed, nearly half of the responding officials rated the SCA's performance as less than adequate and two-thirds of the responding officials stated that excessive maintenance or repairs were needed to correct conditions resulting from poor construction. The audit recommended that the SCA improve its contract award and monitoring practices, and establish a system for following up on completed projects.

Division of School Facilities Repairs and Maintenance Program Needs To Be Accelerated To Alleviate the Disrepair in City Schools **(A-18-93)** — As of July 1993, there was a backlog of 51,000 work order requests from school custodians, including 28,508 which were over one year old. The report found: that NYC Board of Education's tardiness in completing work has contributed to the deterioration of physical conditions in NYC's schools; neglecting to make routine repairs in a timely manner results in the ever increasing need for capital expenditures; and, decreasing the amount of funds available for maintaining schools only increases future costs.

Capital Improvement Projects **(A-11-93)** — The objective of this review was to determine if Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) submitted to the School Construction Authority (SCA) by the NYC Board of Education were being completed to the Board's satisfaction. A sample was selected of projects submitted by the Board that were either under construction or had been completed by SCA as of September 1992. Projects handled by SCA are contained in the Board's five-year capital plan, which authorized the Board to spend $4.3 billion, including $1 billion for the CIPs. As of September 1992, the SCA reported that it had completed 602 projects, and 1,117 were in construction. It was found that there was poor project management coordination at SCA's Office of Project Management. At one school, for example, two sets of window guards were ordered. The

window guards that were used were of inferior quality and improperly installed. The superior window guards, which cost $40,000 were the wrong size and could not be used. CIPs submitted to SCA were supposed to be entered into the SCA's data base to ensure they were accounted for. It was found that 177 of the 1,027 sampled projects (17 percent) submitted by the Board to SCA in fiscal years 1991 and 1992 could not be located on SCA's data base. It was also found that the Office of Project Management, which is responsible for completion of CIP work, did not have a data base to track project progress, and that the Board had no access to information regarding the status of the projects submitted to SCA.

New York City School Construction Authority and Board of Education Review of Time Frames to Construct New Schools and Modernize Existing Facilities **(A-15-92)*** — A prior report by the Comptroller's Office, *School Construction in New York City: Roadblocks and Remedies (Report No. 1-89)*, found that the New York City Board of Education took an average of 9.3 years to build a school. In this audit it was found that the average time to construct new schools was 6.5 years, 2.8 years less than the prior average. Auditors also found that many projects will not be completed within the Capital Plan estimated time frames. In addition, projects underway to modernize or rehabilitate existing school buildings will probably take two years longer than constructing new schools.

State Construction Agencies:

Staff Study on State Construction Agencies' Performance Indicators **(95-D-28)**— The Office of General Services, the Dormitory Authority and the Facilities Development Corporation construct or maintain buildings for State agencies. The auditors conducted a study to determine whether these three agencies would benefit from the use of performance indicators, to measure the extent to which construction and rehabilitation projects are managed effectively. The study concluded that these agencies would benefit significantly from the use of performance indicators, and suggested that the three agencies work together to identify appropriate indicators, develop systems for collecting the data needed, and periodically publish their performance results. (See also report 94-S-24, *State University Construction Fund, Performance Indicators.*)

Appendix I: Selected Bibliography

Report of the Commission on School Facilities and Maintenance Reform, the final report of the "Levy Commission" (June , 1995).

School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State, United States General Accounting Office, (June, 1996) GAO/HEHS-96-148.

School Construction — A Continuing Problem, New York State Senate Committee on Investigations, Taxation and Government Operations (April, 1993).

Bursting at the Seams, The Citizen's Commission on Planning for Enrollment Growth (January, 1995).

School Decay: A Prescription for Recovery, New York State United Teachers (March, 1994)

School Buildings in Crises, Conference of Big 5 School Districts (May, 1996).

Environmental Quality of Schools, Regents Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality in Schools, NYS Education Depatment (1994).

Overcrowding in New York City Public Schools: Where Do We go from Here?, Office of the Comptroller, City of New York (January, 1995).

The State of Municipal Services in the 1990s: Crowding, Building Conditions and Staffing in the New York City Schools, The Citizens Budget Commission (September, 1997).

Voter's Choice: The School Facility Health and Safety Bond Act of 1997, New York City Independent Budget Office (October, 1997).

A Statewide Study of Student Achievement and Behavior and School Building Condition, Earthman, Cash and Van Berkum, paper to the Annual Meeting, Council of Educational Facilities Planners, International, Dallas, 1995.

"The School Environment: A Link to Understanding Stress," Dennis Connors, *Theory into Practice*, vol. XXII, number 1, pp 15-20.

NOTE: See also the audit reports from the Office of the State Comptroller, described in a preceding chapter of this report.

Appendix II: Projected Minor Maintenance Aid

This appendix provides a district-by-district projections for minor maintenance aid to be received next year, under current statutes. This program was added in the 1997-98 budget, but aid payments will not begin until the 1998-99 school year. Minor maintenance aid will provide $50 million in funding statewide annually in the 1998-99 though 2000-01 school years, and $80 million in 2001-02; this projection is based on the $50 million funding level.

The legislation specifies that New York City will receive $33.3 million from 1998-99 until 2000-01, and $53 million in 2001-02. For school districts outside New York City, $16.7 million will be provided annually from 1998-99 until 2000-01, and $26.7 million in 2001-02. The funds will be apportioned among school districts through a formula based on the relative age of facilities and the long-term enrollment growth trends in each school district.

The minor maintenance aid estimates provided in this appendix should be considered to be a preliminary estimate of the funds that will be available to each school district next year under this program. The estimates are based on the formula now in statute, although some aspects of the calculations may be altered by data updates or rules adopted by the State Education Department. The data employed to calculate minor maintenance aid was obtained from the State Education Department Office of Fiscal Analysis and Services, which also reviewed the projection methodology.

The minor maintenance aid formula is based on an "age of facilities index," a "long-term growth index," and school district enrollment. Each school district's average school building age is computed based on building ages and square footage (i.e., the average age is weighted by the square footage of buildings). This district average age is divided by a state average age (currently calculated to be 41 years) to arrive at an age of facilities index. Although more recent data is available, the long-term growth index is statutorily described as the ratio of 1993-94 enrollment to 1989-90 enrollment (but not less that one). The aid amounts are calculated by multiplying each district's age of facilities index by the long-term growth index by current enrollment. This figure is divided by the statewide figure to determine the proportion of the available funds to go to each school district. Districts receive a minimum of $2,000 annually (districts with missing data are shown as receiving this amount of aid).

The district-by-district listing which follows is in the school district/county code order normally seen on state aid computer runs. It includes other data of interest, such as enrollment figures and trends, and information on capital expenditures over a ten-year period and school district "operations and maintenance" or O&M spending in 1994-95. The data on school district capital and O&M spending was obtained from the State Education Department's Facilities Planning Unit. Similar data from that office will be presented on school district report cards for the first time this year; its presentation here will allow time for school administrators to react to the data shown for their district and comment on its accuracy and appropriateness for reporting on maintenance issues. Note that there is missing data for some school districts.

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
ALBANY COUNTY:										
010100	ALBANY	53.7	9,751	22.6%	9.0%	$123,984	45,785,848	5,280	7,251,365	836
010201	BERNE KNOX	45.3	1,254	8.9%	10.0%	$13,647	4,913,000	3,881	587,467	464
010306	BETHLEHEM	49.1	4,593	20.0%	10.3%	$54,087	22,776,053	5,392	3,075,192	728
010402	RAVENA COEYMAN	33.3	2,473	3.3%	3.5%	$18,473	7,346,287	2,965	1,487,656	600
010500	COHOES	38.1	2,318	1.7%	-2.3%	$19,138	13,305,030	5,972	1,425,999	640
010601	SOUTH COLONIE	34.2	5,716	9.4%	3.8%	$44,102	19,836,568	3,656	3,533,209	651
010605	NORTH COLONIE	37.6	5,165	11.2%	9.2%	$46,099	12,939,798	2,551	3,497,477	689
010615	MENANDS	41.0	242	27.4%	14.7%	$2,496	1,290,900	5,922	165,936	761
010622	MAPLEWOOD	69.8	182	-10.3%	-17.2%	$2,829	103,500	616	116,888	696
010701	GREEN ISLAND	64.0	280	8.9%	13.6%	$4,493	440,000	1,507	177,396	608
010802	GUILDERLAND	34.8	5,367	21.5%	12.2%	$45,599	37,311,625	7,529	3,564,904	719
011003	VOORHEESVILLE	49.5	1,361	14.5%	7.8%	$15,810	12,829,873	10,008	779,581	608
011200	WATERVLIET	49.8	1,552	17.9%	18.1%	$19,804	5,776,648	3,717	734,380	473
ALLEGANY COUNTY:										
020101	ALFRED ALMOND	55.0	758	2.0%	8.6%	$9,819	11,048,089	13,690	353,410	438
020601	ANDOVER	55.0	461	3.8%	2.0%	$5,658	5,670,000	12,517	271,114	598
020702	GENESEE VALLEY	57.2	821	10.8%	4.6%	$10,651	**********	Data Unavailable	**********	
020801	BELFAST	75.3	504	13.5%	6.5%	$8,820	2,108,692	4,458	278,211	588
021102	CANASERAGA	56.4	337	-7.4%	-5.5%	$4,161	3,650,450	10,612	186,555	542
021601	FRIENDSHIP	56.0	432	-7.1%	6.9%	$5,658	3,771,834	7,589	244,353	492
022001	FILLMORE	70.0	781	1.0%	5.8%	$12,648	7,177,400	8,774	329,440	403
022101	WHITESVILLE	45.0	309	-2.5%	2.2%	$3,162	1,112,830	3,435	145,947	450
022302	CUBA-RUSHFORD	53.2	1,308	30.8%	31.1%	$19,804	18,724,747	14,283	704,424	537
022401	SCIO	56.0	557	-10.6%	-10.0%	$6,823	6,742,185	12,018	426,623	760
022601	WELLSVILLE	13.2	1,696	-4.7%	-6.9%	$4,826	6,499,000	3,925	930,542	562
022902	BOLIVAR-RICHBG	65.4	1,063	-0.2%	1.8%	$15,311	4,275,000	3,944	555,797	513
BROOME COUNTY:										
030101	CHENANGO FORKS	33.3	2,131	-2.8%	1.8%	$15,644	11,973,041	5,364	1,220,880	547
030200	BINGHAMTON	53.2	6,245	4.3%	5.8%	$76,554	18,921,936	2,985	4,132,190	652
030501	HARPURSVILLE	48.6	1,244	11.7%	13.2%	$14,812	12,749,618	10,111	510,251	405
030601	SUSQUEHANNA VA	34.3	2,288	6.2%	8.2%	$18,473	2,440,786	1,047	1,487,248	638
030701	CHENANGO VALLE	47.3	2,036	6.6%	5.2%	$21,968	9,299,874	4,627	1,674,546	833
031101	MAINE ENDWELL	31.7	2,625	5.4%	4.7%	$18,972	6,084,314	2,333	1,831,925	702
031301	DEPOSIT	51.2	811	-4.5%	-3.8%	$8,987	10,498,064	12,850	540,136	661
031401	WHITNEY POINT	43.8	2,260	16.1%	10.8%	$23,798	14,902,090	6,912	840,538	390
031501	UNION-ENDICOTT	64.2	4,770	-0.5%	4.8%	$69,731	9,757,382	1,941	3,600,078	716
031502	JOHNSON CITY	42.7	2,875	5.5%	6.9%	$28,624	5,672,219	1,947	2,112,577	725

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
031601	VESTAL	34.7	4,297	6.7%	6.6%	$34,616	9,894,621	2,304	2,737,270	637
031701	WINDSOR	43.8	2,116	4.0%	9.0%	$21,968	9,777,416	4,410	1,291,895	583
CATTARAGAUGUS COUNTY:										
040204	WEST VALLEY	58.0	498	4.2%	-7.7%	$6,324	599,959	1,360	255,103	578
040302	ALLEGANY-LIMES	59.8	1,640	3.7%	1.9%	$21,801	343,219	213	1,034,944	642
040901	ELLICOTTVILLE	34.0	750	13.8%	8.0%	$5,991	3,556,779	4,995	461,173	648
041101	FRANKLINVILLE	53.4	1,045	19.7%	9.7%	$13,314	6,083,341	6,350	578,531	604
041401	HINSDALE	60.0	613	6.8%	0.7%	$7,988	2,108,500	3,648	238,373	412
041801	LITTLE VALLEY	71.0	508	14.7%	8.4%	$8,487	1,282,835	2,673	191,007	398
042301	CATTARAUGUS	40.0	849	2.4%	6.3%	$7,822	7,435,693	8,440	415,709	472
042400	OLEAN	47.9	2,698	1.9%	6.1%	$29,789	16,821,142	5,986	1,576,767	561
042801	GOWANDA	45.2	1,514	-9.1%	-5.2%	$14,812	3,006,000	1,905	973,105	617
042901	PORTVILLE	44.0	1,343	9.6%	6.9%	$13,813	3,758,744	2,871	734,864	561
043001	RANDOLPH	52.6	1,049	-6.2%	1.2%	$12,149	5,099,730	4,509	540,704	478
043200	SALAMANCA	29.1	1,525	-4.6%	-4.0%	$9,652	14,632,252	9,532	918,748	599
043501	YORKSHRE-PIONE	33.6	3,668	10.9%	4.4%	$27,959	26,087,214	7,553	1,304,951	378
CAYUGA COUNTY:										
050100	AUBURN	39.0	5,176	-5.0%	3.1%	$45,267	40,366,290	7,186	2,574,983	458
050301	WEEDSPORT	53.8	1,115	12.2%	5.5%	$13,813	6,640,440	6,330	595,709	568
050401	CATO MERIDIAN	42.5	1,370	10.4%	10.2%	$13,979	5,003,294	3,657	685,425	501
050701	SOUTHERN CAYUG	34.3	1,292	13.8%	10.1%	$10,651	3,643,206	2,915	562,717	450
051101	PORT BYRON	45.9	1,344	5.1%	4.4%	$13,979	12,134,100	9,089	631,439	473
051301	MORAVIA	37.5	1,325	1.6%	5.1%	$11,317	13,568,630	9,897	651,199	475
051901	UNION SPRINGS	48.0	1,201	4.3%	5.7%	$13,314	1,536,431	1,262	770,649	633
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY:										
060201	SOUTHWESTERN	45.6	1,883	6.1%	1.2%	$18,972	4,456,000	2,481	1,044,158	581
060301	FREWSBURG	40.9	1,098	12.5%	8.5%	$10,651	3,155,000	2,979	727,339	687
060401	CASSADAGA VALL	44.6	1,447	5.7%	10.6%	$15,477	1,737,739	1,148	625,562	413
060503	CHAUTAUQUA	62.7	1,084	3.0%	2.7%	$15,144	**********	Data Unavailable	**********	
060601	PINE VALLEY	32.3	934	14.0%	5.4%	$6,990	6,615,220	7,665	490,849	569
060701	CLYMER	54.7	569	-7.0%	-0.3%	$6,823	885,000	1,451	324,391	532
060800	DUNKIRK	49.7	2,393	-0.5%	-0.5%	$25,795	8,703,624	3,634	1,576,725	658
061001	BEMUS POINT	31.1	894	1.7%	0.7%	$6,158	6,011,000	6,792	666,035	753
061101	FALCONER	54.4	1,536	9.8%	7.8%	$19,638	12,975,000	8,604	766,091	508
061501	SILVER CREEK	27.0	1,522	22.9%	14.1%	$10,152	6,314,573	4,469	768,014	544
061503	FORESTVILLE	60.4	708	10.6%	10.0%	$10,318	1,298,575	1,845	491,381	698
061601	PANAMA	65.0	937	11.4%	9.3%	$14,479	6,584,888	7,165	469,547	511
061700	JAMESTOWN	51.3	5,782	-1.4%	-0.5%	$64,572	11,408,765	1,955	2,814,799	482

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
062201	FREDONIA	32.9	2,109	0.7%	-2.7%	$15,144	4,442,687	2,179	1,189,092	583
062301	BROCTON	56.0	868	-0.5%	6.4%	$11,317	4,800,963	5,173	0	0
062401	RIPLEY	66.7	481	-6.2%	2.1%	$7,156	978,376	1,867	275,521	526
062601	SHERMAN	82.1	531	-4.3%	2.9%	$9,819	680,000	1,191	263,316	461
062901	WESTFIELD	42.0	1,042	-5.5%	2.2%	$9,652	10,651,351	9,451	614,292	545
CHEMUNG COUNTY:										
070600	ELMIRA	42.1	8,311	3.6%	5.3%	$80,049	30,819,273	3,649	4,764,302	564
070901	HORSEHEADS	44.7	4,575	-4.9%	2.1%	$45,433	13,686,412	2,786	3,025,535	616
070902	ELMIRA HEIGHTS	32.4	1,158	6.4%	6.7%	$8,654	10,731,700	9,243	619,813	534
CHENANGO COUNTY:										
080101	AFTON	80.9	819	5.4%	3.3%	$14,812	6,200,000	7,721	455,571	567
080201	BAINBRIDGE GUI	53.8	1,147	1.8%	6.3%	$14,312	10,869,786	9,073	631,627	527
080601	GREENE	35.5	1,462	4.2%	4.4%	$11,816	10,459,677	7,140	875,225	597
081003	UNADILLA	52.6	1,063	1.4%	-1.3%	$12,149	**********	Data Unavailable	**********	
081200	NORWICH	30.8	2,498	-0.6%	0.6%	$16,809	17,652,166	6,980	1,477,780	584
081401	GRGETWN-SO OTS	60.3	511	0.8%	-1.8%	$6,657	5,783,220	11,613	335,862	674
081501	OXFORD	29.0	1,070	-3.2%	2.0%	$6,823	6,079,966	5,395	513,477	456
082001	SHERBURNE EARL	30.8	1,815	13.0%	6.5%	$12,981	17,186,768	10,045	945,754	553
CLINTON COUNTY:										
090201	AUSABLE VALLEY	25.8	1,601	5.9%	10.1%	$9,819	4,568,187	2,744	0	0
090301	BEEKMANTOWN	36.0	2,131	4.1%	9.5%	$18,306	8,656,569	3,861	1,151,568	514
090501	NORTHEASTERN	44.7	1,607	6.9%	3.3%	$16,143	11,782,257	7,592	898,983	579
090601	CHAZY	26.5	615	12.8%	8.1%	$3,828	2,822,595	4,792	316,363	537
090901	NORTHRN ADIRON	37.5	1,245	5.4%	7.6%	$10,984	3,127,614	2,461	698,763	550
091101	PERU	36.2	2,347	-22.7%	0.5%	$18,639	5,878,144	1,925	1,287,342	422
091200	PLATTSBURGH	31.8	2,189	-1.0%	5.4%	$15,976	9,635,000	4,132	1,525,389	654
091402	SARANAC	36.7	1,912	13.3%	9.4%	$16,642	22,487,384	12,182	1,061,641	575
COLUMBIA COUNTY:										
100501	COPAKE-TACONIC	53.8	1,865	14.1%	4.5%	$22,800	2,093,207	1,225	1,364,542	798
100902	GERMANTOWN	70.6	833	22.3%	9.5%	$13,979	601,500	806	418,876	561
101001	CHATHAM	45.6	1,544	2.8%	3.2%	$15,810	7,540,850	4,865	1,094,267	706
101300	HUDSON	39.2	2,421	1.8%	5.5%	$21,801	49,111,957	19,567	0	0
101401	KINDERHOOK	49.1	2,425	-2.0%	-0.4%	$25,962	16,834,427	6,832	1,618,424	657
101601	NEW LEBANON	43.8	680	7.6%	3.6%	$6,657	2,031,425	3,101	542,378	828
CORTLAND COUNTY:										
110101	CINCINNATUS	58.1	726	2.3%	4.5%	$9,652	9,010,210	12,143	423,245	570
110200	CORTLAND	39.9	2,922	-3.5%	-0.5%	$25,296	18,702,313	6,207	2,065,036	685
110304	MCGRAW	51.6	692	3.1%	2.5%	$7,988	3,406,646	4,952	440,214	640

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
110701	HOMER	43.9	2,647	4.3%	4.3%	$26,295	6,778,102	2,560	1,511,247	571
110901	MARATHON	58.1	969	9.2%	16.3%	$14,312	10,310,703	9,991	418,678	406
DELAWARE COUNTY:										
120102	ANDES	54.5	176	-2.8%	-2.2%	$2,163	30,000	169	133,990	757
120301	DOWNSVILLE	55.0	356	-2.5%	-4.4%	$4,327	1,165,680	3,340	327,117	937
120401	CHARLOTTE VALL	56.0	483	3.4%	-0.4%	$5,825	3,121,400	6,713	187,199	403
120501	DELHI	49.2	1,313	6.1%	8.5%	$15,311	16,619,915	12,375	705,939	526
120701	FRANKLIN	70.3	374	13.3%	24.8%	$7,156	3,084,900	7,488	223,016	541
120906	HANCOCK	54.0	645	-5.4%	-1.8%	$7,655	917,250	1,369	531,900	794
121401	MARGARETVILLE	54.3	530	-2.2%	6.6%	$6,657	260,000	450	255,141	441
121502	ROXBURY	52.8	403	-8.2%	-4.1%	$4,660	8,866,000	21,059	238,962	568
121601	SIDNEY	35.5	1,523	-2.2%	2.5%	$11,982	1,307,498	819	871,063	545
121701	STAMFORD	57.6	530	4.5%	0.6%	$6,657	7,628,199	14,957	354,215	695
121702	S. KORTRIGHT	54.0	415	-3.7%	7.9%	$5,325	2,879,185	6,192	217,517	468
121901	WALTON	45.3	1,338	-9.2%	-0.4%	$13,147	8,054,609	5,491	782,000	533
DUTCHESS COUNTY:										
130200	BEACON	50.4	3,041	15.7%	11.3%	$37,112	29,454,163	10,066	1,646,591	563
130502	DOVER	53.0	1,713	20.6%	15.8%	$22,800	22,639,649	13,771	741,048	451
130801	HYDE PARK	40.3	4,524	12.6%	6.8%	$42,271	9,012,955	2,100	2,483,981	579
131101	NORTHEAST	45.5	1,056	-1.4%	1.3%	$10,651	1,821,555	1,679	624,267	575
131201	PAWLING	42.0	1,263	31.4%	18.0%	$13,647	7,930,469	6,993	885,176	781
131301	PINE PLAINS	37.6	1,496	10.2%	12.7%	$13,813	2,213,600	1,447	732,267	479
131500	POUGHKEEPSIE	34.2	4,051	10.3%	5.7%	$31,786	12,321,829	3,172	2,222,785	572
131601	ARLINGTON	40.8	8,435	17.1%	9.0%	$81,546	16,915,449	2,154	5,141,496	655
131602	SPACKENKILL	29.0	1,695	17.0%	2.3%	$10,984	5,104,361	3,442	1,307,528	882
131701	RED HOOK	34.9	2,200	20.9%	13.2%	$18,972	14,928,142	7,247	1,036,104	503
131801	RHINEBECK	38.9	1,247	7.0%	5.3%	$11,150	5,253,480	4,282	849,778	693
132101	WAPPINGERS	30.5	11,328	3.7%	0.9%	$75,722	29,721,184	2,697	6,386,953	579
132201	MILLBROOK	33.3	1,098	26.8%	16.1%	$9,153	4,276,229	4,255	726,408	723
ERIE COUNTY:										
140101	ALDEN	49.8	1,993	11.9%	8.4%	$23,465	4,662,082	2,416	1,397,579	724
140201	AMHERST	48.8	2,990	13.9%	6.1%	$33,617	17,383,983	6,244	2,708,235	973
140203	WILLIAMSVILLE	26.0	10,618	17.8%	13.5%	$68,233	39,577,528	3,867	8,505,337	831
140207	SWEET HOME	32.6	4,056	5.1%	1.2%	$29,124	11,626,158	2,975	2,904,159	743
140301	EAST AURORA	48.6	1,968	10.6%	11.1%	$23,133	4,420,672	2,235	1,501,177	759
140600	BUFFALO	62.8	46,147	3.2%	3.1%	$650,042	85,960,446	1,865	37,076,311	805
140701	CHEEKTOWAGA	30.7	2,316	15.3%	6.5%	$16,476	15,273,224	7,140	1,546,313	723
140702	MARYVALE	36.4	2,521	5.0%	-0.2%	$19,971	13,227,349	5,525	1,965,896	821

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
140703	CLEVELAND HILL	52.7	1,568	15.5%	7.9%	$19,471	5,414,305	3,698	1,026,240	701
140707	DEPEW	39.5	2,620	-5.0%	-2.9%	$22,467	7,197,463	2,688	1,516,881	566
140709	SLOAN	50.8	1,403	20.1%	4.2%	$16,143	19,582,630	16,091	1,003,348	824
140801	CLARENCE	37.2	4,015	24.7%	12.1%	$36,446	15,643,128	4,332	2,503,093	693
141101	SPRINGVILLE-GR	35.8	2,459	10.3%	10.2%	$21,136	6,052,229	2,463	1,378,467	561
141201	EDEN	35.4	1,860	18.2%	4.2%	$14,978	3,805,140	2,322	1,010,530	617
141301	IROQUOIS	38.1	2,825	12.5%	2.4%	$23,965	10,999,322	4,280	1,822,937	709
141401	EVANS-BRANT	39.5	3,696	6.7%	3.2%	$32,785	13,583,788	3,800	2,312,864	647
141501	GRAND ISLAND	34.1	3,228	12.3%	10.0%	$26,295	10,084,910	3,189	2,161,909	684
141601	HAMBURG	41.5	4,111	5.1%	0.9%	$37,445	10,288,722	2,606	3,089,010	782
141604	FRONTIER	32.0	5,506	15.6%	6.5%	$40,773	24,451,056	4,821	3,408,170	672
141701	HOLLAND	40.5	1,434	5.8%	4.7%	$13,314	13,734,727	9,679	724,016	510
141800	LACKAWANNA	44.5	2,335	-2.7%	0.6%	$22,800	2,384,000	987	1,725,053	714
141901	LANCASTER	45.8	5,217	29.4%	17.9%	$61,243	12,833,148	2,699	3,293,039	693
142101	AKRON	55.6	1,600	11.3%	9.9%	$21,302	11,464,006	7,251	753,013	476
142201	NORTH COLLINS	33.3	774	5.2%	3.5%	$5,825	1,965,584	2,580	448,987	589
142301	ORCHARD PARK	36.5	5,246	21.3%	11.7%	$46,432	21,629,058	4,475	3,141,100	650
142500	TONAWANDA	48.0	2,667	3.1%	0.9%	$28,125	7,522,907	2,881	1,881,236	721
142601	KENMORE	46.3	9,246	9.7%	6.6%	$99,187	11,050,982	1,231	7,786,058	867
142801	WEST SENECA	32.8	7,810	-1.1%	-1.2%	$55,751	29,030,832	3,721	4,717,529	605
ESSEX COUNTY:										
150203	CROWN POINT	69.0	398	-4.3%	-5.3%	$5,991	2,478,154	6,290	252,743	641
150301	ELIZABETHTOWN	43.0	437	6.8%	11.5%	$4,493	2,890,000	6,338	215,234	472
150601	KEENE	57.0	202	15.4%	-8.0%	$2,496	99,000	615	134,027	832
150801	MINERVA	58.0	166	0.6%	-4.8%	$2,163	3,965,505	25,258	226,059	1,440
150901	MORIAH	27.0	860	-7.5%	-5.2%	$4,993	394,800	448	562,790	638
151001	NEWCOMB	46.0	69	-5.5%	-13.7%	$2,000	1,292,611	20,518	161,638	2,566
151102	LAKE PLACID	63.7	888	16.2%	8.4%	$13,314	1,521,365	1,837	431,199	521
151401	SCHROON LAKE	59.0	282	2.2%	5.4%	$3,828	471,900	1,622	163,937	563
151501	TICONDEROGA	47.6	1,115	2.8%	-0.9%	$11,483	3,163,234	2,943	889,493	827
151601	WESTPORT	61.0	279	-4.1%	-1.4%	$3,661	2,487,000	8,666	162,349	566
151701	WILLSBORO	60.8	439	24.4%	7.6%	$6,324	434,925	1,145	0	0
FRANKLIN COUNTY:										
160101	TUPPER LAKE	46.1	1,166	17.3%	14.1%	$13,314	2,781,000	2,452	429,900	379
160801	CHATEAUGAY	42.0	675	18.8%	8.1%	$6,657	4,455,193	7,256	377,999	616
161201	SALMON RIVER	42.4	1,428	-8.4%	1.4%	$13,314	7,605,479	4,811	1,149,402	727
161401	SARANAC LAKE	44.8	1,765	2.1%	5.7%	$18,140	2,518,227	1,378	1,213,050	664
161501	MALONE	44.1	2,769	4.2%	8.8%	$28,957	2,896,652	1,002	1,607,683	556

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
161601	BRUSHTON MOIRA	42.9	982	6.7%	4.5%	$9,652	5,371,590	5,590	487,685	507
161801	ST REGIS FALLS	67.0	403	-1.7%	-4.9%	$5,825	1,113,000	2,854	284,032	728
FULTON COUNTY:										
170301	WHEELERVILLE	3.0	190	-5.0%	5.5%	$2,000	4,331,500	20,528	188,331	893
170500	GLOVERSVILLE	49.0	3,418	-2.2%	-0.4%	$36,446	32,099,546	9,216	1,941,233	557
170600	JOHNSTOWN	37.9	2,207	1.2%	4.6%	$18,972	12,270,413	5,382	1,451,478	637
170801	MAYFIELD	45.1	1,242	8.1%	5.8%	$12,814	7,448,363	6,125	582,695	479
170901	NORTHVILLE	58.4	575	-10.2%	-6.3%	$7,323	2,341,950	3,903	337,510	563
171001	OPPENHEIM EPHR	40.5	529	-2.6%	1.1%	$4,660	6,915,000	12,596	262,936	479
171102	BROADALBIN-PER	62.1	1,840	11.9%	6.5%	$26,461	29,127,928	16,635	984,220	562
GENESSEE COUNTY:										
180202	ALEXANDER	48.8	1,100	14.9%	13.1%	$13,147	3,796,810	3,509	593,310	548
180300	BATAVIA	42.7	2,889	2.2%	4.4%	$27,959	9,487,422	3,216	1,970,581	668
180701	BYRON BERGEN	33.6	1,423	14.1%	5.1%	$10,984	8,136,500	6,206	676,636	516
180901	ELBA	56.0	594	2.6%	7.1%	$7,822	2,790,590	4,501	0	0
181001	LE ROY	43.1	1,518	6.2%	4.4%	$14,812	11,507,650	7,713	691,991	464
181101	OAKFIELD ALABA	34.2	1,253	3.0%	0.8%	$9,320	16,113,355	13,132	677,238	552
181201	PAVILION	48.7	1,056	8.4%	6.4%	$11,982	2,493,634	2,407	528,879	511
181302	PEMBROKE	41.9	1,539	27.0%	20.0%	$16,809	7,630,129	5,248	850,222	585
GREENE COUNTY:										
190301	CAIRO-DURHAM	39.8	1,701	25.0%	11.0%	$16,309	13,567,956	8,979	617,690	409
190401	CATSKILL	55.7	1,699	-2.0%	-0.9%	$20,636	2,952,574	1,720	924,582	538
190501	COXSACKIE ATHE	36.1	1,617	7.1%	8.7%	$13,813	7,961,671	4,849	875,103	533
190701	GREENVILLE	37.0	1,384	13.1%	4.8%	$11,649	4,731,397	3,688	639,226	498
190901	HUNTER TANNERS	59.0	585	26.3%	10.8%	$8,321	2,331,750	4,545	365,182	712
191401	WINDHAM ASHLAN	58.0	517	5.3%	6.1%	$6,990	835,802	1,604	338,933	651
HAMILTON COUNTY:										
200401	INDIAN LAKE	65.0	218	3.3%	5.7%	$3,328	636,000	2,852	235,883	1,058
200601	LAKE PLEASANT	63.9	110	-22.5%	-21.1%	$2,000	169,591	1,514	127,661	1,140
200701	LONG LAKE	69.0	118	-4.1%	-3.3%	$2,000	306,730	2,578	133,410	1,121
200901	WELLS	31.0	190	-17.0%	-8.7%	$2,000	421,490	2,017	168,667	807
HERKIMER COUNTY:										
210302	WEST CANADA VA	31.0	1,054	7.0%	6.1%	$7,489	6,487,500	6,208	504,660	483
210402	FRANKFORT-SCHU	47.9	1,288	5.1%	9.0%	$14,645	1,082,000	810	703,405	527
210501	ILION	33.1	1,979	-5.2%	-2.4%	$14,312	6,189,000	3,037	732,488	359
210502	MOHAWK	67.3	1,019	-12.2%	-10.1%	$14,978	18,678,554	17,891	583,107	559
210601	HERKIMER	23.8	1,458	27.6%	14.6%	$8,654	10,518,150	8,029	695,143	531
210800	LITTLE FALLS	50.4	1,335	-7.2%	-0.8%	$14,645	20,651,340	14,462	955,343	669

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
211003	DOLGEVILLE	40.0	1,169	-2.6%	2.6%	$10,485	8,079,669	6,564	509,672	414
211103	POLAND	59.0	786	4.5%	1.3%	$10,152	2,694,681	3,536	398,961	524
211701	VAN HORNSVILLE	65.0	274	1.5%	4.8%	$3,994	712,500	2,518	212,717	752
211901	TOWN OF WEBB	68.1	429	21.5%	11.9%	$7,156	1,076,217	2,725	377,571	956
212001	BRIDGEWATER-W	18.6	1,670	9.9%	7.9%	$7,323	15,587,112	9,504	1,053,449	642
JEFFERSON COUNTY:										
220101	S. JEFFERSON	41.2	2,173	9.3%	5.4%	$20,470	19,848,949	9,474	1,125,497	537
220202	ALEXANDRIA	62.6	721	2.4%	-4.7%	$9,819	1,056,663	1,575	284,298	424
220301	INDIAN RIVER	24.5	3,717	21.1%	22.1%	$24,298	37,254,622	9,937	2,027,124	541
220401	GENERAL BROWN	38.7	1,725	0.8%	0.2%	$14,645	15,200,000	8,858	832,059	485
220701	THOUSAND ISLAN	39.6	1,367	14.5%	9.3%	$12,814	5,888,567	4,512	759,849	582
220909	BELLEVILLE-HEN	31.9	605	4.3%	4.1%	$4,327	11,120,650	18,412	298,777	495
221001	SACKETS HARBOR	66.0	524	-7.1%	-3.4%	$7,489	3,931,064	7,213	269,896	495
221301	LYME	57.0	436	16.9%	5.9%	$5,658	1,595,000	4,038	186,021	471
221401	LA FARGEVILLE	70.0	484	-0.6%	6.0%	$7,822	4,884,296	9,466	301,754	585
222000	WATERTOWN	46.2	4,804	6.6%	8.8%	$52,589	28,207,389	5,755	3,006,658	613
222201	CARTHAGE	37.8	3,153	-5.8%	-2.5%	$25,962	30,205,117	9,257	2,086,157	639
LEWIS COUNTY:										
230201	COPENHAGEN	58.0	625	7.0%	13.5%	$8,987	1,429,595	2,156	265,701	401
230301	HARRISVILLE	37.0	498	-7.9%	-8.7%	$3,994	265,903	538	299,938	607
230901	LOWVILLE	70.0	1,521	-1.2%	4.1%	$24,131	2,970,598	1,854	813,176	508
231101	SOUTH LEWIS	33.1	1,446	-2.9%	0.3%	$10,485	20,197,554	13,519	994,079	665
231301	BEAVER RIVER	40.0	1,216	2.0%	5.4%	$11,150	2,000,000	1,592	631,660	503
LIVINGSTON COUNTY:										
240101	AVON	42.0	1,197	12.6%	9.3%	$11,982	7,211,713	6,206	892,455	768
240201	CALEDONIA MUMF	41.5	1,242	7.1%	4.0%	$11,649	1,052,589	873	530,833	440
240401	GENESEO	20.0	1,031	-2.7%	-2.3%	$4,493	5,181,424	5,001	674,237	651
240801	LIVONIA	36.8	2,259	18.3%	13.4%	$20,470	685,000	316	1,067,884	493
240901	MOUNT MORRIS	39.0	679	1.0%	2.4%	$5,825	4,422,000	6,427	401,750	584
241001	DANSVILLE	41.9	1,972	5.9%	9.5%	$19,638	3,138,373	1,538	893,051	438
241101	DALTON-NUNDA	64.6	1,118	2.8%	3.3%	$16,309	4,746,899	4,223	728,797	648
241701	YORK	56.0	1,159	13.2%	7.4%	$15,144	8,547,690	7,771	578,491	526
MADISON COUNTY:										
250109	BROOKFIELD	62.0	277	-4.5%	-7.2%	$3,661	3,279,407	12,191	170,341	633
250201	CAZENOVIA	53.1	1,881	9.9%	10.7%	$23,965	15,030,000	7,927	1,079,339	569
250301	DE RUYTER	56.7	567	-3.6%	-3.9%	$6,990	7,802,028	13,809	250,383	443
250401	MORRISVILLE EA	41.8	1,120	19.4%	9.4%	$11,150	7,020,000	6,842	559,277	545
250701	HAMILTON	36.6	879	16.1%	11.2%	$7,822	2,599,000	3,087	436,585	519

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
250901	CANASTOTA	45.4	1,660	-5.0%	-5.3%	$16,476	6,541,123	3,955	817,918	495
251101	MADISON	61.5	542	-3.7%	-2.0%	$7,323	1,719,159	3,114	252,875	458
251400	ONEIDA CITY	38.9	2,725	5.9%	2.3%	$23,632	4,247,300	1,613	1,443,899	548
251501	STOCKBRIDGE VA	66.0	583	4.5%	3.9%	$8,654	10,288,500	17,739	297,421	513
251601	CHITTENANGO	45.1	2,779	8.3%	7.7%	$29,457	29,376,700	10,628	1,700,436	615
MONROE COUNTY:										
260101	BRIGHTON	49.2	3,296	19.1%	9.5%	$38,610	30,171,812	9,954	2,833,882	935
260401	GATES CHILI	38.4	5,363	15.7%	10.5%	$49,427	15,624,451	3,050	3,117,907	609
260501	GREECE	26.9	14,299	18.3%	12.6%	$94,195	63,853,713	4,692	7,601,937	559
260801	E. IRONDEQUOIT	43.0	3,269	30.4%	20.3%	$36,779	16,227,296	5,380	2,002,695	664
260803	W. IRONDEQUOIT	49.5	3,935	17.5%	14.8%	$48,595	17,889,948	4,656	2,684,704	699
260901	HONEOYE FALLS	45.6	2,396	23.1%	12.3%	$26,627	28,792,891	13,171	1,584,536	725
261001	SPENCERPORT	30.7	4,197	18.8%	12.3%	$31,454	13,413,539	3,380	2,094,003	528
261101	HILTON	29.9	4,512	24.6%	18.0%	$34,616	14,715,105	3,443	2,467,359	577
261201	PENFIELD	33.7	4,945	23.3%	15.2%	$41,772	31,163,897	6,743	3,392,160	734
261301	FAIRPORT	29.0	7,094	7.7%	3.7%	$46,432	19,665,293	2,878	3,473,378	508
261313	EAST ROCHESTER	20.8	1,313	15.5%	16.4%	$6,990	22,155,179	16,734	1,029,421	778
261401	PITTSFORD	32.5	5,346	9.3%	5.4%	$39,775	15,981,865	3,101	3,544,762	688
261501	CHURCHVILLE CH	35.4	4,664	28.4%	18.2%	$42,437	26,698,249	6,215	1,898,422	442
261600	ROCHESTER	51.1	36,860	17.0%	10.2%	$451,335	216,447,571	6,236	21,447,112	618
261701	RUSH HENRIETTA	32.7	5,896	15.1%	9.7%	$46,099	24,580,575	4,374	3,695,191	658
261801	BROCKPORT	26.3	4,760	10.1%	9.4%	$29,789	30,964,728	6,549	2,872,211	607
261901	WEBSTER	32.8	7,898	27.1%	16.5%	$65,570	29,241,174	4,037	4,455,871	615
262001	WHEATLAND CHIL	42.9	1,077	17.2%	17.8%	$11,816	4,136,430	3,819	906,533	837
MONTGOMERY COUNTY:										
270100	AMSTERDAM	32.7	3,602	-6.9%	-1.1%	$25,629	35,682,097	9,321	2,391,916	625
270301	CANAJOHARIE	52.2	1,200	9.5%	4.2%	$14,146	2,672,601	2,340	837,592	733
270601	FONDA FULTONVI	36.0	1,713	4.1%	8.8%	$14,645	7,969,158	4,450	802,515	448
270701	FORT PLAIN	53.9	973	-10.9%	-0.4%	$11,483	3,958,882	3,639	603,609	555
271102	ST JOHNSVILLE	56.5	609	3.0%	2.0%	$7,655	4,055,384	6,725	398,244	660
NASSAU COUNTY:										
280100	GLEN COVE	57.0	3,005	8.1%	7.2%	$39,941	11,618,758	3,899	3,553,546	1,192
280201	HEMPSTEAD	49.2	6,252	19.1%	4.4%	$69,897	21,034,978	3,836	0	0
280202	UNIONDALE	45.1	5,336	18.3%	7.0%	$56,084	10,232,414	2,120	5,312,298	1,101
280203	EAST MEADOW	38.9	7,759	9.1%	5.9%	$69,564	13,632,300	1,811	5,489,725	729
280204	NORTH BELLMORE	46.5	2,182	13.0%	3.7%	$22,800	9,192,816	4,592	1,702,766	851
280205	LEVITTOWN	2.9	7,145	10.1%	2.5%	$4,660	30,657,010	4,610	6,279,241	944
280206	SEAFORD	36.5	2,450	2.7%	-2.9%	$19,471	7,752,210	3,346	2,013,716	869

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
280207	BELLMORE	44.9	1,136	19.3%	4.7%	$11,649	5,082,268	5,098	1,105,312	1,109
280208	ROOSEVELT	53.1	2,730	-7.1%	0.6%	$31,620	6,183,218	2,092	2,410,866	816
280209	FREEPORT	34.1	6,877	22.9%	14.5%	$58,414	11,123,425	1,736	4,119,748	643
280210	BALDWIN	42.1	5,039	12.6%	6.6%	$49,094	19,002,192	3,985	4,068,538	853
280211	OCEANSIDE	48.3	5,767	14.2%	6.5%	$64,572	27,936,545	5,197	4,648,784	865
280212	MALVERNE	55.4	1,802	4.0%	4.3%	$22,633	3,655,693	2,023	1,605,870	889
280213	V STR THIRTEEN	50.6	2,121	13.1%	9.5%	$25,462	2,792,312	1,359	1,124,153	547
280214	HEWLETT WOODME	45.6	3,078	16.9%	9.5%	$33,451	24,535,432	8,513	4,162,383	1,444
280215	LAWRENCE	46.8	3,790	3.8%	0.4%	$38,776	24,374,715	6,654	5,150,345	1,406
280216	ELMONT	53.3	3,843	28.4%	14.3%	$50,925	7,917,866	2,314	2,269,636	663
280217	FRANKLIN SQUAR	51.6	1,708	13.7%	8.3%	$20,803	4,285,013	2,634	838,175	515
280218	GARDEN CITY	52.1	3,323	15.6%	5.9%	$39,941	4,203,300	1,381	3,852,703	1,266
280219	EAST ROCKAWAY	62.6	1,217	10.2%	5.8%	$17,474	7,914,882	6,776	1,003,313	859
280220	LYNBROOK	59.3	2,760	18.1%	10.1%	$39,275	5,506,948	2,140	2,979,902	1,158
280221	ROCKVILLE CENT	54.7	3,317	7.0%	3.8%	$40,940	6,386,334	1,983	3,206,493	996
280222	FLORAL PARK	68.4	1,675	26.9%	17.0%	$29,124	7,799,793	5,048	801,145	519
280223	WANTAGH	39.1	2,925	13.3%	5.7%	$26,295	2,844,390	1,043	3,005,244	1,102
280224	V STR TWENTY-F	54.3	1,045	27.9%	15.3%	$14,312	1,579,998	1,677	739,132	785
280225	MERRICK	48.5	1,824	15.8%	8.6%	$20,969	9,456,592	5,527	1,268,318	741
280226	ISLAND TREES	39.6	2,402	16.2%	3.7%	$21,468	10,340,514	4,825	2,438,186	1,138
280227	WEST HEMPSTEAD	47.3	2,240	4.8%	2.3%	$23,632	6,330,633	2,895	1,794,056	820
280229	NORTH MERRICK	53.5	1,266	20.7%	9.2%	$16,143	4,246,693	3,709	1,027,198	897
280230	VALLEY STR UF	46.7	1,319	23.7%	12.8%	$15,144	1,318,788	1,097	1,195,863	995
280231	ISLAND PARK	40.8	835	7.1%	4.7%	$7,822	8,012,368	9,807	922,823	1,130
280251	VALLEY STR CHS	45.6	3,580	6.1%	2.5%	$36,280	6,631,257	1,917	4,162,145	1,203
280252	SEWANHAKA	43.1	7,196	17.4%	7.9%	$72,893	14,553,998	2,200	5,328,141	805
280253	BELLMORE-MERRI	45.2	4,832	-0.5%	-3.0%	$47,597	19,343,657	4,108	4,825,717	1,025
280300	LONG BEACH	41.2	4,346	12.2%	7.6%	$41,938	15,096,845	3,622	4,849,984	1,164
280401	WESTBURY	46.5	3,281	22.2%	12.3%	$37,278	9,126,579	3,029	3,549,595	1,178
280402	EAST WILLISTON	48.3	1,501	20.8%	15.2%	$18,140	13,075,021	9,131	1,516,692	1,059
280403	ROSLYN	50.4	2,669	9.9%	2.5%	$29,956	18,217,166	7,319	3,580,991	1,439
280404	PORT WASHINGTO	51.7	4,052	11.7%	4.9%	$47,763	22,400,899	5,889	5,142,939	1,352
280405	NEW HYDE PARK	54.8	1,446	21.4%	9.5%	$18,806	2,941,507	2,256	1,029,954	790
280406	MANHASSET	51.9	2,396	13.9%	7.4%	$29,124	21,037,264	9,317	2,885,725	1,278
280407	GREAT NECK	46.0	5,608	5.6%	2.8%	$57,582	35,292,807	6,462	12,400,236	2,270
280409	HERRICKS	37.4	3,536	8.5%	7.0%	$30,788	16,525,445	4,739	3,873,210	1,111
280410	MINEOLA	47.0	2,735	6.0%	2.7%	$28,624	4,661,403	1,759	3,067,036	1,157
280411	CARLE PLACE	40.3	1,507	9.8%	7.0%	$14,146	4,404,844	3,001	1,916,476	1,306

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
280501	NORTH SHORE	53.1	2,339	29.2%	15.2%	$31,121	10,911,512	5,233	2,784,829	1,336
280502	SYOSSET	37.5	5,553	7.2%	1.9%	$46,099	19,109,276	3,623	5,848,768	1,109
280503	LOCUST VALLEY	45.3	2,094	16.0%	9.5%	$22,633	2,365,050	1,197	2,503,541	1,267
280504	PLAINVIEW	23.2	4,415	8.4%	5.3%	$23,465	11,714,890	2,732	4,621,818	1,078
280506	OYSTER BAY	54.0	1,391	13.4%	8.3%	$17,641	4,767,555	3,587	1,524,963	1,147
280515	JERICHO	46.4	2,432	27.3%	10.2%	$27,127	6,681,209	3,174	5,002,343	2,376
280517	HICKSVILLE	47.5	4,556	4.4%	1.7%	$47,763	10,314,375	2,324	5,188,870	1,169
280518	PLAINEDGE	36.4	3,043	15.4%	6.5%	$25,629	6,842,956	2,436	2,904,944	1,034
280521	BETHPAGE	38.4	2,707	11.0%	2.2%	$23,133	10,844,511	4,352	3,183,637	1,278
280522	FARMINGDALE	33.4	5,816	12.6%	6.8%	$45,100	20,264,343	3,674	5,560,414	1,008
280523	MASSAPEQUA	39.9	7,038	4.2%	-0.9%	$61,077	24,668,947	3,687	5,498,740	822
300000	NEW YORK CITY	NA	1,052,313	14.6%	8.2%	$33,330,000	**********	Data Unavailable	**********	
NIAGARA COUNTY:										
400301	LEWISTON PORTE	32.5	2,613	-3.3%	-0.3%	$18,473	8,545,576	3,174	2,259,480	839
400400	LOCKPORT	50.3	6,380	4.8%	6.2%	$74,058	31,518,886	4,878	2,848,575	441
400601	NEWFANE	37.6	2,047	9.7%	2.5%	$17,141	9,429,350	4,932	1,231,145	644
400701	NIAGARA WHEATF	41.5	3,981	10.0%	7.5%	$38,610	15,502,224	3,986	2,222,043	571
400800	NIAGARA FALLS	56.3	9,075	0.1%	-1.2%	$111,169	63,131,797	7,051	7,126,704	796
400900	N. TONAWANDA	40.7	5,528	5.8%	3.4%	$50,592	32,021,290	5,923	3,814,856	706
401001	STARPOINT	36.6	2,598	30.4%	15.2%	$23,798	13,770,100	6,003	1,177,492	513
401201	ROYALTON HARTL	59.2	1,798	7.0%	7.7%	$24,963	14,322,420	7,917	996,997	551
401301	BARKER	67.1	1,179	9.0%	4.2%	$17,974	3,395,213	3,013	1,013,646	899
401501	WILSON	51.8	1,540	1.0%	4.5%	$18,140	11,229,600	7,049	898,698	564
ONEIDA COUNTY:										
410401	ADIRONDACK	52.9	1,889	6.6%	5.5%	$22,966	2,008,180	1,074	914,937	490
410601	CAMDEN	66.8	2,943	6.5%	7.7%	$46,099	13,951,118	4,686	1,587,957	533
411101	CLINTON	44.3	1,866	18.9%	13.4%	$20,303	10,024,741	5,632	792,234	445
411501	NEW HARTFORD	45.0	2,893	-1.0%	1.3%	$28,624	12,558,371	4,241	2,089,465	706
411504	NEW YORK MILLS	38.2	622	1.6%	4.4%	$5,325	855,850	1,339	409,610	641
411603	SAUQUOIT VALLE	38.2	1,527	10.5%	7.5%	$13,647	19,089,786	12,855	803,613	541
411701	REMSEN	42.1	710	19.5%	13.5%	$7,323	2,330,563	3,458	310,772	461
411800	ROME	45.4	6,377	-18.7%	0.6%	$63,240	23,368,899	2,959	4,362,099	552
411902	WATERVILLE	25.4	1,240	2.5%	4.6%	$7,156	9,244,881	7,302	612,173	484
412000	SHERRILL	37.1	2,497	0.9%	5.7%	$21,302	17,555,440	6,711	1,246,957	477
412201	HOLLAND PATENT	38.4	2,041	5.9%	3.6%	$17,641	3,707,658	1,858	1,530,536	767
412300	UTICA	50.4	8,052	1.4%	5.1%	$92,697	47,951,955	5,750	5,527,619	663

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
412801	WESTMORELAND	43.9	1,322	17.6%	11.3%	$13,979	7,473,652	5,974	617,132	493
412901	ORISKANY	53.3	815	0.9%	-1.9%	$9,486	4,921,042	6,206	590,565	745
412902	WHITESBORO	37.0	3,947	8.8%	7.9%	$34,283	7,472,807	1,909	2,377,662	607
ONONDAGA COUNTY:										
420101	WEST GENESEE	34.2	5,086	11.0%	4.3%	$39,442	15,086,978	3,160	2,786,100	583
420303	NORTH SYRACUSE	36.8	9,861	3.5%	2.0%	$80,548	21,145,979	2,176	6,527,783	672
420401	E SYRACUSE-MIN	34.1	3,906	6.9%	4.1%	$30,122	3,063,984	805	3,214,705	845
420411	JAMESVILLE-DEW	39.9	2,492	14.9%	10.7%	$23,965	22,824,628	9,502	1,553,866	647
420501	JORDAN ELBRIDG	52.4	1,964	5.5%	3.3%	$23,133	20,767,959	10,794	916,609	476
420601	FABIUS-POMPEY	46.3	948	13.1%	14.0%	$10,817	6,670,879	6,985	592,253	620
420701	WESTHILL	40.5	2,007	32.0%	23.1%	$21,801	4,505,320	2,408	1,147,252	613
420702	SOLVAY	38.7	1,742	7.7%	4.6%	$15,311	2,950,420	1,744	635,002	375
420807	LA FAYETTE	41.1	1,205	9.6%	7.4%	$11,483	4,911,441	4,162	743,110	630
420901	BALDWINSVILLE	33.3	5,807	8.6%	6.2%	$44,601	7,432,011	1,308	3,325,566	585
421001	FAYETTEVILLE	12.0	4,159	10.2%	5.1%	$11,317	20,680,913	5,213	2,977,640	751
421101	MARCELLUS	41.3	2,096	8.4%	6.7%	$20,137	5,225,675	2,532	1,051,350	509
421201	ONONDAGA	49.6	1,094	10.5%	6.8%	$12,648	7,113,800	6,730	706,395	668
421501	LIVERPOOL	31.0	9,190	-5.7%	-1.2%	$61,909	24,197,810	2,513	6,175,165	641
421504	LYNCOURT	61.0	322	16.2%	23.5%	$5,325	745,093	2,179	213,576	624
421601	SKANEATELES	35.4	1,836	11.5%	5.2%	$14,812	6,061,466	3,500	941,189	543
421800	SYRACUSE	52.4	22,949	8.7%	6.9%	$279,422	126,117,323	5,587	15,703,756	696
421902	TULLY	44.2	1,249	12.5%	11.5%	$13,314	2,430,006	1,963	850,570	687
ONTARIO COUNTY:										
430300	CANANDAIGUA	31.8	4,220	13.5%	12.2%	$32,785	38,091,780	9,133	2,274,068	545
430501	EAST BLOOMFIEL	42.2	1,211	1.5%	1.2%	$11,317	10,570,763	8,758	696,246	577
430700	GENEVA	40.8	2,568	13.5%	4.5%	$23,798	17,096,130	7,232	1,968,425	833
430901	GORHAM-MIDDLES	37.9	1,829	13.9%	10.5%	$16,642	13,954,990	7,866	1,037,102	585
431101	MANCHSTR-SHRTS	28.0	1,068	5.3%	2.4%	$6,657	2,621,236	2,525	466,579	449
431201	NAPLES	44.5	981	-0.4%	4.9%	$9,985	5,644,923	5,465	475,912	461
431301	PHELPS-CLIFTON	45.8	2,160	12.4%	4.5%	$22,467	25,586,980	12,736	0	0
431401	HONEOYE	44.0	1,090	9.8%	3.9%	$10,817	5,865,990	5,684	523,504	507
431701	VICTOR	36.6	2,970	11.6%	7.5%	$25,462	15,658,911	5,473	1,606,210	561
ORANGE COUNTY:										
440102	WASHINGTONVILL	36.8	4,755	17.1%	9.0%	$41,439	26,288,655	5,937	2,739,507	619
440201	CHESTER	39.3	865	10.9%	10.1%	$8,155	1,285,950	1,497	675,289	786
440301	CORNWALL	45.6	2,603	17.9%	12.1%	$28,957	4,212,218	1,702	1,160,325	469
440401	PINE BUSH	27.2	5,701	17.0%	13.7%	$38,277	45,003,800	8,129	2,764,165	499
440601	GOSHEN	36.6	2,399	4.9%	2.2%	$19,471	6,963,174	2,978	1,713,822	733

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
440901	HIGHLAND FALLS	36.7	1,045	0.0%	-0.2%	$8,321	3,427,247	3,286	834,528	800
441000	MIDDLETOWN	57.8	5,810	14.6%	6.4%	$77,719	73,629,110	13,655	3,924,247	728
441101	MINISINK VALLE	33.9	3,821	16.6%	8.8%	$30,622	20,085,513	5,629	2,106,406	590
441201	MONROE WOODBUR	37.0	5,988	20.4%	8.5%	$52,256	3,211,130	595	5,877,451	1,089
441202	KIRYAS JOEL	4.0	175			$2,000	0	0	0	0
441301	VALLEY-MONTGMR	42.3	4,735	18.4%	12.0%	$48,761	23,209,358	5,185	2,268,072	507
441600	NEWBURGH	51.9	11,695	14.4%	8.0%	$142,623	57,453,060	5,200	6,816,841	617
441800	PORT JERVIS	36.2	3,505	11.1%	10.4%	$30,455	10,340,358	2,969	1,917,112	550
441903	TUXEDO	70.8	539	37.2%	11.7%	$9,320	3,026,300	6,894	544,899	1,241
442101	WARWICK VALLEY	36.7	3,828	35.4%	22.2%	$37,278	26,222,323	7,590	2,226,568	644
442111	GREENWOOD LAKE	39.1	844	52.6%	31.1%	$9,486	7,540,334	10,400	496,386	685
442115	FLORIDA	41.0	751	14.1%	-3.6%	$6,657	10,463,592	16,504	370,577	585
ORLEANS COUNTY:										
450101	ALBION	40.1	2,730	9.9%	6.3%	$25,296	5,724,747	2,168	1,423,169	539
450607	KENDALL	42.2	1,193	9.6%	4.8%	$11,483	375,000	329	554,687	486
450704	HOLLEY	25.0	1,501	19.9%	14.9%	$9,320	4,132,500	2,874	708,723	493
450801	MEDINA	26.8	2,346	-0.8%	2.0%	$13,979	14,405,017	5,970	1,012,167	419
451001	LYNDONVILLE	47.9	905	2.3%	4.5%	$9,819	2,739,762	2,962	482,222	521
OSWEGO COUNTY:										
460102	ALTMAR PARISH	31.7	1,812	9.2%	9.0%	$13,647	14,451,232	7,984	908,192	502
460500	FULTON	36.5	4,177	1.0%	2.7%	$34,116	28,998,168	6,825	2,919,499	687
460701	HANNIBAL	53.3	1,748	2.2%	2.7%	$20,803	6,154,497	3,505	874,598	498
460801	CENTRAL SQUARE	28.6	4,963	8.9%	6.5%	$32,785	39,418,732	8,126	3,237,459	667
460901	MEXICO	33.7	2,801	4.6%	5.9%	$21,635	15,174,096	5,354	1,771,173	625
461300	OSWEGO	35.2	5,370	11.5%	8.5%	$44,601	23,848,538	4,568	4,192,610	803
461801	PULASKI	39.3	1,306	1.2%	-4.0%	$11,150	2,025,735	1,635	759,303	613
461901	SANDY CREEK	64.0	1,179	6.3%	2.5%	$16,809	367,518	323	534,756	470
462001	PHOENIX	36.3	2,754	5.2%	2.7%	$22,300	9,330,349	3,470	1,549,631	576
OTSEGO COUNTY:										
470202	GLBTSVLLE-MT U	52.5	645	20.8%	13.3%	$8,321	11,300,000	18,678	293,087	484
470501	EDMESTON	56.6	581	11.1%	10.9%	$7,988	4,135,500	7,130	261,872	452
470801	LAURENS	64.5	488	-1.6%	-5.2%	$6,823	3,095,500	6,586	259,462	552
470901	SCHENEVUS	53.0	446	2.8%	-8.1%	$5,159	5,889,000	14,759	265,348	665
471101	MILFORD	7.0	477	7.4%	8.1%	$2,000	6,000,000	12,500	295,010	615
471201	MORRIS	62.1	486	11.2%	5.5%	$6,990	4,499,200	9,760	203,996	443
471400	ONEONTA	37.5	2,189	5.2%	4.3%	$18,639	19,919,733	9,180	1,346,746	621
471601	OTEGO-UNADILLA	40.8	1,437	14.8%	12.2%	$14,312	1,642,804	1,169	0	0
471701	COOPERSTOWN	31.2	1,311	2.5%	5.6%	$9,486	4,456,310	3,301	596,470	442

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
472001	RICHFIELD SPRI	55.5	802	-1.2%	0.5%	$9,652	904,297	1,108	410,642	503
472202	CHERRY VLY-SPR	5.0	831	6.1%	12.9%	$2,000	18,147,420	20,529	544,778	616
472506	WORCESTER	60.5	478	3.0%	2.4%	$6,490	875,372	1,843	225,088	474
PUTNAM COUNTY:										
480101	MAHOPAC	32.9	4,452	13.2%	2.9%	$32,785	7,490,520	1,851	3,820,190	944
480102	CARMEL	40.0	4,562	8.2%	4.4%	$41,439	3,089,212	702	3,139,481	713
480401	HALDANE	66.9	774	5.0%	1.1%	$11,317	949,200	1,274	618,468	830
480404	GARRISON	86.0	280	34.0%	22.0%	$6,324	123,000	482	184,970	725
480503	PUTNAM VALLEY	40.7	1,227	11.6%	14.3%	$12,482	1,700,000	1,354	934,212	744
480601	BREWSTER	37.1	3,162	20.9%	10.0%	$28,125	2,167,638	753	2,351,468	817
RENSSELAER COUNTY:										
490101	BERLIN	41.7	1,189	5.2%	0.6%	$10,817	6,996,254	6,153	1,142,885	1,005
490202	BRUNSWICK CENT	36.0	1,411	5.9%	8.2%	$11,982	8,179,500	5,672	795,214	551
490301	EAST GREENBUSH	36.2	4,638	13.0%	8.3%	$39,442	8,378,446	1,885	3,089,033	695
490501	HOOSICK FALLS	34.0	1,481	4.2%	2.4%	$11,150	1,482,397	1,019	0	0
490601	LANSINGBURGH	40.1	2,351	-0.0%	-1.2%	$20,470	4,127,397	1,776	1,411,427	607
490804	WYNANTSKILL	16.5	391	-10.7%	-8.2%	$2,000	250,100	622	285,975	711
491200	RENSSELAER	15.5	1,130	10.0%	-1.5%	$3,828	11,262,850	11,129	1,028,825	1,017
491302	AVERILL PARK	41.3	3,444	23.9%	11.5%	$34,449	42,889,760	13,840	1,350,392	436
491401	HOOSIC VALLEY	38.0	1,275	10.9%	4.2%	$10,984	11,775,460	9,829	554,881	463
491501	SCHODACK	41.5	1,193	18.0%	15.0%	$12,315	7,315,030	6,290	705,536	607
491700	TROY	41.3	4,971	-6.4%	-2.2%	$44,601	26,466,644	5,100	3,719,268	717
ROCKLAND COUNTY:										
500101	CLARKSTOWN	32.0	8,573	-1.5%	-2.0%	$59,745	12,704,578	1,489	7,877,815	923
500108	NANUET	41.3	1,788	14.8%	10.3%	$17,807	481,000	280	2,191,580	1,275
500201	HAVERSTRAW-ST	31.7	7,446	17.1%	9.6%	$56,250	28,646,555	4,111	6,676,103	958
500301	S. ORANGETOWN	33.3	2,684	21.9%	10.9%	$21,635	16,981,792	6,957	2,348,615	962
500304	NYACK	41.0	3,054	16.0%	12.6%	$30,622	38,949,523	13,136	2,635,080	889
500308	PEARL RIVER	31.9	2,142	26.9%	12.6%	$16,809	13,846,149	7,287	1,743,310	918
500401	RAMAPO	32.3	4,092	11.7%	6.5%	$30,622	16,602,761	4,258	3,738,944	959
500402	EAST RAMAPO	30.9	9,044	2.4%	-1.5%	$60,744	5,463,708	628	8,497,997	977
ST LAWRENCE COUNTY:										
510101	BRASHER FALLS	37.4	1,086	-3.6%	0.0%	$8,820	105,837	94	587,339	521
510201	CANTON	34.1	1,849	12.0%	9.7%	$14,978	5,754,142	3,177	1,010,771	558
510401	CLIFTON FINE	44.0	536	-10.4%	-9.9%	$5,159	1,620,003	3,006	473,822	879
510501	COLTON PIERREP	45.0	474	6.0%	3.8%	$4,826	1,390,693	2,997	310,140	668
511101	GOUVERNEUR	71.7	1,967	-11.1%	-6.9%	$30,622	10,321,360	5,008	1,129,215	548
511201	HAMMOND	43.0	384	22.3%	19.1%	$4,327	2,452,518	6,558	154,706	414

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
511301	HERMON DEKALB	37.0	500	-10.2%	-3.1%	$3,994	3,558,376	6,590	318,573	590
511602	LISBON	40.0	719	5.9%	2.2%	$6,324	7,546,590	10,874	440,071	634
511901	MADRID WADDING	33.0	842	2.7%	6.0%	$6,324	11,458,324	13,186	475,635	547
512001	MASSENA	35.8	3,022	2.5%	4.4%	$24,630	4,375,403	1,421	1,385,432	450
512101	MORRISTOWN	55.0	411	-16.1%	-6.9%	$4,993	3,969,292	8,705	286,168	628
512201	NORWOOD NORFOL	62.6	1,270	-9.0%	-8.0%	$17,308	15,332,770	11,941	758,425	591
512300	OGDENSBURG	46.1	2,343	6.4%	9.6%	$25,795	31,085,500	12,872	1,832,169	759
512404	HEUVELTON	41.0	715	-3.8%	-5.5%	$6,324	5,645,620	8,042	412,143	587
512501	PARISHVILLE	60.0	565	0.0%	0.4%	$7,323	2,255,000	3,977	262,783	463
512902	POTSDAM	42.6	1,645	2.9%	2.3%	$15,644	16,937,927	10,360	979,943	599
513102	EDWARDS-KNOX	5.0	814	17.3%	5.8%	$2,000	12,732,000	17,346	474,150	646
SARATOGA COUNTY:										
520101	BURNT HILLS	41.1	3,353	2.0%	1.6%	$30,455	9,941,645	2,977	2,155,861	645
520302	SHENENDEHOWA	26.6	9,092	9.9%	6.9%	$56,250	37,095,835	4,193	5,512,737	623
520401	CORINTH	55.2	1,369	6.0%	1.5%	$16,642	9,771,225	7,448	825,864	629
520601	EDINBURG	7.0	123	-1.6%	0.8%	$2,000	2,500,000	19,841	73,084	580
520701	GALWAY	40.8	1,261	7.7%	3.2%	$11,483	8,006,382	6,622	717,575	594
521200	MECHANICVILLE	60.9	1,455	7.9%	10.1%	$21,136	5,390,643	3,630	928,029	625
521301	BALLSTON SPA	41.3	4,015	28.8%	17.1%	$42,271	11,066,598	3,031	2,221,731	609
521401	S. GLENS FALLS	36.9	2,964	12.4%	9.1%	$25,962	13,233,996	4,602	1,592,680	554
521701	SCHUYLERVILLE	37.5	1,597	10.9%	7.6%	$13,979	14,757,635	9,527	735,584	475
521800	SARATOGA SPRIN	28.2	6,820	4.6%	5.0%	$43,769	39,401,959	5,756	4,016,773	587
522001	STILLWATER	23.4	1,373	6.0%	1.5%	$7,156	8,096,475	6,157	688,721	524
522101	WATERFORD	33.0	859	-1.8%	3.0%	$6,324	826,084	917	518,466	575
SCHENECTADY COUNTY:										
530101	DUANESBURG	50.5	894	10.6%	9.9%	$10,817	2,107,826	2,374	420,319	473
530202	SCOTIA GLENVIL	38.7	3,097	11.4%	8.7%	$28,292	13,752,545	4,549	2,045,053	676
530301	NISKAYUNA	40.8	4,059	14.8%	10.3%	$39,608	21,656,569	5,553	3,020,408	774
530501	SCHALMONT	41.8	2,257	5.0%	6.8%	$21,968	5,174,249	2,254	1,428,380	622
530515	MOHONASEN	34.1	3,108	10.1%	5.0%	$24,298	31,271,483	10,547	1,457,927	492
530600	SCHENECTADY	39.7	8,284	11.9%	6.8%	$76,221	30,266,470	3,826	6,059,850	766
SCHOHARIE COUNTY:										
540801	GILBOA CONESVI	63.7	427	-8.4%	-2.4%	$5,991	1,974,300	4,339	352,239	774
540901	JEFFERSON	58.0	330	30.4%	21.7%	$4,993	3,839,689	12,467	161,922	526
541001	MIDDLEBURGH	45.4	1,054	5.5%	10.2%	$11,483	4,838,500	4,395	495,790	450
541102	COBLESKL-RICHM	56.9	2,261	2.7%	2.6%	$28,791	29,739,226	13,165	1,395,296	618
541201	SCHOHARIE	53.8	1,258	-0.6%	3.3%	$15,144	2,273,585	1,738	569,853	436
541401	SHARON SPRINGS	65.0	441	20.8%	19.7%	$7,489	1,070,000	2,449	201,861	462

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
SCHUYLER COUNTY:										
550101	ODESSA MONTOUR	49.0	973	-10.7%	-6.8%	$10,318	4,848,440	4,772	713,674	702
550301	WATKINS GLEN	40.1	1,379	-5.7%	-1.0%	$11,982	11,086,248	7,651	749,830	517
SENECA COUNTY:										
560501	SOUTH SENECA	58.5	1,159	6.4%	3.5%	$15,311	14,922,929	13,241	779,890	692
560603	ROMULUS	56.0	615	-9.2%	-18.5%	$7,489	3,490,000	6,322	400,748	726
560701	SENECA FALLS	43.0	1,687	13.6%	8.6%	$17,141	5,356,156	3,321	905,844	562
561006	WATERLOO CENT	46.1	2,021	7.6%	1.9%	$20,636	7,061,602	3,688	1,215,779	635
STEUBEN COUNTY:										
570101	ADDISON	53.9	1,378	-5.5%	-2.6%	$16,143	13,140,996	9,254	752,656	530
570201	AVOCA	72.0	714	8.3%	11.8%	$12,482	3,196,310	4,337	325,665	442
570302	BATH	48.5	2,179	10.3%	6.9%	$24,630	10,564,897	5,000	983,031	465
570401	BRADFORD	17.0	285	-26.7%	-15.2%	$2,000	414,200	1,255	214,229	649
570603	CAMPBELL-SAVON	63.0	1,203	0.4%	-1.8%	$16,476	29,888,345	25,415	643,096	547
570701	CANISTEO	65.5	992	-4.9%	-5.3%	$14,146	2,028,709	2,053	510,065	516
571000	CORNING	41.9	5,448	-3.6%	-2.2%	$49,594	32,861,281	5,943	3,727,082	674
571501	GREENWOOD	59.0	260	-5.8%	0.4%	$3,328	1,611,121	5,816	0	0
571800	HORNELL	45.9	2,302	5.2%	-2.1%	$22,966	16,088,193	7,514	1,421,083	664
571901	ARKPORT	58.0	600	21.0%	5.0%	$7,988	5,253,286	10,083	299,968	576
572301	PRATTSBURG	68.8	577	8.9%	2.1%	$8,820	3,510,365	6,489	313,921	580
572702	JASPER-TRPSBRG	60.9	656	-3.2%	-4.4%	$8,654	9,365,182	14,452	421,287	650
572901	HAMMONDSPORT	42.8	785	-2.1%	0.2%	$7,323	1,171,060	1,457	571,466	711
573002	WAYLAND-COHOCT	48.2	1,982	8.0%	6.4%	$22,134	5,281,800	2,703	997,548	511
SUFFOLK COUNTY:										
580101	BABYLON	56.1	1,844	6.2%	3.2%	$23,299	12,519,042	6,982	1,401,260	782
580102	WEST BABYLON	35.9	4,555	15.2%	6.6%	$37,944	19,946,929	4,732	3,439,877	816
580103	NORTH BABYLON	35.1	4,676	5.4%	1.4%	$36,113	3,368,989	749	4,545,612	1,011
580104	LINDENHURST	40.2	6,838	13.7%	6.4%	$63,573	21,187,698	3,311	5,006,944	782
580105	COPIAGUE	31.6	4,275	11.3%	2.7%	$30,122	19,743,869	5,006	2,942,356	746
580106	AMITYVILLE	35.3	2,989	6.3%	4.2%	$23,965	1,337,204	457	3,504,304	1,196
580107	DEER PARK	39.2	3,719	7.3%	1.3%	$32,119	4,943,033	1,409	3,294,733	939
580109	WYANDANCH	34.3	2,220	5.6%	1.2%	$16,809	15,490,422	7,283	2,304,880	1,084
580201	THREE VILLAGE	28.0	6,642	-4.8%	-2.9%	$40,440	13,697,231	2,021	6,301,621	930
580203	COMSEWOGUE	28.7	3,408	1.8%	-5.2%	$21,302	8,110,931	2,555	2,505,056	789
580205	SACHEM	31.1	14,499	-7.0%	-6.7%	$98,022	41,613,573	2,861	10,366,253	713
580206	PORT JEFFERSON	52.5	1,031	-38.4%	-34.4%	$11,816	1,826,930	1,665	1,727,408	1,575
580207	MOUNT SINAI	14.5	2,094	28.6%	27.6%	$8,487	26,363,400	12,693	1,785,567	860
580208	MILLER PLACE	26.3	2,724	2.8%	0.5%	$15,644	8,190,495	3,073	1,470,189	552

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
580209	ROCKY POINT	32.2	2,770	4.0%	3.9%	$20,137	5,515,682	1,993	1,324,326	479
580211	MIDDLE COUNTRY	28.1	10,350	3.8%	-1.6%	$63,407	32,761,059	3,339	8,739,347	891
580212	LONGWOOD	21.4	9,528	10.4%	5.5%	$46,764	9,261,154	1,017	7,642,624	839
580221	SOUTH MANOR	30.7	1,191	26.4%	17.4%	$9,320	2,900,840	2,623	653,682	591
580224	PATCHOGUE-MEDF	31.8	8,579	1.4%	-1.3%	$59,412	13,903,037	1,665	4,613,623	553
580232	WILLIAM FLOYD	23.5	9,668	4.8%	1.9%	$50,426	77,534,005	8,250	7,551,333	804
580233	CENTER MORICHE	43.2	1,191	3.9%	-1.5%	$11,150	4,252,030	3,766	738,591	654
580234	EAST MORICHES	36.5	586	1.0%	0.2%	$4,660	1,022,008	1,759	383,489	660
580235	SOUTH COUNTRY	36.7	4,467	-9.2%	-5.6%	$35,614	9,159,158	1,972	3,620,541	779
580301	EAST HAMPTON	41.7	1,602	42.8%	24.3%	$17,974	8,804,000	6,311	1,751,943	1,256
580303	AMAGANSETT	58.0	132	65.0%	42.5%	$2,330	178,800	1,568	233,956	2,052
580304	SPRINGS	63.0	563	34.4%	29.8%	$9,985	1,628,000	2,993	392,170	721
580305	SAG HARBOR	68.9	759	32.5%	9.6%	$12,482	961,022	1,530	848,732	1,351
580306	MONTAUK	66.0	363	47.6%	28.5%	$6,657	1,702,436	5,387	347,268	1,099
580401	ELWOOD	30.2	2,028	4.3%	-1.1%	$13,314	5,448,497	2,833	2,667,431	1,387
580402	COLD SPRING HA	42.2	1,609	28.3%	18.0%	$17,474	2,635,388	1,781	1,856,991	1,255
580403	HUNTINGTON	32.8	3,986	-6.8%	-4.7%	$28,458	16,316,140	4,004	3,943,013	968
580404	NORTHPORT	39.0	5,427	-0.4%	-4.6%	$45,932	6,335,218	1,219	5,650,842	1,087
580405	HALF HOLLOW HI	26.5	7,251	-2.6%	-5.1%	$41,772	8,701,269	1,231	7,144,334	1,011
580406	HARBORFIELDS	30.8	2,779	7.4%	-2.6%	$18,639	1,485,980	589	2,473,735	981
580410	COMMACK	29.1	5,875	4.0%	0.3%	$37,278	13,171,740	2,323	6,790,182	1,198
580413	S. HUNTINGTON	36.2	5,492	4.9%	1.2%	$43,769	12,434,464	2,347	5,160,626	974
580501	BAY SHORE	47.2	5,000	12.1%	8.6%	$55,751	5,112,749	1,055	3,873,770	799
580502	ISLIP	29.8	3,111	14.6%	3.8%	$20,969	14,965,639	5,309	2,739,253	972
580503	EAST ISLIP	30.3	4,629	7.8%	2.7%	$31,287	10,113,372	2,293	3,896,356	884
580504	SAYVILLE	35.8	3,335	7.9%	2.0%	$26,461	12,850,673	4,077	2,822,618	896
580505	BAYPORT BLUE P	43.8	2,142	2.5%	-3.0%	$20,470	11,085,622	5,469	2,443,348	1,205
580506	HAUPPAUGE	17.2	3,472	-4.1%	-4.9%	$12,981	11,181,761	3,251	4,782,224	1,390
580507	CONNETQUOT	32.4	6,639	-3.4%	-4.0%	$46,764	11,703,715	1,774	6,050,361	917
580509	WEST ISLIP	33.6	4,990	6.5%	-0.4%	$36,446	19,800,352	4,244	3,914,294	839
580512	BRENTWOOD	32.6	13,528	18.4%	8.9%	$104,513	24,756,989	1,991	10,587,882	851
580513	CENTRAL ISLIP	34.9	5,427	8.1%	-0.3%	$41,106	1,055,880	211	5,278,221	1,055
580514	FIRE ISLAND	40.0	48	11.6%	18.6%	$2,000	917,060	17,982	164,024	3,216
580601	SHOREHAM-WADIN	25.4	2,146	10.6%	4.6%	$12,315	3,448,204	1,699	3,333,084	1,642
580602	RIVERHEAD	37.1	4,338	21.0%	14.3%	$39,941	17,938,054	4,378	3,665,558	895
580701	SHELTER ISLAND	70.0	245	-1.6%	-3.2%	$3,661	5,919,440	24,562	385,271	1,599
580801	SMITHTOWN	31.1	7,847	3.6%	-2.6%	$53,088	21,960,762	2,977	7,851,382	1,064
580805	KINGS PARK	28.1	3,406	4.6%	-3.5%	$20,803	345,590	110	3,585,544	1,141

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
580901	REMSENBURG	30.0	170	60.4%	54.7%	$2,000	322,750	1,968	173,887	1,060
580902	WESTHAMPTON BE	36.6	1,568	24.9%	15.9%	$14,479	3,894,867	2,677	1,543,067	1,061
580903	QUOGUE	59.0	80	21.2%	33.3%	$2,000	844,524	9,597	0	0
580905	HAMPTON BAYS	28.7	1,372	19.7%	15.0%	$9,819	1,760,460	1,336	956,211	726
580906	SOUTHAMPTON	33.1	1,571	20.6%	11.3%	$12,648	2,567,350	1,771	2,655,974	1,832
580909	BRIDGEHAMPTON	55.4	153	6.3%	2.1%	$2,000	2,167,200	14,743	294,582	2,004
580911	EASTPORT	59.2	1,014	82.4%	41.5%	$18,473	7,590,954	9,645	802,455	1,020
580913	TUCKAHOE COMMO	62.0	220	43.8%	25.5%	$3,661	3,252,788	16,942	293,855	1,530
580917	EAST QUOGUE	37.8	342	16.7%	9.9%	$3,162	650,000	2,019	177,384	551
581002	OYSTERPONDS	28.0	125	19.0%	2.9%	$2,000	126,360	1,170	106,649	987
581004	FISHERS ISLAND	22.0	77	24.2%	6.5%	$2,000	**********	Data Unavailable	**********	
581005	SOUTHOLD	63.0	885	23.8%	10.8%	$13,480	1,797,909	2,270	806,920	1,019
581009	MATTITUCK	40.6	1,285	2.7%	0.6%	$11,483	1,602,101	1,274	1,040,803	827
581010	GREENPORT	62.0	609	8.9%	1.6%	$8,321	3,339,008	5,879	426,532	751
581011	LAUREL	39.5	101	-20.5%	-13.4%	$2,000	49,000	445	53,592	487
SULLIVAN COUNTY:										
590201	JEFF YOUNGSVIL	57.5	881	14.9%	9.0%	$11,982	7,104,940	8,499	661,011	791
590401	DELAWARE VALLE	41.5	574	1.4%	0.5%	$5,159	1,437,430	2,526	259,621	456
590501	FALLSBURGH	32.5	1,401	5.8%	3.2%	$10,152	17,402,109	12,730	986,500	722
590801	ELDRED	52.3	779	32.7%	20.4%	$10,651	5,450,000	7,709	543,051	768
590901	LIBERTY	44.6	1,777	3.7%	2.9%	$17,807	14,990,827	8,503	1,334,231	757
591201	TRI VALLEY	36.2	1,208	15.7%	8.9%	$10,318	9,954,032	8,755	978,072	860
591301	ROSCOE	55.0	329	-16.5%	-6.9%	$3,994	30,000	82	259,020	706
591302	LIVINGSTON MAN	56.0	735	-0.9%	-0.9%	$8,987	2,134,962	2,905	605,929	824
591401	MONTICELLO	43.0	3,582	12.1%	12.6%	$37,778	5,416,188	1,505	1,921,365	534
591501	NARROWSBURG	45.0	299	6.4%	12.8%	$3,328	94,000	297	195,890	618
TIOGA COUNTY:										
600101	WAVERLY	38.5	1,938	-1.5%	1.8%	$16,476	3,772,205	1,884	836,809	418
600301	CANDOR	68.8	1,100	7.5%	5.7%	$17,474	8,144,206	7,534	517,844	479
600402	NEWARK VALLEY	40.8	1,659	-2.2%	5.5%	$15,477	4,061,930	2,269	979,960	547
600601	OWEGO-APALACHI	29.8	2,705	1.0%	10.3%	$19,305	3,479,974	1,178	1,579,468	535
600801	SPENCER VAN ET	26.8	1,186	3.0%	-1.0%	$6,990	11,554,047	10,135	696,269	611
600903	TIOGA	32.4	1,309	3.0%	2.8%	$9,486	3,067,258	2,347	711,517	544
TOMPKINS COUNTY:										
610301	DRYDEN	44.9	2,130	1.0%	-0.6%	$20,803	7,235,961	3,452	1,136,552	542
610501	GROTON	36.9	1,274	9.3%	4.4%	$10,651	9,304,320	7,645	621,180	510
610600	ITHACA	35.1	6,079	7.4%	7.2%	$49,760	27,909,234	4,598	4,223,633	696
610801	LANSING	41.3	1,230	17.0%	4.4%	$11,483	1,414,663	1,290	961,596	877

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
610901	NEWFIELD	23.2	1,005	3.1%	4.2%	$5,325	1,848,356	1,819	635,493	625
611001	TRUMANSBURG	49.5	1,488	8.0%	6.1%	$16,975	8,442,677	5,775	839,418	574
ULSTER COUNTY:										
620600	KINGSTON	41.0	7,801	5.8%	2.5%	$71,228	25,192,466	3,333	5,212,504	690
620803	HIGHLAND		1,834	9.6%	8.4%	$2,000	69,000	38	996,620	550
620901	RONDOUT VALLEY	35.5	2,881	14.5%	9.7%	$24,464	10,275,000	3,723	1,777,764	644
621001	MARLBORO	36.3	2,089	12.6%	10.1%	$18,140	800,128	392	1,271,955	623
621101	NEW PALTZ	31.1	2,239	13.4%	12.7%	$17,141	17,400,900	7,821	1,398,356	628
621201	ONTEORA	39.7	2,426	9.5%	4.2%	$21,801	9,387,003	4,065	1,819,468	788
621601	SAUGERTIES	36.9	3,450	12.4%	8.0%	$29,956	10,702,943	3,228	1,467,743	443
621801	WALLKILL	44.4	3,374	18.5%	11.2%	$36,280	22,477,190	7,100	1,411,633	446
622002	ELLENVILLE	80.1	1,880	1.0%	5.4%	$34,449	20,843,000	10,623	1,176,343	600
WARREN COUNTY:										
630101	BOLTON	66.0	250	-7.1%	-13.8%	$3,661	128,000	552	223,768	965
630202	NORTH WARREN	58.9	685	14.9%	14.6%	$9,985	3,026,057	4,431	390,856	572
630300	GLENS FALLS	51.4	2,790	3.3%	4.4%	$32,452	2,850,575	1,010	1,546,735	548
630601	JOHNSBURG	68.0	417	-9.0%	-8.5%	$6,158	3,292,872	7,859	282,596	674
630701	LAKE GEORGE	48.7	1,072	-0.5%	-4.1%	$11,317	12,561,546	12,160	665,916	645
630801	HADLEY LUZERNE	36.1	1,163	22.4%	14.6%	$10,485	5,772,400	5,301	779,505	716
630902	QUEENSBURY	33.4	3,625	14.0%	7.5%	$28,292	13,437,074	3,929	1,782,929	521
630918	GLENS FALLS CO	56.1	196	54.3%	35.4%	$3,162	2,044,600	11,887	108,730	632
631201	WARRENSBURG	26.5	1,104	8.1%	5.4%	$6,657	12,717,002	11,819	823,917	766
WASHINGTON COUNTY:										
640101	ARGYLE	55.0	796	22.3%	9.7%	$10,485	367,100	514	323,409	453
640502	FORT ANN	56.0	608	-6.6%	4.3%	$7,655	2,281,171	3,360	287,164	423
640601	FORT EDWARD	46.1	584	-6.1%	-9.2%	$5,825	704,060	1,246	378,606	670
640701	GRANVILLE	53.4	1,456	1.1%	-0.3%	$16,975	1,054,468	735	642,383	448
640801	GREENWICH	45.7	1,248	0.8%	3.6%	$12,814	3,438,499	2,682	631,475	493
641001	HARTFORD	46.7	604	18.2%	4.9%	$6,490	2,245,375	4,189	289,423	540
641301	HUDSON FALLS	36.8	2,457	-7.1%	-3.7%	$19,638	11,066,546	4,347	1,503,642	591
641401	PUTNAM	66.0	32	-40.7%	-27.8%	$2,000	214,830	5,508	42,725	1,096
641501	SALEM	54.1	931	24.1%	14.8%	$12,648	1,947,020	2,261	410,687	477
641610	CAMBRIDGE	45.8	1,200	7.3%	2.9%	$12,315	2,732,712	2,376	528,756	460
641701	WHITEHALL	29.4	978	1.6%	-0.7%	$6,324	3,200,525	3,348	716,173	749
WAYNE COUNTY:										
650101	NEWARK	47.1	2,918	12.7%	11.6%	$33,284	4,391,506	1,519	1,346,495	466
650301	CLYDE-SAVANNAH	41.4	1,129	2.6%	5.4%	$10,651	14,411,000	12,434	816,526	705
650501	LYONS	56.6	1,265	0.9%	-2.2%	$15,477	5,260,510	4,287	618,934	504

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
650701	MARION	46.3	1,207	-1.9%	-0.7%	$12,149	7,531,304	6,163	626,083	512
650801	WAYNE	33.0	2,899	19.9%	11.4%	$23,133	22,669,095	8,421	1,502,820	558
650901	PALMYRA-MACEDO	44.1	2,365	6.2%	2.8%	$23,299	12,489,615	5,454	1,715,427	749
650902	GANANDA	15.5	1,042	56.2%	29.7%	$4,493	15,205,269	17,578	551,091	637
651201	SODUS	38.0	1,690	8.6%	4.5%	$14,645	4,453,593	2,739	953,524	586
651402	WILLIAMSON	41.6	1,429	7.8%	6.9%	$13,813	12,931,654	9,126	711,996	502
651501	N. ROSE-WOLCOT	44.9	1,929	2.7%	0.1%	$18,806	17,356,000	9,232	1,287,451	685
651503	RED CREEK	28.7	1,204	5.2%	4.9%	$7,822	6,720,000	5,600	567,734	473
	WESTCHESTER COUNTY:									
660101	KATONAH LEWISB	35.7	3,384	30.7%	13.5%	$29,789	6,393,348	2,175	2,722,009	926
660102	BEDFORD	44.6	3,302	16.6%	7.3%	$34,283	10,910,050	3,590	3,873,888	1,275
660202	CROTON HARMON	60.0	1,197	16.2%	10.0%	$17,141	8,251,214	7,283	0	- 0
660203	HENDRICK HUDSO	41.5	2,465	18.9%	10.3%	$24,464	4,976,080	2,176	2,813,612	1,230
660301	EASTCHESTER		2,085	19.4%	6.9%	$2,000	2,922,824	1,566	2,346,128	1,257
660302	TUCKAHOE	38.0	957	28.1%	31.2%	$10,318	4,664,039	4,759	730,447	745
660303	BRONXVILLE	74.0	1,245	35.3%	17.2%	$23,465	5,953,514	5,523	1,625,996	1,508
660401	TARRYTOWN	55.1	2,018	19.9%	8.3%	$26,128	2,556,553	1,403	1,858,607	1,020
660402	IRVINGTON	46.9	1,374	26.3%	10.8%	$15,477	9,774,799	8,105	1,566,394	1,299
660403	DOBBS FERRY	44.7	1,255	27.0%	12.9%	$13,813	7,539,798	6,762	1,182,331	1,060
660404	HASTINGS ON HU	86.8	1,375	35.7%	23.6%	$32,119	10,351,167	8,268	1,610,786	1,287
660405	ARDSLEY	31.5	1,825	26.3%	14.7%	$14,312	11,273,524	6,804	1,557,864	940
660406	EDGEMONT	45.5	1,485	11.4%	4.8%	$15,477	9,791,715	7,009	1,992,995	1,427
660407	GREENBURGH	44.3	2,077	16.2%	10.0%	$21,968	6,998,842	3,558	2,560,684	1,302
660409	ELMSFORD	61.4	720	25.4%	12.4%	$10,817	3,317,360	5,143	1,120,840	1,738
660501	HARRISON	48.8	2,841	27.9%	11.4%	$33,617	19,550,676	7,902	3,804,735	1,538
660701	MAMARONECK	60.7	4,198	16.2%	3.8%	$57,415	14,245,483	3,800	5,103,111	1,361
660801	MT PLEAS CENT	37.0	1,696	9.6%	3.7%	$14,146	4,867,867	3,033	1,408,787	878
660802	POCANTICO HILL	62.0	321	28.4%	15.6%	$4,993	2,086,722	7,220	463,512	1,604
660805	VALHALLA	46.2	1,141	28.8%	12.0%	$12,814	6,402,543	6,454	1,230,760	1,241
660809	PLEASANTVILLE	64.0	1,532	40.3%	18.0%	$25,130	5,874,072	4,557	1,531,892	1,188
660900	MOUNT VERNON	47.0	9,878	8.4%	5.5%	$106,510	23,853,828	2,482	8,208,389	854
661004	CHAPPAQUA	50.5	3,330	18.5%	7.6%	$39,275	13,549,269	4,484	4,623,494	1,530
661100	NEW ROCHELLE	48.9	8,866	20.5%	10.3%	$104,013	56,328,699	6,937	8,791,238	1,083
661201	BYRAM HILLS	33.2	2,090	27.5%	14.6%	$17,308	13,379,465	7,121	2,012,118	1,071
661301	NORTH SALEM	25.6	1,186	28.6%	16.3%	$7,655	6,603,432	6,160	1,244,687	1,161
661401	OSSINING	45.4	3,504	20.5%	10.0%	$38,111	17,161,881	5,363	3,043,019	951
661402	BRIARCLIFF MAN	30.6	1,218	24.4%	9.4%	$8,820	2,976,672	2,779	1,102,240	1,029
661500	PEEKSKILL	43.1	2,745	17.4%	6.1%	$27,293	9,446,998	3,808	2,385,640	962

County/ Code	School District	Average Age of Buildings	1996-97 Enrollment	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 96-97	Enrollment Growth 1989-90 to 93-94	Minor Maintenance Aid	10-Year Capital Spending (85-86 to 95-96)	Capital Per Pupil (93-94 Enr.)	1994-95 Operations & Maintenance	O&M Expense Per Pupil
661601	PELHAM	75.1	2,032	25.6%	8.7%	$36,113	12,885,818	7,326	1,930,473	1,097
661800	RYE	60.9	2,202	23.2%	9.6%	$31,953	14,133,856	7,215	1,889,277	964
661901	RYE NECK		1,151	21.3%	12.2%	$2,000	6,456,535	6,062	1,477,914	1,388
661904	PORT CHESTER	51.7	3,229	24.5%	16.8%	$42,437	6,933,301	2,289	2,614,391	863
661905	BLIND BROOK-RY	34.0	952	25.6%	11.6%	$7,822	2,141,694	2,532	1,294,774	1,530
662001	SCARSDALE	46.5	3,987	7.8%	0.3%	$40,440	30,815,963	8,308	4,394,791	1,185
662101	SOMERS	44.6	2,387	11.0%	-0.3%	$23,133	10,607,347	4,945	2,133,816	995
662200	WHITE PLAINS	54.9	5,921	22.2%	15.1%	$81,380	58,799,444	10,547	5,915,580	1,061
662300	YONKERS	54.1	22,751	30.5%	17.7%	$314,869	70,331,739	3,427	17,048,168	831
662401	LAKELAND	31.2	5,846	18.1%	7.4%	$42,604	11,404,690	2,147	5,220,921	983
662402	YORKTOWN	31.3	3,684	21.9%	12.4%	$28,125	9,043,581	2,664	2,470,285	728
	WYOMING COUNTY:									
670201	ATTICA	45.7	1,982	5.1%	5.7%	$20,803	4,791,800	2,404	0	0
670401	LETCHWORTH	40.0	1,395	5.3%	2.0%	$12,315	3,745,389	2,772	686,464	508
671002	WYOMING	53.1	275	-12.4%	-22.9%	$3,162	62,500	258	209,200	864
671201	PERRY	69.1	1,328	-1.6%	0.8%	$20,137	5,260,274	3,865	605,437	445
671501	WARSAW	39.3	1,170	1.2%	2.9%	$10,318	9,186,875	7,720	615,284	517
	YATES COUNTY:									
680601	PENN YAN	42.8	2,134	5.3%	6.8%	$21,136	********** Data Unavailable **********			
680801	DUNDEE	54.4	995	-0.6%	1.0%	$11,982	********** Data Unavailable **********			
STATEWIDE TOTAL/AVERAGE		41.0	2,789,908	11.0%	6.5%	$50,000,000	7,548,798,726	5,292	1,238,727,548	715

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").