


# 2011 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN



## **NORTHSHORE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 417**

3330 MONTE VILLA PARKWAY  
BOTHELL, WASHINGTON 98021-8972

"STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY THROUGH EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION"

### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

<b>Dawn McCravey</b>	<b>President</b>
<b>Julia Lacey</b>	<b>Vice-President</b>
<b>Todd Banks</b>	<b>Director</b>
<b>Sandy Hayes</b>	<b>Director</b>
<b>Janet Quinn</b>	<b>Director</b>

**Larry Francois, Superintendent**

Adopted 5/10/11

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Section 1--Introduction.....	3
Section 2--Student Enrollment Trends and Projections .....	5
Section 3--District Standard of Service .....	10
Section 4--Capital Facilities Inventory .....	13
Section 5--Projected Facility Needs .....	18
Section 6--Growth Related Projects.....	24
Section 7--Capital Instructional Facilities Plan .....	26
Section 8--Capital Facilities Financing Plan .....	28
Section 9--Impact Fees.....	31
Appendix A--Definitions .....	32
Appendix B--District Map .....	34
Appendix C--Summary of Changes .....	35

## Executive Summary

### SECTION 1 -- INTRODUCTION

#### **Purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan**

Presented herein, in conformance with the Washington State Growth Management Act, the Codes of King and Snohomish Counties, and the cities of Bothell, Kenmore, and Woodinville, is the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) of the Northshore School District.

This CFP is intended to provide the School District, King County, Snohomish County and the cities of Bothell, Kenmore, and Woodinville with a description of facilities needed to accommodate projected student enrollment at acceptable levels of service over the long term (2011-2025), and a more detailed schedule and financing program for capital improvement over the next six years (2011-2017).

This CFP is also intended to provide local jurisdictions with information on the School District's ability to accommodate projected population and enrollment demands anticipated through implementation of various comprehensive land use plan alternatives.

The role of impact fees in funding school construction is addressed in Section 9 of this report.

#### **Summary**

The District continues to experience growth in its northern central corridor, while implications of the Urban Growth Boundary Line are resulting in flat or declining enrollments in its eastern areas of the district. Recent capacity that was added in the northern corridor is projected to be fully utilized by 2015. Alternatives such as service area changes continue to be reviewed, but a new facility may be necessary and, if approved by the Board, would be included in the 2014 bond for voter approval. The District continues to review several alternative configurations, including a four year high school program, a sixth through eighth grade middle school program, a Kindergarten through fifth grade elementary program, and/or the possibility of a Kindergarten through eighth or Kindergarten through ninth grade program, any of which could affect the CFP plans and assumptions.

#### **Overview of the Northshore School District**

The Northshore School District services five jurisdictions: King County, Snohomish County, the City of Bothell, the City of Kenmore, and the City of Woodinville. The physical area and student population are roughly two-thirds in King County and one-third in Snohomish County. The District is 62 square miles and is located at the north end of Lake Washington, extending north into Snohomish County, with a population estimated at 117,819. The District currently serves an enrollment of 18,469<sup>1</sup> with

---

<sup>1</sup>Full-time equivalents/October 2009 census.

twenty elementary schools, six junior high schools, three high schools, one alternative secondary school, and one early childhood center. The grade configuration is kindergarten through sixth for elementary, seventh through ninth for junior high, and tenth through twelfth for high school. The District continues to examine the advantages of various models, including a kindergarten through fifth grade elementary school, sixth through eighth grade middle school, ninth through twelfth high school, or a kindergarten through eighth or kindergarten through ninth grade program. The Urban Growth Boundary Line (UGA) splits the District, exacerbating challenges in meeting equitable service levels. Generally, schools on the eastern side of the UGA line are seeing declining enrollment while schools on the western side are seeing increasing enrollment. To optimize instructional program flexibility and maximize service levels in the most cost effective way possible, the District maintains approximately ten - fifteen percent of its total classroom capacity in relocatables (portables).

## SECTION 2 -- STUDENT ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

### NORTHSHORE ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS: 2011-2025<sup>2</sup>

#### Introduction

In general, enrollment growth in the Puget Sound has been slower in the past decade than in the previous decade. This slow-down in enrollment growth from the District's high point in 1998, is correlated with a modest decline in births and with a slowdown in overall population growth in the region. The District has followed that trend with headcount enrollment declining steadily since October 2006. The biggest losses in the District in recent years have been seen at the junior high and high school level as the smaller elementary classes from the past few years have moved up. Elementary enrollment, after stabilizing at around 9,800 students for the past 3 years, trended up above 10,000 in 2010.

For this year's District projections, regional trends were modified to include population and housing growth, and any market share losses or gains due to private schools. In addition, assumptions and corresponding projections were taken down to the feeder pattern level. Growth rates were adjusted based on a database of new housing and construction information specific to those respective areas. The resulting trends were used to further refine the projection methodology for both headcount and full time equivalent (FTE) forecasts used in this document. The following section describes in more detail the assumptions used to develop the forecast and compares the result of this projection to other available methodologies.

---

<sup>2</sup> The District contracts with an independent consultant to produce enrollment projections for the Capital Facilities Plan. The consultant has a long history of working with local school districts in doing projections, including 7 years as the demographer for the Seattle Public Schools and 14 years as an independent consultant providing long-range projections for the Highline, Edmonds, Mukilteo, Puyallup, Federal Way, Marysville, Bethel, South Kitsap, Bremerton, Tacoma, and Seattle school districts. For new housing and construction data the District contracts with a separate firm to collect and update this data on a regular basis.

## Methodology

Numerous methodologies are available for projecting long-term enrollment. The most common method is known as cohort survival, which tracks groups of students through the system and adjusts the populations to account for the average year-to-year growth. For example, this year's fourth grade is adjusted based on the average enrollment trend of the past in order to estimate next year's fifth grade enrollment. This calculation method considers the past five years' trends to determine the average adjustment factor for each grade, or cohort. The method works well for all grades except kindergarten, where there is no previous grade. At kindergarten two methodologies are generally used. First, one can use a linear extrapolation from the previous five years, assuming that there is a trend. Or, alternatively, one can compare the kindergarten enrollment to births from five years prior to calculate a "birth-to-k" ratio. For example, kindergarten enrollment in 2010 is divided by the total births in King and Snohomish counties in 2005 to produce a birth-to-k ratio. The average ratio for the last five years can then be applied to births in subsequent years to estimate kindergarten enrollment.

The cohort survival method has been used by OSPI to predict enrollment for all districts in the state. In past years OSPI has used a five-year cohort average for grades 1-12 and a linear extrapolation method at kindergarten. In 2008 OSPI commissioned a study to evaluate the effectiveness of this method for predicting enrollment. The report recommended the use of the "birth-to-k" method for predicting kindergarten enrollment and the use of a housing adjustment factor for districts that are likely to be impacted by large numbers of new housing developments. To date, these suggestions have not been implemented. The latest forecast from OSPI for the District continues to use cohort survival with a linear extrapolation at the kindergarten level.

Table 2-1 shows a projection for Northshore using the headcount projection provided by OSPI. This model converts the OSPI headcount forecast to an FTE forecast based on the latest data comparing headcount to FTE enrollment in Northshore. The OSPI forecast predicts a gradual increase in FTE enrollment over the next six years, with growth primarily at the elementary level.

**TABLE 2-1**

**OSPI Cohort Headcount Forecast CONVERTED to FTE Based on Latest Northshore FTE Data  
October FTE**

Grade	Actual 10/11*	Projected 11/12	Projected 12/13	Projected 13/14	Projected 14/15	Projected 15/16	Projected 16/17
K	681	683	693	703	714	724	735
1	1,447	1,454	1,460	1,481	1,504	1,525	1,548
2	1,431	1,481	1,493	1,499	1,520	1,543	1,566
3	1,390	1,443	1,494	1,506	1,511	1,533	1,556
4	1,413	1,398	1,458	1,509	1,521	1,527	1,549
5	1,427	1,428	1,415	1,475	1,527	1,539	1,545
6	1,484	1,455	1,454	1,440	1,502	1,555	1,567
7	1,450	1,529	1,481	1,480	1,466	1,529	1,583
8	1,550	1,478	1,558	1,509	1,508	1,493	1,558
9	1,499	1,557	1,490	1,570	1,521	1,520	1,505
10	1,655	1,530	1,589	1,519	1,602	1,551	1,550
11	1,497	1,585	1,467	1,523	1,456	1,535	1,487
12	1,556	1,436	1,522	1,409	1,464	1,399	1,475
Total K-6	9,271	9,343	9,466	9,613	9,800	9,947	10,066
Total 7-9	4,498	4,565	4,529	4,560	4,495	4,542	4,645
Total 10-12	4,709	4,551	4,578	4,452	4,521	4,485	4,512
District Total	18,478	18,458	18,573	18,624	18,816	18,974	19,223
		-21	115	51	192	158	249
		-0.1%	0.6%	0.3%	1.0%	0.8%	1.3%

\*Actual FTE Enrollment as of 10/10

The cohort method displayed in Table 2-1 generally works well for districts that have a consistent trend of gradual increases or declines in enrollment. It is less reliable in districts where spikes in demographic trends (especially a marked increase or decrease in new housing) can lead to dramatic swings in enrollment from one year to the next. Combining cohort survival with other information about housing, regional population trends, and even trends in service area and private school enrollment can sometimes provide for a more accurate forecast. New home construction and sales, for example, have declined dramatically in Northshore and the rest of the region since 2007. A five year average of historical trends from the past five years could well miss the significance of this trend going forward. Data from New Home Trends, for example, indicates that new home sales in Northshore in 2010 were about half of what they were between 2005 and 2007.

Table 2-2 shows an alternative to the OSPI forecast that combines cohort survival methodology with information about new housing, the District's predicted share of the King and Snohomish County birth cohort, and any predicted gains or losses in the District's market share. Market share refers to the District's share of the K-12 public school population in the region as well as any expected effect from private schools. For this forecast, the average rollup at existing grades was combined with estimates of growth that might be expected from new housing, and assumptions about market share gains or losses that the District is likely to see at certain grade levels. Estimates of housing growth for this model were obtained from Northshore's housing development database. Table 2-2 shows the forecast based on this methodology.

This forecast produces a result that is similar to the OSPI forecast, though it predicts greater growth at the elementary and kindergarten level. This difference results primarily from a consideration of births and housing trends for various service areas within the District. Overall, enrollment is predicted to remain stable into 2011 and

then gradually increase from 2011 to 2016. Similar to the cohort forecast, the growth is expected to be concentrated at the elementary level. Elementary enrollment is predicted to grow from 9,271 FTE in October 2010 to 10,346 FTE by October 2016. Junior high enrollment is projected to decline through 2014 before starting to increase again after that. High school enrollment is projected to decline from 4,709 FTE in 2010 to 4,448 FTE in 2016.

**TABLE 2-2**  
**FTE Forecast**  
**Facilities Forecast -- OCTOBER MEDIUM**

October FTE	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
Grade	10/11*	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17
K	681	713	723	734	720	737	733
1	1,447	1,465	1,528	1,549	1,573	1,541	1,580
2	1,431	1,479	1,500	1,565	1,586	1,610	1,578
3	1,390	1,451	1,498	1,520	1,584	1,606	1,631
4	1,413	1,407	1,472	1,519	1,541	1,607	1,630
5	1,427	1,437	1,427	1,492	1,541	1,562	1,629
6	1,484	1,435	1,441	1,430	1,496	1,544	1,566
7	1,450	1,500	1,452	1,457	1,446	1,513	1,562
8	1,550	1,481	1,532	1,483	1,488	1,477	1,545
9	1,499	1,555	1,493	1,544	1,495	1,500	1,489
10	1,655	1,532	1,591	1,528	1,579	1,528	1,534
11	1,497	1,582	1,467	1,523	1,462	1,512	1,464
12	1,556	1,432	1,518	1,408	1,462	1,403	1,451
Total K-6	9,271	9,388	9,589	9,809	10,040	10,209	10,346
Total 7-9	4,498	4,536	4,476	4,484	4,429	4,490	4,596
Total 10-12	4,709	4,546	4,576	4,458	4,502	4,443	4,448
District Total	18,478	18,470	18,641	18,750	18,972	19,142	19,390
		-9	171	110	221	170	249
		0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.3%

\*Actual FTE Enrollment of 10/10



## Long Range Projections

The methodology described above was extrapolated to 2020 and 2025 to produce a longer-range forecast. In general, this model assumes that the period between 2016 and 2025 will have slightly better population and housing growth than is expected between 2010 and 2015. Similar to the methodology used above, the average cohort survival rollup-rate for each grade was calculated and applied at each grade level to predict the growth in each subsequent year. Kindergarten was projected using the birth-to-k ratio method described above. Longer-range kindergarten projections were arrived at by applying the latest fertility rates to the State projections of females in their child-bearing years for both King and Snohomish counties. This provided a projection of the number of births expected in the coming years. The average birth-to-k ratio for the last five years was then applied to the projected births to predict kindergarten enrollment. A growth factor was then applied to each of the grade level projections (K-12) to account for expected population and housing growth in future years. This factor was based on an analysis of future population growth for neighborhoods in and around the District obtained from the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Using this methodology, the District's enrollment shows continued growth from 2016 to 2025. As shown in Table 2-3, FTE enrollment in 2020 is projected to be 20,486 and projected FTE enrollment for 2025 is predicted to be 21,548. Elementary enrollment is expected to grow more dramatically between 2016 and 2025 when the birth cohorts entering school are expected to be larger. In fact, the State of Washington is predicting a marked increase in K-12 enrollment between 2015 and 2025 as the grandchildren of baby boomers reach school age. The State model assumes a stable fertility rate (number of births per female in her child-bearing years), and a generally positive economic outlook that will continue to bring new residents into the area.

Obviously, future growth trends are somewhat uncertain. Changes in population growth, fertility rates, or a sharp downturn in the economic conditions in the Puget Sound region could have a major impact on long term enrollment, making it significantly lower or higher than the current estimate. Given this uncertainty, the current projection should be considered a reasonable estimate based on the best information available, but subject to change as newer information about trends becomes available.

**TABLE 2-3**  
**Projected FTE Enrollment**

Level	2015	2020	2025
Elementary	10,209	10,668	11,203
Jr. High	4,490	5,112	5,247
High School	4,443	4,706	5,098
Total	19,142 FTE	20,486 FTE	21,548 FTE

### SECTION 3 -- DISTRICT STANDARD OF SERVICE

Optimizing student learning is the heart of what the District strives for in establishing its service standard for classroom capacity utilization. This requires a constant refinement and review of instructional practices, learning environment and program development. These elements are combined with demographic projections and cost considerations in determining service levels.

The District provides traditional educational programs and nontraditional programs (See Table 3-1) such as special education, expanded bilingual education, remediation, alcohol and drug education, preschool and daycare programs, home school, computer labs, music programs, movement programs, etc. Programs and the associated learning environment are regularly reviewed to attempt to determine the optimum instructional method and learning environment at each school. The required space for these programs is determined by noise, level of physical activity, teacher to student ratios, privacy and/or the need for physical proximity to other services/facilities. Adequate space must exist for program flexibility, differing learning styles, program experimentation, and pre- and post- school activities. For example, service level capacities in rooms utilized for programs such as special education would reflect lower capacities of the defined service levels (See Table 3-2), eight versus 24 (for a standard size room or relocatables/portables). A second example is the Dual Language program with two dedicated classrooms at each grade level, in addition to the regular education classrooms. These classes have a scheduled use of 24 students per room.

Special teaching stations and programs offered by the Northshore School District at specific school sites are included in Table 3-1.

**TABLE 3-1**  
**Programs and Teaching Stations**

	Elementary	Secondary
Computer Labs	X	X
Group Activities Rooms	X	
Elementary Advanced Placement (EAP)	X	
All Day Kindergarten	X	
Parents Active in Cooperative Education (PACE)	X	
Special Education	X	X
Contained Learning Centers (CLC)	X	X
Learning Centers (LC)	X	X
Learning Assistance Program (LAP)	X	X
English Language Learners (ELL)	X	X
Dual Language (DL)	X	
Home School	X	X
Alternative School Program		X
Career Technical Education		X
International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP)		X

School-to-Work		X
Running Start		X
College in the High School		X

A number of the above programs affect the design capacity of some of the buildings housing these programs. Special programs usually require space modifications and sometimes have less density than other, more traditional programs; this potentially translates into greater space requirements. These requirements are part of the difference that we see between design capacity and scheduled capacity (see page 14).

Teaching station loading is identified in Table 3-2. Class sizes are averages based on actual utilization as influenced by state funding and instructional program standards. The District's standard of service is based on state and/or contractual requirements.

**TABLE 3-2**  
**Standard of Service –Class Size (Average)**

Classroom Type	Elementary – Average Students Per Classroom	Junior High – Average Students Per Classroom	High School – Average Students Per Classroom
Kindergarten	23	NA	NA
Regular, Alternative, EAP	24	27	27
Regular (portables)	24	27	27
Special Education (CLC)	12	12	12
Special Education – Severe/Profound (CLC)	8	8	8
Integrated - Regular & Special Education (15 regular & 6 special education students)	21	NA	NA
Special Education	8 (Sorenson & Woodmoor)	NA	NA
Vocational	NA	27	27
Dual Language - assuming 2 classes per grade level	24	NA	NA

Snohomish County has requested that the District's plan include a measurement of the current levels of service to compare to the District's minimum levels of service. A possible indicator of that is summarized in Table 3-3, which shows the District's average students per teaching station as a measurement of its minimum levels of service as of October 31, 2010.

**TABLE 3-3**  
**Average Students per Scheduled Teaching Station**

Grade Level	# of Scheduled Teaching Stations	FTE Scheduled Capacity	Calculated Standard of Service (1)	FTE Enrollment (2)	Average FTE / Teaching station
K - 6	466	10,783	23.1	9,222	19.8
7 - 9	225	5,833	25.9	4,430	19.7
10 - 12	226	5,688	25.2	4,590	20.3
Total	917	22,304		18,242	

- (1) Capacity divided by the number of teaching stations
- (2) Excludes alternative programs except SAS

## SECTION 4 -- CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY

Under the Growth Management Act, a public entity must periodically determine its capacity by conducting an inventory of its capital facilities. As seen in Table 4-1, this section summarizes the capacity owned and operated by the Northshore School District including permanent classrooms, relocatable classrooms (portables), developed school sites, undeveloped land, and support facilities.

Site capacities are established based on existing programs, projected future programs and, where possible the recommendation of local site administration. To monitor this, and for use in preliminary capacity planning, the District establishes design capacities. This is the maximum number of students a site can accommodate based on a standard room capacity of 54, 27, 24, or 12 FTE depending on room size. These figures are compared on a regular basis to the actual utilization or Scheduled Capacity. Scheduled Capacity takes into consideration the specific programs that actually take place in each of the rooms. For example, capacities in rooms utilized for programs such as special education would reflect capacities of the defined service levels (See Table 3-2), eight versus 24 (for a standard size room or relocatables/portables). Due to the need to provide planning time and space for teacher preparation, some facilities will only support a design capacity utilization of 85%. In secondary schools where recent modernizations have added more teacher preparation space, the utilization percentage is higher.

### Schools

The Northshore School District currently operates 20 elementary schools (grades K-6), six junior high schools (grades 7-9), and three high schools (grades 10-12). The District also has one alternative secondary school program, a home school program and an early childhood center.

TABLE 4-1

### Elementary School Capacity Inventory (Including Relocatables)

School	Year Built	Last Modernization or Capacity addition	Total # of Rooms		Capacity		# Students / Rm		Relocatables	
			Design	Schedule	Design	Schedule	Design	Schedule	Schedule Capacity	% of Schedule
Arrowhead	1957	1994/2011	26	17	622	382	23.9	22.5	24	6.3%
Bear Creek	1988	2011	22	21	526	502	23.9	23.9	0	0.0%
Canyon Creek	1977	1999/2008	34	29	813	689	23.9	23.1	72	10.8%
Collage Lake	1958	2005	23	16	550	358	23.9	22.4	0	0.0%
Crystal Springs	1957	2002/2010	28	24	670	574	23.9	23.9	96	16.7%
East Ridge	1991		27	18	646	430	23.9	23.9	24	5.6%
Fernwood	1988	2002/2010	32	28	785	660	23.9	23.6	48	7.3%
Frank Love	1990		27	20	646	478	23.9	23.9	24	5.0%
Hollywood Hill	1980	2001	25	16	598	394	23.9	24.6	0	0.0%
Kenmore	1955	2002/2011	27	23	645	549	23.9	23.9	48	8.7%
Kokanee	1994		31	25	741	597	23.9	23.9	48	8.0%
Lockwood	1962	2004/2011	28	21	670	502	23.9	23.9	24	4.8%
Maywood Hills	1961	2002	26	25	622	579	23.9	23.2	68	11.7%
Moorlands	1963	2002/2011	32	27	764	620	23.9	23.0	12	1.9%
Shelton View	1969	1999/2011	24	20	574	443	23.9	22.2	24	5.4%
Sorenson ECC*	2002									
Sunrise	1985		26	17	622	382	23.9	22.5	24	6.3%
Wellington	1978	2000/2011	28	25	670	597	23.9	23.9	47	7.9%
Westhill	1980	1995/2011	25	21	598	478	23.9	22.8	24	5.0%
Woodin	1970	2003	29	28	692	668	23.9	23.9	120	18.0%
Woodmoor	1994		46	45	1101	921	23.9	20.5	0	0.0%
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>566</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>13,535</b>	<b>10,783</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
Canyon Park	1964	2000/2005	47	41	1,285	1,039	27.3	25.3	0	0.0%
Kenmore	1961	2002/2008	51	36	1,378	913	27.0	25.4	0	0.0%
Leota	1972	1998	44	36	1,204	943	27.4	26.2	39	4.1%
Northshore	1977	2004	44	38	1,222	970	27.8	25.5	27	2.8%
Skyview	1992		44	41	1,219	1,048	27.7	25.6	108	10.3%
Timbercrest	1997		38	35	1,072	920	28.2	26.3	0	0.0%
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>268</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>7,380</b>	<b>5,833</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>25.7</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>3.0%</b>
Bothell	1953	2005	87	76	2,221	1,936	25.5	25.5	27	1.4%
Inglamoor	1964	2000	62	73	2,140	1,912	26.1	26.2	162	8.5%
Woodinville	1983	1994/2008	66	62	1,725	1,618	26.1	26.1	127	7.8%
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>235</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>6,086</b>	<b>5,466</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
SAS	2010		18	15	264	222	14.7	14.8	0	0.0%
<b>Total K-12 All</b>			<b>1,087</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>27,265</b>	<b>22,304</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>1,217</b>	<b>5.5%</b>

\* Sorenson ECC has 10 classrooms designed and scheduled with 142 students that do not count toward district FTE.  
 Note 1: Includes planned summer 2011 work; boiler, roofing and window replacements

### **Relocatable Classroom Facilities (Portables)**

To achieve efficient facility utilization and encourage new programs and differing learning styles, the District maintains ten - fifteen percent of its Design Capacity in relocatables (portables). The use of relocatables is an effective way to provide capacity on relatively short notice in order to support the dynamic nature of growth and program changes. This provides a cost effective method to encourage innovation and new approaches, particularly for non-core or pilot programs.

A typical portable classroom provides capacity for 24 students at the elementary level and 27 at the secondary level. Relocatables are used to meet a variety of instructional needs. Of the 132 relocatable classrooms (portables) that the District owns, 81 are used as classrooms housing students for scheduled classes or for pull out programs. Within the financial capabilities of the District, the intent is to minimize the size of the first group. Their actual use may reflect loads that are less than the standards of service identified in Section 3. Not included in Scheduled Capacity is approximately 33 relocatables that are used for daycare, PTA, Conference Rooms/Resource Rooms, temporary housing in conjunction with pending modernizations or recently vacated as a result of the consolidation of some programs within other existing permanent space. A summary of relocatables is presented in Table 4-2.

**TABLE 4-2  
Relocatable Classroom Facilities**

School	Total # of Portables	Portables Scheduled (Note 1)	Designed Student Capacity	Scheduled Student Capacity	"Pull Out" Programs (Note 2)
Arrowhead	6	1	144	24	3
Bear Creek	0	0	0	0	0
Canyon Creek	8	3	192	72	3
Cottage Lake	0	0	0	0	0
Crystal Springs	8	4	192	96	1
East Ridge	5	1	120	24	0
Fernwood	6	2	144	48	4
Frank Love	5	1	120	24	3
Hollywood Hill	2	0	48	0	0
Kenmore	5	2	120	48	3
Kokanee	6	2	144	48	4
Lockwood	2	1	48	24	1
Maywood Hills	4	3	96	68	1
Moorlands	5	1	120	12	0
Shelton View	4	1	96	24	2
Sorenson ECC**	0	0	0	0	0
Sunrise	5	1	120	24	2
Wellington	4	2	96	47	2
Westhill	5	1	120	24	2
Woodin	6	5	144	120	1
Woodmoor	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2,064</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>32</b>
Canyon Park	4	2	108	0	0
Kenmore	7	0	189	0	0
Leota	9	3	243	39	0
Northshore	4	1	108	27	0
Skyview	4	4	108	108	0
Timbercrest	1	0	27	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>0</b>
Bothell	6	0	162	27	3
Inglemoor	7	7	189	162	0
Woodinville	4	3	108	127	0
SAS	0				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total K-12 All</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3,306</b>	<b>1,217</b>	<b>35</b>

Note 1: Excluded from Scheduled Capacity are portables used for OTPT/LAP/Science Labs/Computer Labs/Admin/ASB/Music

Note 2: "Pull Out" programs include OTPT/LAP/Science Labs/Computer Labs/Admin/ASB/Music but exclude Day Care/PTA/Resource/Conference Rooms/Counseling/Storage



### Other Facilities and Land

Northshore School District owns and operates facilities that provide operational support to the schools such as District Administration, Transportation and Facilities Management. The District also holds undeveloped properties that are being held for possible instructional use and/or are surplus properties. An inventory of those facilities is provided in Table 4-3 below. The District owns two undeveloped sites, one located in the east portion of the District and one located in the northern central corridor of the District. Property that was sold to the City of Bothell on August 1, 2010 has been removed from the list.

**TABLE 4-3  
Inventory of Support Facilities**

Facility Name	Status	Building Area (Sq Feet)	Site Size (Acres)
Administrative Center (Monte Villa)		49,373	5
Support Services Building		41,913	5
Paradise Lake Site			26
Warehouse	Leased	44,786	2
Proposed Site of a New Elementary School in the Growth Corridor			20

## SECTION 5 -- PROJECTED FACILITY NEEDS

### **Near-term Facility Needs**

Changing capacity needs as well as shifts in demographic growth patterns are reviewed by District staff and a group of parents, educators, administrators and consultants who comprise the Enrollment Demographic Task Force (EDTF). The EDTF examines enrollment projections, capacity considerations, program choices, etc. and recommends potential solutions to enrollment issues. These recommendations, as they are approved by the Board and implemented by the District, are incorporated into the Capital Facilities Plan.

The District continues to experience growth in its north central corridor and declining enrollment in its eastern area, primarily due to the positioning of the Urban Growth Boundary Line. In 2008, the District implemented the recommendation of the EDTF to adjust boundaries in the northern, fast-growing urban portion of the District to balance school enrollments, particularly at the elementary level. Also, after a recommendation by the EDTF, the District submitted a School Closure Analysis to the Board that was tabled until the full affects of the boundary changes could be assessed.

Capacity in the District's northern central corridor has been increased through permanent capacity additions and changes in service boundaries. The District included in its 2010 bond, funds for planning a new elementary site. Construction of a new instructional site would require approval by the voters of construction funding, possibly in 2014, and an assessment of whether its additional operational costs could be financed or necessitate the possible closure or consolidation of other facilities to minimize the amount of operational costs. While a full analysis has not been completed, extended ride times and resulting increased transportation costs may limit the extent to which service area changes could be a reasonable alternative.

Should unexpectedly high growth occur in the next six years, the District would retain relocatables that would otherwise be declared surplus, convert special-use relocatables into additional classrooms, review feeder patterns and/or convert some specialized permanent spaces for use as classrooms. The latter action would involve revising the District's Standard of Service and also be reflected in the next updated CFP.

Those schools projected by 2014 to have either a high design capacity utilization (80% or more) or those projected to have a low capacity utilization (55% or less) are overlaid on a District map in Table 5-3 and shown in detail in Tables 5-1 and 5-2.

**TABLE 5-1 School Enrollment vs. Scheduled & Design Capacity**

Enrollment vs Scheduled Capacity	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
<b>Elementary Enrollment</b>	9,271	9,388	9,589	9,809	10,040	10,209	10,346
Scheduled Permanent Capacity - Existing	10,056	10,056	10,056	10,056	10,056	10,056	10,656
Scheduled Capacity in New Permanent Facilities						600	
Scheduled Capacity in Relocatables	727	727	727	727	727	727	727
# of Relocatables included in Scheduled Capacity	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
Total Scheduled Capacity with Relocatables	10,783	10,783	10,783	10,783	10,783	11,383	11,383
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	1,512	1,395	1,194	974	743	1,174	1,037
<b>Junior High School Enrollment</b>	4,498	4,536	4,476	4,484	4,429	4,490	4,596
Scheduled Permanent Capacity - Existing	5,659	5,659	5,659	5,659	5,659	5,659	5,659
Scheduled Capacity in New Permanent Facilities							
Scheduled Capacity in Relocatables	174	174	174	174	174	174	174
# of Relocatables included in Scheduled Capacity	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Total Scheduled Capacity with Relocatables	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833	5,833
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	1,335	1,297	1,357	1,349	1,404	1,343	1,237
<b>High School Enrollment</b>	4,709	4,546	4,576	4,458	4,502	4,443	4,448
Scheduled Permanent Capacity - Existing	5,372	5,372	5,372	5,372	5,372	5,372	5,372
Scheduled Capacity in New Permanent Facilities							
Scheduled Capacity in Relocatables	316	316	316	316	316	316	316
# of Relocatables included in Scheduled Capacity	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Total Scheduled Capacity with Relocatables	5,688	5,688	5,688	5,688	5,688	5,688	5,688
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	979	1,142	1,112	1,230	1,186	1,245	1,240
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	18,478	18,470	18,641	18,751	18,971	19,142	19,390
Scheduled Permanent Capacity - Existing	21,087	21,087	21,087	21,087	21,087	21,087	21,687
Scheduled Capacity in New Permanent Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	600	-
Scheduled Capacity in Relocatables	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217
# of Relocatables included in Scheduled Capacity	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
Total Scheduled Capacity with Relocatables	22,304	22,304	22,304	22,304	22,304	22,904	22,904
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	3,826	3,834	3,663	3,553	3,333	3,762	3,514

Enrollment vs Design Capacity	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
<b>Elementary Enrollment</b>	9,271	9,388	9,589	9,809	10,040	10,209	10,346
Designed Permanent Capacity - Existing	11,471	11,471	11,471	11,471	11,471	11,471	12,071
Designed Capacity in New Permanent Facilities						600	
Designed Capacity in Relocatables	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064
# of Relocatables included in Designed Capacity	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
Total Designed Capacity with Relocatables	13,535	13,535	13,535	13,535	13,535	14,135	14,135
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	<i>4,264</i>	<i>4,147</i>	<i>3,946</i>	<i>3,726</i>	<i>3,495</i>	<i>3,926</i>	<i>3,789</i>
<b>Junior High School Enrollment</b>	4,498	4,536	4,476	4,484	4,429	4,490	4,596
Designed Permanent Capacity - Existing	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597
Designed Capacity in New Permanent Facilities							
Designed Capacity in Relocatables	783	783	783	783	783	783	783
# of Relocatables included in Designed Capacity	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Total Designed Capacity with Relocatables	7,380	7,380	7,380	7,380	7,380	7,380	7,380
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	<i>2,882</i>	<i>2,844</i>	<i>2,904</i>	<i>2,896</i>	<i>2,951</i>	<i>2,890</i>	<i>2,784</i>
<b>High School Enrollment</b>	4,709	4,546	4,576	4,458	4,502	4,443	4,448
Designed Permanent Capacity - Existing	5,891	5,891	5,891	5,891	5,891	5,891	5,891
Designed Capacity in New Permanent Facilities							
Designed Capacity in Relocatables	459	459	459	459	459	459	459
# of Relocatables included in Designed Capacity	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Total Designed Capacity with Relocatables	6,350	6,350	6,350	6,350	6,350	6,350	6,350
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	<i>1,641</i>	<i>1,804</i>	<i>1,774</i>	<i>1,892</i>	<i>1,848</i>	<i>1,907</i>	<i>1,902</i>
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	18,478	18,470	18,641	18,751	18,971	19,142	19,390
Designed Permanent Capacity - Existing	23,959	23,959	23,959	23,959	23,959	23,959	24,559
Designed Capacity in New Permanent Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	600	-
Designed Capacity in Relocatables	3,306	3,306	3,306	3,306	3,306	3,306	3,306
# of Relocatables included in Designed Capacity	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
Total Designed Capacity with Relocatables	27,265	27,265	27,265	27,265	27,265	27,865	27,865
<i>Surplus Capacity</i>	<i>8,787</i>	<i>8,795</i>	<i>8,624</i>	<i>8,514</i>	<i>8,294</i>	<i>8,723</i>	<i>8,475</i>


**TABLE 5-2  
Capacity Utilization**

Elementary Schools	Oct - 2014 Enrollment 80% or > than Design Capacity OR 55% or < than Design Capacity	Enrollment					Capacity	
		Oct - 2009	Oct - 2010	Oct - 2014 Projected	Average ('04 - '09)	Average ('88 - '04)	2010 Design	2010 Schedule
Arrowhead	49.2%	317	325	306	371	399	622	382
Bear Creek	85.0%	395	438	447	376	378	526	502
Canyon Creek	84.6%	553	591	688	501	437	813	689
Cottage Lake	50.9%	289	280	280	322	399	550	358
Crystal Springs	84.8%	486	516	587	505	543	670	574
East Ridge	48.5%	380	371	313	446	535	646	430
Fernwood	91.2%	534	558	688	549	548	765	660
Frank Love		412	435	442	378	425	646	478
Hollywood Hill	55.8%	338	330	334	346	405	598	394
Kenmore		435	440	500	422	445	645	549
Kokanee	86.0%	505	516	637	487	439	741	697
Lockwood		446	439	482	451	529	670	502
Maywood Hills	88.7%	481	488	552	487	520	622	579
Moorlands		532	537	598	543	575	764	620
Shelton View	80.5%	391	417	482	338	340	574	443
Sorenson ECC								
Sunrise	42.4%	332	303	284	358	418	622	382
Wellington	81.2%	505	530	544	530	541	670	597
Westhill		401	405	436	433	397	598	478
Woodin	85.5%	521	523	592	448	404	692	668
Woodmoor		815	780	827	787	825	1,101	921
Total Elementary		9,066	9,222	9,979	9,058	9,504	13,535	10,783

Secondary Schools	Oct - 2014 Enrollment 80% or > than Design Capacity OR 65% or < than Design	Enrollment					Capacity	
		Oct - 2009	Oct - 2010	Oct - 2014 Projected	Average ('04 - '09)	Average ('98 - '03)	2010 Design	2010 Schedule
Canyon Park		753	797	807	797	830	1,285	1,039
Kenmore	47.5%	743	688	654	772	828	1,378	813
Leola		712	658	684	673	737	1,204	943
Northshore	49.3%	717	697	603	848	902	1,222	870
Skyview		834	803	803	870	869	1,219	1,048
Timbercrest		785	791	838	712	749	1,072	920
Total Junior High		4,544	4,430	4,369	4,673	4,913	7,380	5,833
Bothell		1,597	1,500	1,423	1,620	1,483	2,221	1,938
Inglamoor		1,715	1,698	1,490	1,822	1,887	2,140	1,912
Woodinville		1,195	1,263	1,358	1,277	1,395	1,725	1,818
Total High Schools		4,507	4,459	4,271	4,719	4,565	6,085	5,468
SAS		125	131	128	116	135	264	222
Total Secondary		8,176	8,020	8,768	9,508	9,613	13,730	11,521
Other		227	238	228				
Total K-12 All		18,469	18,478	18,973	18,586	19,117	27,265	22,304

**Table 5-3  
Sites with 2014 High and Low Design Capacity Utilization**

**Northshore School District**



### Long-term Facility Needs (Year 2025)

A long-term projection of unhoused students and facilities needs is shown in Table 5-4 below. The capacity shown assumes the construction of a new elementary school in the District's northern central corridor. As with any long term projections, many assumptions and estimates must be made which are subject to change.

**TABLE 5-4**  
**Long-term Projection of Enrollment and Facility Needs Year 2025**

Grade Level	FTE Designed Capacity	FTE Enrollment
Elementary	14,135	11,203
Jr. High	7,380	5,247
High School	6,350	5,098
Total	27,865	21,548

## SECTION 6 -- GROWTH RELATED PROJECTS

### **Planned Improvements - Construction to Accommodate New Growth**

In Snohomish County, growth is expected to continue while enrollment in the eastern parts of the District is projected to be flat or declining. Insufficient residential growth to offset graduating classes and other elements previously mentioned are the primary cause.

If projected increases through 2016 materialize in the current Fernwood, Canyon Creek and Kokanee service areas, recent capacity increases from capital projects and boundary adjustments that moved students to adjoining schools will be fully utilized in the near future. While other options continue to be reviewed, this CFP assumes the construction of a new elementary school, as shown in Table 6-1.

Long term projections indicate growth with the District possibly experiencing an increase of up to 3,000 new students in the next fifteen years. The District will continue to monitor the multitude of factors that shape our capacity needs, e.g. instructional delivery, the economy, changes in planned land use, permit activity, and birth rates in order to help ensure needed instructional space is available when and where needed.

### **Planned Improvements – Existing Facilities (Building Improvement Program)**

In a number of other sites where the existing facility layout meets instructional needs and building structural integrity is relatively good, individual buildings systems are targeted for replacement or modernization to extend the life of the overall site. Planned modernizations or the replacement of one or more major building system(s) (Building Improvement Program – BIP) are planned for Bear Creek Elementary, Crystal Springs Elementary, Shelton View Elementary, Canyon Creek Elementary, Lockwood Elementary, East Ridge Elementary, Arrowhead Elementary, Kenmore Elementary, Wellington Elementary and Skyview Junior High. Other planned projects include renovating play fields and athletic fields, providing and upgrading technology and replacing/upgrading building systems. See Section 7 for a list of projects.

### **Modernizations/Building Improvement Programs**

In 2009, modernizations were completed at Woodinville High School (Phase I), and Kenmore Junior High (Phase II). Capacity additions at Canyon Creek Elementary and Fernwood Elementary were completed in the Fall of 2009 and Fall of 2010 respectively. The relocation of the alternative program (SAS) and Transportation was completed by the Fall of 2010. Phase II of the Woodinville High Modernization and Phase III of the Kenmore Junior High Modernization are expected to be completed by 2013.



**New Facilities and Additions**

Planning for needed new elementary capacity is included in the 2010 bond with construction funding planned for inclusion in the 2014 bond.

**TABLE 6-1  
Planned Construction Projects – Growth Related**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Projected Student Capacity Added</b>
New Elementary School – Growth Corridor	2016	550 – 650

SECTION 7 – CAPITAL INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES PLAN

**Six Year Capital Instructional Facilities Construction Schedule**

**2011/2012 Construction \***

Kenmore Junior High Phase III Modernization  
Woodinville High School Phase II Modernization (Continuation)  
BIP – Building Improvement Projects  
Field Improvements  
Technology Improvements  
Special Projects

**2012/2013 Construction \***

Woodinville High School Phase II Modernization (Continuation)  
Kenmore Junior High Phase III Modernization (Continuation)  
BIP – Building Improvement Projects  
Field Improvements  
Technology Improvements  
Special Projects

**2013/2014 Construction \***

**New Elementary School – Growth Corridor**  
BIP – Building Improvement Projects  
Field Improvements  
Technology Improvements  
Special Projects

**2014/2015 \***

**New Elementary School – Growth Corridor**  
BIP – Building Improvement Projects  
Field Improvements  
Technology Improvements  
Special Projects

**2015/2016\***

**New Elementary School – Growth Corridor**

WHS Phase III

BIP – Building Improvement Projects

Field Improvements

Technology Improvements

Special Projects

**2016/2017**

Existing Elementary Modernization

WHS Phase III

BIP – Building Improvement Projects

Field Improvements

Technology Improvements

Special Projects

**Note:** All projects in bold indicate growth-related improvements.

\*Projects in 2014 thru 2017 are subject to passage of the corresponding bond by voters and approval of the Board with the submission of the 2014 bond/levy recommendations.

## SECTION 8 -- CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN

Funding of school facilities is typically secured from a number of sources including voter-approved bonds, state matching funds, impact fees, and mitigation payments. Each of these funding sources is discussed below.

### **General Obligation Bonds**

Bonds are typically used to fund construction of new schools and other capital improvement projects. A 60% voter approval is required to pass a bond issue. Bonds are sold as necessary to generate revenue. They are retired through collection of property taxes. Voters approved a bond of 149.2 million in February 2010. Revenues from these bonds will be used to implement the Capital Facilities Plan set forth herein. If needed to meet growth, funding for the construction of a new elementary school would be presented to the voters in a new bond initiative in 2014.

### **State Financial Assistance**

State financial assistance comes from the Common School Construction Fund. Bonds are sold on behalf of the fund then retired from revenues accruing predominantly from the sale of renewable resources (i.e. timber) from state school lands set aside by the Enabling Act of 1889. If these sources are insufficient to meet needs, the Legislature can appropriate funds or the State Board of Education can establish a moratorium on certain projects.

State financial assistance is available for qualifying school construction projects, however these funds may not be received until two to three years after a matched project has been completed. This forces the District to finance the complete project with local funds. Site acquisition and site improvements are not eligible to receive matching funds. These funds, as with all State funded programs, have been reduced and given the current state budget could be eliminated. Also, if no changes to existing capacity are made, district demographics are projected to result in a loss of eligibility for state match at the secondary level. The district is already currently ineligible for state match at the elementary level.

### **Impact Fees**

Authorization to collect impact fees has been adopted by a number of jurisdictions as a means of supplementing traditional funding sources for construction of public facilities needed to accommodate new development. Impact fees are generally collected by the permitting agency at the time of final plat approval or when building permits are issued. In the case of the three cities in the District, the Capital Projects Office collects fees prior to recording of plats, or issuance of permits. The District will not request the collection of impact fees in 2011/2012. See the discussion regarding the impacts of growth in Section 6. The District may request impact fees in future CFP updates.

### **Budget and Financing Plan**

Table 8-1 is a summary of the budget that supports the Capital Facilities Plan. Each project budget represents the total project costs which include: construction, taxes, planning, architectural and engineering services, permitting, environmental impact mitigation, construction testing and inspection, furnishings and equipment, escalation, and contingencies.

The School District's planning for bond issues is outlined on Table 8-1. The District expects the proceeds of the bond sales to be supplemented by state financial assistance<sup>3</sup>. However, since the timing and amounts of these supplemental sources are unpredictable, they have not been included in the District's internal budgeting.

**TABLE 8-1  
Facilities Plan Budget**

2011 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN BUDGET * \$\$ IN 000s	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17
<b>MODERNIZATIONS/BUILDING SYSTEMS REPLACEMENT</b>							
Woodinville High School Modernization Phase II	20,000	24,000	8,000				
Kenmore Junior High Modernization Phase III	8,000	12,000	5,000				
Building Improvement Program	4,824	5,065	5,318	5,584	5,863	5,863	6,156
Woodinville High School Modernization Phase III						2,000	13,000
<b>NEW CONSTRUCTION</b>							
New Elementary School Growth Corridor Planning/Design			1,000	1,500			
New Elementary School Growth Corridor - Construction				15,000	15,000		
Technology	2,436	2,558	2,636	2,810	2,961	2,961	3,109
Fields	732	768	807	847	890	889	935
Code Compliance/Small Works	1,582	1,661	1,745	1,832	1,923	1,924	2,018
Site Purchase	488	513	538	565	593	593	623
Overhead	1,071	1,125	1,181	1,240	1,302	1,367	1,435
Bond Expenses		175			700		
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>39,133</b>	<b>47,865</b>	<b>26,275</b>	<b>29,388</b>	<b>29,732</b>	<b>15,598</b>	<b>27,277</b>
Bond Expenditures	39,133	47,865	26,275	29,388	29,732	15,598	27,277

\* Note projects are dependent upon Board approval and passage of related bond measures by voters

The financing plan in Table 8-2 addresses only the growth-related projects from Section 7.

**TABLE 8-2**

<sup>3</sup>State funding represents a significant challenge to the District. Although the District at times has a real need for additional classroom and support spaces, the criteria and formulas established by the state do not recognize this need, and as noted on page 28, the District has previously constructed growth-related additions without state financial assistance. Even where the District is eligible for State financial assistance, the present inadequate funding mechanism has resulted in significant delays in receiving the funds and a consequent reduction in their value.

### Financing Plan – Growth Projects

\$s in 000s	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	Local Funds	State Financial Assistance	Impact Fees/Mlt Payments
New Elementary School – Growth Corridor		1,000	16,500	15,000	0	32,500		

## SECTION 9 -- IMPACT FEES

### School Impact Fees under the Washington State Growth Management Act

The Growth Management Act (GMA) authorizes jurisdictions to collect impact fees to supplement funding of additional public facilities needed to accommodate new development. Impact fees cannot be used for the operation, maintenance, repair, alteration, or replacement of existing capital facilities used to meet existing service demands.<sup>1</sup>

### Methodology and Variables Used to Calculate School Impact Fees

Impact fees have been calculated based on the District's cost per dwelling unit to purchase land for school sites, make site improvements, construct schools and purchase/install temporary facilities (portables). As required under GMA, credits have also been applied for State Match Funds to be reimbursed to the District, property taxes and capital project funds to be proposed for future bond measures. Credit may also be given for construction projects that will be built to accommodate current unhoused students.

The District has recently made several boundary adjustments to increase District wide facility utilization and accommodate planned growth. The District is evaluating the impact of these changes, and may at a later point in the next six years seek the collection of impact fees for growth related projects. The District will upgrade this CFP to reflect the new information.

### Impact Fee Schedules

The impact fee calculations in accordance with the formulas applicable to all jurisdictions are shown below:

**TABLE 9-1**  
**Impact Fee Schedule – All Jurisdictions**

Housing Type	Impact Fee per Unit
Single-family	\$0
Multi-family	\$0
Multi-family (2+ Bedroom)	\$0

<sup>1</sup> Paying for Growth's Impacts - A Guide To Impact Fees, State of Washington Department of Community Development Growth Management Division, January, 1992

DEFINITIONS

Throughout the Capital Facilities Plan a number of terms are used which are defined as follows:

**Boeckh Index.** WAC 392-343-060 establishes guidelines for determining the per square foot area cost allowance for new school construction. Washington State uses what is called a "Boeckh Index." The Boeckh Index is the average of a seven-city building cost index for commercial and factory buildings in Washington State, as reported by the E.H. Boeckh Company. The index is adjusted every two months from a base index of \$74.87, which was established in 1984.<sup>1</sup>

**CFP.** Capital Facilities Plan - refers to this document.

**DCD.** Washington State Department of Community Development.

**FTE.** Full Time Equivalent. This is a means of measuring student enrollment based on the number of hours per day in attendance at District schools. A student is considered an FTE if he/she is enrolled for the equivalent of a full schedule each school day. Kindergarten students attending half-day programs are counted as 0.5 FTE.

**GFA (per student).** Gross floor area per student.

**GMA.** Washington State Growth Management Act.

**Multi-Family Dwelling Unit.** A residential dwelling unit contained in a building consisting of two or more attached residential dwelling units.

**OFM.** Washington State Office of Financial Management.

**OSPI.** Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

**SEPA.** Washington State Environmental Policy Act.

**Single-Family Dwelling Unit.** A detached residential dwelling unit designed for occupancy by a single family or household, including mobile homes.

**Student Factor or Student Generation Rate.** The Student Factor is the average number of students by grade span (elementary, junior high, and high school) typically generated by each housing type. Student Factors are calculated based on

---

<sup>1</sup> Paying For Growth's Impacts - A Guide To Impact Fees, State of Washington Department of Community Development Growth Management Division, January 1992.



a survey of all new residential units permitted by jurisdictions within the District during the most recent five-year period.


**Teaching Station.** A facility space (classroom) specifically dedicated to implementing the District's educational program. In addition to traditional classrooms, these spaces can include computer labs, auditoriums, gymnasiums, music rooms, other special education, and resource rooms.

**Unhoused Students.** District enrolled students who are housed in portable temporary classroom space, or in permanent classrooms in which the maximum class size is exceeded.

**WAC.** Washington Administrative Code.

# Northshore School District

- Administrative Resources**
- 96 Administration Bldg.
  - 99 Support Services/Media Resource Ctr./Graphics Ctr./Warehouse
  - 86 Transportation Center
- Junior High Schools**
- 43 Canyon Park Junior High
  - 42 Kenmore Junior High
  - 46 Leota Junior High
  - 47 Northshore Junior High
  - 44 Skyview Junior High
  - 45 Timbercrest Junior High
- High Schools**
- 71 Bothell High School
  - 72 Inglemoor High School
  - 73 Woodville High School
  - 59 Secondary Academy for Success
  - 81 Northshore Networks
- Elementary Schools**
- 1 Arrowhead Elementary
  - 25 Bear Creek Elementary
  - 20 Canyon Creek Elementary
  - 3 Cottage Lake Elementary
  - 4 Crystal Springs Elementary
  - 14 East Ridge Elementary
  - 23 Fernwood Elementary
  - 19 Frank Love Elementary
  - 22 Hollywood Hill Elementary
  - 5 Kenmore Elementary
  - 15 Kokanee Elementary
  - 9 Lockwood Elementary
  - 6 Maywood Hills Elementary
  - 10 Moorlands Elementary
  - 11 Shelton View Elementary
  - 31 Sorenson Early Childhood Ctr.
  - 24 Sunrise Elementary
  - 21 Wellington Elementary
  - 7 Westhill Elementary
  - 13 Woodin Elementary
  - 26 Woodmoor Elementary



## SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN THIS YEAR'S CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

This year's Capital Facilities Plan is an updated document, based on the 2008 CFP. The significant changes reflected in the 2011 Plan are identified below. Please note that the tables have been renumbered.

### **Section 2 - Student Enrollment Trends and Projections**

Enrollment projections were updated to reflect recent enrollment trends for the years 2010 through 2017 and new long range projections for the year 2025.

### **Section 3 – District Standard of Service**

Table 3-3 was updated.

### **Section 4 - Capital Facilities Inventory**

Tables 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3 were revised to reflect reallocation of classroom utilization, movement of relocatable classrooms and design/schedule capacity as well as the sale of surplus District property.

### **Section 5 - Projected Facility Needs**

Table 5-1 was changed to reflect new enrollment forecasts noted in Section 2, schedule/design capacity, pullout utilization and changes to capacity noted in Sections 4 & 6.

Table 5-2 was added to overlay those specific sites where projected 2014 enrollment indicates high/low design capacity utilization.

Table 5-4 was updated to the year 2025.

### **Section 6 - Growth Related Projects**

Table 6-1 updated for the possible construction of a new elementary school in the District's northern growth corridor and the capacity addition in progress at Fernwood Elementary.

**Section 7 - Capital Facilities Plan**

This section was updated to reflect changes in scheduled modernizations and non-growth related projects.

**Section 8 – Finance Plan**

The finance plan has been updated.

**Section 9 – Impact Fees**

Student Factors section removed.

# Schools and Undeveloped Site in Northshore School District

