16698

Adopted
May 12, 2009
RIVERVIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 407
2009
CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN



# **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Greg Bawden Carol Van Noy Dan Pflugrath Lori Oviatt Danny L. Edwards

President
Vice-President
Director
Director
Director

Conrad Robertson, Superintendent

Prepared by: William J. Adamo Director of Business and Operations (425) 844-4505

ATTACHMENT C

2009-579

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Description	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Student Enrollment Trends and Projections	4
3	Standard of Service	5
4	Capital Facilities Inventory	7
5	Projected Facility Needs	9
6	Capital Facilities Plan with Growth Related Projects	11
	Identified	
7	Capital Facilities Financing Plan	13
8	Impact Fees	16
Appendix A	Definitions	20
Appendix B	Project cost allocation by enrollment	21

### **SECTION 1 -- INTRODUCTION**

# Purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan

Presented herein, in conformance with the Growth Management Act and local county and municipal codes is the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) of the Riverview School District.

This Capital Facilities Plan is intended to provide the City of Carnation, the City of Duvall, King County, other jurisdictions, and our own community with a description of facilities needed to accommodate projected student enrollment at acceptable levels of service over the next six years (2009 – 2015).

The Growth Management Act also requires reassessment of the land use element of local comprehensive plans if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs, and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. This Capital Facilities Plan is 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 plan land use alternatives.

The role of impact fees in funding school construction is addressed in Section 8 of this report.

### Overview of the Riverview School District

The Riverview School District services three jurisdictions: King County, the City of Carnation, and the City of Duvall. The district is 250 square miles and is located in northeast King County serving the Snoqualmie River valley from the King/Snohomish County line south approximately 16 miles, and from the western ridge of the valley to the cascade foothills. The district currently serves an enrollment of approximately 3,114 (headcount enrollment) students, with three elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, an alternative high school program, and two alternative elementary school programs. The grade configuration is kindergarten through fifth grade for elementary school, sixth through eighth for middle school, and ninth through twelfth for high school. One of the alternative programs, housed at Carnation Elementary School, serves grades K-12.

# **SECTION 2 -- STUDENT ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS**

# **Projected Student Enrollment 2009-2015**

Enrollment projections are most accurate for the initial years of the forecast period. For later years, the review of enrollment patterns, housing trends, and other demographic changes are useful yearly activities in evaluating and adjusting projections. This year's plan anticipates a 3% growth in student enrollment which is based on recent enrollment trends. Some of the trends are as a result of transfers from private schools; increases in preschool age children from the district's existing population; and significant decreases students attending school outside the district. Although housing starts have decreased from recent years, the district will experience enrollment growth from new developments in the City of Carnation and City of Duvall. The new sewer system in Carnation has freed up large tracts of developable land within the incorporated city limits. In the event that enrollment growth slows, plans for new facilities can be delayed. It is much more difficult, however, to initiate new projects or speed projects up in the event enrollment growth exceeds the projections.

The Riverview School District, like most school districts, projects enrollment using a modified "Cohort Survival" method. This method tracks groups of students through the K-12 system, and notes and adjusts the projections to account for year-to-year changes, including local population growth. For example, this year's fourth grade is adjusted based on average past enrollment trends in order to estimate next year's fifth grade enrollment.

Since the yearly figures for each grade are dependent on the previous years' grades, kindergarten projections are treated differently. Riverview projects its kindergarten enrollment based on historical kindergarten enrollment patterns and district enrollment growth patterns.

Table 2.1

Riverview School District Headcount Enrollment Projection

Grade	08-09 Actual*	May Miller on St	ringer street in die	Transport			I agranda e e e
<b>X</b>		09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
K	236	237	237	237	237	237	237
1	247	243	244	244	244	244	244
2	252	254	250	251	251	251	251
3	262	260	262	258	259	259	259
4	255	270	268	270	266	267	267
5	258	263	278	276	278	274	275
K-5	1,510	1,527	1,539	1,536	1,535	1,532	1,533
6	243	254	259	274	272	274	270
7	210	250	262	267	282	280	282
8	237	216	258	270	275	290	288
6-8	690	720	779	811	829	844	840
9	225	244	222	266	278	283	299
10	234	222	240	219	262	274	279
11	238	226	214	232	211	253	264
12	217	218	207	196	212	193	231
9-12	914	910	883	913	963	1,003	1,073
Total	3,114	3,157	3,201	3,260	3,327	3,379	3,446

<sup>\*</sup> thru 4-1-09

Growth rate of 3%, with assumptions for variations at grades 6, 10, 11, and 12.

## **SECTION 3 -- DISTRICT STANDARD OF SERVICE**

School facility and student capacity needs are dictated by the types and amounts of space required to accommodate the district's adopted educational program. The educational program standards which typically drive facility space needs include grade configuration, optimal facility size, optimal school enrollment size, class size, educational program offerings, classroom utilization and scheduling requirements, and use of portable classroom facilities.

In addition to factors which affect the amount of space required, government mandates, contractual requirements, and community expectations may affect how classroom space is used. Traditional educational programs offered by school districts are often supplemented by nontraditional or special programs such as special education, expanded bilingual education, remediation, migrant education, alcohol and drug education, preschool and daycare programs, home school, computer labs, music programs, movement programs, etc. These special or nontraditional educational programs can have a significant impact on the available student capacity of school facilities.

Special teaching stations and programs offered by the Riverview School District at specific school sites include:

### Elementary:

- Computer Labs
- Classroom Computers
- Group Activities Rooms
- Program for Academically Talented (Gifted/PAT)
- Special Education (The District attempts to integrate special education students and regular education students to as great an extent as possible. Most special education students are served both in a regular education classroom and a special education classroom.)
- Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Home School Alternative (PARADE)
- Preschool Education Program (ECEAP)
- Multi-Age (Eagle Rock /ERMA)

#### Secondary:

- Computer Labs
- Alternative (CLIP high school program)
- Special Education
- LAP
- ELL
- Vocational
- School-to-Work

Variations in student capacity between schools are often a result of what special or nontraditional programs are offered at specific schools. These special programs require classroom space which can reduce the permanent capacity of some of the buildings housing these programs. Some students, for example, leave their regular classrooms for a short period of time to receive instruction in these special programs. Schools often require space modifications to accommodate special programs, and in some

circumstances, these modifications may reduce the overall classroom capacities of the buildings.

The current Standard of Service data for Riverview, in terms of teaching station loading, is identified on Table 3.1. Class sizes are averages based on actual utilization as influenced by state funding and collective bargaining restrictions.

Riverview's Standard of Service also considers the different educational functions when considering student capacity needs. Those functions are as follows:

## Elementary classrooms -

- regular, grades K-5
- self-contained learning center (special education)
- learning support classrooms (special education pullout, LAP, Title I, etc.)

### Secondary -

- regular, grades 6-8
- special education, grades 6-8
- learning support, grades 6-8
- regular, grades 9-12
- learning support, grades 9-12 (special education pullout, LAP, Title I, etc.)

Involuntarily transferring students to a school with excess capacity is done rarely as a last resort and with Board of Directors' authorization. Involuntarily transferring of students can result in difficulties in the community, with staffing, and with transportation.

### Table 3.1

# Riverview School District Standard of Service

#### **CLASS SIZE**

#### Elementary Regular, alternative, gifted students/classroom, average 24 Self-contained learning classrooms 12 students/classroom, average Learning support classrooms students/classroom, average 0 Middle School Regular 24 students/classroom, average Regular (portables) 24 students/classroom, average Self-contained learning classrooms 12 students/classroom, average Learning support classrooms students/classroom, average **High School** Regular students/classroom, average 24 Regular (portables) 24 students/classroom, average Self-contained learning classrooms students/classroom, average 12 Learning support classrooms 0 students/classroom, average Vocational education 24 students/classroom, average

# **SECTION 4 -- CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY**

Under the Growth Management Act, public entities are required to inventory existing capital facilities. Capital facilities are defined as any structure, improvement, piece of equipment or other major asset, including land, which has a useful life of at least ten years. The purpose of the facilities inventory is to establish a baseline for determining what facilities will be required to accommodate student enrollment in the future at established levels of service. This section provides an inventory of capital facilities of the Riverview School District including site-built schools, portable classrooms, developed school sites, undeveloped land and support facilities. School facility capacity figures are based on the inventory of current facilities and the district's adopted educational program standards as presented in the previous section.

#### **Schools**

The Riverview School District currently operates 3 elementary schools (grades K-5), one middle school (grades 6-8), and one high school (grades 9-12). The district also provides the Eagle Rock Multi-age Program, an elementary alternative program, sited adjacent to the Cedarcrest High School campus. In addition the district supports the following alternative programs: CLIP, an alternative high school; PARADE, a home school support program; and ECEAP, a pre-school program.

Individual school capacity has been determined using the number of teaching stations within each building and the space requirements of the district's adopted educational program. This capacity calculation is used to establish the district's baseline capacity and determine future capacity needs when considering projected student enrollment.

Classroom capacities have been determined for each school according to their usage. For the purpose of this Plan, classroom uses are: regular education, self-contained special-education, and learning support. The school facility inventory is summarized on Table 4.1. The current inventory of facilities indicates a permanent capacity of 3,084 students, with an additional 624 student capacity available in interim facilities.

The School Board of the Riverview School District is committed to serving students at small schools. Evidence suggests that this practice a significantly beneficial affect on student learning. Further, there are significant benefits to school culture and climate.

4.	
Φ	
Table	

				KIVELVIEW SC	KIVERVIEW SCHOOL District Facility Inventory and Capacity Calculations 2009	acility inver	tory and Cal	pacity Calc	ulations 200	o				
School	Grade Levels Served	Site Size	Building Area (Sq. Et.)	Permanent Teaching Stations	Self- Contained Special Education Classrooms	Stations Used for Learning Support Purposes*	Stations Used for Learning Support Sudont Usoses Cabacity	interim Teaching Stations	Self- Contained Special Education	Interim Stations Used for Learning Support	Student Student	Total Student	Year	Port of the state
Carnation Elementary	χ. ιλ-	10.89	50,567	21	-	3	444	4	0	C		#1	1960	1000
Cherry Valley Elementary	Қ-5	12	48,363	23	0	2	504	2	0	0	48	552	1053	1997
Stillwater Elementary	χ-5	19	49,588	22	1	2	492	4	0	2	48	540	1088	6/0
Multiage Program	Қ-5	@ CHS Site	٥	0	0	0	0	ω ·	0	0	120	120	<i>e/u</i>	6/0
Subtotal K-5		41.89	148,518	99	2	7	1,440	15	0	2	312	1 752		

Tolt Middle	چ چ	40	85 157	30	c	c	420	(						
		,	20,100	30	J	?	77)	٥	<b>&gt;</b>	>	144	864	1964	2009
Subtotal 6-8		40	85,157	32	2	ო	720	9	0	c	144	864		
										À		100		
Cedarcrest														
High School	9-12	78	108,946	43	-	m	626	7	c	c	168	1 170	7003	0000
									,	>	20	- 1	200	2008
Subtotal 9-12		78	108,946	43	1	(r)	626	7	c	c	169	4 440		
				7					>	)	3	2		

3,756

624

28

141

342,621

159.89

Total K-12

ses that do not allow them to be used as regular classrooms. E.g. computer labs, music classrooms, storage, special-ed pullout programs.   pport Stestige Building Area   Computer labs   Computer labs   Computer labs   Computer labs      Computer labs   Computer labs   Computer labs   Computer labs		
n to be used as regular classroom iliding Area (Sq.Ft)	. 500	1,910
io not allow their	adj. to Carn. ES	adj. to CV. ES
purposes that c	Stepping Stones (portable)	Extended day
re used for Bullding Area (Sq. Ft.)	08'9	7,200
Stations a	adj. to Tolt MS	adj. to Carn. ES
*Some teaching stations are used for purpo Site Support Size Area (Sq. Facilities (acres) Ft.) Facilities	in/Trans cility	istrict Office oortables)

# **SECTION 5 -- PROJECTED FACILITY NEEDS**

## **Near-term Facility Needs**

This Capital Facilities Plan has been organized in such a way as to maintain adequate capacity of the district's facilities through the construction and/or expansion of permanent facilities. Table 5.1 is a summary by school level of projected enrollments, current capacities, and projected additional capacities. Based upon current enrollment projections, the district has permanent capacity needs at all grade levels. To meet these capacity needs in the near-term, the District plans to construct a new K-12 Riverview Learning Center. The District is also in the preliminary planning stages of a new comprehensive K-8 school and anticipates that the construction of this school will be complete within the six years of this planning period.

# Planned near-term non-capacity facility improvements

In February, 2007 the voters of the Riverview School District approved a \$56,600,000 bond issue that will be utilized to finance a variety of improvements to the facilities of the district over a four year period. Capital improvements shall be made to Cedarcrest High, Tolt Middle School, Carnation Elementary, Eagle Rock Multi-Age Program, and Cherry Valley Elementary. The improvements include replacing heating and cooling systems in most of the buildings; modernization of Cherry Valley Elementary, and Cherry Valley Elementary; adding to and repairing of athletic facilities at Cedarcrest High. Capital improvements that are financed by this bond issue and increase capacity are detailed in the plan.

Table 5.1
School Enrollment and Capacity Projections 2009-10 through 2014-15

	.,	000110 1	-000 10	unouç	311 ZU 17	- 13	
Elementary (K=5)	08-09 Actual	09:10	10-11	11-12	A Secretary of the Contract of	13-14	14-15
Projected Enrollment	1,510	1,527	1,539	1,536	1,535	1,532	1,533
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	1,440	1,440	1,440	1,440	1,488	1,488	1,488
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (New K-8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (New Riverview Learning Center)				48			
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities	-70	-87	-99	-48	-47	-44	155
Capacity in Relocatables	312	312	312	312	312	312	312
Number of Relocatables	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Capacity with Relocatables	1,752	1,752	1,752	1,800	1,800	1.800	2,000
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities	242	225	213	264	265	268	467

	08-09			Same			
Middle School (6-8)	Actual	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
Projected Enrollment	690	720	779	811	829	844	840
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	720	720	720	720	763	763	763
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (New K-8)							520
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (New Riverview Learning Center)				43			
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities	30	0	-59	-48	-66	-81	443
Capacity in Relocatables	144	144	144	144	144	144	144
Number of Relocatables	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Capacity with Relocatables	864	864	864	907	907	907	1,427
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities	174	144	85	96	78	63	587

High School (9-12)	08-09		446				
	Actual	₹09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
Projected Enrollment	914	910	883	913	963	1,003	1,073
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	972	972	972	972	1,049	1,049	1,049
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (P.E.)					,		,
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities (New Riverview Learning Center)				77			
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities	58	62	89	136	86	46	-24
Capacity in Relocatables	168	160	400	400	100	100	100
	108	168	168	168	168	168	168
Number of Relocatables	7	7	7	7	. 7	7	7
Capacity with Relocatables	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217
Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities	226	230	257	304	254	214	144

	08-09						
Surplus/Deficiency Capacity (K-12)	Actual	-09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
Projected Enrollment	3,114	3,157	3,201	3,260	3,327	3,379	3,446
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	3,132	3,132	3,132	3,132	3,300	3,300	3,300
Capacity in New Perm. Facilities	0	0	0	168	0	0	720
Capacity in Perm. Facil. and Relocatables	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,924	3,924	3,924	4,644
Surplus Capacity with Relocatables	642	599	555	664	597	545	1,198
Surplus Capacity without Relocatables	18	-25	-69	40	-27	-79	574

# SECTION 6 - CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN WITH GROWTH RELATED PROJECTS IDENTIFIED

# Planned New Improvements - Construction to Accommodate Growth and Adequate Capacity

As summarized in Table 6.1, the district plans to build on the site adjacent to Carnation Elementary a new Riverview Learning Center, which is funded by a bond issue approved by the voters in February of 2007. The district also plans to build on the site adjacent to Cedarcrest High School an additional Kindergarten through 8th grade school. However, the district may determine the site to be unsuitable and, as a result, acquire an alternative site. This project is scheduled begin construction in 2013 provided a new voter approved bond issue is secured to finance, in part, this project.

# Planned Improvements - To Existing Facilities that include a Growth Related Project

As summarized in Table 6.2, the district plans technology upgrades which are funded by a capital projects levy approved by the voters in February of 2006 and a planned levy in 2010; and to modernize and enlarge the Cherry Valley Elementary facility; and to modernize the Carnation Elementary facility. Both of these projects will be completed in 2010-2011 and will be funded, in part, by a bond issue approved by the voters in February of 2007.

Table 6.1

	Pla	inned New P	ojects		
<u>P</u> roject	Location	Capacity Added	Source of: Funds*	% of project from New Development	Growth related project? Yes or No.
2010-2011					
Riverview Learning Center 2014 - 2015	Carnation	168	Impact Fees, State Match, and local approved bond issue	100%	Yes
New kindergarten through 8th grade	Duvall	720	Impact Fees, State Match, and local approved bond issue	100%	Yes

Table 6.2
Planned Projects to Existing Facilities

Project	Location	Capacity Added	Source of Funds*	% of project as a result of New Development	Growth related project? Yes or No
2009-2010					
Technology Upgrades	All	0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No
2010-2011					
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No
Carnation Elementary modernization Cherry Valley Elementary modernization and	All	-0-	2006 voter approved bonds and state match 2006 voter	-0-	No
addition	All	-0-	approved bonds and state match	-0-	No
2011-2012					
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No
2012-2013		VEF.ASSISSYVAXI			
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No
2013-2014					
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No
2014-2015					
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	-0-	No

<sup>\*\*</sup> Technology upgrades are based on using funds from the Technology Levy approved by voters in February 2006 and a Technology Levy planned for February 2010.

# **SECTION 7 - CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN**

Funding of school facilities is typically secured from a number of sources including voter approved bonds, voter approved levies, 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. In February, 2007 the voters of the Riverview School District approved a \$56,600,000 bond issue that will be utilized to finance a variety of improvements to the facilities of the district over a four year period.

# **Capital Projects Levies**

Capital Projects Levies are typically used to fund small construction projects and other capital improvements or acquisitions. A 50% voter approval is required to pass a levy. Money comes to the district through the collection of property taxes. The district passed a four year capital improvement levy in February of 2006 for the upgrade of technology assets including new computers, upgrades to the network infrastructure, and software.

#### State Financial Assistance

State financial assistance comes from the State's 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 matching funds can be applied to school construction projects only. Site acquisition and improvements are not eligible to receive matching funds from the state. Because availability of state matching funds has not kept pace with the rapid enrollment growth occurring in many of Washington's school districts, matching funds from the State may not be received by a school district until two to three years after a matched project has been completed. In such cases, the district must "front fund" a project. That is, the district must finance the complete project with local funds.

#### Impact Fees

Impact fees have 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 on new residential construction by the permitting agency at the time of final plat approval or when building permits are issued.

# **Budget and Financing Plan**

Table 7.1 is a summary of the budget that supports the elements of this Capital Facilities Plan. Each project budget represents the total project costs which include: acquisition, construction, taxes, planning, architectural and engineering services, permitting, environmental impact mitigation, construction testing and inspection, furnishings and equipment, escalation, and contingencies. In addition, it includes financing that is separated into three components: estimated state financial assistance, estimated impact fees, and projected local revenues (i.e., interest income and local levies).

Table 7.1 2009 Capital Facilities Plan Budget

Impact Fees		\$500,000	\$3.500.000					
<u>State</u> Assistance		\$1,200,000	\$8.140.000	ļ	\$2 400 000	000 000	000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Local Funds		3,900,000	\$10,818,240		\$10,000,000	000 00%	000 096 88	
Total	. 1 4	\$5,600,000	1		\$12.400.000	813 RNO DOO	\$3.960.000	1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
2014-15			\$22,458,240				\$660,000	
2013-14							000'099\$	
2012-13						·	\$660,000	
2011-12							\$660,000	
2010-11		\$5,600,000			\$12,400,000	\$12,600,000	\$660,000	
2009-10							\$660,000	6
PROJECT	Growth Related Projects	Riverview Learning Center	New kindergarten through 8th grade	Other Projects	Carnation Elementary modernization	Cherry Valley Elementary modernization and addition	Technology Acquisitions & Upgrades	Totale:

#### **SECTION 8 -- 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. The calculation contained in this Plan yields impact fees to be collected during calendar year 2009.

# Methodology and Variables Used to Calculate School Impact Fees

Impact fees are calculated based on the district's estimated cost per new dwelling unit to purchase land for school sites, make site improvements, construct schools and purchase/install temporary facilities (portables).

### **Student Factors**

The student factor (or student generation rate), a significant factor in determining impact fees, is the average number of students generated by each housing type - single-family dwellings and multiple-family dwellings.

The District was unable to obtain sufficient permit data to calculate its own student generation factors, it instead chose to use generation rates representative of unweighted averages based on neighboring school districts. In accordance with KCC 21A.06.1260, the definition for student factor, when such information is not available in the district, is the data from adjacent districts, districts with similar demographics, or countywide averages.

Table 8.1 and 8.2 set forth those student factors and the Impact fee schedule.

Table 8.1
Student Generation Rates (1)

# Single Family Dwelling Unit

	Auburn	Issaquah	Kent	Lk. Wash	Average
Elementary	0.320	0.374	0.445	0.457	0.399
Middle	0.152	0.145	0.118	0.125	0.135
High	0.158	0.146	0.245	0.093	0.161
Total	0.630	0.665	0.808	0.675	0.695

# Multi-Family Dwelling Unit

	Auburn	Issaquah	Kent	Lk. Wash	Average
Elementary	0.079	0.102	0.296	0.132	0.152
Middle	0.034	0.049	0.075	0.049	0.052
High	0.042	0.052	0.111	0.031	0.059
Total	0.155	0.203	0.482	0.212	0.263

The impact fee calculations in accordance with the formulas applicable to each jurisdiction are shown below:

Table 8.2
Impact Fee Schedule - All Jurisdictions

Housing Type	Impact Fee per Unit					
Single-family	\$5,648					
Multi-family	\$2,233					

(1)The District's student generation rates are based on a county-wide average as provided for in Ordinance No. 10162, Section R.

Table 8.3 SCHOOL IMPACT FEE CALCULATIONS

DISTRICT:

Riverview School District #407

YEAR:

2009

JURISDICTION:

King County, Cities of Carnation and Duvall

School Site Acquisit	ion Cost:						
Acres x Cost per Ac	re / Facility Capacity x S	Student Generati	on Factor				
				Student	Student		
	Facility	Cost/	Facility	Factor	Factor	Cost/	Cost/
	Acreage	Acre	Capacity	SFR	MFR	SFR	MFR
Elementary	15.0	\$0	0	0.401	0.137	\$0.00	\$0.00
Middle	20.0	\$0	0	0.135	0.045	\$0.00	\$0.00
Senior	40.0	\$0	700	0.166	0.056	\$0.00	\$0.00
. тот	AL					\$0.00	\$0.00

School Construction Cost

Facility Cost / Facility Capacity x Student Generation Factor x Permanent/Total Sq. Ft

				Student	Student		
	% Perm/	Facility	Facility	Factor	Factor	Cost/	Cost/
	Total Sq/Ft	Cost	Capacity	SFR	MFR	SFR	MFR
Elementary	92.25%	\$7,844,990	248	0.399	0.152	\$11,643.40	\$4,435.58
Middle	92.25%	\$17,647,890	563	0.135	0.052	\$3,903.77	\$1,503.68
Senior	92.25%	\$2,565,360	77	0.161	0.059	\$4,948.23	\$1,813.33
TOTAL		\$28,058,240	888		=	\$20,495.40	\$7,752.59

Table 8.3 continued

Temporary Facility Cost	s						
Facility Cost / Facility Co	apacity x Student G	Seneration F	actor x Tem	porary/Total So	ı. Ft		
				Student	Student		
	%Temp/	Facility	Facility	Factor	Factor	Cost/	Cost/
	Total Sq/Ft	Cost	Capacity	SFR	MFR	SFR	MFR
Elementary	7.75%	\$0	0	0.399	0.152	\$ -	\$ -
Middle	7.75%	\$0	24	0.135	0.052	\$0	\$0
Senior	7.75%	\$0	00	0.161	0.059	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL						\$0.00	\$0.00
State Matching Credit							
Boeckh Index x SPI Squ	are Footage x Dist	rict Match %	x Student F	actor			
	_			Student	Student		
	Boeckh	SPI	State	Factor	Factor	Cost/	Cost/
	Index	Footage	Match %	SFR	MFR	SFR	MFR
Elementary	\$168.79	90	44.0%	0.399	0.152	\$2,666.95	\$1,015.98
Middle	\$168.79	117	44.0%	0.135	0.052	\$1,173.06	\$451.84
Senior	\$168.79	130	44.0%	0.161	0.059	\$1,554.42	\$569.63
TOTAL						\$5,394.43	\$2,037.45
Tax Payment Credit:	······································					SFR	MFR
Average Assessed Value	•					\$465,802	\$152,977
Capital Bond Interest Rat	te					4.96%	4.96%
Years Amortized						10	10
Property Tax Bond Rate						1.0559	1.0559
	Present Value o	f Revenue S	Stream			\$3,805.25	\$1,249.71
				Single	D. A. slatin Lo.		
	Fee Summary	•		Family	Multiple Family		
	Site Acquisition C	Cost		\$0	\$0		
	Permanent Facili	ty Cost		\$20,495	\$7,753		
	Temporary Facilit	y Cost		\$0	\$0		
	State Match Cred	lit		(\$5,394.43)	(\$2,037.45)		
	Tax Payment Cre	dit	_	(\$3,805.25)	(\$1,249.71)		
	FEE (AS CALCU	LATED)		\$11,295.32	\$4,465.84		
	50% FEE (AS DISCOUNTED)		_	\$5,647.66	\$2,232.92		
	FINAL FEE (ALL	)	_	\$5,647.66	\$2,232.92		

#### APPENDIX A

#### **DEFINITIONS**

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

**Area Cost Allowance**. WAC 180-27-060 establishes guidelines for determining the per square foot area cost allowance for new school construction. Projects funded as part of the July 1, 2006 release of State Assistance Construction Grants will be funded at an area cost allowance of \$154.22 per square foot of eligible area.

CFP. Capital Facilities Plan - refers to this document.

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

GMA. Washington State Growth Management Act.

Multi-Family Dwelling Unit. In King County, three or more attached residential dwelling units.

**Single-Family Dwelling Unit**. In King County, detached residential dwelling units including duplexes and mobile homes. In Snohomish County, a detached residential dwelling unit designed for occupancy by a single family or household.

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 typically based on census data or empirical studies conducted by the school district.

**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 and 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

\$2,565,360

\$17,647,890

\$28,058,240 \$7,844,990

**Grand Total** 

K-8 grade facility

Riverview Learning Center &

Appendix B Project cost allocation by enrollment

Riverview Learning Center

-ф.	School										\$500 080	\$533.120	\$766.080	\$766.080	\$2 565 360	0000000	High	School										\$0
	Middle School							\$366 800	\$533 120	\$533,120					\$1.433.040			Middle School							\$5 392 223	\$5.396.715	\$5,425,912	\$16,214,850
Ü	Elementary	\$233,520	\$234,640	\$199,920	\$300.160	\$500,080	\$133,280								\$1,601,600			Elementary	\$1,091,470	\$1,091,470	\$1,091,470	\$1,095,962	\$936,509	\$936,509			İ	\$6,243,390
ممانا المانية المانية	Loginguisin Ison	\$233,520	\$234,640	\$199.920	\$300.160	\$500,080	\$133,280	\$366,800	\$533,120	\$533,120	\$500,080	\$533,120	\$766.080	\$766,640	\$5,600,000			cost distribution	\$1,091,470	\$1,091,470	\$1,091,470	\$1,095,962	\$936,509	\$936,509	\$5,392,223	\$5,396,715	\$5,425,912	\$22,458,240
8	0/	4.17%	4.19%	3.57%	5.36%	8.93%	2.38%	6.55%	9.52%	9.52%	8.93%	9.52%	13.69%	13.69%	100.02%	•		percentage	4.86%	4.86%	4.86%	4.88%	4.17%	4.17%	24.01%	24.03%	24.17%	100.01%
Total	000	7	7	ဖ	O	15	4	11	16	16	15	16	23	23	168			Total	35	35	35	35	30	30	173	173	174	720
Alt. High School											4	4	3	4	15													0
Alt.Middle School									G)	6					15													0
i i												5	10	14	30													0
Parade	,	\	7	9	6	15	4	=	10	7	4	7	10	5	108		Head	Count	35	35	35	35	30	30	173	173	174	720
Head Count	1	•	<u> </u>	O	8	4	C)	ဖ	~	ھ	o	10	<del>-</del>	12	Total	K- 8 grade facility			X		2	e E	4	Li VΩ	ω		8	Total