

2025 School District Capital Facilities Plans and Impact Fees Report

September 29, 2025



King County

I. Contents

II. King County Code 21A.28.154	4
III. Executive Summary	5
IV. Background.....	7
V. Report Requirements.....	10
VI. Capital Facility Plan Analysis and Recommendation	14
Auburn School District	14
Enumclaw School District.....	17
Federal Way School District	20
Fife School District	23
Highline School District	26
Issaquah School District	29
Kent School District.....	32
Lake Washington School District.....	35
Northshore School District.....	38
Renton School District.....	41
Riverview School District.....	44
Snoqualmie Valley School District.....	47
Tahoma School District	50
VII. Conclusion	54
VIII. Appendices	54
Appendix A. Comparison of School District Level of Service (LOS) Standards.....	55
Appendix B. Proposed School Impact Fees – Effective January 1, 2026.....	57

List of Tables

Table 1. Auburn School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	15
Table 2. Auburn School District Standard of Service	16
Table 3. Enumclaw School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	18
Table 4. Enumclaw School District Standard of Service	19
Table 5. Federal Way School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment.....	21
Table 6. Federal Way School District Standard of Service	22
Table 7. Fife School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	24
Table 8. Fife School District Standard of Service	25
Table 9. Highline School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment.....	27
Table 10. Highline School District Standard of Service	28
Table 11. Issaquah School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment.....	30
Table 12. Issaquah School District Standard of Service	31
Table 13. Kent School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	33
Table 14. Kent School District Standard of Service	34
Table 15. Lake Washington School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	36
Table 16. Lake Washington School District Standard of Service.....	37
Table 17. Northshore School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	39
Table 18. Northshore School District Standard of Service	40
Table 19. Renton School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	42
Table 20. Renton School District Standard of Service.....	43
Table 21. Riverview School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	45
Table 22. Riverview School District Standard of Service.....	46
Table 23. Snoqualmie Valley School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment	48
Table 24. Snoqualmie Valley School District Standard of Service.....	48
Table 25. Tahoma School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment.....	51
Table 26. Tahoma School District Standard of Service	52

II. King County Code 21A.28.154

The following excerpt from King County Code (KCC) 21A.28.154¹ describes the duties of the King County School Technical Review Committee (STRC). It requires that the STRC chair: 1) generate a report to document the STRC's review and analysis of capital facilities plans (CFPs), including proposed impact fees, submitted by school districts (districts) to King County for consideration of adoption, and 2) include this report along with a proposed Ordinance that would adopt the submitted CFPs and associated impact fees.

K. The chair of the committee shall document the outcome of the committee meeting each school district's capital facility plan and associated proposed impact fees in a report. The report shall include analysis consistent with subsections F. through J. of this section. The chair of the committee shall submit copies of its report to the director, hearing examiner, and school districts and shall post the report on the county's website.

L. In accordance with KCC 20.18.060 and 20.18.070 and based on committee input, the chair of the committee shall recommend to the executive, and the executive shall transmit to the council, a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment adopting the school district's capital facilities plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan, for any plan that the committee concludes accurately reflects the school district's facilities status. The transmittal shall include the report required by subsection K. of this section.

¹ KCC 21A.28: [\[LINK\]](#)

III. Executive Summary

This is the King County School Technical Review Committee's (STRC's) first annual report pursuant to King County Code (KCC) 21A.28.154. The STRC is responsible for reviewing capital facility plans (CFPs) submitted to the County by school districts (districts) seeking to collect impact fees for new residential development in unincorporated King County served by those districts. These plans must include the rationale for any proposed impact fees, along with the detailed calculations supporting those fees. While the STRC has always been required to evaluate CFPs and associated school impact fees, this is the first year these assessments have been compiled into a report for the Council. In future years, updated CFPs will trigger new STRC evaluations and reports to assess revised forecasts, community trends, and capital needs.

The review process is guided by a combination of state and local statutes:

- Washington State Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington (RCW)): Requires jurisdictions to plan for public facilities, including schools, that support new development.
- RCW 82.02.050 to 090: Authorizes the collection of impact fees for public facilities, provided they are addressed in a capital facilities element of a comprehensive plan.
- KCC 21A.28.154: Establishes the criteria and procedures for evaluating school district CFPs and calculating impact fees.

This review ensures that school infrastructure remains aligned with population growth and students living in unincorporated King County are provided with adequate educational facilities. For the 2025 review cycle, 13 public school districts serving unincorporated King County submitted CFPs to the STRC for evaluation:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Auburn School District | 8. Lake Washington School District |
| 2. Enumclaw School District | 9. Northshore School District |
| 3. Federal Way School District | 10. Renton School District |
| 4. Fife School District | 11. Riverview School District |
| 5. Highline School District | 12. Snoqualmie School District |
| 6. Issaquah School District | 13. Tahoma School District |
| 7. Kent School District | |

Each CFP outlines projected student enrollment, identifies facility capacity needs, defines standards of classroom service, financing mechanisms to support future development, and proposes school impact fees designed to offset the cost of accommodating growth driven by new residential development. Impact fees serve as a tool to ensure that infrastructure expansion is shared equitably among new and existing residents.

CFP Evaluation

This report provides a comprehensive summary of the STRC's evaluation of each district's CFP, including technical analysis, policy compliance, and recommendations for adoption into the King County Comprehensive Plan. It also sets the stage for future annual reports, which will reflect updated enrollment data, facility conditions, and financial strategies.

The STRC evaluated each CFP using detailed technical and policy criteria from KCC 21A.28.154 subsections F through J. The CFPs included projected enrollment, facility needs, and the financing mechanisms to support future development. They were reviewed for:

- Enrollment forecasting accuracy;
- Facility capacity and service standards;
- Capital deficiencies and funding plans;
- Financial planning; and
- CFP submittal compliance.

Summary of Findings

Enrollment Forecasting Accuracy: All districts used the cohort survival method, which tracks student progression by grade level and incorporates local birth rates, as the baseline methodology, and most incorporated housing development data. Forecasts were compared against actual enrollment over two six-year periods to assess reliability. A roughly 12 percent margin of error was considered acceptable, with allowances for greater variance in smaller districts and unforeseen circumstances.

Facility Capacity and Service Standards: Each district established a locally defined standard of service, typically expressed as students per classroom by grade level. These standards were compared across districts to ensure consistency. The STRC also reviewed whether districts met or exceeded the state-mandated staffing ratio.

Capital Deficiencies and Funding Plans: Where districts identified shortfalls in total student capacity, they proposed solutions such as portable classrooms or new construction. Funding sources included general obligation bonds, impact fees, and anticipated state School Construction Assistance Program funds.

Financial Planning: All districts submitted six-year finance plans detailing proposed capital projects and associated funding mechanisms.

CFP Submittal Compliance: Each district submitted both draft and final CFPs within the required timeframe. No district required resubmittal or a change in their service standard. Only minor textual adjustments were recommended to improve internal clarity.

STRC Recommendation

The STRC concluded that all 13 districts demonstrated reasonable enrollment projections, adequate planning for future capacity, and sound financial strategies. Classroom service standards and staffing ratios were consistent with state and regional expectations. While some districts reported capacity constraints, all proposed feasible remedies backed by identified funding sources or reconfiguration opportunities. No district required substantive revisions to its plan. Only minor editorial adjustments were recommended to improve clarity and internal consistency. The STRC recommends adoption of all submitted CFPs and associated impact fees into the King County Comprehensive Plan.

IV. Background

Department Overview: King County Department of Local Services (DLS) works to promote the well-being of residents and communities in unincorporated King County (UKC) by seeking to understand their needs and delivering responsive government services. This includes maintaining roads and bridges, issuing permits, managing land use planning, and providing several programs to unincorporated areas such as participatory budgeting, community needs lists, and subarea planning.

DLS provides administrative support for the School Technical Review Committee (STRC) established by King County Code (KCC) 21A.28.154. The STRC consists of three members representing:

- Department of Local Services;
- Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (Regional Planning), and
- County Council Staff.

The County Council representative serves as an ex officio member. The Department of Local Services representative serves as the STRC chair (chair).¹ The STRC is responsible for reviewing capital facility plans submitted to the County by school districts (districts) seeking to collect impact fees for new residential development in UKC served by those districts. Per KCC, these plans must include the rationale for any proposed impact fees, along with the detailed calculations supporting those fees.

Funding Public School Capital Facility Projects: Public school construction in Washington state is funded primarily through voter-approved local bonds and capital levies. Additional funding sources include matching funds from the State's School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), residential development impact fees, investment earnings, property sale proceeds, and rent or lease income. SCAP is the State's primary source of funding for school construction.

SCAP provides matching funds for eligible projects based on a district's need for additional instructional space. Funding levels are determined by the project's eligible square footage, recognized construction costs, and the district's financial assistance percentage. Projects are ineligible for SCAP funding if the district already has adequate student capacity under the State's service model. Funding for eligible projects is not guaranteed; money is awarded only if sufficient funds have been allocated in the State's biennial capital budget.

School construction projects that expand student capacity may also be funded through school impact fees. Authorized under the Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington (RCW)), these fees are charged on new residential developments to help offset the cost of building or expanding schools needed to serve students from those developments. Fees must be proportional to the impact of each dwelling type and may only be used to add capacity.

In areas where impact fees are not assessed, districts may seek mitigation for school facility impacts through the State Environmental Policy Act or the State Subdivision Act. Both laws require that new developments address their impact on school infrastructure and allow districts to work directly with local governments and developers to identify impacts and negotiate mitigation measures.

¹ KCC 21A.28: [\[LINK\]](#)

Key Historical Context: The 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA) passed by the Washington State Legislature authorized the collection of impact fees to help fund school construction (RCW 82.020.050). These fees can be collected by the County from new residential developments, with limited exceptions. For the County to collect impact fees, a district must have its capital facility plan (CFP) adopted as part of the capital facilities element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.²

King County began collecting impact fees for districts serving residents in UKC in 1994, following passage of Ordinance 11621.³ The impact fee amount is determined by a formula adopted as Attachment A to Ordinance 11621. The formula takes into account student enrollment projections; the standard of service, which defines the desired level of classroom space per student; student capacity, which assesses the ability of existing school facilities to accommodate projected growth; and a student generation factor, which quantifies the average number of students expected to be generated by new housing units by housing type.

Impact fee amounts are updated annually and incorporated into DLS Permitting's fee schedule that goes into effect on January 1 of each year, following adoption of the district's CFP into the King County Comprehensive Plan. The amount of fees collected for a district can fluctuate based on several factors, including:

- Student enrollment;
- Building plans;
- New residential growth; and
- State reimbursement levels.

If a district does not need to construct capacity improvements to accommodate anticipated student enrollment growth in the next six years due to new residential development, an impact fee is not justified. In such cases, no school impact fees are assessed. The County has adopted CFPs and established impact fees for 13 districts. These districts are:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Auburn School District | 8. Lake Washington School District |
| 2. Enumclaw School District | 9. Northshore School District |
| 3. Federal Way School District | 10. Renton School District |
| 4. Fife School District | 11. Riverview School District |
| 5. Highline School District | 12. Snoqualmie School District |
| 6. Issaquah School District | 13. Tahoma School District |
| 7. Kent School District | |

Key Current Context: Districts submitted draft CFPs to the STRC chair in mid-May 2025. The chair conducted an initial review of the draft CFPs and provided feedback to each district on their draft CFP by May 31, 2025. On June 6, 2025, every district presented its proposed CFP and associated impact fees to the STRC during a workshop session. Through each of their presentations the districts discussed:

- Capital projects that support student growth;
- Major capital projects recently completed or currently underway;
- Anticipated student generation numbers assumed in their impact fee calculations;

² RCW 82.02.050: [\[LINK\]](#)

³ Ordinance 11621: [\[LINK\]](#)

- Past and planned bonds and levies; and,
- Proposed impact fee amounts.

STRC members had the opportunity to ask questions and offer input to the chair after each presentation, thus ensuring that the STRC had a thorough understanding of each district's proposed CFP. The workshop sessions were open to the public. Public notice was provided on DLS Permitting's public notice web page.

Following the workshop, the chair solicited STRC member feedback to make recommendations, which are included in this report, to the Executive regarding whether to adopt each district's CFP into the King County Comprehensive Plan.¹ Only STRC members representing the Executive branch may make recommendations to adopt each district plan into the King County Comprehensive Plan and approve the proposed impact fees. The STRC member representing the County Council remains neutral to maintain the Council's prerogative to consider the Executive's recommendation during the legislative process.

The board of directors for each district is also required to approve its respective CFP. This action includes a public notice and the issuance of a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold determination by each district.

This is the STRC's first annual report pursuant to Ordinance 19881² that added a reporting requirement to KCC 21A.28.154 in 2024. While evaluation of school district CFPs and associated school impact fees has always been required as described above, this is the first year these assessments have been compiled into a report for the Council. In future years, updated CFPs will trigger new STRC evaluations and reports, to assess revised forecasts, community trends, and capital needs.

This report reflects King County's commitment to transparency in responsible growth management. For elected officials, it provides a data-driven foundation for policy decisions related to school infrastructure and development planning. For residents, it ensures that new housing contributes fairly to the cost of expanding school facilities, protecting classroom quality, and preventing overcrowding. The review process also strengthens coordination between districts and the County. By aligning enrollment forecasts with housing development trends and funding strategies, the districts can better anticipate future needs and allocate resources efficiently.

Before the next CFP update, the school impact fee methodology will be revised to comply with State Bill 5258, passed by the State Legislature during the 2023 session. The legislation requires local governments to impose lower impact fees for smaller housing units compared to larger ones within the same school district to better reflect the proportionate impact of new housing development.

Report Methodology: This report is based on information from CFPs submitted by districts, as well as relevant sections of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Washington Administrative Code (WAC). If a district's CFP did not include the required information, the STRC chair requested the district provide it through email or another means of written documentation. Districts provided information when requested.

¹ KCC 21A.28: [\[LINK\]](#)

² Ordinance 19881: [\[LINK\]](#)

V. Report Requirements

This section outlines the information the STRC must consider when reviewing each submitted district CFP, as well as other information that must be analyzed and documented in the report. This report includes the analysis required by KCC 21A.28.154.F through J for each district's CFP. The KCC provides flexibility for the STRC in its decision-making process. In forming its recommendations for each district, the STRC considers district-specific factors and broader trends. The following is a summary of report requirements, the sources of information, and the general approach to analysis.

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

- 1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.**

Analysis Approach: Enrollment projections were compared with actual reported enrollment to assess the reliability of each district's enrollment forecasting system. The data was compiled from previous district CFPs and includes two six-year periods: 2014–2020 and 2019–2024. The earlier period is useful for comparison as the later period is impacted by the pandemic. The specific document from which the data is derived is cited under each district's report section.

Enrollment projections are generally most accurate in the early years of the projection period. This is because assumptions about economic conditions and demographic trends, which impact the projections, become more uncertain over time. While previous enrollment projections may differ from actual enrollment each year, student enrollment projections are updated in each new CPF to reflect actual enrollment numbers as well as current economic forecasts and demographic trends.

Research on acceptable margins of error for school district student growth projections yielded no established standard. Thus, the STRC has opted to instead use the acceptable margin of error for countywide population projections, which is 12 percent.³ Noting that projections for smaller populations tend to have wider margins of error than those for larger populations and that near-term projections are typically more accurate than long-term projections, the STRC concluded that projections that are roughly within 12 percent of actual enrollment should be considered reliable. Further, an increased margin of error may be acceptable for smaller school districts.

The projection methodology used by a district, as documented in its 2025 CFP, is reviewed to assess the reasonableness of its enrollment forecasting system. While there is no single "best" method for school enrollment forecasting, it is generally recognized that a reasonable approach should combine more than one methodology.⁴ However, there may be exceptions if a district has used only one methodology and it has been demonstrated to be an accurate approach over time.

The baseline methodology used by districts is the cohort survival method. This approach applies historical enrollment trends to track the progression of existing students through each grade level. The cohort survival method is effective for districts with gradual changes in student enrollment over several

³ Lombard, Hamilton, "How accurate are population projections?," University of Virginia Demographics StatChat, June 21, 2017: [\[LINK\]](#)

⁴ Lycan, D. Richard, Forecasting K-12 Enrollment Using GIS Tools, Portland State University, undated: [\[LINK\]](#)

years. However, for districts experiencing significant growth, the results from this method should be adjusted using other relevant data. Districts may adjust these projections by incorporating additional relevant factors, such as expected new housing development, student migration patterns, and birth rate data.

The analysis section provides a comparison between a district's enrollment projection and actual enrollment and describes the district's projection methodology.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis Approach: The STRC reviewed the information in each district's 2025 CFP and noted where there was voter support for bond issues to fund capital projects included in the district's current six-year financial program. If mentioned in the plan, support for previous bond measures is also acknowledged. The lack of information about bond measures not linked to current or proposed capital projects does not influence the STRC's recommendation. The analysis section summarizes the bond information provided by the district.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis Approach: Assessing a district's ability to secure anticipated State funding is difficult, as State matching funds are not guaranteed until a project moves forward, and the district does not receive these funds until the capital project is completed. Additionally, the State Legislature updates the construction cost allocation every two years and revises the district's eligibility annually.⁵

The STRC has reviewed each district's 2025 CFP to determine whether the following information is included:

- The district's most recent bond or capital levy proposal, including amount requested, the projects to be financed (if known), and whether voters approved it.
- The district's next anticipated bond or capital levy proposal (if any), including the projects to be financed (if known), and anticipated timing (if known).
- Whether the district anticipates receiving School Construction Assistance Program funds for any project and if this is included in the finance plan. The School Construction Assistance Program funds are referred to as State funding assistance in the remainder of the report.

The STRC reviewed the State funding assumptions as well as existing and anticipated bond or capital levy proposals to support district capital projects as documented in each district's CFP. The analysis section summarizes the existing and potential bonds and levies that support proposed capital projects and notes if State funding is anticipated.

⁵ School Construction Assistance Program: Summary Handbook, 2021, Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction: [\[LINK\]](#)

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis Approach: If a district has experienced an emergency closure of school facility, it should be identified and addressed in its CFP capacity analysis. An emergency closure of a school facility does not influence the STRC's recommendation regarding a district's proposed CFP and associated impact fees. The analysis section indicates if a district has had an emergency closure of a school facility.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis Approach: Level of service standards for grade levels or categories of grade levels have been compiled for comparison between districts. The information was extracted from each district's 2025 CFP. The data reviewed by the STRC for this analysis is provided in Appendix A. The analysis section provides the district's service standard for elementary, middle, and high schools and states if the district's service standards are reasonably consistent, when compared to the service levels provided in Appendix A.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis Approach: RCW 28A.150.100 (Basic Education Certificated Instructional Staff – Definition – Ratio to Students) requires each district to maintain a minimum of 46 certificated instructional staff members for every 1,000 annual average full-time equivalent students. This sets a standard ratio of 21.7 students per certificated staff member, excluding alternative learning courses. The analysis section compares this standard with information provided by the district.

Statutory language provides a basis for the State funding allocation model. It broadly defines certificated staff to include classroom teachers, librarians, counselors, health service staff, and other certificated instructional staff (e.g. specialists, tutors, instructional coaches). It further identifies that the staffing ratio covers staffing not just at the “regular classroom level” but includes basic education, secondary vocational education, general instruction support, and support services, and excludes student counts in alternative learning programs.

Consequently, this is not a teacher-to-student ratio by classroom analysis or a building level application. The statute states expressly that it does not require a particular classroom teacher-to-student ratio. The Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), through apportionment compliance, annually reviews and certifies district compliance with the Basic Education provisions for purposes of distributing operational funds from the State.

With this information, the STRC acknowledges 1) the State sets basic education apportionment funding standards relative to staffing ratios for K-12 instruction, 2) the OSPI monitors compliance by each district with State staffing ratios for purposes of the State funding allocation, and 3) in some cases, districts may exceed State allocation standards in setting their locally adopted standards of service based on unique factors related to local educational programming and district-specific bargained contracts.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis Approach: Each district's 2025 CFP includes a narrative or data table that clearly identifies any deficiencies in total programming capacity, including permanent and relocatable facilities (portables). Most districts have shown no deficiencies. For districts with deficiencies, the STRC reviewed the financial plans to ensure all funding sources are identified to achieve the required level of service. The analysis section indicates if a district has any deficiencies in its program capacity and summarize identified funding sources to address the deficiencies.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis Approach: The STRC reviewed the financial information in each district's 2025 CFP, identifying approved and proposed bonds and capital levies intended to support the proposed capital projects. Additionally, the STRC noted proposed capital projects that do not have an existing or identified potential funding source. The analysis section includes a summary of the information provided in each district's CFP.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis Approach: The STRC reviewed the financial information in each district's CFP to assess the district's efforts to secure State funding and comply with State eligibility requirements. If a capital project qualifies for State funding, it is expected that the district will include this information in its financial plan and apply for the funding, as it helps reduce the financial burden on local taxpayers. The analysis section includes a summary of the information provided in each district's CFP.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis Approach: The analysis section documents if the STRC requested that the district review and resubmit its CFP, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new

students. It should be noted that districts provide the STRC a draft CFP and are required to submit a final CFP to the STRC after the district's board of directors approves its final document. Where the STRC requested changes, the STRC confirmed that the changes were made in its final CFP as approved by the district's board of directors.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis Approach: The analysis section documents the submittal date for each district's draft and final CFP. Not all districts that serve UKC have submitted a CFP for consideration. Districts that do not submit CFPs so that the County can collect impact fees in the unincorporated areas of their districts may still request mitigation for impacts to school facilities caused by new residential development on a project-by-project basis, per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

VI. Capital Facility Plan Analysis and Recommendation

This section provides the STRC's recommendation for each district and documents the analysis and conclusions as required by KCC 21A.28.154.K.

Auburn School District

Overview

The Auburn School District covers about 62 square miles, mainly in King County, with a small area extending into Pierce County. It includes areas within the cities of Algona, Auburn, Pacific, and surrounding UKC. The district has 16 elementary schools, four middle schools, and four high schools. Currently, it educates more than 17,300 students from Pre-K through 12th grade. Student enrollment is expected to grow by roughly six percent over the next six years, reaching around 18,370 students by 2030. The six-year capital construction plan in the district's CFP includes five projects or categories, with a total estimated cost of approximately \$544 million.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$8,003; Multiunit = \$8,966.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Auburn School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis.

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

- 1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.**

Analysis: The district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has proven to be reliable. A comparison of the projections for 2014 to 2019 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were accurate, with a 0.7 percent overestimate for 2014 and a 2.3 percent overestimate for 2019. Comparing the projections for 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment reveals a slightly larger discrepancy,

although it still fell within an acceptable margin of variance. The difference between the projected and actual enrollment during this period ranged from two percent to 9.1 percent.

Table 1. Auburn School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ⁶	17,261	17,618	18,005	18,347	18,700	19,053
	Actual ⁷	16,905	16,190	16,601	17,059	17,239	17,312
	% Difference	2.1%	8.1%	7.8%	7.0%	7.8%	9.1%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ⁸	15,391	15,788	16,252	16,814	17,248	17,702
	Actual ⁹	15,277	15,663	15,945	16,525	16,949	17,300
	% Difference	0.7%	0.8%	1.9%	1.7%	1.7%	2.3%

The district's forecasting system for enrollment projections is reasonable. It combines historical student population data, demographic trends, such as expected kindergarten enrollment based on birth rates, and planned residential developments to project future student enrollment.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The voters in the district approved a proposed \$456 million bond measure in November 2016 with a 62.38 percent approval rate. A proposed November 2024 bond measure failed with a 55.05¹⁰ percent approval rate.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The voters in the district approved a \$456 million bond measure in November 2016 with 62.38 percent approval. A proposed November 2024 bond measure failed with a 55.05 percent approval. The district is considering submitting a bond measure to the voters in November 2025 to build a new middle school, replace an elementary school and a middle school, and make improvements at 22 existing facilities.

The district's CFP states the construction of the new middle school is not eligible for State funding assistance. However, it is eligible for State funding assistance for the replacement of the elementary and middle schools.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

⁶ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 through 2025, June 24, 2019.

⁷ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 through 2031, June 9, 2025.

⁸ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2014 through 2020, June 9, 2014.

⁹ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020 through 2026, June 22, 2020.

¹⁰ Bond measures typically need a 60 percent favorable majority to pass, per RCW 28A.530.020: [\[LINK\]](#)

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 2. Auburn School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	Pre-K	K - 3	4 - 5	6	7 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	20	17	27	27	28.53	28.74

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:10.47 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its middle and high schools do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate future students at its current standard of service. The district has identified both permanent capacity and relocatable capacity projects to meet the future needs. Through its 2025 CFP, the district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve its standard of service. These sources are: 1) general obligation bonds, 2) school mitigation and impact fees, and 3) State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes a potential bond measure and State funding assistance.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district is eligible for State funding assistance for the two school replacement projects. It is not eligible for State funding assistance for a new middle school project.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 draft CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted a 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on June 17, 2025.

Enumclaw School District

Overview

The Enumclaw School District encompasses approximately 449 square miles in southern King County. It includes areas within the cities of Enumclaw and Black Diamond, and surrounding UKC. The district has five elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. The district currently serves more than 4,300 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to increase by about 25 percent over the next six years, reaching around 5,311 by 2030. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP identifies project costs estimated at approximately \$156 million. These costs include six projects that add to student capacity at the elementary and middle school level.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$12,619; Multiunit = \$5,469.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Enumclaw School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable considering the size of the district and impact of the pandemic. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 with actual enrollment data shows that most projections fell within an acceptable margin of variance. Projections from 2019 to 2024 compared to actual enrollment were within 12 percent of actual figures in the early years of the series. However, the margin of variance increases toward the end of the projection period, eventually exceeding 18 percent in 2024. This larger discrepancy is attributed to lower than expected number of housing units completed within both of the large master planned developments located within the district. The district has adjusted its future projections to accommodate for the anticipated build-out of these communities.

Table 3. Enumclaw School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ¹¹	4,152	4,361	4,591	4,821	5,051	5,281
	Actual ¹²	4,104	3,951	4,046	4,236	4,269	4,304
	% Difference	1.2%	9.4%	11.9%	12.1%	15.5%	18.5%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ¹³	3,858	4,143	4,390	4,580	4,703	4,732
	Actual ¹⁴	3,964	3,963	3,934	3,963	3,971	4,104
	% Difference	(2.8%)	4.3%	10.4%	13.5%	15.6%	13.3%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. The district uses two population forecasts to project student enrollment. The first is an estimate provided by the OSPI, which predicts future enrollment through 2029 using the cohort survival method. The second forecast is a modified cohort analysis. This approach builds on the cohort projections by incorporating King County live birth data and the district's historical percentage of those births to estimate the number of kindergartners entering the system. It also takes into account assumptions based on proposed new residential developments within the district. These projections are further validated by the district's multi-year demographic study.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The voters in the district approved a \$68.5 million bond measure in April 2015. Two proposed bond measures failed in 2023. The first measure in 2023 included building a new elementary school and replacing an elementary school. The second measure included replacing an elementary school and districtwide maintenance projects.

¹¹ Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024, July 15, 2019.

¹² Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 30, 2025.

¹³ Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2014-2019, July 21, 2014.

¹⁴ Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020-2025, July 20, 2020.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: Two separate proposed bond measures failed in 2023. The district anticipates submitting one or more bond measures to voters by 2027 for several projects. The district anticipates a new elementary school and an elementary school replacement project will be eligible for State funding assistance.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 4. Enumclaw School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	20	26	28	28

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:15.85 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district anticipates a new elementary school and an elementary school replacement project will be eligible for State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 18, 2025, and a final CFP on July 7, 2025.

Federal Way School District

Overview

The Federal Way School District encompasses approximately 35 square miles in South King County. It includes areas within the cities of Federal Way, Des Moines, Auburn, and Kent, and surrounding UKC. The district has 20 elementary schools, three K–8 schools, six middle schools, four high schools, and four small secondary schools. The district currently serves more than 21,000 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to stay flat with relatively low increases in the next six years. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP includes two school projects, one with increased student capacity, along with projects related to a stadium, site acquisition, and portables, with an estimated cost totaling \$31 million between 2025 and 2032.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Federal Way School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by seven percent, while the 2019 projection was off by only three percent. For the 2019 to 2024 series, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2021 projection had a nine percent difference from actuals.

Table 5. Federal Way School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ¹⁵	21,823	22,243	22,347	22,489	22,713	22,967
	Actual ¹⁶	21,778	20,567	20,305	20,568	20,696	21,148
	% Difference	0.2%	7.5%	9.1%	8.5%	8.9%	7.9%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ¹⁷	20,312	20,351	20,424	20,472	20,696	20,945
	Actual ¹⁸	21,754	21,995	21,933	21,915	21,716	21,584
	% Difference	(7.1%)	(8.1%)	(7.4%)	(7.1%)	(4.9%)	(3.1%)

The district's forecasting system for enrollment projections is reasonable. It relies on a range of statistical methods, with the core approach being a cohort survival analysis. The projections also incorporate expected enrollment changes due to new housing developments and account for net migration gains or losses.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The voters in the district approved a \$450 million bond measure in 2017 with a 62 percent approval rate. This measure supported the replacement, and in some instances, increased student capacity for eight schools.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues

Analysis: The district anticipates State funding assistance for a project to increase student capacity. The district may propose a bond or levy measure to voters in November 2026 or February 2027.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

¹⁵ Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2020, June 6, 2019.

¹⁶ Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2026, June 10, 2025.

¹⁷ Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2014, June 25, 2013.

¹⁸ Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2021, June 5, 2020.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 6. Federal Way School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K – 3	4 – 5	6 - 12
Students Per Classroom	18.9	25	26

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:13.49 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The district anticipates received State funding assistance for future projects that were approved through the district's 2017 approved bond measure.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;
2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or
3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on June 16, 2025.

Fife School District

Overview

The Fife School District includes parts of the cities of Fife, Milton, and Edgewood, and unincorporated areas in Pierce and King counties. The district has one primary school, two elementary schools, one middle school, one Junior High, and one high school. The district currently serves more than 3,800 students in grades Pre-K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to increase by approximately 40 students per year, reaching around 4,065 students by 2030. The estimated near term total project costs in the district's CFP include the moderation and addition of a new high school at an estimated cost of approximately \$225 million.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$5,595; Multiunit = \$1,747.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Fife School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has proven to be reliable. A comparison of the projections for 2014 to 2019 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were accurate, with a 1.2 percent underestimate for 2014 and exact for 2019. Projections for 2019 to 2024 had a slightly larger discrepancy compared with actual enrollment. The difference between the

projected and actual enrollment during this period ranged from 1.5 percent for 2019 to 4.4 percent for 2024. These projections fell within an acceptable margin of variance.

Table 7. Fife School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ¹⁹	3,837	3,886	3,887	3,935	3,991	4,005
	Actual ²⁰	3,728	3,681	3,686	3,783	3,814	3,838
	% Difference	2.8%	5.3%	5.2%	3.9%	4.4%	4.4%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ²¹	3,547	3,615	3,655	3,742	3,769	3,848
	Actual ²²	3,589	3,644	3,663	3,820	3,773	3,847
	% Difference	(1.2%)	(0.8%)	(0.2%)	(2.1%)	(0.1%)	0.0%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It uses a modified cohort survival method to account for changes in student migration into the district. The traditional cohort survival method serves as the foundation, and the district refines these projections by incorporating data on new housing developments from comprehensive plans, as well as population statistics from the counties and cities within and around the district.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The district's voters approved a \$176.3 million bond in February 2018. The district anticipates presenting a bond proposal to voters potentially in November 2025 to replace the existing high school with a new expanded facility.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues

Analysis: The district has received State funding assistance for recent projects.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

¹⁹ Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 – 2025, July 29, 2019.

²⁰ Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2031, July 28, 2025.

²¹ Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2014 – 2020, June 30, 2014.

²² Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020 – 2026, September 28, 2020.

Table 8. Fife School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K – 3	4 – 5	6 - 12
Students Per Classroom	17	17 - 25	25

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:14.25 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its high school does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate future students at its current standard of service. The district has identified a high school replacement project that increases capacity. Through its 2025 CFP, the district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve its standard of service. These sources are 1) general obligation bonds, 2) impact fees, and 3) State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The district received State funding assistance for past projects. The district anticipates it will be eligible and receive for State funding assistance its new Fife High School modernization and addition project.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**

2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or

3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on April 29, 2025, and a final CFP on July 28, 2025.

Highline School District

Overview

The Highline School District encompasses approximately 31 square miles. It includes areas within the cities of Burien, Des Moines, Normandy Park, and SeaTac, and parts of White Center in UKC. The district has 18 elementary schools, five middle schools, and five comprehensive high schools, along with several alternative programs including Big Picture Schools and Maritime High School. The district currently serves more than 17,350 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to reach around 17,720 students by 2030. The six-year capital facilities financing plan in the district's CFP includes 45 projects totaling more than \$567 million and reflects the continuation of a multi-phase investment strategy to modernize the district's facilities through school replacements, operational and support infrastructure, and systemwide improvements, such as roof restoration and remediation. This includes the replacement of three schools with an estimated cost totaling \$467 million.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Highline School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and from 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by 3.5 percent, while the 2019 projection was overestimated by 7.8 percent. For the 2019 to 2024 series, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2024 projection had a 3.6 percent variance from actuals.

Table 9. Highline School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ²³	18,034	17,911	17,785	17,744	17,831	18,031
	Actual ²⁴	18,189	17,745	17,476	17,341	17,069	17,377
	% Difference	(0.9%)	0.9%	1.7%	2.3%	4.3%	3.6%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ²⁵	18,670	18,746	19,017	19,209	19,423	19,725
	Actual ²⁶	19,322	19,058	19,187	18,783	18,273	18,189
	% Difference	(3.5%)	(1.7%)	(0.9%)	2.2%	5.9%	7.8%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It uses a modified cohort survival method and takes into account several factors to assess potential student population growth. These factors include projected births, anticipated growth in the K-12 population, and a model that evaluates population and housing growth within the district's boundaries. Additionally, the methodology considers the impact of charter school enrollment within the district, based on assumptions derived from recent trends.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The voters in the district approved four bond measures between 2002 and 2022:

- 2002 - \$189 million bond;
- 2006 - \$148 million bond;
- 2016 - \$299 million bond; and
- 2022 - \$518.3 million bond that had a 68.84 percent approval rate.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district qualified for State funding assistance for its 2016 and 2022 bond projects. The district anticipates putting a bond measure before voters in 2026; however, the district's CFP states that it has reached the maximum SCAP eligibility threshold under current State funding formulas and does not expect to receive further State funding assistance for projects included in the 2026 bond measure.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: During the 2024–2025 school year, a school facility was closed due to an emergency. However, since the building had been repurposed to house the district's Virtual Academy and the Innovation Heights program, the closure did not impact student enrollment capacity for general education programs.

²³ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 – 2024, July 10, 2019.

²⁴ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024–2029, July 10, 2024, and Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 2030, July 10, 2025.

²⁵ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2013 – 2019, June 26, 2013.

²⁶ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020–2025, July 8, 2020.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 10. Highline School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K – 3	4 – 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	17	27	29	29

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:11.95 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its elementary and high schools do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate existing and future students at its current standard of service. While no additional portables are currently planned at the elementary or high school levels during this CFP cycle, the district will use portables as needed to meet short-term enrollment pressures.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and funding from the Port of Seattle/Federal Administration Authority due to the proximity of a future school project to air traffic corridors.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district does not expect to receive further State funding assistance for projects in its 2026 bond proposal.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;
2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or
3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on July 11, 2025.

Issaquah School District

Overview

The Issaquah School District encompasses approximately 110 square miles in East King County. It includes areas within the cities of Issaquah, Sammamish, Newcastle, and Renton, and surrounding UKC. The district has 16 elementary schools, six middle schools, and four high schools. The district currently serves more than 18,300 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to decrease by approximately 450 students over the next six years. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP includes the construction of a new high school with an estimated total cost of \$145.7 million.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Issaquah School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by 1.5 percent, while the 2019 projection was underestimated by approximately 10 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2024 projection was off by a little over 11 percent.

Table 11. Issaquah School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ²⁷	20,105	20,259	20,450	20,457	20,443	20,684
	Actual ²⁸	20,472	19,431	18,892	18,861	18,755	18,364
	% Difference	(1.8%)	5.5%	8.9%	9.2%	9.7%	11.2%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ²⁹	17,740	17,959	18,034	18,214	18,226	18,388
	Actual ³⁰	18,006	18,445	19,606	20,072	19,971	20,245
	% Difference	(1.5%)	(2.7%)	(8.7%)	(10.2%)	(9.6%)	(10.1%)

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It employs a cohort survival method, which predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students, and supplements this with projections of new students from upcoming developments within the district.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The district's voters approved a \$533 million bond measure in 2016. This bond measure provides funding for a new high school, new middle school, two new elementary schools, a rebuild/expansion of an existing middle school and additions to six existing elementary schools. The voters also approved an April 2022 capital levy to provide additional funding for the high school project as well as other projects.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues

Analysis: The district anticipates receiving State funding assistance for its new high school project.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

²⁷ Issaquah School District, 2019 Capital Facilities Plan, May 22, 2019.

²⁸ Issaquah School District, 2025 Capital Facilities Plan, June 10, 2025.

²⁹ Issaquah School District, 2014 Capital Facilities Plan, July 9, 2014.

³⁰ Issaquah School District, 2020 Capital Facilities Plan, May 28, 2020.

Table 12. Issaquah School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 5	6 – 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	20	26	28

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:14.62 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its high school does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate future students at its current standard of service. The district has identified a new high school project that will increase capacity. Through its 2025 CFP, the district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve its standard of service. These sources are 1) general obligation bonds, 2) State funding assistance, and 3) impact fees.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes expenditure of an approved bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district anticipates its new high school project will be eligible for State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;

2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or

3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on June 16, 2025.

Kent School District

Overview

The Kent School District spans approximately 73 square miles in South King County. It includes areas within the cities of Kent, Covington, Auburn, Black Diamond, Maple Valley, Renton, SeaTac, and Tukwila, and surrounding UKC. The district has 29 elementary schools, seven middle schools, and four high schools. The district's currently serves more than 24,400 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to be about 22,340 students by 2030, a decrease of approximately 2,100 students between 2025 and 2030. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP indicates that there are no school projects planned between 2022 and 2028.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Kent School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was overestimated by under one percent, while the 2019 projection was overestimated by approximately 11 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2021 projection was off by just over five percent.

Table 13. Kent School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ³¹	25,688	25,585	25,523	25,455	25,395	25,171
	Actual ³²	25,912	24,543	24,151	24,480	24,435	24,432
	% Difference	(0.9%)	4.1%	5.4%	3.8%	3.8%	2.9%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ³³	26,868	27,229	27,677	28,096	28,629	29,219
	Actual ³⁴	26,724	26,512	26,529	26,524	25,834	25,913
	% Difference	0.5%	2.6%	4.2%	5.6%	9.8%	11.3%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It employs a cohort survival method, which predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students, and supplements this with projections of new students from upcoming developments within the district.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The district voters approved a \$252 million bond measure in November 2016. In 2018, district voters approved a capital levy. A \$495 million bond measure in April 2023 was not approved by the voters. While a levy in early 2024 did not pass, voters approved a November 2024 levy that included only critical building needs.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district anticipates presenting a bond measure to voters in 2028 to address more immediate needs, including deferred maintenance, tenant improvement projects, and possible facility replacement. The district expects to receive State funding assistance for projects included in this CFP.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

³¹ Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2018-19 through 2024-25, May 2019

³² Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2024-2025 through 2030-2031, June 2025.

³³ Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2014- 2015 – 2019-2020, April 2014.

³⁴ Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2020- 21 through 2025-2026, June 2020.

Table 14. Kent School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	24	27	28	32

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:13.01 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan does not include any projects associated with permanent facilities. The need for additional portables is pending. If there is a need for replacement or additional portables in the future, they may be funded with previously collected impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: Not applicable as the district has not identified any projects within the six-year time frame of its CFP.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**

3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on July 7, 2025.

Lake Washington School District

Overview

The Lake Washington School District serves a 68.7 square mile area. It includes areas within the cities of Redmond, Kirkland, Sammamish, Bellevue, Woodinville, and surrounding UKC. The district has 32 elementary schools, 13 middle schools, and seven high schools. The district currently serves more than 30,600 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to decrease by roughly 1,750 between 2024 and 2030, to a total of approximately 28,900 students; however, high school student enrollment is projected to grow by approximately 275 students. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP includes 12 projects with an estimated total cost of \$745 million for rebuilding, enlarging, and adding to elementary, middle and high schools within the district.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$7,277; Multiunit = \$170.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Lake Washington School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was overestimated by under one percent, while the 2019 projection was underestimated by approximately seven percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by one percent, and the 2024 projection was off by approximately six percent.

Table 15. Lake Washington School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ³⁵	30,780	31,487	32,055	32,367	32,525	32,733
	Actual ³⁶	31,100	30,689	30,548	30,422	30,611	30,654
	% Difference	(1.0%)	2.5%	4.7%	6.0%	5.9%	6.4%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ³⁷	26,876	27,536	28,048	28,519	28,863	29,046
	Actual ³⁸	26,716	27,830	29,006	29,570	29,987	31,106
	% Difference	0.6%	(1.1%)	(3.4%)	(3.7%)	(3.9%)	(7.1%)

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It employs a cohort survival method, which predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students, and supplements this with projections of new students from upcoming developments within the district.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: The district's voters approved a bond measure in April 2016. The district had a bond measure that failed in February 2018. In April 2019, voters approved a six-year Capital Project Levy measure. In February 2022, voters approved a capital levy to fund the first part of the district's Building Excellence Plan, which includes capital projects that provide additional classroom capacity at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. This additional capacity is primarily accomplished through additions to existing schools, and a few remodels or rebuilding of existing schools. In November 2024 district voters approved funds through a capital levy for part two of this plan.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues

Analysis: The district has received State funding assistance for past projects. The planned projects are eligible for State funding assistance. The district anticipates receiving State funding assistance.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

³⁵ Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019 – 2024, June 10, 2019.

³⁶ Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 23, 2025.

³⁷ Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2014 – 2019, May 19, 2014.

³⁸ Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2020 – 2025, June 1, 2020.

Table 16. Lake Washington School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 – 12
Students Per Classroom	20	23	27	30	32

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:14.21 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP established a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes voter-approved levies and impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The planned projects are eligible for State funding assistance. The district anticipates receiving State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district to review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on June 24, 2025.

Northshore School District

Overview

The Northshore School District encompasses 60 square miles across portions of King and Snohomish counties. Approximately two-thirds of the district is located within King County. It includes areas within the cities of Bothell, Kenmore, Woodinville, and Brier along with UKC. The district has 20 elementary schools, six middle schools, and six high schools. The district currently serves more than 22,000 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to increase by roughly 1,560 students between 2024 and 2030, to a total of approximately 23,600 students. The eight-year capital facilities expenditure finance plan in the district's CFP identifies 13 student capacity projects with a total estimated cost of \$820 million between 2024 and 2029-30. This plan also identifies seven other categories of projects that do not add student capacity with a total estimate cost of \$330 million between 2024 and 2032-32.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$16,550; Multiunit = \$3,023.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Northshore School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

- 1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.**

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by under one percent, while the 2019 projection was underestimated by approximately 10 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2024 projection was off by approximately 7.5 percent.

Table 17. Northshore School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ³⁹	23,088	23,445	23,585	23,683	23,825	23,854
	Actual ⁴⁰	22,943	22,686	22,419	22,318	22,391	22,064
	% Difference	0.6%	3.2%	4.9%	5.8%	6.0%	7.5%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ⁴¹	19,580	19,753	20,032	20,255	20,529	20,732
	Actual ⁴²	19,671	20,018	20,449	22,021	22,622	22,943
	% Difference	(0.5%)	(1.3%)	(2.1%)	(8.7%)	(10.2%)	(10.7%)

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It uses the cohort survival method alongside several additional factors to predict potential student population growth. These factors include projected birth rates, housing development, regional population trends, and enrollment in homeschooling and private schools.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: District voters approved a \$275 million bond measure in 2018. In 2022, voters approved a \$425 million bond measure by a 61.2 percent rate.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district is currently eligible for State funding assistance. The district anticipates receiving State funding assistance for the elementary and middle school capacity projects identified in its CFP.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

³⁹ Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 – 2025, July 8, 2019.

⁴⁰ Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 31, June 23, 2025. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024-30, June 2024. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2023-29, June 2023. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2022-28, May 2022. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2021 – 2027, June 28, 2021. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020 – 2026, July 13, 2020.

⁴¹ Northshore School District, 2014 Capital Facilities Plan, June 10, 2014.

⁴² Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020-26, July 13, 2020. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2025, July 8, 2019. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2018-2024, June 25, 2018. Northshore School District, DRAFT Capital Facilities Plan 2016. Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2015, June 23, 2015.

Table 18. Northshore School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 1	2 -3	4 - 5	6 – 12
Students Per Classroom	24	26	27	27

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:18.3 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes approved and planned (2026) bond measures, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The district is currently eligible for State funding assistance. The district anticipates receiving State funding assistance for the elementary and middle school capacity projects identified in its CFP.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 8, 2025, and a final CFP on June 24, 2025.

Renton School District

Overview

The Renton School District encompasses approximately 32.5 square miles. It includes areas within the cities of Renton, Bellevue, and Newcastle, and surrounding UKC. The district has 16 elementary schools, four middle schools, and four high schools. The district currently serves more than 13,800 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to decrease by approximately 825 between 2024 and 2030. The six-year finance plan in the district's CFP shows an estimated \$8 million being expended for student capacity projects between 2024 and 2030. During this same period, a total of approximately \$589 million may be expended on non-capacity projects, including the modernization and replacement of two high schools.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Renton School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

- 1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.**

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by under two percent, while the 2019 projection was overestimated by approximately 12 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by approximately one percent, and the 2024 projection was off by a little less than 11 percent.

Table 19. Renton School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ⁴³	15,352	15,431	15,504	15,554	15,567	15,544
	Actual ⁴⁴	15,173	14,911	14,592	14,371	14,125	13,863
	% Difference	1.2%	3.4%	5.9%	7.6%	9.3%	10.8%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ⁴⁵	14,672	15,044	15,475	16,031	16,539	17,064
	Actual ⁴⁶	14,918	15,078	15,117	15,274	15,254	14,986
	% Difference	(1.7%)	(0.2%)	2.3%	4.7%	7.8%	12.2%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It employs a cohort survival method, which predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students, and supplements this with projections of new students from new housing and assumptions about market share gains or losses that the district is likely to see at certain grade levels.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: District voters approved a \$249.6 million bond measure in November 2019, and a \$676 million bond measure in 2022. The 2022 bond measure allows the district to purchase property and plan for the replacement of Renton High School.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district is currently pursuing State funding assistance for the modernization of the Hazen High School. This is the only project eligible for State funding assistance.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

⁴³ Renton School District, 2019 Capital Facilities Plan, May 2019.

⁴⁴ Renton School District 2025 Capital Facilities Plan, June 25, 2025. Renton School District, 2024 Capital Facilities Plan, July 2024. Renton School District, 2023 Capital Facilities Plan, July 2023. Renton School District, 2022 Capital Facilities Plan, June 2022. Renton School District, 2021 Capital Facilities Plan, July 2021.

⁴⁵ Renton School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2014 – 2020, March 2014.

⁴⁶ Renton School District, 2020 Capital Facilities Plan, June 2020. Renton School District, 2018 Capital Facilities Plan, May 2018. Renton School District, 2017 Capital Facilities Plan, May 2017. Renton School District, 2016 Capital Facilities Plan, May 2016. Renton School District, 2015-2021 Capital Facilities Plan, May 27, 2015.

Table 20. Renton School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 1	2	3	4 - 12
Students Per Classroom	21	22	24	29

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS: 9.0 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes an approved bond measure and State funding assistance.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The district is currently pursuing State funding assistance for the modernization of the Hazen High School. This is the only project eligible for State funding assistance.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on June July 1, 2025.

Riverview School District

Overview

The Riverview School District encompasses approximately 250 square miles in the lower Snoqualmie Valley. It includes areas within the cities of Duval and Carnation and surrounding UKC. The district has three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school, in addition to supporting several alternative programs at the Riverview Learning Center. The district currently serves more than 2,800 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to increase by approximately 45 students, reaching around 2,930 students by 2030. The 2025 – 2031 financing plan in the district's CFP shows an estimated cost of \$132 million for the rebuild of a middle school and an estimated cost of \$46 million for major facility maintenance, technology/security upgrades, and portable classrooms.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$0; Multiunit = \$0.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Riverview School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be relatively reliable for the first few years of the projection. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections had a higher margin of variance in the out-years. This may be a consequence of the small size of the district and impact of the pandemic. For 2014, enrollment was overestimated by approximately nine percent, while the 2019 projection was overestimated by a little under 10 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by approximately four percent, and the 2024 projection was off by approximately 23 percent.

Table 21. Riverview School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
2019 - 2024	Projected ⁴⁷	3,412	3,530	3,582	3,667	3,705	3,769
	Actual ⁴⁸	3,268	3,001	2,982	3,037	2,987	2,881
	% Difference	4.2%	14.9%	16.8%	17.2%	19.4%	23.6%
		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
2014 - 2019	Projected ⁴⁹	3,311	3,371	3,445	3,511	3,569	3,628
	Actual ⁵⁰	3,011	3,158	3,268	3,277	3,296	3,268
	% Difference	9.1%	6.3%	5.1%	6.7%	7.7%	9.9%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It employs a cohort survival method, which predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students, and supplements it with other enrollment factors, including local and surrounding housing growth.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: District voters did not pass the most recent bond measure in 2022. In February 2022, voters approved a four-year capital improvement levy that generates \$3.8 million per year. This levy will fund technology infrastructure and building improvements.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district anticipates requesting voter approval for a replacement capital levy in February 2026. The district may also request voter approval in 2026 for a bond measure to fund a rebuild of a middle school in addition to improvements to other school facilities. The district is monitoring to determine if the middle school project will be eligible for State funding assistance. If eligible, the district will pursue the funding.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably

⁴⁷ Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019, June 25, 2019.

⁴⁸ Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025, June 24, 2025. Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024, June 25, 2024. Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2023, June 27, 2023. Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2022. Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2021. Riverview School District, 2020 Capital Facilities Plan.

⁴⁹ Riverview School District, 2014 Capital Facilities Plan, May 27, 2014.

⁵⁰ Riverview School District, 2020 Capital Facilities Plan. Riverview School District, 2019 Capital Facilities Plan, June 25, 2019. Riverview School District, 2018 Capital Facilities Plan, June 12, 2018. Riverview School District, 2017 Capital Facilities Plan, June 13, 2017. Riverview School District, 2016 Capital Facilities Plan, May 24, 2016. Riverview School District, 2015 Capital Facilities Plan, June 23, 2015.

consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 22. Riverview School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	17	24	27	27

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:13.09 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that it does not have any deficiencies in its current facilities.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes an approved levy, a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district is monitoring if its middle school project will be eligible for State funding assistance. If eligible, the district will pursue the funding.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;

2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or

3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's draft 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 12, 2025, and a final CFP on July 11, 2025.

Snoqualmie Valley School District

Overview

The Snoqualmie Valley School District encompasses approximately 400 square miles in eastern King County. It includes areas within the cities of Snoqualmie and North Bend, and the unincorporated area of Fall City, and other surrounding UKC. The district has six elementary schools, three middle schools, and two high schools. The district currently serves more than 6,800 students in grades K through 12. Total student enrollment is projected to decline slightly, by 12 students, over the next 6 years; however, elementary student enrollment is projected to grow by approximately 140 students. The finance plan in the district's CFP includes a cost estimate of \$121.8 million for the construction of an elementary school, and another approximately \$14 million for preschool, potable classrooms, and land acquisition/development for transportation facility expansion.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$13,126.84; Multiunit = \$6,170.35.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Snoqualmie Valley School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by under one percent, while the 2018 projection was overestimated by approximately four percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by approximately three percent, and the 2024 projection was off by approximately six percent.

Table 23. Snoqualmie Valley School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ⁵¹	6,747	6,897	7,010	7,073	7,192	7,257
	Actual ⁵²	6,946	6,610	6,876	6,813	6,836	6,815
	% Difference	(2.9%)	4.2%	1.9%	3.7%	4.9%	6.1%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ⁵³	6,115	6,271	6,678	6,852	7,017	7,142
	Actual ⁵⁴	6,160	6,322	6,629	6,691	6,728	6,946
	% Difference	(0.7%)	(0.8%)	0.7%	2.4%	4.1%	2.7%

The district's forecasting system for enrollment projections is sound and reasonable. It combines historical student population data, future housing construction plans, birth rates, as well as economic factors that contribute to overall population growth.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: District voters approved a \$244 million bond measure in 2015 with 62.52 percent in favor.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues

Analysis: The district received State funding assistance for the Timber Ridge Elementary and Mount Si High School projects. As the CFP states, "The district is not currently eligible for 'unhoused' construction funding since middle school capacity offsets elementary students in portables."

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 24. Snoqualmie Valley School District Standard of Service

Grade Level	K - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	17	27	27	30

⁵¹ Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019, June 6, 2019.

⁵² Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024, June 5, 2025.

⁵³ Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2014, June 12, 2014.

⁵⁴ Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020, June 4, 2020.

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:14.36 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its existing facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate existing and future students at its current standard of service.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a finance plan. The finance plan includes the approved bond measure, a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees.

- 2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.**

Analysis: The district is not eligible for State funding for new construction to increase student capacity in elementary schools.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's draft 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 15, 2025, and a final CFP on June 6, 2025.

Tahoma School District

Overview

The Tahoma School District encompasses approximately 60 square miles in southeast King County. It includes areas within the cities of Covington, Black Diamond, and Renton, and surrounding unincorporated King County. The district has six elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. The district currently serves more than 8,900 students in grades K through 12. Student enrollment is projected to grow to a total of approximately 9,150 by the 2030-31 school year, an increase of roughly 250 students. The finance plan in the district's CFP shows two capacity projects, one middle school and one high school, with an estimated cost of approximately \$75 million. The district's CFP indicates that it currently does not have any non-capacity projects.

The CFP documents the following impact fees: Single Detached = \$3,465; Multiunit = \$1,568.

Recommendation

The STRC recommends approval of the Tahoma School District's 2025 CFP and the proposed impact fees based on the following analysis:

KCC 21A.28.154.F.

In its review, the committee shall consider the following factors:

- 1. Whether the school district's forecasting system for enrollment projections has been demonstrated to be reliable and reasonable.**

Analysis: The district's enrollment forecasting system has proven to be reliable. A comparison of projections from 2014 to 2019 and 2019 to 2024 with actual enrollment data shows that the projections were within an acceptable margin of variance. For 2014, enrollment was underestimated by under one percent, while the 2019 projection was overestimated by 3.4 percent. For 2019 to 2024, the 2019 projection differed by less than one percent, and the 2024 projection was off by a little more than 1.5 percent.

Table 25. Tahoma School District Projected/Actual Student Enrollment

2019 - 2024		'19/'20	'20/'21	'21/'22	'22/'23	'23/'24	'24/'25
	Projected ⁵⁵	8,563	8,718	8,847	8,896	8,993	9,070
	Actual ⁵⁶	8,614	8,414	8,621	8,829	8,873	8,928
	% Difference	(0.6%)	3.5%	2.6%	0.8%	1.3%	1.6%
2014 - 2019		'14/'15	'15/'16	'16/'17	'17/'18	'18/'19	'19/'20
	Projected ⁵⁷	7,736	7,855	8,005	8,875	8,952	9,154
	Actual ⁵⁸	7,763	7,914	8,083	8,354	8,560	8,846
	% Difference	(0.4%)	(0.8%)	(0.9%)	5.9%	4.4%	3.4%

The district's enrollment forecasting system is reasonable. It uses a cohort survival method that predicts enrollment growth based on the progression of current students and considers population and housing growth within the district.

2. The historic levels of funding and voter support for bond issues in the school district.

Analysis: District voters approved a \$195 million bond measure in 2013 with a 69.5 percent approval rate. Voters have also approved two of three capital levies for district capital projects over the past decade. While a capital levy failed in 2018, voters passed a \$9.4 million capital levy in February 2024 with a 51.3 percent approval rate.

3. The inability of the school district to obtain the anticipated state funding or to receive voter approval for school district bond issues.

Analysis: The district has received State funding assistance for projects in the 2013 bond measure. The district anticipates it will receive State funding assistance for projects included in this six-year CFP.

4. In emergency or emergencies in the school district that required the closing of a school facility or facilities resulting in a sudden and unanticipated decline in districtwide capacity.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP does not identify any emergency school facility closures.

5. The standards of service set by school districts in similar types of communities. While community differences will be allowed, the standard established by the school district should be reasonably consistent with the standards set by other school districts in communities of similar socioeconomic profile.

⁵⁵ Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 to 2024, June 25, 2019.

⁵⁶ Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 to 2030, June 5, 2025. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024 to 2029, June 11, 2024. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2023 to 2028, June 13, 2023. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2022 to 2027, June 28, 2022. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2021 to 2026, June 22, 2021. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020 to 2025, July 14, 2020.

⁵⁷ Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2014 to 2019, July 29, 2014.

⁵⁸ Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2020 to 2025, July 14, 2020. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2019 to 2024, June 25, 2019. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2018 to 2023, June 26, 2018. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2017 to 2022, June 27, 2017. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2016 to 2021, June 28, 2016. Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2015 to 2020, July 28, 2015.

Analysis: The district's CFP indicates the district's general standard of service (students per classroom) is as follows:

Table 26. Tahoma School District Standard of Service				
Grade Level	K - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 12
Students Per Classroom	17	26	30	32

A review of the standard of service for all the districts the County collects impact fees for (Appendix A) shows the district's standard of service is reasonably consistent with the standards set by other districts.

6. The standards identified by the state concerning the ratios of certificated instructional staff to students.

Analysis: The district's ratio of certificated instructional staff (CIS) to students is 1 CIS:15.76 students. This is less than the State ratio of 1 CIS:21.7 students.

KCC 21A.28.154.G.

In the event that the school district's standard of service reveals a deficiency in its current facilities, the committee shall review the school district's capital facilities plan to determine whether the school district has identified all sources of funding necessary to achieve the standard of service.

Analysis: The district's 2025 CFP indicates that its existing elementary schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate existing and future students at its current standard of service. The district's existing middle and high schools do not have capacity to accommodate its future students. The CFP includes additional permanent capacity at the middle and high school categories; even with these improvements, the district will not have sufficient capacity to meet its current standard of service at the high school level.

However, the CFP states, "As needed, utilization factors may be changed and/or portable adjustments performed to address deficiencies." Consequently, students over capacity are accommodated in existing school facilities through the reconfiguration of existing space, use of special program space and existing portables, the creation of temporary spaces within the existing school facility, as well as adjusting utilization factors. Through its 2025 CFP, the district has identified future bonds as the funding source to complete its capacity projects, along with impact fees if related to growth capacity.

KCC 21A.28.154.H.

The school district in developing the financing plan component of the capital facilities plan shall plan on a six-year horizon and shall document that it took the following steps:

- 1. Establish a six-year financing plan, and propose the necessary bond issues and levies required by and consistent with that plan and as approved by the school board and consistent with RCW 28A.53.020, 84.52.052 and 84.52.056, as amended; and**

Analysis: The district's CFP establishes a six-year finance plan. The finance plan includes unsecured local funds, which may be a potential bond measure, State funding assistance, and impact fees to be used for capacity projects resulting from growth.

2. Apply to the state for funding, and comply with the state requirement for eligibility to the best of the school district's ability.

Analysis: The district anticipates it will receive State funding assistance for projects included in this six-year capital facilities plan. It is committed to complying with the State requirement for eligibility.

KCC 21A.28.154.I.

The committee may request that a school district review and resubmit its capital facilities plan, establish a different standard of service, or review its capacity for accommodating new students, or any combination thereof, under any of the following circumstances:

- 1. The standard of service established by the school district is not reasonable in light of the factors in subsection F. of this section;**
- 2. The committee finds that the school district's standard of service cannot reasonably be achieved in light of the secured financial commitments and the historic levels of support in the school district; or**
- 3. Any other basis that is consistent with this section.**

Analysis: The STRC reviewed the district's draft 2025 CFP prior to the June 6, 2025, STRC workshop session. The STRC did not request that the district review and resubmit its plan to establish a different standard or review its capacity for accommodating new students.

KCC 21A.28.154.J.

If a school district fails to submit its capital facilities plan for review by the committee, King County shall assume the school district has adequate capacity to accommodate growth for the following six years.

Analysis: The district submitted its 2025 draft CFP on May 9, 2025, and a final CFP on June 12, 2025.

VII. Conclusion

The STRC is required to consider several factors when assessing each district's proposed CFP and associated impact fees. These factors include the reliability of enrollment projections, the historical levels of funding and voter support for bond issues, a comparison of service standards and staffing ratios, and the availability of State funding assistance for capital projects. The STRC also considers whether districts have identified all necessary funding sources for deficiencies in service standards, and whether the districts have planned for bond issues, levies, and State funding assistance in the coming six years. In cases where a district fails to meet its service standard or secure sufficient funding, the STRC may request a review or revision of the plan.

For the 2025 CFP and impact fee update cycle, 13 school districts submitted plans to the STRC for review. After evaluating the submissions, the STRC did not request that any district revise its level of service standards or make changes to its plan, except for minor edits to improve internal consistency or clarity. Consequently, the STRC recommends approval of all the proposed CFPs and associated impact fees.

Before the next CFP update, the school impact fee methodology will be revised to comply with SB 5258, a law passed by the State Legislature during the 2023 session. The legislation reflects an intent to have lower impact fees for smaller housing units compared to larger ones within the same school district. The STRC report associated with the 2027 CFPs and impact fees will conform with the modified methodology and any new provisions incorporated into the approved County legislation.⁵⁹

VIII. Appendices

- A. Comparison of School District Level of Service Standards
- B. Proposed School Impact Fees – Effective January 1, 2026

⁵⁹ Adopted Ordinance 19965: [\[LINK\]](#)

Appendix A. Comparison of School District Level of Service (LOS) Standards

The following table provides a comparison of the level of service standards for each of the 13 school districts evaluated in this report, measured by number of students per classroom.

School District		Elementary School			Middle School		High School
Auburn⁶⁰	Grade Level	Pre-K	K - 3	4 - 5	6	7 - 8	9 - 12
	LOS	20	17	27	27	28.53	28.74
Enumclaw⁶¹	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5	6 - 8		9 - 12
	LOS	20		26	28		28
Federal Way⁶²	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5	6 - 12		
	LOS	18.9		25	26		
Fife⁶³	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5	6 - 12		
	LOS	17		17-25	25		
Highline⁶⁴	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5	6 - 8		9 - 12
	LOS	17		27	29		29
Issaquah⁶⁵	Grade Level	K - 5			6 - 8		9 - 12
	LOS	20			26		28
Kent⁶⁶	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5	6 - 8		9 - 12
	LOS	24		27	28		32
Lake Washington⁶⁷	Grade Level	K - 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	6 - 8		9 - 12
	LOS	20	23	27	30		32
Northshore⁶⁸	Grade Level	K - 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	6 - 12		
	LOS	24	26	27	27		

⁶⁰ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 through 2031, June 9, 2025.

⁶¹ Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 30, 2025.

⁶² Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2026, June 10, 2025.

⁶³ Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2031, July 28, 2025.

⁶⁴ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 2030, July 10, 2025.

⁶⁵ Issaquah School District, 20245 Capital Facilities Plan, June 10, 2025.

⁶⁶ Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2024-2025 through 2030-2031, June 2025.

⁶⁷ Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 23, 2025.

⁶⁸ Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 31, June 23, 2025.

School District		Elementary School				Middle School	High School
Renton⁶⁹	Grade Level	K - 1	2	3	4 - 5	6 - 12	
	LOS	21	22	24	29	29	
Riverview⁷⁰	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5		6 - 8	9 - 12
	LOS	17		24		27	27
Snoqualmie Valley⁷¹	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5		6 - 8	9 - 12
	LOS	17		27		27	30
Tahoma⁷²	Grade Level	K - 3		4 - 5		6 - 8	9 - 12
	LOS	17		26		30	32

⁶⁹ Renton School District 2025 Capital Facilities Plan, June 25, 2025

⁷⁰ Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025, June 24, 2025

⁷¹ Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024, June 5, 2025.

⁷² Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 to 2030, June 5, 2025.

Appendix B. Proposed School Impact Fees – Effective January 1, 2026

School District	Single Detached (\$)	Multiunit (\$)
Auburn ⁷³	8,003	\$5,000 ⁷⁴
Enumclaw ⁷⁵	12,619	5,000 ⁷⁶
Federal Way ⁷⁷	0	0
Fife ⁷⁸	5,595	1,747
Highline ⁷⁹	0	0
Issaquah ⁸⁰	0	0
Kent ⁸¹	0	0
Lake Washington ⁸²	7,277	170
Northshore ⁸³	16,550	3,023
Renton ⁸⁴	0	0
Riverview ⁸⁵	0	0
Snoqualmie Valley ⁸⁶	13,126.84	5,000 ⁸⁷
Tahoma ⁸⁸	3,465	1,568

⁷³ Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 through 2031, June 9, 2025.

⁷⁴ Per adopted Ordinance 19965 maximum impact fee for multiunit of \$5,000 per dwelling unit updates the proposed amount from the documented amount of \$8,966 from Auburn School District, Capital Facilities Plan.

⁷⁵ Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 30, 2025.

⁷⁶ Per adopted Ordinance 19965 maximum impact fee for multiunit of \$5,000 per dwelling unit updates the proposed amount from the documented amount of \$5,469 from Enumclaw School District, Capital Facilities Plan.

⁷⁷ Federal Way Public Schools, Capital Facilities Plan 2026, June 10, 2025.

⁷⁸ Fife School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2031, July 28, 2025.

⁷⁹ Highline School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 2030, July 10, 2025.

⁸⁰ Issaquah School District, 20245 Capital Facilities Plan, June 10, 2025.

⁸¹ Kent School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2024-2025 through 2030-2031, June 2025.

⁸² Lake Washington School District, Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2025-2030, June 23, 2025.

⁸³ Northshore School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 – 31, June 23, 2025.

⁸⁴ Renton School District 2025 Capital Facilities Plan, June 25, 2025.

⁸⁵ Riverview School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025, June 24, 2025.

⁸⁶ Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2024, June 5, 2025.

⁸⁷ Per adopted Ordinance 19965 maximum impact fee for multiunit of \$5,000 per dwelling unit updates the proposed amount from the documented amount of \$6,170.35 from Snoqualmie Valley School District, Capital Facilities Plan.

⁸⁸ Tahoma School District, Capital Facilities Plan 2025 to 2030, June 5, 2025.