

SURVEY RESPONSES: SCHOOL FACILITIES - FUTURE PLANS
KING COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH RURAL/URBAN STUDENTS
(Responses received November 2013)

	ENUMCLAW	ISSAQUAH	LAKE WASHINGTON	NORTHSHORE	RIVERVIEW	SNOQUALMIE VALLEY
<p>1. As it relates to school capacity needs, what changes to you anticipate with student population, programmatic requirements or needs, or other factors in your school district in the next 10-12 years?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Near 50% increase in student population projected from master planned developments in Black Diamond (15-20 years). New growth in City of Enumclaw and uninc. King County. Legislative directives requiring reduced K-3 class size (ESD already implements all-day K). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Issaquah Downtown Core redevelopment (estimated 3,500 new students over 20 years). Existing schools in affected area are at or above capacity currently. -Additional enrollment growth from cities of Issaquah, Renton, Bellevue, Newcastle, and Sammamish, especially as housing market continues recovery. -Legislative directives requiring all-day K (est. 38 new classrooms) by 2018 and reduced K-3 class size (est. 60 new classrooms). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated growth of 4,000 students by 2020 (estimated prior to commencement of 2013 school year; 2013 enrollment saw 800 new students). Expect the 4,000 student figure to increase. Growth in special needs population (impacts capacity/program facility space). Changing programmatic needs (STEM and other curriculum-driven initiatives). Code changes (zoning, Fire & Building) -Unknown factors: continued rebound of housing market; increased in-fill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated growth of 1,150 students by 2017, primarily at K-5; projected 13% increase in enrollment by 2025 Growth in special needs population (impacts capacity/program facility space). Legislative directives requiring all-day K and reduced K-3 class size will require additional elementary capacity. -Legislative directives for implementing highly capable program will require additional elementary and secondary capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected 18% increase in enrollment by 2025. Anticipated additional growth as housing market continues recovery. Legislative directives requiring all-day K and reduced K-3 class size will require additional elementary capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected annual growth of 1-2.5% over the next 10-12 years. Legislative directives requiring all-day K and reduced K-3 class size will require additional elementary capacity (between 50 to 60 classrooms, or two elementary schools)

			development; park & ride mixed use (Redmond Transfer Station/Kirkland Park & Ride)			
2. Based on this, how many new school buildings are you currently planning or thinking about? What types of buildings, and how soon do you expect them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Near term: expand existing elementary school, plan for new elementary school and new middle school. Long term: 2-3 additional elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 comprehensive high school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districtwide capacity needs. Short term: 4 new elementary schools Long term (to address Issaquah Downtown Core): 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 high school. No sites; no vacant land within the district inside the UGA. Need to identify approximately 155 total acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districtwide capacity needs. Within next 8 years: need minimum three new elementary schools, 1 new middle school, and 1 comprehensive high school or equivalent capacity (no sites). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade reconfiguration in 2017. New comprehensive (1,600 FTE) high school on district owned land (est. 2017). New middle or elementary school by fall 2018-19 (no site). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipate construction of a new K-8 school (no identified site). Additional needs will be assessed in subsequent updates to the district's Capital Facilities Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected need for at least two new elementary schools, plus 600-700 additional capacity at the secondary level. Currently have more than 30 portables serving the K-5 population. Need to either build a new middle school or a larger high school facility to address secondary capacity issues.
3. In what areas of your school district do you anticipate new schools will be needed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Diamond 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districtwide but focused in Issaquah Corridor, Sammamish Plateau, south end near Renton, Newcastle, and unincorporated King Co. Majority of near- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily in east and north sides of the district; however, significant growth in Kirkland requires a new elementary school in Kirkland (no site). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SE Snohomish County and/or N King County (northern territory of the District). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Near or in Duvall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next elementary is slated for Snoqualmie Ridge (district land). Second elementary slated for District-owned land adjacent to Twin Falls Middle School (outside

		<p>term growth expected in the Issaquah corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative directives affect capacity needs within and outside of the UGA. • District has 80 acres in the south end (outside UGA) of the district that it can no longer use due to County legislative action. Was planned for future middle school and elementary school (co-located) to address growth needs. 				<p>UGA, but approved for use by SSTF).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District land in Snoqualmie Ridge could be used for new middle school. • Challenges with longer term siting needs due to the large areas of floodplain within the district.
<p>4. What site size are you considering to accommodate your needs? Would you consider building a multi-story school on a smaller footprint? If</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school requires 40 acres. • Middle school requires 20-25 acres. • Elementary school requires 10-15 acres. • Multi-story buildings considered, but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school requires 45 acres. • Middle school requires 25 acres. • Elementary schools require 12 acres. • Site sizes are based on program standards and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school requires 40 acres. • Middle school requires 25 acres. • Elementary schools require 15 acres. • Choice school acreage is dependent on the level, capacity and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school requires 40 to 60 acres; proposing multi-story building. • Middle school requires 25 to 40 acres; most district middle schools are multi-story. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New K-8 school requires 20 acre site; may be multi-story. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School remodel would require a three story building elevated on stilts (floodplain issues and to provide adequate parking). • Middle school needs to be one story due to

not, why?	<p>programmatic needs and development regulations do not significantly reduce required acreage.</p>	<p>community expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District has several multi-story buildings. Some have smaller footprints. However, size of footprint is only one aspect of program needs. Also need to consider parking requirements, play/athletic fields, local development regulations. 	<p>program of the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District currently builds multi-story facilities. • -Site sizes are based on locally-driven programmatic requirements, local and state code and safety requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary schools require 15 to 25 acres; student safety, student management, and teacher sight lines present concerns with building multi-story schools for K-5. 		<p>restrictions made by Snoqualmie to minimize school visibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considering multi-story elementary schools at this time due to cost, community, and safety-related factors (in addition to local zoning restriction requiring minimal visibility).
<p>5. Is it possible that any of your anticipated school buildings could be located near existing public facilities owned by city(ies) in your district (such that there could be shared use opportunities)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May make sense in certain circumstances. However, different services and different security needs. • Land scarcity may require acquisition of green spaces, parklands for school buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have been in contact with our cities on this issue. They have no solutions for us (but understand our predicament). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Anticipated school sites are not located near an existing public facility. • In the past, we have shared/built co-existing buildings (City of Bothell). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No known opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No known opportunities; not enough land in areas of identified sites as they are in fully developed areas and most are in the floodway. • Have had preliminary discussions with City of Snoqualmie regarding development of new transportation facility next to

						City's storm water treatment plant.
6. What challenges/obstacles are there in your district in locating land for new schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned school sites secured by a school mitigation agreement; however, recent King County legislative directives affect three of the sites but direct King County to work with the district and the MPD developer to identify alternative/modified sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District recently worked with a broker on an extensive site search. Result: only one site identified within the UGA for a school, at a cost of over \$1M/acre. Cost is significant obstacle for district taxpayers. -Location of available sites is critical for purposes of serving attendance areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District recently worked with a broker on an extensive site search. Result: no vacant land within UGA with acreage appropriate for siting school. --In one case where commercial property may have been viable, told by city that school would never be permitted on that property (loss of property tax concern). -In past, where property has been located within UGA, cost has been prohibitive for taxpayers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District recently conducted an extensive site search. Result: found lack of available, usable and buildable parcels within the UGA. Cost of land is prohibitive. Federal, State, local, and neighborhood restrictions/regulations prohibit or limit viability of school construction on some sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of level land in the district. Result is that limited amount of suitable building sites are prohibitively expensive. District can't compete with developers for limited available land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floodway restrictions and local zoning regulations result in lack of adequate land within the UGA.
7. In the past, have the County and city(ies) in your school district worked with you to help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No previous assistance in locating school sites. Particularly need King County's assistance to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No previous assistance in locating school sites. Most helpful action would be to set aside land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District is in regular contact with all three cities in district boundaries. Cities agree that there is a lack of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District contacted County and city for assistance in most recent property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No previous assistance in locating school sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No previous assistance in locating school sites. Would appreciate help

<p>locate property to build schools? If not, would this be helpful? What type of collaboration would be most helpful to you?</p>	<p>address item identified in Question 6 above.</p>	<p>for schools or to provide the corresponding funding needed to acquire sites within the UGA.</p>	<p>available land for schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met with King County and are working to determine if certain land use modifications are possible to site a school in Redmond Ridge UPD Commercial Area. 	<p>search, but no assistance provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would help if County/city(ies) worked with districts, particularly on relaxing mitigation requirements (roads, noise, wetlands, etc.) that lead to larger school site requirements. 		<p>locating property, particularly because district is simply responding to residential development permitted by the cities and the County.</p>
<p>8. In order to meet the requirement to build schools within the UGA, would flexibility in state, county, and local standards be useful to you in siting and building new schools? What types of flexibility would be helpful in siting and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See answers to Questions 6 & 7 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School districts are constitutionally obligated to serve all students within boundaries. Attendance areas and boundaries pre-date the GMA and cross the UGA. Schools are an essential public facility needed to support enrollment growth permitted by local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School districts need flexibility to site schools in the areas where, based on student residences and defined service areas, the schools are most needed. Need to recognize efficiencies in school planning and delivery. In alternative, would be helpful if school districts could use sites bordering or near 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater flexibility in Federal, State, and local standards. Create incentives (e.g. increased state match or mitigation relief) for school districts who build inside the UGA or with multi-storied buildings. Minimize or cap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relief from rigid standards on where school districts can build schools. Relief from standards that increase site requirements (mitigation requirements, building code requirements). Recognition that school districts have limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater flexibility in local zoning for school siting in terms of location and design (e.g., allow taller buildings). Greater flexibility to locate affordable sites located within defined service areas. Set aside land

<p><i>building new schools?</i></p>		<p>jurisdictions. Need to provide best value to taxpayers. School districts should be provided with flexibility to site schools in areas that effectively and efficiently serve student enrollment needs.</p>	<p>UGA (but on rural side). Would provide for financial feasibility and responsible utilization of taxpayer dollars. Would have minimal impact on rural area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would help if school sites were set aside as jurisdictions plan density increases as a part of comprehensive planning. • A hard school concurrency requirement may be helpful. 	<p>mitigation requirements (road/traffic, noise, wetland, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize overlapping agency reviews. • Create incentives for public agency's cooperation with building developments. 	<p>taxpayer funds to fulfill constitutional obligations and need to site schools in a cost-effective manner.</p>	<p>now or permit schools on lands near or bordering the UGA boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater flexibility in state and local building codes/fire codes related to school facilities (e.g., avoid impractical/unnecessary requirements that result in larger and more expensive schools).
--	--	---	---	--	--	--