



Study Session of the Board of Directors

Steilacoom High School 54 Sentinel Drive Steilacoom, WA 98388

1/10/2018 06:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER (Action)
 - a. Pledge of Allegiance
 - b. Roll Call
 - c. Approval of Agenda
2. TOPIC FOR BOARD DISCUSSION
 - a. School Resource Officer Program Report (Discussion)
Presenter: Chief Rodriguez and Officer Hamrick
 - b. Review of Board Operating Protocol (Discussion)
[School Board Operating Protocol DRAFT.pdf \(p. 2\)](#)
 - c. Long-Range Capital Facility Plan Meeting - January 22, 2018 (Discussion)
Presenter: Jim Brittain
[Steilacoom Long Range Capital Facility Planning DRAFT.pdf \(p. 6\)](#)
3. ADJOURNMENT (Action)

Steilacoom Historical School District No. 1

Board of Directors' Operating Protocol

To be Adopted January 24, 2018

The most effective way to operate and supervise a dynamic, growing school district is through close cooperation between the school board, the superintendent, and the administrative leadership team. Each group plays a different role, and each role is essential to the success of the entire system (staff and students). In order to allow each group to compliment and ensure the success of the others, there must be agreement on some philosophical ideas and practical ways of working together to achieve the common goal – quality education programs for each student. To achieve, within the legal and financial limits of the District, quality education programs for each student, the Board pledges to strive toward excellence in performance and expects the same from each individual who works in Steilacoom Historical School District.

Board directors and administrators have an obligation to provide educational leadership. The public expects the best in planning, decision-making, communication, and educational expertise. However, all decisions and policies of the Board-Administration Team must be gauged and tested against two fundamental beliefs: schools are for kids; and schools belong to the people.

For the purpose of enhancing teamwork among members of the Board and between the Board and the Administrative Team, we, the members of the Steilacoom School District Board of Directors, do hereby publicly commit ourselves collectively and individually to the following operating protocol:

PRINCIPLES FOR BOARD-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONS

The following philosophical ideas, operating principles, and behaviors, when adhered to by all, will create an open, productive environment for a team approach to school leadership:

1. Positive Approach

Each member of the team is charged with the responsibility of working with the team to find the best way to meet the needs of the students and staff. An open, positive, and problem solving atmosphere toward designing, implementing, and assessing plans to achieve the goals of the organization is critical.

2. Judgment and Trust

To develop an effective team process, each group must support and cooperate with team members, collectively and individually.

3. Loyalty and Disagreement

Cooperation, support, and loyalty do not mean there will be agreement on every issue. Dialogue, divergent thinking, and debate will encourage the best decisions. To clarify this principle, a few ground rules must be covered:

- Each team member has the responsibility for being loyal to the District, to each member of the team, and to the primary goal -- a quality education for every child.
- Board Directors should not be contacting employees of the District on operational issues. Questions about operations, direction, etc., should be directed to the Superintendent.
- Board Directors are encouraged to offer praise for employees, but criticism must be channeled through the Superintendent's office.
- Debate the issues, not one another. Avoid personal slurs and snide comments.
- Information about employees, negotiations, and other confidential areas discussed in executive session will remain completely confidential. Information given in confidence, particularly when planning and exploring alternatives must also remain confidential. Team members should state in advance whatever they consider to be confidential information.
- When Board Directors or the superintendent find themselves in disagreement with another team member, a one-to-one meeting with that person should be arranged to resolve the disagreement. Once resolved, the disagreement will remain a private matter.
- Discussion at meetings and debate over issues should be open and honest. Once a final team decision is reached, each member has the responsibility to support the decision.
- Agendas must be open and on the table for meaningful dialogue to occur. Information upon which decisions are to be made, with accompanying alternatives, will be given to the Board in a timely manner so that appropriate input and analysis can take place prior to the time of the decision. Surprises at meetings are counterproductive.

4. Accountability to Community

The School Board, Superintendent, and administrative team are accountable to the public for the decisions made and for the quality of their work. Responsibility to the community is demonstrated by listening to them and by using effective systems of gathering information as assessment.

5. Communication

Effective interpersonal communication requires a healthy communication climate with high levels of trust and respect for individuals and for the mission of providing a quality education for all students. To achieve this, messages must be open, straightforward, and honest.

- The Superintendent and the Board will make deliberate attempts to share information and data with all team members. Team members shall utilize the chain of command as outlined by District policy/procedures.
- When an individual Board Director is contacted by a staff or community member, each member has agreed to the following procedures:
 - a. Hear out the individual's concern.
 - b. Ask if the issue has been discussed with the person immediately responsible.
 - c. Express concern about the issue and a desire to assist in resolution, while reinforcing the need to resolve the issue at the immediate local level. If unsuccessful, proceed to the next level(s) of responsibility.
- Only the Superintendent, his/her designee, or a Board-designated representative may contact the District's negotiator, should one be used, on current negotiations. If a Board Director feels a need to talk to District counsel or the negotiator, he or she is to contact the Superintendent who will arrange for all meetings. The Board president may contact the District's legal counsel in reference to the Superintendent's contract.
- It is important to keep the Superintendent and other Board members informed of unusual happenings as quickly as they occur.
- The Superintendent is responsible for communicating official district operational positions to the media. There will also be occasions when the Board president communicates the official District position. Board members may certainly state personal positions; as long as they make it known they are not speaking for the Board or the District.
- The Board will emphasize planning, policy making, and public relations rather than becoming involved in the daily operations of the schools.
- After reviewing the agenda, Board members agree to ask questions when clarification is needed so that the Board meetings can proceed smoothly and efficiently. Board members can also contact the Superintendent to discuss issues prior to the meetings. Members may also request addition of items to the agenda prior to its adoption.

- Each Board member will become conversant with matters on which the Board acts, reviewing all materials prior to meetings. They will attend essential Board training and inform themselves about important issues through individual readings.
- All personnel complaints and criticisms received by the Board or its individual members will be directed to the Superintendent.
- Members agree to operate as a team and employ appropriate group problem solving techniques. They agree to focus on issues rather than personalities, to propose viable alternatives to problems, to disagree constructively and communicate with each other in a respectful manner.

Signed this 24th day of January 2018;

Bob Forbes, Board Chair

Jason Pierce, Vice Chair

Kathi Weight, Superintendent

Steve Schenk, Board Director

Sam Scott, Board Director

Jennifer McDonald, Legislative Representative



The best education for every student.

STEILACOOM

Historical School District No. 1

Long Range Capital Facility Plan 2018

DRAFT

Long Range Capital Facility Plan – Summary Report

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction & Background.....	X
II.	Board Charge to the Committee.....	X
III.	Committee Membership, Organization, and Timeline.....	X
IV.	Summary of the Work	X
	A. Committee Vision Statement	X
	B. Educational Standards	X
	C. Identification of Major Facility Improvement Needs	X
	D. OSPI Study & Survey – Inventory of Facilities & Existing Conditions School Profiles	
	E. District Maintenance Issues	X
	F. Data Collection	X
	• Student Enrollment	
	• Demographic Data	
	• Housing & Growth Projections	
	G. Funding Considerations	X
	• OSPI Construction Assistance Eligibility	
	• District Bond Debt Capacity	
	• Funding Scenarios	
	H. Community / School Priorities & Values	X
	I. Committee Recommendations	X
	• Facility Improvement Components	
	• Phasing Recommendation & Timeline	
	• Phase I – Capital Bonding Recommendation	
	o Project –	
	▪ Description	
	▪ Programming & Space Allocation	
	o Bond Amount	
	o Election Date	
V.	Committee Chair’s Message	X
VI.	Appendices	X

SECTION CONTENTS

Section X Introduction and Background

This section provides a brief description of the chronology of events surrounding Steilacoom Historical School District's facility planning interest and key conditions central to a successful facility improvement plan as well as local priorities.

DRAFT

Introduction & Background

In the fall of 2016, a meeting was held with the School Board and Superintendent Weight to begin a discussions regarding the development of a comprehensive facility improvement plan for the Steilacoom Historical School District. The discussion focused on the Steilacoom High School and the property the district owns, but the Superintendent preferred to approach the issue of district's facilities and land usage from a total district wide perspective, engage community participation and feedback throughout the process, with an outcome that would provide direction for years to come.

At the January 2017 Board meeting, a participatory and transparent process outlined by representatives of Erickson and McGovern Architects aligned with the Superintendent Weight's vision for developing a plan.

Following a February board presentation of a proposed Long Range Capital Facility Plan (Plan) process, Superintendent Dr. Weight proposed that we move forward with a Plan. The district would develop a preliminary Plan in preparation in establishing a community based committee. The committee would start with the district's preliminary Plan in January 2018.

The Plan would be developed with representatives from the community and staff to address the district needs and to be consistent with Board Policy No. 6900, Facilities Planning. Key elements within the charge include:

- Thoughtful direction for current and future planning
- Identification of major maintenance projects
- Consideration of changing demographics as well as instructional and curricular changes
- Membership is to reflect a cross-section of the community and staff
- The process is to transparent, participatory and communicates the work in a timely manner

On January 22, 2018, Dr. Weight opened the first meeting of the District's long-range facility planning committee. The committee was joined by Ray Mow and Steve Storaasli, Erickson and McGovern Architects, who provided technical assistance throughout the process.

Following over a year of study, analysis, feedback, and consensus building the Committee finalized its recommendations on December 2019. The comprehensive Plan was presented to the Board of Directors on January 2019.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX

Superintendent's Long Range Capital Facility Planning Committee

Prior to constituting a citizens' based facility planning committee the Superintendent approved the Committee consistent with Board Policy No. 6900. Reflected in the Board's interest to have a comprehensive plan that will extend for ten to twenty years. The Plan was to specify specific projects, a timeline for those projects, initial cost estimates, and funding options.

DRAFT

LONG RANGE CAPITAL FACILITY PLAN

Committee Responsibility

Consistent with Board Policy No. 6900 – Management Support / Facility Planning, this committee is charged with the development of a district wide Plan. The Plan is a document which defines thoughtful direction for buildings, grounds, and undeveloped properties of the District. The Plan will provide recommended direction for future decisions such as renovation, construction, demolition and sale of buildings or land, or decisions specific to district property. Major maintenance projects should also be identified. Development of the Plan should focus on anticipated topics and issues that are broader than facility concerns alone. These include demographic changes, rapidly changing instructional and curricular needs, and general education requirements based upon the vision of the District.

The Plan is to specify recommended projects, the timing and sequencing of the projects, their estimated costs and funding source(s). The Plan should extend for a minimum of ten years to a maximum of twenty years with scheduled updates every three to five years. Past district Facility Master Plans will be used as a reference.

The committee is to be comprised of a cross-section of school personnel, parents and community members. Opportunity for municipal agencies and civic organizations to be represented on the committee is encouraged. The committee will develop, utilize and implement a planning process that is transparent, participatory and communicates effectively in a timely manner to all community members and district staff. The committee is to meet monthly starting in January 2018 and into the 2018-2019 School Year. It is to provide opportunity for public input which will be considered in generating the final Plan. The committee shall hold its first meeting in January 2018 and is to present its final report and recommendation to the Steilacoom Historical School District Board of Directors in January 2019.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XXX

Committee Membership, Organization, and Timeline

This section includes committee membership, committee leadership, consultant support, and a master schedule outlining the process.

DRAFT

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP, ORGANIZATION, & TIMELINE

Committee Membership

Community Members:

Amy Burgess, DuPont Resident
Starlene Enfield, Steilacoom Resident
Mike Miller, SHS Principal
Gary Yoho, Chloe Clark Principal
Colby Davis, SHS Teacher
Blair Suek, SHS Teacher
Brian Kirby, Cherrydale Teacher

Organization

Planning Team Membership

School Board: Bob Forbes, School Board Chair
Sam Scott, School Board Position

District: Dr. Kathi Weight, Superintendent
Jim Brittain, Chief of Finance and Operations

Building Administrators and Staff:

Consultants: Ray Mow, Erickson McGovern
Steve Storaasli, Erickson McGovern

Committee Meetings – 12 monthly committee meetings were held January 2018 through December 2018. Refer to district master file for agendas and minutes for each committee meeting.

Facility Tours – Committee members toured all district buildings, grounds, and property.

Community Input – Several surveys focusing on facility improvement issues were conducted during the long-range facility planning process and two community forums were conducted.

Board Presentations – Facility Planning

January 2018 – Long Range Capital Facility Planning
March 2018 – LRFP Condition
May 2018 – LRFP Financial Data
June 2018 – LRFP Enrollment and Demographics
August 2018 – LRFP Technology
November 2018 – LRFP Draft Plan Board Study Session
January 2019 – LRFP Final Presentation

Timeline

Refer to Appendices for master schedule of timeline and activities. This master schedule was prepared consistent with the Superintendent Long Range Capital Facility Plan Committee completion date.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX

Summary Report

The following components of the Executive Summary reflect key long range facility planning topics and products reviewed and developed by the Committee. Additional material presented to and reviewed (e.g. meeting agendas and minutes) by the Committee can be found in the complete file located in the superintendent's office.

DRAFT

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

Facility Planning Vision Statement

The Committee's Facility Planning Vision Statement reflects the priorities and values held by members of the Committee as well as those perceived to be important to the Steilacoom, DuPont and Anderson Island communities. The Committee went through a process of development, refinement, and final approval. It has been used as an important reference when evaluating a number of recommendations to ensure alignment and consistency.

FACILITY PLANNING VISION STATEMENT

Current District Guiding References

Vision

Success Through Aligned, Intentional, and Meaningful Programs

Board Goal #1

Project and prepare for future facility needs including successfully funding changes and specific facilities plans

Facility Planning Committee Vision Statement – Our Future

For the past 137 years skilled educators and staff have dedicated their time, energy, and talents to deliver to Steilacoom, DuPont and Anderson Island's youth a quality educational program. In response to those efforts over time, the citizens of these communities have given generously to support all aspects of the educational program, and in particular the District's facilities. Through the years those facilities have been modernized, expanded, and built new to address perceived student needs. It is the desire of this committee to address current facility needs as well as plan for the future, and to do so with these guiding values:

- All students will have a common school/grade experience;
- Safety and security issues are of the highest priority;
- Improvement efforts are developed in a manner that is both fiscally responsible and cost effective given the best information available at the time;
- To the degree possible, all schools will provide equitable educational spaces that support the ability to adapt to changing instructional needs;
- Because Steilacoom Historical School District buildings belong to the community they will be designed and operated in a warm and welcoming manner for students, staff, and visitors as well as accessibility to specialized areas of interest to the community; and,
- While schools must be sustainable over time, proactive planning for modernization, expansion, or replacement is to be proactive and ongoing.

With these values as a guide, the Committee visualizes implementing a plan that, over time, will influence district facilities by becoming more common in quality and efficiency, mitigating outstanding major maintenance issues, addressing current safety and security concerns, and planning for the future.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XXXX Educational Standards

School facility and student capacity needs are dictated by the types and amounts of space required to accommodate the District's adopted educational program. The educational program standards which typically drive facility space needs include:

- grade configuration
- optimum facility size
- class size
- educational program offerings
- classroom utilization
- scheduling requirements

The State Legislature's implementation of requirements for full-day kindergarten and reduced K-3 class size also impact school capacity and educational program standards. The District has implemented full-day kindergarten classes. The District anticipates implementation of reduced K-3 class sizes in the 2018-2019 school year. However, the details of implementation are still being reviewed.

Special programs offered by the District at specific school sites include, but are not limited to:

- Special education - Preschool
- Special education – Resource room and self-contained
- Special education – 18-21 year old transitional program
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Title I
- Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
- Career and Technical Education (CTE)
- Technology Education
- Highly capable
- Music education
- Computer Labs
- Birth to Three Programs

Variations in student capacity among schools are often a result of what special or nontraditional programs are offered at specific schools. These special programs require classroom space which can reduce the permanent capacity of some of the buildings housing these programs.

District educational program standards will undoubtedly change in the future as a result of changes in the program year, special programs, class sizes, grade span configurations, and use

of new technology, as well as other physical aspects of school facilities. The school capacity inventory will be reviewed periodically and adjusted for any changes to the educational program standards.

The District educational program standards which directly affect school capacity are outlined below for the elementary, middle, and high school grade levels.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Class size for grades	State Funding Level	District's Standard of Service
Pre-K	17	20
K	17	20
1	17	20
2 - 3	17	20
4 - 5	27	20

- Music and physical education specialist time will require separate classroom spaces.
- Optimum design capacity for new elementary schools is 500-550 students. However, actual capacity of individual schools may vary depending on the educational programs offered.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Class size for grades	State Funding Level	Standard of Service Level
6	27	25
7 - 8	28.53	25
9-12	28.74	25

As a result of scheduling conflicts for student programs, the need for specialized rooms for certain programs, and the need for teachers to have a work space during planning periods, it is not possible to achieve 100% utilization of all regular teaching stations throughout the day.

Nontraditional educational opportunities will be provided in classrooms designated as follows: Special Education Classrooms; and Program Specific Classrooms (i.e. music, art, science, physical education, technology education, Career and Technical Education programs).

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XXXX

School Capacity

Steilacoom Historical School District No. 1 has elected to define its “level of service” (LOS) in terms of each student’s share of the District’s permanent school facilities, with reference to the District’s standard for average class load and identification of classrooms available for regular instruction.

Steilacoom Historical School District No. 1 has adopted an organization that houses kindergarten through fifth grade in elementary schools, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade in middle schools, and ninth through twelfth grade in high schools.

The District has adopted a traditional calendar beginning in early September and ending in mid-June, and a traditional daily schedule with academic classes beginning between 7:35 a.m. and 9:05 a.m. and ending mid-afternoon. Although the District continues to study alternate organizations, calendars, and schedules, the District believes the adopted organization is educationally sound and reflects community values.

The capacity for each facility is established by multiplying the regular classrooms available by the District’s standard for average class load (the “Standard of Service”). Spaces used for special program needs are included in the definition of regular classrooms. Core facilities and special use facilities are compared to classroom capacity to confirm that facility capacity is not limited by limitations in core facilities.

The District’s educational program includes individual and small group work, as well as full class activities.

The District has set minimum educational standard of service based on several criteria.

Exceeding these minimum standards will trigger significant changes in program delivery. If there are more than 20 students per classroom in a majority of K-5 classrooms, or more than 25 students in a majority of grade 6-12 classrooms, the minimum standards have not been met. For purposes of this determination, the term “classroom” includes special education classrooms or special program classrooms (i.e. computer labs, art rooms, chorus and band rooms, spaces used for physical education and other special program areas).

The capacity for each facility is established by multiplying the classrooms available by the District’s standard for average class load (the “Standard of Service”). Core facilities and special use facilities are compared to classroom capacity to confirm that facility capacity is not limited by limitations in core facilities.

High Number	Standard of Service
High School	25 students/classroom
Middle School	25 students/classroom
Elementary	20 students/classroom

Using the Standard of Service and updated information regarding classroom utilization, the

District's current facility capacity is as follows:

Facility	Area (SF)	Actual Building Classrooms	Capacity (Classroom Per Student FTE)	Actual September 2017 Enrollment
Steilacoom High School	133,374	42	1050	1050
Pioneer Middle School	103,128	37	925	769
Saltar's Point Elementary*	55,235	25	625	492
Anderson Island Elementary	11,366	2	40	35
Cherrydale Elementary	42,083	22	440	382
Chloe Clark Elementary	59,333	31	620	576
Total Elementary			1,725	1,485

The level of service is dictated by the amount of space required to accommodate the District's adopted educational program. The LOS will change as the District changes its educational program and it must be reviewed and modified periodically.

Long Range Capital Facility Committee - The following information and possible recommendations will be discussed and analyzed by the Long Range Capital Facility Committee to determine impact to the district on establishing the Long Range Capital Facility Plan. The recommendations are only draft assumptions.

Grade Configuration – The District believes the organization of grade levels is best influenced by the number of transitions between schools.

Recommended Organization

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Anderson Island Elementary | Grades Preschool – 5 th |
| • Cherrydale and Chloe Clark Elementary | Grades Preschool – 3 rd |
| • Saltar's Point Elementary | Grades 4 th – 5 th |
| • Pioneer Middle School | Grades 6 th – 8 th |
| • Steilacoom High School | Grades 9 th – 12 th |

Note: Anderson Island Elementary is a remote and necessary school. The district received \$11,536 in the additional funding for the 2016-2017 school year.

School Size

rd
Rec
om
me
nde
d
Sta
nda

- At elementary level, school size to accommodate grade level teams of 7 to 10 teams.
- Design options to address potential growth should not exceed school size beyond 500 students.

School Site Recommended Standard

- Location
 - Acreage:
 - Elementary – 5 acres, plus one additional acre per 100 students
 - Secondary – 10 acres, plus one additional acre per 100 students
- Note – State now emphasizes that school sites will be of sufficient size to provide for the health & safety of the school enrollment as well educational program needs.
- Playground & Sports Fields (Including OMS)
 - Parking for Staff & Visitors

Class Size Targets - To the degree possible given program decisions, facility limitations, staffing availability, and financial resources district learning spaces should be designed for the following targets:

Recommended Standard –

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Size</u>
• Pre - Kindergarten	12
• K – 3 rd	17
• 4 th – 5 th	27
• 6 th – 12 th	32

Program Space – Classroom size and school size program space calculations vary depending on program requirements. Student classroom space and school capacity will be guided by the following:

Recommended Standard –

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| Student Classroom Spaces | Minimum of 960 Sq. Ft. |
| Special Program Spaces | Program Specific |
| • Life Skills Rooms | |
| • Separate Music Program | |
| • Auxiliary Special Services | |
| • Auxiliary Learning Spaces | |
| • HS/MS CTE Programs | |
| • Preschool Components | |
| Sufficient Classrooms to Accommodate Class Configuration | |
| • Based on Age | |
| • Divided Playground Spaces Preschool separate from other elementary grades | |

Auxiliary Areas

Recommended Minimum

- Cafeteria - Common Areas
- Performance - Multiple Use
- Community Use Storage
- Gymnasium - Locker Rooms (Age Appropriate)
- Full Kitchen/Modernize/All Schools

Health, Safety & Security

Recommended Standard

- Entrance Visibility
- Exterior Access Control Communication
- Interior Access Control
- VOIP (Voice Over Internet Protocol)
- Sufficient Water & Restrooms
- Stations Locker Rooms
- Secure Lockers & Showers

DRAFT

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

Identification of Major Facility Improvement Needs

This section contains a summary of two facility evaluation perspectives. The first is a summary of the work completed by Erickson McGovern Architects contracted to complete a formal evaluation using the Office of Superintendent Public Instruction (OSPI) Inventory and Condition of Schools (ICOS). The complete Study & Survey can be found in the superintendent's office for review. Second, a set of school profiles for each of the four schools prepared by each principal from a user perspective.

IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR FACILITY IMPROVEMENT NEEDS

OSPI Study & Survey – Inventory of Facilities & Existing Conditions

Anderson Island Elementary

<u>Square Footage</u>		<u>Built</u>
Multipurpose Building	2,741 SF	1981
Playshed	2,400 SF	1981
Multipurpose Portable	2,865 SF	2006
Portable A	1,680 SF	1991
Portable B	1,680 SF	1991

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Multipurpose Building	92.91%	Good Condition
Playshed	99.19%	Excellent Condition
Multipurpose Portable	90.00%	Good Condition
Portable A	99.83%	Excellent Condition

Cherrydale Primary

<u>Square Footage</u>		<u>Built</u>
Main Building	38,483 SF	1961
Playshed	3,600 SF	1961

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	88.94%	Good Condition
Playshed	90.00%	Good Condition

Chloe Clark Elementary

<u>Square Footage</u>		<u>Built</u>
Main Building	59,333 SF	2001

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	91.91%	Good Condition
---------------	--------	----------------

Saltar's Point Elementary

<u>Square Footage</u>		<u>Built</u>
Main Building	53,135 SF	1999
Modular Building	2,240 SF	2013

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	93.47%	Good Condition
Modular Building	97.99	Excellent Condition

Pioneer Middle SchoolSquare FootageBuilt

Main Building	103,128 SF	2008
---------------	------------	------

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	97.99%	Excellent Condition
---------------	--------	---------------------

Steilacoom High SchoolSquare FootageBuilt

Main Building	132,414 SF	1981
Athletic Storage	1,400 SF	2007
Greenhouse	960 SF	2005
Field Press Box	170 SF	2009

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	83.96%	Fair Condition
Athletic Storage		Not Required
Greenhouse	92.60%	Good Condition
Field Press Box	95.29%	Excellent Condition

District Administration CenterSquare FootageBuilt

Main Building	10,606 SF	1917
PDC	4,049	1999

OSPI – Information & Condition of Schools – Assessment

Main Building	81.99%	Fair Condition
PDC		Not Required
Bus Transportation		Not Required
510 Chambers Street		Not Required

School Profiles – Principals of each school facility were asked to prepare a school profile that included school size, grade configuration, staffing and a list from a user’s perspective of the facility’s attributes and challenges. Listed below are key challenges identified by each principal. See Appendices for full report.

Steilacoom High School – Prepared by Mike Miller, Principal

Key Attributes and Challenges:

- Not enough Locker Room Space
 - (Storage for equipment in the gym areas)
- No Facilities for Officials
- Several points of entry into building that are not secured
 - (no one point entry, too many entry points)
- Covered stands, expanded Visitors seating
- No space for new or some existing programs
 - (Lab space for Science)
- Sound system not working properly
- New appliances for staff room (Fridge, Dishwasher)
- Getting our Sports facilities more secure

Pioneer School – Prepared by JoAnne Fernandes, Principal

Key Attributes and Challenges:

- Cafeteria is overcrowded and being used for a classroom. For ease of clean up and safety for students large tables with seats attached (fold –up type) would be helpful.
- Compass letters need to be placed over exits (align letters to that of the Police maps).
- No space for new programs.
- Outside field areas have no communications with building (only two way radios).
- Fastpitch backstop is crumbling
- Outside landscape needs to be cleaned up.
- Garden areas between wings are not being maintained and should be improved.
- Downspout gutters are not working causing possible erosion to many areas around the building.
- Football/Soccer field is overused and needs to be shut down every winter. Artificial turf would be an answer.
- ELA classes are lacking basic technology for student work. Laptops/Chromebooks may be an answer.
- Storage cage in the GYM needs a fenced in top. Items have disappeared over the summer time from people climbing over the cage.
- Front office area greeting station is a bit tight for our asb secretary. The area should be rethought.

Key Attributes:

- Building in good physical condition.
- Copiers that are reliable and fast.
- 1:1 Chromebook devices in third grade
- Adequate play structures for our population (added one 2015-16).
- We have enough classroom spaces for each general education classroom for this school year.
- Updated security system with cameras working well.
- Phone system updated and a real plus.
- Classroom technology working well (Smart boards; doc cameras, teacher computers).
- Landscaping/tree trimming that was done for safety/security reasons makes visibility much better all-around the school

Key Challenges:

- No space for growth.
- Doubling-up and tripling-up in office spaces.
- SPED program sharing space, multiple groups running at the same time with no other options as to alternative areas where groups can be held.
- Hi-Cap and Preschool sharing classroom space this year. Next year Hi-Cap and library will share space.
- Would like to move towards 1:1 devices for each child to utilize district tech programs and software.
- Hand dryer in one student bathroom missing (grade one boys' restroom).
- PA system-volume level doesn't match in old and new wing
- Sink in nurse's restroom; trickles water and never gets hot (can it be replaced?)
- Community Room PA system aging and not working at times (this is something used daily)
- Areas of the exterior of the building (esp. Phase 1) need attention (e.g. wood exposed, significant paint peeling).
- Overall landscaping needs to be examined and cleaned up – esp. in the front of the school.

Anderson Island Elementary – Prepared by Susan Greer, Principal

Key Attributes and Challenges:

- Surveillance/Cameras – could use more for field
- Driveway/parking area - -cracks; parking on field – puddling
- Needed outside PA system
- Bell system

Cherrydale Primary – Prepared by Ryan Douglas, Principal

Key Attributes and Challenges:

- Shared spaces for all music programs
- Sound system is old and doesn't always work properly
- Area not safe from intruders (need back parking lot fence) and old surveillance equipment.
- Playfield doesn't drain properly.
- Take down some of the trees new old military road.
- Move valet gate closer to field and make it a gate that would block play equipment from rolling onto Old Military Road.
- Overall lack of available parking.
- At this point we have all classroom spaces occupied. Space may start to be a concern if our enrollment continues to increase.
- Repave under covered area.
- Update playground equipment.
- Paint exterior and interior.

Saltar's Point Elementary – Prepared by Alex Clausen, Principal

Key Attributes:

- Modern facility with preventative maintenance and immediate repair plan
- Covered play area
- Large, functional library
- Functional classrooms with wet areas and cubbies
- Adequate classroom built-in storage
- SMART board technology in every classroom
- Functioning FM system in each classroom
- Music room and stage
- Amphitheater
- Large play field
- Welcoming front office design
- Space for specialists and support staff
- Modern modular unit

Challenges:

- Lack of parking for large events and field trips
- In need of updated PA system so all areas have access to PA announcements
- Outdated playground equipment
- Classroom furniture is failing and too large for student centered learning. The need is for different kinds of seating
- Gym is also used as cafeteria. Difficult to schedule PE when lunch is going on.
- HVAC system needs to be updated as it is inconsistent with temperature / Windows that open
- New paint in main building areas
- Remove automatic hand dryers as they are incredibly disruptive due to noise

- Permanently block the birds from nesting in the gym eaves
- Replace current fluorescent bulbs with bulbs that are less glaring
- Replace main office counters
- Reconfigure attached furniture in administrative offices
- Carpet in hallways would eliminate disruptive noise and slips

DRAFT

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

District Maintenance Issues

District staff have compiled a list of prioritized maintenance issues for facilities district wide. The accompanying list will be reviewed annually by district officials to identify priority projects that can be funded with general fund resources and those requiring alternative funding support.

DRAFT

MAINTENANCE ISSUES AND TIMELINE

Examples only

Maintenance	Location	Est. Start
• Intercom Systems • Parking Lot Lighting • Carpet / Flooring • Storage • HVAC Controls & Equipment • Football Bleachers	- District Wide - District Wide - District Wide - District wide - High School	
• Carpet / Flooring Replacement	District Wide	

Preventative Items / Budgetary

• Carpet / Flooring • Air Quality • Door Hardware • Fence Repair & Updates	- Budgetary Scheduled - Filter Changes & Budgetary - Budget Yearly
--	--

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

Data Collection

During the course of the facility planning process members of the Committee were provided information useful in forecasting future facility needs by looking at projected student enrollment, population demographic changes, and housing and economic indicators related to forecasting future student growth. It appears after review and discussion short term, a conservative facility growth estimate would be accurate.

DRAFT

DATA COLLECTION

Student Enrollment – The enrollment projections completed by Calm River in September 2017 provides a forecast for future student enrollment based on the 2017-2018 current enrollment figures. The projections are for the next five years (2018/2019 to 2022/2023). By analyzing prior and current cohort data for the next five years only a “slight” increase is anticipated in the district’s overall enrollment.

In their current enrollment projects, they stated that enrollment projections significantly changed since the October 2014 projections due to:

- Switch to full day Kindergarten in 2016-2017 school year
- 2017-2018 Senior class increased in unanticipated enrollment
- Grades 9 through 12 are all record breaking years compared to last projections

Demographic – The demographic analysis found the district is generating more students per housing unit. The past two years show a moderate increase from the 2015-2016 school year in total number of students per household. The analysis also indicates total housing units have not increased significantly and there is a decrease in vacant house within the district.

The following tables provide demographic details for Pierce County and Steilacoom School District:

Housing – The district will continue to have only slight increases in housing availability. Both the Town of Steilacoom and City of DuPont have limited single and multi-housing parcels available. There is no indication land will become available within the next 10 years to have substantial housing increases.

The tables on the following pages provides Calm River’s enrollment projections, peak enrollment cohorts, and demographic analysis.

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Enrollment Projections																		
School Year	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23
District Total - FTE	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276	3,252	3,285	3,287	3,326	3,279
Annual Net Change		+57	+103	+211	+141	+20	+60	+73	-47	-22	+97	+162	+213	-24	+33	+2	+40	-47
Annual Percentage Change		+2.6%	+4.6%	+8.9%	+5.5%	+0.7%	+2.2%	+2.6%	-1.6%	-0.8%	+3.5%	+5.6%	+7.0%	-0.9%	+1.0%	+0.0%	+1.2%	-1.4%
5 Year Net Change						532	535	505	247	84	161	263	403	512	485	414	501	476
5 Year Percentage Change						+24.1%	+23.6%	+21.3%	+9.6%	+3.1%	+5.9%	+9.4%	+14.0%	+18.7%	+17.3%	+14.4%	+17.7%	+17.0%
Elementary / Primary																		
K	91	84	110	102	125	106	110	119	133	107	119	231	251	249	251	253	253	254
1	169	199	192	235	234	231	222	227	228	256	223	263	242	255	252	252	253	256
2	191	187	211	199	242	237	242	238	221	229	270	214	259	245	259	254	254	254
3	198	208	196	231	212	247	253	251	210	207	243	267	222	263	248	261	255	256
4	167	202	226	215	223	219	248	268	242	195	206	219	267	224	264	251	263	257
5	184	171	205	236	218	218	233	252	254	252	207	216	230	271	228	266	253	265
Elementary Total	1,000	1,051	1,141	1,219	1,254	1,259	1,308	1,354	1,298	1,246	1,268	1,410	1,471	1,507	1,502	1,537	1,531	1,542
Annual Net Change		+51	+90	+78	+34	+5	+49	+46	-56	-52	+22	+143	+61	+36	-5	+35	-5	+11
Annual Percentage Change		+5.1%	+8.6%	+6.8%	+2.8%	+0.4%	+3.9%	+3.5%	-4.2%	-4.0%	+1.8%	+11.3%	+4.3%	+2.9%	-0.3%	+2.3%	-0.3%	+0.7%
5 Year Net Change						259	257	213	78	-8	9	102	117	209	256	269	121	71
5 Year Percentage Change						+25.9%	+24.4%	+18.6%	+6.4%	-0.6%	+0.7%	+7.8%	+8.6%	+16.1%	+20.6%	+21.2%	+8.6%	+4.9%
Middle																		
6	194	189	178	244	241	229	242	246	250	267	269	247	242	234	275	231	269	258
7	183	185	200	194	242	252	232	263	229	245	276	279	243	244	236	277	252	271
8	198	182	174	218	203	239	239	230	267	227	250	278	277	245	246	238	279	234
Middle Total	575	556	552	656	686	720	713	739	746	739	795	804	762	723	757	746	780	763
Annual Net Change		-19	-4	+104	+30	+34	-7	+25	+8	-7	+56	+9	-42	-39	+34	-11	+34	-17
Annual Percentage Change		-3.3%	-0.7%	+18.8%	+4.6%	+5.0%	-1.0%	+3.6%	+1.0%	-1.0%	+7.6%	+1.1%	-5.2%	-5.3%	+4.7%	-1.5%	+4.6%	-2.2%
5 Year Net Change						145	157	187	90	53	75	91	23	-23	18	-49	-24	1
5 Year Percentage Change						+25.2%	+28.3%	+33.8%	+13.8%	+7.7%	+10.4%	+12.8%	+3.2%	-3.1%	+2.4%	-6.2%	-3.0%	+0.1%
High																		
9	180	208	202	199	232	194	235	215	219	246	231	257	279	248	248	242	281	236
10	171	178	194	188	213	222	199	217	211	216	258	230	266	283	251	250	245	255
11	158	167	152	197	177	188	187	178	190	188	188	205	237	266	283	251	250	245
12	124	104	127	119	159	158	158	170	162	169	161	156	261	225	244	261	239	238
High Total	633	658	675	704	780	761	779	780	782	819	838	848	1,043	1,022	1,026	1,004	1,015	974
Annual Net Change		+25	+17	+29	+76	-19	+17	+1	+2	+37	+19	+10	+195	-21	+4	-22	+11	-41
Annual Percentage Change		+3.9%	+2.5%	+4.3%	+10.8%	-2.4%	+2.3%	+0.2%	+0.2%	+4.7%	+2.3%	+1.2%	+22.9%	-2.6%	+0.4%	-2.1%	+1.1%	-4.0%
5 Year Net Change						128	121	106	78	39	77	70	263	240	207	166	167	-69
5 Year Percentage Change						+20.3%	+18.4%	+15.7%	+11.1%	+5.0%	+10.1%	+8.9%	+33.7%	+30.7%	+25.3%	+19.8%	+19.6%	-6.6%

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Peak Enrollment Cohorts														
K	91	84	110	102	125	106	110	119	133	107	119	231	251	100.0%
1	169	199	192	235	234	231	222	227	228	256	223	263	242	92.0%
2	191	187	211	199	242	237	242	238	221	229	270	214	259	95.9%
3	198	208	196	231	212	247	253	251	210	207	243	267	222	83.1%
4	167	202	226	216	223	219	248	268	242	195	206	219	267	99.8%
5	184	171	206	236	218	218	233	252	264	252	207	216	230	87.3%
6	194	189	178	244	241	229	242	246	250	267	269	247	242	90.1%
7	183	185	200	194	242	252	232	263	229	245	276	279	243	87.1%
8	198	182	174	218	203	239	239	230	267	227	250	278	277	99.5%
9	180	208	202	199	232	194	235	215	219	246	231	257	279	100.0%
10	171	178	194	188	213	222	199	217	211	216	258	230	266	100.0%
11	158	167	152	197	177	188	187	178	190	188	188	205	237	100.0%
12	124	104	127	119	159	158	158	170	162	169	161	156	261	100.0%
Total District Enrollment	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276	100.0%

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Specific School Projections																		
School Year	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23
Anderson Island Elementray																		
K - FTE					3.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.5									
K - Head Count					7	3	3	3	7	3	7	5	7	6	6	7	7	7
1					5	10	3	3	5	7	8	8	6	7	6	6	7	7
2					5	6	6	2	6	4	8	2	8	6	7	6	6	7
3					5	5	3	7	3	6	5	9	4	8	6	7	6	6
4					5	5	4	5	12	3	7	3	9	4	8	6	7	6
5					4	4	5	4	5	12	3	5	2	9	4	8	6	7
Total					31	33	24	24	38	35	38	32	36	40	37	40	39	40
Net Change						+2	-9	+0	+14	-3	+3	-6	+4	+4	-3	+3	-0	+1
Percent Change						6.45	-27.27	0.00	58.33	-7.89	8.57	-14.63	10.97	11.11	-7.50	6.96	-0.44	2.54
Chloe Clark Elementary																		
K - FTE					83.8	69.1	73.0	71.0	83.0									
K - Head Count					169	139	146	142	166	63	137	148	148	149	150	151	151	151
1					136	143	143	145	143	170	134	143	155	150	150	151	150	152
2					154	146	162	154	139	140	178	128	147	157	152	151	152	150
3					114	157	169	160	133	132	152	171	117	149	158	153	151	152
Total					573	585	620	601	581	505	601	590	567	605	610	606	604	605
Net Change						+12	+35	-19	-20	-77	+97	-11	-23	+38	+5	-4	-2	+1
Percent Change						2.09	5.98	-3.06	-3.33	-13.17	19.13	-1.83	-3.91	6.70	0.83	-0.66	-0.33	0.17
Cherrydale Primary																		
K - FTE					37.0	35.8	35.5	46.5	46.5									
K - Head Count					74	72	71	93	93	41	93	78	96	94	95	95	95	96
1					94	78	76	79	81	79	81	112	81	98	96	95	96	97
2					81	86	74	82	76	85	84	84	104	82	100	97	96	97
3					91	86	81	84	75	69	86	87	101	106	84	101	98	98
Total					340	322	302	338	325	274	344	361	382	380	375	388	385	388
Net Change						-18	-20	+36	-13	-51	+70	+17	+21	-2	-5	+13	-3	+3
Percent Change						-5.29	-6.21	11.92	-3.85	-15.69	25.55	4.94	5.82	-0.52	-1.32	3.47	-0.77	0.78
Salter's Point Elementary																		
4					218	214	244	264	230	192	199	216	258	220	256	245	256	251
5					214	213	228	249	258	240	204	211	228	262	224	258	247	258
Total					432	427	472	513	488	432	403	427	486	482	480	503	503	509
Net Change						-5	+45	+41	-25	-56	-29	+24	+59	-4	-2	+23	+0	+6
Percent Change						-1.16	10.54	8.69	-4.87	-11.43	-6.75	5.95	13.82	-0.82	-0.41	4.79	0.00	1.19

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Specific School Projections																		
School Year	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23
Middle School																		
Pioneer Middle School																		
6					241	229	241	246	251	267	269	247	242	234	275	231	269	258
7					244	252	231	263	230	245	276	279	243	244	236	277	232	271
8					203	237	238	230	268	227	250	278	277	245	246	238	279	234
Total					688	718	710	739	749	739	795	804	762	723	757	746	780	763
Net Change						+30	-8	+29	+10	-10	+56	+9	-42	-39	+34	-11	+34	-17
Percent Change						4.36	-1.11	4.08	1.35	-1.33	7.60	1.12	-5.23	-5.12	4.70	-1.45	4.56	-2.18
High School																		
Steilacoom High School																		
9					233	195	234	214	220	246	231	257	279	248	248	242	281	236
10					214	221	194	217	211	216	258	230	266	283	251	250	245	255
11					194	203	202	191	220	188	188	205	237	266	283	251	250	245
12					187	164	173	182	179	169	161	156	261	225	244	261	239	238
Total					828	783	803	804	830	819	838	848	1,043	1,022	1,026	1,004	1,015	974
Net Change						-45	+20	+1	+26	-11	+19	+10	+195	-21	+4	-22	+11	-41
Percent Change						-5.43	2.55	0.12	3.23	-1.35	2.34	1.24	22.95	-2.01	0.39	-2.14	1.10	-4.04

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Demographics													
Births - All													
WA State	82,625	86,845	88,921	90,270	89,242	86,480	86,929	87,417	86,566	88,561	89,000		
Rate - Statewide	13.2	13.6	13.7	13.7	13.4	12.9	12.8	12.8	12.6	12.7	12.6		
Pierce County	10,469	11,139	11,391	11,537	11,636	10,686	11,240	11,285	11,115	11,664	11,541		
Rate - Pierce County	13.8	14.4	14.4	14.3	14.3	13.4	14.0	14.0	13.6	14.2	13.9		
School Year	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18
Population - County													
Population - Pierce Co.	756,919	774,050	786,911	794,330	796,900	795,225	802,150	808,200	814,500	821,300	830,120	844,490	859,400
Percent Change	1.78	2.26	1.66	0.94	0.32	-0.21	0.87	0.75	0.78	0.83	1.07	1.73	1.77
Population - Municipalities													
City of DuPont	5,410	6,610	7,045	7,390	7,650	8,199	8,430	8,640	8,855	9,175	9,250	9,330	9,385
percent change	22.3%	22.2%	6.6%	4.9%	3.5%	7.2%	2.8%	2.5%	2.5%	3.6%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%
City of Steilacoom	6,175	6,200	6,220	6,255	6,285	5,985	6,000	6,015	6,040	6,060	6,115	6,170	6,410
percent change	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	-4.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	3.9%
Steilacoom + DuPont	11,585	12,810	13,265	13,645	13,935	14,184	14,430	14,655	14,895	15,235	15,365	15,500	15,795
percent change	9.4%	10.6%	3.6%	2.9%	2.1%	1.8%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	2.3%	0.9%	0.9%	1.9%
Enrollment	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276
percent change		2.6%	4.6%	8.9%	5.5%	0.7%	2.2%	2.6%	-1.6%	-0.8%	3.5%	5.6%	7.0%
Enrollment as a % of Population	19.1%	17.7%	17.9%	18.9%	19.5%	19.3%	19.4%	19.6%	19.0%	18.4%	18.9%	19.8%	20.7%
Population - District													
Steilacoom Hist. District	18,701	19,384	19,964	20,406	20,721	20,920	20,020	20,283	20,569	20,992	21,091	21,264	21,626
Enrollment	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276
percent change		2.6%	4.6%	8.9%	5.5%	0.7%	2.2%	2.6%	-1.6%	-0.8%	3.5%	5.6%	7.0%
Enrollment as a % of Population	11.8%	11.7%	11.9%	12.6%	13.1%	13.1%	14.0%	14.2%	13.7%	13.4%	13.8%	14.4%	15.1%

Steilacoom Historical School District #1
Demographic Analysis / Enrollment Projections
2018 through 2022
Executive Summary

Demographics													
Births - All													
WA State	82,625	86,845	88,921	90,270	89,242	86,480	86,929	87,417	86,566	88,561	89,000		
Rate - Statewide	13.2	13.6	13.7	13.7	13.4	12.9	12.8	12.8	12.6	12.7	12.6		
Pierce County	10,469	11,139	11,391	11,537	11,636	10,686	11,240	11,285	11,115	11,664	11,541		
Rate - Pierce County	13.8	14.4	14.4	14.3	14.3	13.4	14.0	14.0	13.6	14.2	13.9		
School Year	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18
Population - County													
Population - Pierce Co.	756,919	774,050	786,911	794,330	796,900	795,225	802,150	808,200	814,500	821,300	830,120	844,490	859,400
Percent Change	1.78	2.26	1.66	0.94	0.32	-0.21	0.87	0.75	0.78	0.83	1.07	1.73	1.77
Population - Municipalities													
City of DuPont	5,410	6,610	7,045	7,390	7,650	8,199	8,430	8,640	8,855	9,175	9,250	9,330	9,385
percent change	22.3%	22.2%	6.6%	4.9%	3.5%	7.2%	2.8%	2.5%	2.5%	3.6%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%
City of Steilacoom	6,175	6,200	6,220	6,255	6,285	5,985	6,000	6,015	6,040	6,060	6,115	6,170	6,410
percent change	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	-4.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	3.9%
Steilacoom + DuPont	11,585	12,810	13,265	13,645	13,935	14,184	14,430	14,655	14,895	15,235	15,365	15,500	15,795
percent change	9.4%	10.6%	3.6%	2.9%	2.1%	1.8%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	2.3%	0.9%	0.9%	1.9%
Enrollment	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276
percent change		2.6%	4.6%	8.9%	5.5%	0.7%	2.2%	2.6%	-1.6%	-0.8%	3.5%	5.6%	7.0%
Enrollment as a % of Population	19.1%	17.7%	17.9%	18.9%	19.5%	19.3%	19.4%	19.6%	19.0%	18.4%	18.9%	19.8%	20.7%
Population - District													
Steilacoom Hist. District	18,701	19,384	19,964	20,406	20,721	20,920	20,020	20,283	20,569	20,992	21,091	21,264	21,626
Enrollment	2,208	2,265	2,368	2,579	2,720	2,740	2,800	2,873	2,826	2,804	2,901	3,063	3,276
percent change		2.6%	4.6%	8.9%	5.5%	0.7%	2.2%	2.6%	-1.6%	-0.8%	3.5%	5.6%	7.0%
Enrollment as a % of Population	11.8%	11.7%	11.9%	12.6%	13.1%	13.1%	14.0%	14.2%	13.7%	13.4%	13.8%	14.4%	15.1%

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

Funding Considerations

The committee will take into consideration the key financial information necessary to establish the District's ability to raise funds for school and other construction projects. Working with OSPI, the District will estimate the District's School Construction Assistance (State Match) eligibility. Areas this section will cover once the LRCFP committee determines needs are the following:

- State Construction Assistance Program (SCAP)
- Bond Debt Capacity
- Other Information

While the Committee was not to develop a specific bond amount proposal, the Committee did request estimated costs and funding sources. With the assistance and expertise of Ryan Swanson, Piper Jaffray & Company, the Committee was presented key financial information necessary to establish the District's ability to raise funds for school construction. Additionally, Erickson and McGovern Architects (EMA), working with OSPI were able to estimate the District's School Construction Assistance (State Match) eligibility. Based on preliminary cost estimates provided by EMA, the Committee was able to develop a Phase I bond proposal. This section contains a summary of this information.

FUNDING CONSIDERATIONS

State Funding Assistance: The School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP) provides funding assistance to school districts that are undertaking a major new construction or modernization project. Projects must meet eligibility requirements based on age and condition for modernization and a need for more space for new construction. School districts are responsible to secure local funding for construction projects. If eligible, the State provides partial funding based on formulas, allowances, and costs related to certain aspects of a construction project called recognized project costs. Steilacoom Historical School District's funding assistance percentage for recognized project costs for 2017 is currently 53.81%. The actual SCAP assistance would be determined by OSPI based on the project.

Bond Debt Funding Bond Debt Capacity – Washington State schools are limited to a total bond debt capacity of 5% of the district's assessed valuation.

Voter-approved bonds:

- Unlimited Tax General Obligation (UTGO) Bonds
- Repaid with property taxes
- Approved with a 60% yes vote, 40% validation Super-majority is needed to pass a voted bond.
- Voted debt capacity is 5% of assessed value
- 40-year maximum term

Non-voted bonds:

- Limited General Obligation (LGO) Bonds
- Repaid with existing revenue sources (ex: General Fund)
- May not be used for "new" construction
- Non-voted debt capacity is 3/8 of 1% of assessed value
- Public notice required prior to selling non-voted debt

Total Debt Capacity

2017 Bond Assessed Value	\$2,815,189,376
Statutory Capacity Rate	5.000%
Total Statutory Capacity	<u>\$140,759,469</u>
Less: Outstanding Voted Debt	(\$46,960,000)
Less: Outstanding Non-Voted Debt	<u>\$0.00</u>
Remaining Capacity	<u><u>\$93,799,469</u></u>

Non-Voted Debt Capacity

2017 Bond Assessed Value	\$2,815,189,376
Statutory Capacity Rate	0.375%
Total Statutory Capacity	<u>\$10,556,960</u>
Less: Outstanding Non-Voted Debt	<u>\$0.00</u>
Remaining Capacity	<u><u>\$10,556,960</u></u>

Current Outstanding Voted Bonds

	Principal	Interest	Total
2017	\$4,130,000	\$2,132,700	\$6,262,700
Outstanding Bond Debt			
2018	\$4,940,000	\$1,961,250	\$6,901,250
2019	\$5,425,000	\$1,753,575	\$7,178,575
2020	\$5,965,000	\$1,495,825	\$7,460,825
2021	\$6,555,000	\$1,204,325	\$7,759,325
2022	\$7,385,000	\$920,475	\$8,305,475
2023	\$7,995,000	\$609,625	\$8,604,625
2024	\$8,695,000	\$217,375	\$8,912,375
Total	\$46,960,000	\$8,162,450	\$55,122,450

Note: Principal and Interest paid for fiscal year ending 2017.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X Community / School Priorities & Values

Within the Superintendent Long-Range Facility Plan Committee was language emphasizing the importance of community participation and input. Throughout the process all meeting agendas and minutes were posted and available to interested parties. Additionally, the District contracted with Thought Exchange, an online survey program, to conduct a community wide exchange of ideas on a number of key district topics of interest, including facility planning. Also, two community forums were conducted to seek further community input regarding specific aspects of the planning process.

COMMUNITY / SCHOOL PRIORITIES & VALUES

EXAMPLE ONLY

Thought Exchange Facility Improvement Response – Thought Exchange survey results relative to facility improvement issues was shared with the Committee in early January. A brief review of the data identified the following priorities and values –

Building Renovation & Improvements	Highest Priority
Grade Configuration Options / Modifications	Cost Concerns
General Feedback	Middle School Environment Academic Success & Facilities Are a Higher Priority Than Athletics Facility Infrastructure
Renovate / Replace	#1 Replace Middle School #2 Replace MS & East Elem.
Athletic Facilities	Support Investing Concern for Location

Following this review members of the Committee were asked to identify their four priorities from which the highest two priorities were identified - #1 – replace Omak Middle School & #2 replace East Omak Elementary.

Community Forum #1 – The first community meeting provided a general overview of the process and progress the Committee had made over the past few months. Three middle school scenarios were presented to those in attendance for their feedback which was recorded on charts for display. Members of the audience were then asked to identify their top 5 priorities and/or those statements with which they most agreed. Listed below are the four top responses –

- Of the three scenarios reviewed members of the audience preferred a middle school location other than on the current property or the use of the District's 10 acre parcel.
- Potential property adjacent to North Omak Elementary was of high interest.
- Concern for impacting adjacent neighborhood with evening activities and pedestrian concerns were expressed over the potential location of a school on the 10 acre parcel.
- Concern for ongoing safety issues on the athletic fields the district uses.

Community Forum #2 – The second community forum focused on committee progress, property interests, and next steps in completing the long range facility plan. A number of comments were shared in support of the work of the Committee and appreciation for sharing in detail this work. In a group response those in attendance gave a strong level of support for the District's interest and inquiry into properties adjacent to North Omak Elementary.

SECTION CONTENTS

Section XX.X

Committee Recommendations

Utilizing the various forms of information brought before the Committee for review and consideration, the Committee developed a comprehensive list of facility improvements. These components were then prioritized given public input and financial parameters to form a phasing approach over time. Phase I (replacement of the middle school) required more specific detail including programming and space allocation definition, cost estimates, bond package scenarios, and an election timeline.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

EXAMPLE ONLY

Facility Improvement Components – Members of the Committee identified the following facility improvement components to be of the highest priority given the current information available.

Property Acquisition – Recommend additional property for a proposed

New Middle School – Recommend

Middle School Re-Use – Committee values support responsible re-use of the

Athletic Field Improvements – Recommend a new athletic complex at the high school that includes..... At the middle school resurface track and improve soft ball and baseball fields..... At the elementary schools recondition all the playfields and equipment.....

Elementary School Improvements – Recommend further consideration depending on future district circumstances and priorities and specific modernization that have been identified for Cherrydale and Anderson Island, and for Chloe Clark possible carpeting for hallways. Detailed information is contained within the Study & Survey – Chapters

Early Childhood Learning Center – Recommend an 8,000 SF to 12, 000 SF early learning center to be located..... Detailed information is contained within the Study & Survey

Auxiliary Gym – Recommend a future auxiliary gym..... Detailed information is contained within the Study & Survey.

Steilacoom High School Facility Improvements – A number of facility improvements were identified and reviewed by the Committee. They include – music/performing arts, kitchen upgrades, culinary arts program, science lab, auto shop, CTE program expansion, and additional classroom capacity for growth. Due to funding availability at a later date these items were rated as a lower priority and therefore costs and scope of programs were not finalized but should be part of ongoing long range facility planning.

District Wide Improvements – Recommend a new maintenance and transportation facility. Committee acknowledged the need for a district warehouse. As a low priority cost and scope were not finalized but should be part of ongoing long range facility planning.

Phasing Recommendation & Timeline – Consistent with the Board's Charge to the Committee the above referenced facility improvement components have been prioritized and sequenced over time to develop a multi-year plan – a long range facility plan. This plan proposes facility improvements for the next twenty-one (21) years. Factors influencing this timeline include perceived needs and priorities, the district's bond debt capacity limits, State Match eligibility, and Study & Survey eligibility. See Appendices for SHSD's Long Range Facility Plan Timeline (TO BE DEVELOPED).

Phase I Capital Improvements

List of projects:

- High school
- Middle school
- Elementary schools
- Athletic/Play Fields
- Maintenance/Transportation Facility

COMMITTEE CHAIR'S MESSAGE

EXAMPLE ONLY

January 31, 2019

Steilacoom Historical School District's first ever long range facility plan containing district wide recommendations for years to come is a result of months of effort by a dedicated group of stakeholders serving on the facilities planning committee titled, **Our Future – A Planning Committee**, along with technical assistance. The Committee embraced the Board of Directors – **Charge to the Committee** – working over a period of thirteen months. The Committee became aware of current and pending facility improvement needs and limitations, staff input as to the adequacy of each building in supporting the instructional program, projected enrollment and housing estimates, along with a host of other relevant information. The final product reflects recommendations aligned with Board priorities, community values, committee vision, best practices, best information available at the time, as well as maximizing potential future State Match Assistance.

While past school boards, prior administrations, and maintenance staff have done a commendable job of monitoring and addressing many facility issues within available resources, this plan provides the basis from which the District may take consistent steps in ensuring equitable educational facilities for all students as well as building facilities that will support contemporary instructional and educational demands. I trust the work of all those who participated in the process will be valued by influencing facility decisions for the near future and years to come.

To those that so generously gave of their time and expertise along with our planning team members – job well done!

Name of Chair

Committee Chair

Our Future – A Planning Committee

APPENDICES

Page Master Schedule xx

School Profiles xx

Steilacoom High School Pioneer
Middle School
Saltar's Point Elementary Chloe
Clark Elementary Cherrydale
Elementary
Anderson Island Elementary

Steilacoom Historical School District Bond Debt Capacity Analysis xx

Steilacoom Historical School District Tax Impact Analysis for Scenario #6 xx

Long Range Facilities Planning Timeline xx

Steilacoom Historical School District No. 1

Voted Debt Capacity

2017 Bond Assessed Value	\$	2,814,914,557
Statutory Capacity Rate		5.000%
Total Statutory Capacity	\$	140,745,728
Less: Outstanding Voted Debt	\$	(46,960,000)
Less: Outstanding Non-Voted Debt*		-
Plus: Debt Service Fund Balance	\$	-
Remaining Capacity	\$	93,785,728

Steilacoom Historical School District No. 1

Non-Voted Debt Capacity

2017 Bond Assessed Value	\$	2,814,914,557
Statutory Capacity Rate		0.375%
Total Statutory Capacity	\$	10,555,929
Less: Outstanding Non-Voted Debt*		-
Remaining Capacity	\$	10,555,92972