



FACILITIES MASTER PLAN 2018 UPDATE

October 2018

Seattle Public Schools is committed to making its online information accessible and usable to all people, regardless of ability or technology. Meeting web accessibility guidelines and standards is an ongoing process that we are consistently working to improve.

While Seattle Public Schools endeavors to only post documents optimized for accessibility, due to the nature and complexity of some documents, an accessible version of the document may not be available. In these limited circumstances, the District will provide equally effective alternate access.

For questions and more information about this document, please contact the following:

Rebecca Asencio
K-12 Planning Coordinator
Capital Planning
rsasencio@seattleschools.org

This document is prepared to inform the Board on capital needs districtwide in facilities that help to deliver and support the educational programs as stated in the district's mission. The purpose for this Facility Master Plan (FMP) update is to provide a framework for the BEX V capital levy (BEX V levy) scheduled to be presented to voters February 2019.



Figure 1 picture of Arbor Heights elementary school

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Published 2018
For Planning Horizon 2019- 2026



FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE

PUBLISHED 2018

FOR PLANNING HORIZON 2019-2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
OVERVIEW.....	7
GROWTH TRENDS AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS	13
EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS/ MODERN LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS.....	18
CAPACITY ANALYSIS.....	20
MAINTENANCE OF BUILDING SYSTEMS AND MAJOR COMPONENTS	34
ANALYSIS AND PROPOSED PROJECTS.....	36
AVAILABLE SITES NOT CURRENTLY USED FOR SCHOOL PROGRAMS	70
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	72

ADDENDUM 1: McKinstry Building Condition Assessment Executive Summary

ADDENDUM 2: Building score dashboard (McKinstry 2018)

ADDENDUM 3: Portable scores (McKinstry 2018)

ADDENDUM 4: Report from FMP Task Force 2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Seattle Public Schools serve over 53,000 students in grades PK-12 across the City of Seattle. Students from a wide variety of ethnic groups and neighborhoods attend one of 62 elementary schools, 10 K-8 schools, 12 middle schools, 12 high schools and 8 service school programs. All in all, the District owns 119 sites.

District enrollment has grown by 8,000 students in the past 10 years and many schools are showing signs of strain in accommodating the increase in student population. To compound the problem, many schools are at the end of their life cycle and showing signs of aging and deterioration. In addition, many schools and sites are small and may not be sized for cost-effective operation. Traditionally, facility planning has emphasized the physical condition of buildings and sites in selecting projects for capital investment. However, with changing curriculum and program changes in student learning as well as the growth in special education population (for both advanced learners and students with disabilities), some schools are not sized appropriately to support all the educational programs being offered. Therefore, starting with the 2012 Facilities Master Plan (FMP), educational adequacy was added into the scoring of projects. This plan is an update to the 2012 FMP and follows the same general philosophy in project selection.

The purpose for this Facility Master Plan (FMP) is to provide a framework for the BEX V capital levy (BEX V levy) scheduled to be presented to voters February 2019. If passed, the BEX V levy will replace the BEX IV levy collection in 2020. Capital Planning Staff referenced Board Policy 6901 – Capital Levy Planning and the Board’s May 9, 2018, adopted Guiding Principles along with a data-driven approach in the project selection process. The Board emphasized the district’s commitment to success of every student and the desire to close the achievement and opportunity gaps that still exist today within the district. Board Policy 0030 Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity provides the framework for educational equity and this plan strives to include the tools and methodologies available to attain that goal. A FMP Task Force was established to review elements of the district’s draft long range FMP, including enrollment projections, capacity analysis and the proposed project scoring matrix and provide recommendations to the Board in those areas. The FMP Task Force recommendations are included in Addendum 4.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Policy Guidance

This document outlines the framework and rationale for the potential projects under consideration for inclusion in the Building Excellence V (BEX V) Capital Levy. The facilities master plan acts as a basis for which the Board determines facility needs. The purpose of this 2018 update to the facilities master plan is to evaluate the adequacy of existing educational facilities with current data and plan for future capital facilities spending. This update will address how the student population will be housed over the next 8 years.

To guide the process of project selection and the levy amount, the SPS Board adopted Policy 6901, Capital Levy Planning in 2012. This policy reaffirms the district's commitment to prudent planning for investment of capital funds to assure a quality educational program for all students. Decisions shall be based on sound data, objective standards and open processes. The policy requires adoption of a facilities master plan.

Important principles for capital levy planning include the following: capital projects shall be planned to match the district's educational needs in the short, intermediate and long term, and shall be based on enrollment projections, building capacity, building condition surveys, and the functional adequacy of current buildings to meet educational program needs. Investments shall be made to maintain and improve the physical condition and systems of buildings and annual budgets should establish a regular, consistent budgeting mechanism to fund capital maintenance activities. Building and system designs shall be flexible to meet the changing needs of educational programs, be responsive to the urban context of schools, include advances in technology, and not be tailored to the specific needs of any one program to the detriment of future flexibility.

In addition, the Board strives to reduce district operating costs and carbon emissions by using designs that create conservation opportunities and minimize negative impacts on the environment, while updating current buildings to meet educational program needs. Investments shall be made to maintain and improve the physical condition and systems of buildings and annual budgets should establish a regular, consistent budgeting mechanism to fund capital maintenance activities. Building and system designs shall be flexible to meet the changing needs of educational programs, be responsive to the urban context of schools, include advances in technology, and not be tailored to the specific needs of any one program to the detriment of future flexibility.

Seattle Public Schools needs on-going community support of its BEX and BTA levies to deliver adequate facilities for its educational programs. Other sources for funding capital projects include obtaining schools grants through the state legislature and seeking private funding (donations, naming rights etc.).

The Building Excellence Capital Levy (BEX) enables Seattle Public Schools (SPS) to continue the construction of new school buildings, additions and major renovations to existing buildings to ensure every student has a safe and productive learning environment. The Buildings, Technology and Academics/ Athletics (BTA) levy funds small renovations, maintenance and improvement projects in school and support buildings.

The purpose of Seattle Public Schools BEX V capital levy plan is two-fold:

- Present a comprehensive Building Excellence plan to replace/ modernize existing schools and support facilities within Seattle Public Schools.
- Present the details for implementation of the levy plan to create common understanding throughout the organization and the broader community.

Given numerous goals and constraints, including educational program objectives, enrollment projections, conditions of the SPS buildings, requests from the community and recent changes in the State of Washington concerning education levy funding, a potential project list is compiled and with guiding principles provided by the SPS Board, Capital Planning is presenting a plan for the six years of the levy that will address the district's needs and goals.

Historical Facilities Master Plans


Seattle Public Schools adopted the 2010 (horizon year) Long Range Facilities Master Plan in 1992. This is the district's primary facility planning document. The plan was later amended in 2005 and 2006. In 2006, the State of Washington enacted WAC 392-341-025 requiring school districts perform a study and survey that includes a "long-range (i.e. minimum of 6 years) educational and facilities plan". The intent of the legislation was to provide information to the state concerning construction funding in school buildings. In 2008, SPS Board adopted the 2020 (horizon year) Long Range Facilities Master Plan. This plan is part of the study and survey requirement. This plan was later amended in 2009 and 2010.

In 2012, SPS Board adopted Policy 6901 – Capital Levy Planning which provides guidance for capital levy planning. In the same year, the board adopted the 2012 Facilities Master Plan (planning horizon 2012-2022) which complies with policy 6901 and was the basis for project selections for the BEX IV capital levy. The 2012 Facilities Master Plan was updated in 2015 to provide information for the BTA IV capital levy BTA IV and was utilized to satisfy WAC 392-341-025 in 2016.

Seattle Public Schools is due to update its current study and survey in 2021. To maximize efficiency, Capital Planning utilizes the same plan for both levy planning per Policy 6901 and to comply with WAC 392-341-025. See attached planning timeline Figure A on study and survey requirements and levy planning efforts. This plan serves to provide information about the district's portfolio of buildings and how well they function. The plan seeks to prioritize building new schools and replacing or enlarging aging schools to address capacity and educational program needs. Budgets are also included for technology upgrades, major preventive maintenance and other system improvements necessary to ensure healthy, safe and secure environments for students, staff and community.

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Figure A Facilities Master Plan Work Flow and Planning Timeline



OVERVIEW

Summary of Schools

Seattle Public Schools is made up of 62 elementary schools, 10 K-8 schools, 12 middle schools, 12 high schools, and 8 service schools. See **Figure B**, Building Classification Chart at the end of this section for a list of school properties that SPS own and operates.

While the core mission for Seattle Public Schools is to provide an excellent K-12 educational program for residents of Seattle, research has firmly established that also investing in early learning yields powerful benefits for children, both in early elementary and as a cornerstone to their overall educational success. As part of the initiative to balance inequities of under-served communities and narrow the achievement and opportunity gap (Policy 0030), Seattle Public Schools is collaborating with the City of Seattle to manage multiple pre-school classrooms with priorities in underserved areas. These include:

- **Seattle Pre-school Program (SPP)** that offers high-quality, affordable pre-school to all of Seattle's 3- and 4-year-old children;
- **Head Start (HS)**, a federally funded child development program for eligible families serving 3- and 4-year-old children.
- **Developmental Pre-school (DP)**, designed for children age 3-5 determined eligible with a disability that impacts educational progress and who need specially designed instruction.

In addition, SPS partners with community-based organizations who provide these services by providing needed space for these pre-school programs in school buildings. A list of locations where these Pre-K programs can be found by clicking on the following link:

<https://www.seattleschools.org/cms/One.aspx?portalId=627&pageId=9084716>

Reflecting the diversity of Seattle, the student population at SPS is comprised of various ethnic groups and a wide range of learning aptitudes. SPS strives to accommodate all students and provide appropriate spaces for different learning demands. **Figure C** shows the demographic composition of the schools in the district and serves to inform staff on variable educational program needs beyond the traditional classroom.

Furthermore, to address persistent inequity issues, Seattle Public Schools developed Board Policy 0030 in 2012 to ensure education and racial equity throughout the district. While most of the strategies in implementing policy 0030 deals with increasing achievements for historically underserved populations, having spaces that address cultural differences and disabilities can enhance learning experiences for the underserved. This master plan is committed to follow the policy in allocating resources so that all students benefit.

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Figure B: Building and Site Classification Table 2018

Use	Facility/ School	Classification	Address	Landmark	Building Area (S.F.)	Site Area (Acre)	Date of Construction	Date of last full Renovation / Addition	Levy (1985-2019)
E	Adams	Ess.	6110 28th Ave. NW		63,136	3.4	1989		CIP I
E	Alki	Ess.	3010 59th Ave. SW		45,387	1.4	1954		
E	Arbor Heights	Ess.	3701 SW 104th St.		90,763	5.7	2016		BEX IV
E	B.F. Day	Ess.	3921 Linden Ave. N	✓	65,188	3.9	1892	1991	CIP 1
E	Daniel Bagley (Const. Planned 2020)	Ess.	7821 Stone Ave. N	✓	38,380	3.9	1930	2020	BEX IV
E	Beacon Hill International*	Ess.	2025 14th Ave. S		51,704	1.9	1971		BEX II
E	Bryant	Ess.	3311 NE 60th St.	✓	81,256	3.3	1926	2001	BEX I
E	Cascadia	Ess.	1700 North 90th St.		90,750	5.4	2017		
E	Cedar Park	Ess.	13224 37th Ave NE	✓	31,312	4.4	1959	2015	BEX IV
E	Frantz Coe	Ess.	2424 7th Ave. W		66,884	2.9	2003		BEX I
E	Concord International	Ess.	723 S Concord St.	✓	63,278	3.4	1913	2000	BEX I
E	Dearborn Park International*	Ess.	2820 S Orcas St.		54,266	9.5	1971	2006	BEX II
E	Decatur	Ess.	7711 43rd Ave. NE		43,040	2.6	1961	1966	BEX IV
E	Dunlap	Ess.	4525 S Cloverdale St.	✓	73,068	4.9	1924	2000	BEX I
E	E. C. Hughes (Roxhill ES)	Ess.	7740 34th Ave. SW	✓	45,441	3.7	1926	2018	
E	Emerson	Ess.	9709 60th Ave. S	✓	78,804	1.8	1909	2001	BEX I
E	Fairmount Park	Ess.	3800 SW Findlay St.		63,658	3.1	1964	2014	BEX IV
E	Gatewood	Ess.	4320 SW Myrtle St.	✓	55,785	3.6	1991		CIP 1
E	Bailey Gatzert	Ess.	1301 E Yesler Way		53,001	6.8	1988		CIP 1
E	Genesee Hill	Ess.	5013 SW Dakota St.		91,000	6.8	2016		BEX IV
E	Graham Hill	Ess.	5149 S Graham St.		54,410	4.5	1961	2004	BEX II
E	Green Lake*	Ess.	2400 N 65th St.		47,903	3.4	1970	2015	BEX IV
E	Greenwood	Ess.	144 NW 80th St.	P	63,985	2.8	1909	2002	BEX I
E	Hawthorne	Ess.	4100 39th Ave. S		51,170	2.6	1989		CIP 1
E	Highland Park	Ess.	1012 SW Trenton St.		74,192	3.7	1999		BEX I
E	John Hay	Ess.	201 Garfield St.		51,362	3.2	1989		CIP 1
E	John Stanford International (Latona)	Ess.	4057 5th Ave. NE	✓	60,101	2.2	1906	2000	BEX I
E	Kimball*	Ess.	3200 23rd Ave. S		41,549	4.8	1971	1998	BEX I
E	Lafayette	Ess.	2645 California Ave. SW		51,942	4.7	1950	1953	
E	Laurelhurst	Ess.	4530 46th Ave. NE	P	52,083	2.7	1928	1950	
E	Lawton	Ess.	4000 27th Ave. W.		53,718	5.0	1990		CIP 1
E	Leschi	Ess.	135 32nd Ave.		57,208	3.0	1988		CIP 1
E	Lowell	Ess.	1058 E Mercer St.	P	73,470	3.9	1919	1962	
E	Loyal Heights (Open Fall 2018)	Ess.	7735 25th Ave. NW	✓	88,139	2.9	1932	2018	BEX IV
E	Martin Luther King Jr.	Ess.	6725 45th Ave. S		71,654	3.4	2004		BEX II
E	Magnolia (Re- open Fall 2019)	Ess.	2418 28th Ave. W.	✓	46,320	2.5	1927	2019	
E	Madrona	Ess.	1121 33rd Ave.		68,127	1.8	2002	2002	BEX I
E	Maple*	Ess.	4925 Corson Ave. S		49,730	6.7	1971	2006	BEX II
E	McDonald International	Ess.	6725 45th Ave. S	P	49,431	2.2	1914	1923	
E	McGilvra	Ess.	144 NE 54th St.	✓	37,064	2.5	1913	2018	BEX IV
E	Montlake	Ess.	1617 38th Ave. E.	✓	21,403	1.7	1924		
E	John Muir	Ess.	3301 S Horton St.		58,339	3.3	1991		CIP 1
E	North Beach	Ess.	9018 24th Ave. NW		35,812	6.9	1958		
E	Northgate	Ess.	11725 1st Ave. NE		42,299	5.8	1956		
E	Olympic Hills	Ess.	13018 20th Ave. NE		89,000	6.5	2017		BEX IV
E	Olympic View	Ess.	504 NE 95th St.		52,792	4.3	1989		CIP 1
E	Queen Anne (Open Fall 2019)	Ess.	411 Boston St.	✓	42,446	3.0	1903	2019	BEX IV
E	Rainier View	Ess.	11650 Beacon Ave. S		36,412	8.9	1961		
E	John Rogers	Ess.	4030 NE 109th St.		36,196	9.0	1956		
E	Sacajawea	Ess.	9501 20th Ave. NE		37,600	3.8	1959		
E	Sand Point	Ess.	6208 60th Ave. NE		32,433	4.3	1957		
E	Sanislo*	Ess.	1812 SW Myrtle St.		40,347	8.5	1970	1998	BEX I
E	Stevens	Ess.	1242 18th Ave. E	✓	67,267	2.4	1906	2001	BEX I
E	Thornton Creek	Ess.	7712 40th Ave. NE		91,596	7.3	2016		
E	Thurgood Marshall	Ess.	2401 S Irving St.		60,793	4.5	1991		CIP 1
E	Van Asselt (African American Academy)	Ess.	8311 Beacon Ave. S		104,830	10.9	2000		BEX I
E	View Ridge	Ess.	7047 50th Ave. NE		61,831	9.1	1948	1969	
E	Viewlands	Ess.	10525 3rd Ave. NW		30,423	6.5	1954	1986	
E	Webster (Open Fall 2020)	Ess.	3014 NW 67th St.	✓	56,169	2.0	1908	1930	

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Use	Facility/ School	Classification	Address	Landmark	Building Area (S.F.)	Site Area (Acre)	Date of Construction	Date of last full Renovation / Addition	Levy (1985-2019)
E	Wedgwood	Ess.	2720 NE 85th St.		44,334	4.5	1955		
E	West Seattle ES	Ess.	6760 34th Ave. SW		50,701	6.9	1988		CIP 1
E	West Woodland	Ess.	5601 4th Ave. NW		57,474	3.5	1991		CIP 1
E	Wing Luke	Ess.	3701 S Kenyon St.		50,518	6.9	1971		
E	Whittier	Ess.	1320 NW 75th St.		70,166	2.7	1999		BEX I
K-8	Blaine	Ess.	2550 34th Ave. W		101,584	8.0	1952		
K-8	Louisa Boren (STEM)	Ess.	5950 Delridge Way SW		119,514	15.0	1963		
K-8	Broadview-Thomson	Ess.	13052 Greenwood Ave. N		129,984	9.3	1963		
K-8	Cooper (Pathfinder)	Ess.	1901 SW Genesee St.		72,861	13.9	1999		BEX I
K-8	Hazel Wolf	Ess.	11530 12th Ave. NE		86,558	3.2	2016		BEX IV
K-8	Salmon Bay (Monroe)	Ess.	1810 NW 65th St.	P	117,116	4.2	1931		
K-8	Seward (TOPS)	Ess.	2500 Franklin Ave. E	✓	95,501	1.8	1893	1999	BEX I
K-8	Whitworth (Orca)	Ess.	5215 46th Ave. S		59,505	3.4	1989		CIP 1
K-8	South Shore	Ess.	4800 S. Henderson St.		138,859	11.4	2009		BEX III
M	Aki Kurose	Ess.	3928 S Graham St.	P	171,393	4.8	1952		
M	David T. Denny International	Ess.	2601 SW Kenyon St.		138,778	17.4	2011		BEX III
M	Eckstein	Ess.	3003 NE 75th St.	✓	177,977	13.9	1950	1968	
M	Hamilton International	Ess.	1610 N 41st St.	✓	124,865	2.0	1926	2010	BEX III
M	Jane Addams	Ess.	11051 34th Ave. NE	P	160,645	18.0	1949	1950	BEX IV
M	Madison	Ess.	3429 45th Ave. SW	✓	153,517	8.9	1929	2005	BEX II
M	McClure	Ess.	1915 1st Ave. W		92,727	2.3	1964	1968	
M	Meany	Ess.	301 21st Ave. E		126,351	4.1	1955	2016	BEX IV
M	Mercer International	Ess.	1600 S Columbian Way		122,313	8.4	1957		
M	Robert Eagle Staff (+Licton Springs K-8)	Ess.	1330 N 90th St.		139,400	11.5	2017		BEX IV
M	Washington	Ess.	2101 S Jackson St.		136,368	17.3	1963		
M	Whitman	Ess.	9201 15th Ave. NW		134,056	14.6	1959		
H	Ballard	Ess.	1418 NW 65th St.		242,795	12.3	1999		BEX I
H	Chief Sealth International	Ess.	2600 SW Thistle St.		223,154	21.6	1957	2010	BEX III
H	Center School	Less	305 Harrison St		17,500				
H	Cleveland	Ess.	5511 15th Ave. S	✓	161,731	8.5	1927	2007	BEX II
H	Franklin	Ess.	3013 S Mt. Baker Blvd.	✓	269,201	8.7	1912	1990	CIP 1
H	Garfield	Ess.	400 23rd Ave.	✓	244,177	9.0	1923	2008	BEX II
H	Ingraham	Ess.	1819 N 135th St.	✓	232,099	28.2	1959	2011	BEX III
H	Lincoln	Ess.	4400 Interlake Ave. N	✓	257,157	6.7	1907	1960	BEX IV
H	Nathan Hale	Ess.	10750 30th Ave. NE		235,078	18.4	1963	2010	BEX III
H	Rainier Beach	Ess.	8815 Seward Park Ave S		182,589	21.5	1961	1998	BEX I
H	Roosevelt	Ess.	1410 NE 66th St.	✓	269,297	9.2	1922	2006	BEX II
H	West Seattle High School	Ess.	3000 California Ave. SW	✓	208,981	8.0	1917	2002	BEX I
S	North Queen Anne (CPPP)	Ess.	2919 1st Ave. W		21,257	2.3	1914	1922	
S	Columbia (Interagency)	Ess.	3528 S Ferdinand St.	P	32,332	3.2	1922		
S	Nova Alternative (Horace Mann)	Ess.	2410 E Cherry St.	✓	48,877	1.76	1902	2014	BEX IV
S	South Lake	Ess.	8601 Rainier Ave. S		29,575		2008		BEX II
S	Queen Anne Gym (Interagency)	Ess.	1431 2nd Ave. N		35,805	0.95	1961		
S	Roxhill (Interagency)	Ess.	9501 20th Ave. NE		40,619	2.7	1958		
S	Seattle World School @ T.T. Minor	Ess.	1700 E Union St.			3.49	1941		BEX IV
I	John Marshall (Interim site)	Ess.	520 NE Ravenna Blvd.	P	87,927	3.2	1927		BEX IV
I	Schmitz Park (Interim site)	Ess.	5000 SW Spokane St.		35,258	7.5	1962		
I	Old Van Asselt (Interim site)	Ess.	7201 Beacon Ave. S		55,454	8.4	1950		
A	John Stanford Center	Ess.	2445 3rd Ave. S		350,000	12.1	2002		
A	Old Van Asselt (Original Bldg.) (Closed)	Ess.	7201 Beacon Ave. S	P	13,681	8.4	1909		
F	Memorial Stadium	Ess.	401 5th Ave. N	P	163,290	6.3	1947		
A	Athletic Office	Ess.	401 5th Ave. N		1,803	2.7	1965		
	B.F. Day (Fremont Art Council)	Inven.	3940 Fremont Ave. N	✓	1,696	3.9	1910	2017	
	Columbia Annex (Closed/Leased)	Inven.	3100 S Alaska St.		7,648	1.0	1944		
	Fauntleroy	Inven.	9131 California Ave. SW		-	1.4			
	Lake City	Inven.	2611 NE 125th St.	✓	37,500	2.7			
	Denny Site (Vacant)	Inven.	8402 30th Ave. SW		-	4.16			
	Interlake	Non-E	4416 Wallingford Ave. N	✓	52,078	1.7			
	Cleveland Memorial Forest	Non-E	28322 SE Issaquah-Fall City Rd., Fall City, WA			32.9			
	Jefferson	Non-E	4720 42nd Ave. SW		282,642	3.2			

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Use	Facility/ School	Classification	Address	Landmark	Building Area (S.F.)	Site Area (Acre)	Date of Construction	Date of last full Renovation / Addition	Levy (1985-2019)
	Oak Lake (tenant Oak Tree Plaza)	Non-E	10040 Aurora Ave. N		-	3.4			
	West Queen Anne	Non-E	1401 5th Ave. W	✓		1.7			

* = Open-concept schools
 P = Potential Landmark
 CPPP = Cascade Parent Partnership Program
 F = Field

E = Elementary school
 M = Middle School
 H = High School
 Lee = Leasee; lease space from others

I = Interim site
 A = Administrative Offices
 S = Service Schools

Classifications:

Ess. = Essential - Facilities utilized for either instructional program or instructional program support.
 Inven. = Inventoried – Facilities or vacant sites that are not currently utilized for either instructional program or instructional program support but can be re-activated for instructional use.
 Non-E = Non-Essential; Facilities or vacant sites that are in long term leases to other parties and not available to be re-activated for for either instructional program or instructional program support.

All facilities are located within the City of Seattle, unless otherwise noted.

Figure B

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Figure C: Student Demographics 2017-18 (Annual Enrollment Report March 2018)

School	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Native American	White	Multiracial/ Unknown	Free/ Reduced Lunch	English Language Learners	Special Education (Resource)	Special Education (Self- Contained)	Advanced Learning Eligible
Elementary Schools											
Adams	2%	4%	8%	1%	74%	12%	10%	5%	9%	4%	17%
Alki	4%	6%	9%	1%	68%	11%	14%	4%	13%	0%	14%
Arbor Heights	7%	7%	12%	0%	61%	14%	23%	6%	7%	7%	11%
B.F. Day	5%	12%	5%	0%	62%	16%	23%	6%	8%	5%	23%
Bagley (open fall 2020)	9%	4%	8%	0%	64%	15%	12%	8%	5%	6%	19%
Beacon Hill International*	27%	7%	35%	0%	16%	14%	52%	38%	6%	0%	12%
Bryant	7%	1%	5%	0%	74%	13%	3%	4%	6%	0%	32%
Cascadia (Wilson Pacific)	10%	1%	3%	0%	71%	15%	4%	0%	8%	0%	100%
Cedar Park	16%	4%	5%	0%	56%	18%	23%	7%	5%	0%	9%
Frantz Coe	5%	2%	8%	0%	72%	13%	7%	5%	11%	0%	36%
Concord International	11%	10%	59%	0%	14%	6%	71%	48%	8%	0%	2%
Dearborn Park International	37%	34%	10%	1%	9%	10%	68%	32%	6%	3%	8%
Decatur	19%	0%	5%	0%	56%	20%	2%	0%	10%	0%	100%
Dunlap	27%	43%	19%	0%	3%	9%	70%	40%	6%	NA	2%
E. C. Hughes (open fall 2018)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Emerson	17%	43%	21%	0%	7%	11%	62%	39%	5%	10%	2%
Fairmount Park	6%	5%	10%	0%	62%	17%	14%	6%	10%	0%	50%
Gatewood	3%	8%	11%	0%	64%	15%	19%	6%	5%	3%	9%
Gatzert	11%	56%	16%	0%	5%	12%	71%	37%	7%	10%	7%
Genesee Hill	3%	2%	5%	0%	76%	15%	8%	2%	6%	3%	8%
Graham Hill	20%	30%	18%	0%	19%	13%	58%	36%	6%	6%	17%
Green Lake*	8%	2%	6%	0%	71%	12%	11%	7%	7%	3%	17%
Greenwood	6%	7%	10%	0%	67%	11%	14%	2%	10%	0%	25%
Hawthorne	14%	27%	19%	0%	28%	12%	52%	22%	5%	3%	20%
Highland Park	21%	15%	32%	2%	17%	14%	70%	33%	10%	3%	2%
John Hay	15%	3%	9%	1%	58%	14%	11%	11%	5%	5%	21%
John Stanford International	16%	1%	17%	0%	46%	20%	7%	16%	6%	0%	21%
Kimball*	27%	19%	14%	0%	28%	12%	48%	29%	5%	5%	12%
Lafayette	7%	6%	7%	1%	68%	11%	13%	4%	9%	0%	21%
Laurelhurst	14%	5%	6%	0%	64%	12%	21%	10%	6%	6%	15%
Lawton	5%	3%	6%	1%	72%	13%	5%	5%	9%	3%	30%
Leschi	4%	43%	8%	1%	33%	11%	45%	12%	6%	4%	15%
Lowell	23%	28%	13%	0%	22%	14%	61%	23%	9%	10%	6%
Loyal Heights (open fall 2018)	3%	3%	8%	0%	77%	10%	8%	2%	6%	7%	25%
M.L. King Jr.	31%	46%	13%	0%	3%	8%	72%	43%	10%	3%	7%
Madrona	2%	38%	9%	0%	33%	17%	48%	12%	9%	2%	12%
Magnolia (Re- open fall 2019)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maple*	52%	7%	17%	0%	15%	10%	58%	39%	6%	5%	11%
McDonald International	4%	0%	13%	0%	63%	19%	3%	7%	7%	0%	20%
McGilvra	8%	5%	4%	0%	68%	15%	8%	0%	10%	0%	34%
Montlake	7%	4%	4%	0%	68%	16%	4%	3%	5%	4%	31%
Muir	11%	51%	9%	1%	18%	10%	64%	34%	6%	3%	12%
North Beach	5%	2%	6%	0%	74%	14%	5%	2%	9%	3%	18%
Northgate	7%	22%	41%	0%	18%	12%	70%	36%	9%	7%	6%
Olympic Hills	13%	24%	27%	0%	26%	11%	66%	35%	9%	7%	5%
Olympic View	13%	12%	11%	0%	52%	12%	34%	16%	5%	2%	18%
Queen Anne (open fall 2019)	5%	2%	6%	0%	72%	14%	9%	2%	12%	0%	24%
Rainier View	33%	39%	13%	0%	3%	12%	70%	25%	3%	2%	6%
Rogers	10%	16%	13%	1%	42%	17%	36%	18%	7%	6%	12%
Roxhill	13%	29%	34%	0%	15%	9%	75%	31%	11%	6%	1%
Sacajawea	8%	8%	14%	0%	57%	12%	25%	10%	12%	10%	7%
Sand Point	14%	12%	16%	1%	35%	22%	43%	21%	9%	0%	18%
Sanislo*	20%	23%	22%	0%	20%	13%	66%	24%	5%	8%	4%
Stevens	5%	21%	10%	0%	56%	16%	31%	4%	8%	7%	26%
Thornton Creek	4%	2%	6%	0%	74%	14%	6%	3%	9%	6%	12%
Thurgood Marshall	18%	21%	7%	0%	40%	14%	32%	10%	6%	4%	59%
Van Asselt (African American Academy)	36%	41%	11%	0%	3%	8%	79%	41%	6%	10%	3%

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

School	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Native American	White	Multiracial/ Unknown	Free/ Reduced Lunch	English Language Learners	Special Education (Resource)	Special Education (Self-Contained)	Advanced Learning Eligible
View Ridge	15%	3%	6%	1%	61%	15%	7%	5%	8%	4%	38%
Viewlands	10%	11%	18%	1%	49%	11%	37%	19%	11%	3%	8%
Webster (open fall 2020)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Wedgwood	11%	2%	9%	0%	59%	18%	9%	4%	5%	1%	32%
West Seattle ES	6%	72%	9%	0%	9%	5%	82%	42%	7%	6%	2%
West Woodland	6%	2%	6%	0%	72%	13%	5%	2%	10%	2%	29%
Whittier	4%	2%	5%	0%	79%	11%	8%	3%	4%	3%	23%
Wing Luke (open fall 2020)	33%	48%	5%	0%	5%	9%	74%	39%	7%	6%	7%
K-8 Schools											
Blaine	6%	2%	6%	0%	74%	13%	6%	5%	9%	0%	16%
Boren (STEM)	7%	14%	13%	0%	50%	16%	23%	5%	7%	5%	11%
Broadview-Thomson	14%	22%	26%	2%	29%	8%	55%	28%	8%	7%	9%
Cooper (Pathfinder)	2%	3%	8%	0%	70%	18%	9%	0%	8%	10%	8%
Hazel Wolf	7%	9%	8%	0%	65%	11%	16%	9%	7%	4%	28%
Licton Springs (Wilson Pacific)	9%	9%	13%	12%	39%	19%	51%	7%	10%	9%	6%
Monroe (Salmon Bay)	5%	1%	5%	0%	75%	14%	7%	2%	9%	4%	15%
Seward (TOPS)	20%	10%	5%	0%	46%	19%	23%	9%	5%	4%	16%
Whitworth (Orca)	5%	15%	6%	0%	60%	13%	22%	6%	7%	2%	9%
South Shore	20%	47%	10%	1%	10%	12%	65%	28%	7%	4%	5%
Middle Schools											
Aki Kurose	34%	38%	16%	0%	3%	6%	71%	20%	10%	7%	5%
David T. Denny International	17%	23%	30%	2%	21%	7%	67%	18%	14%	9%	7%
Eckstein	10%	4%	7%	1%	68%	10%	12%	2%	7%	5%	31%
Hamilton	8%	3%	8%	0%	72%	9%	8%	1%	7%	4%	59%
Jane Addams	15%	8%	11%	0%	56%	10%	23%	6%	7%	4%	51%
Madison	7%	10%	9%	1%	63%	10%	20%	3%	10%	4%	33%
McClure	9%	4%	9%	0%	67%	10%	12%	3%	11%	4%	27%
Meany	12%	32%	10%	0%	37%	8%	45%	9%	15%	3%	18%
Mercer International	40%	20%	19%	0%	13%	7%	59%	17%	8%	4%	18%
Robert Eagle Staff (Wilson Pacific)	9%	11%	16%	1%	53%	10%	23%	6%	9%	3%	48%
Washington	19%	25%	6%	1%	39%	10%	37%	9%	8%	3%	59%
Whitman	6%	6%	9%	1%	71%	8%	15%	4%	87%	4%	26%
High Schools											
Ballard	7%	3%	9%	1%	75%	7%	9%	2%	7%	4%	24%
Center School	5%	3%	11%	0%	72%	8%	10%	0%	17%	4%	17%
Chief Sealth International	17%	22%	29%	2%	24%	7%	60%	13%	10%	8%	6%
Cleveland	50%	25%	11%	1%	8%	5%	54%	8%	6%	4%	20%
Franklin	46%	27%	11%	1%	8%	6%	62%	17%	7%	4%	8%
Garfield	16%	23%	8%	1%	43%	9%	27%	4%	6%	2%	45%
Horace Mann (Nova Alt.)	3%	4%	8%	0%	73%	11%	22%	0%	18%	7%	8%
Ingraham	12%	10%	14%	1%	54%	9%	24%	8%	7%	5%	39%
Lincoln (open 2019)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Middle College	10%	17%	10%	3%	51%	12%	23%	1%	29%	0%	3%
Nathan Hale	12%	16%	11%	2%	52%	8%	31%	8%	11%	5%	11%
Rainier Beach	27%	49%	14%	0%	3%	6%	73%	24%	10%	7%	2%
Roosevelt	12%	4%	8%	0%	69%	8%	9%	1%	4%	3%	28%
South Lake	14%	38%	28%	3%	0%	14%	87%	21%	19%	0%	0
West Seattle High School	12%	10%	13%	1%	56%	9%	20%	4%	7%	6%	14%

GROWTH TRENDS AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Seattle lies on a narrow strip of land between the salt waters of Puget Sound and the fresh waters of Lake Washington. Beyond the waters lie two rugged mountain ranges, the Olympics to the west and the Cascades to the east. It is a city built on hills and around water, in a mild marine climate that encourages prolific vegetation and abundant natural resources. Seattle was named for Chief Sealth of the Duwamish and Suquamish Tribes. The Duwamish tribe is considered indigenous natives and have been living in the current metropolitan Seattle area since time immemorial. Seattle was the gateway to the Alaska Gold Rush of the early 1900's, site of the 1962 world's fair and a major shipping and trading center with Asia. In the 167 years since it was settled, Seattle has grown to a population of just over 700,000. The City is known for its arts and cultural institutions and is home to Amazon, Nordstrom and Starbucks.

In recent years, the City of Seattle has seen its population grow from 608,660 in 2010 to 713,700 in 2017 (data from Puget Sound Regional Council). Seattle experienced a **17.3% growth over 7 years**, compared with 11.5% over the same period in King County. Seattle is diverse; latest census data indicates that the largest racial group in Seattle is White (66.8% of the city's population). The next largest group is Asian (14%), followed by Black or African American (8%), Hispanic or Latino ethnicity of any race (6%), two or more races (4%), American Indian & Alaska Native (0.6%), Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander (0.4%), Other races (0.2%). The racial and ethnic groups that grew most quickly in Seattle over the last decade were Asians, multiracial persons, and persons of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. The share of the population who are people of color has continued to increase in Seattle, although less quickly than in King County and the U.S. as a whole. Disparities by race and ethnicity show up in every major indicator of well-being measured in the latest American Community Survey (conducted by the US Census Bureau): education, income, unemployment rates, homeownership, housing costs burdens, vehicle availability, and others. According to the survey, 17.3% of the population is foreign born while 21.3% speaks a language other than English at home. In general, the largest disparities in Seattle, as well as in the nation, are for the Black and Hispanic / Latino populations compared with the White, non-Hispanic population. Asians and multi-race persons are also doing more poorly than non-Hispanic Whites on many of these indicators.

Seattle's Comprehensive Plan designates Urban Centers and Urban Villages to accommodate future population and job growth. The plan identifies places where growth should occur, and guides zoning and infrastructure development needed to accommodate the next 20 years' growth. See Figure D for locations of Urban Centers and Urban Villages superimposed onto elementary school boundaries.


The City of Seattle monitors permits to track the amount and location of housing construction. Over the 20-year period between 1994 and 2014, the city added 67,000 residential units. 75% of the added units are located in designated Urban Centers and Urban Villages. Most of the new housing units are in multi-family buildings (<10% of new housing is single family). Historically, multi-family buildings tend to have fewer children and recent growth in occupied housing units have not to date been definitively correlated with growth in population of children. See Figures E and F on growth in housing units and K-5 residents per elementary school attendance areas. The City of Seattle estimates at least an additional 70,000 housing units by 2035, 80% of which will be in urban centers and urban villages. The City of Seattle plans to make land use or zoning changes that will increase development capacity and expand housing choices in the city to address the affordable housing crisis.

DRAFT
2017-18



City of Seattle
Urban Villages / Centers

Map Data:
2017-18
Last updated:
3/27/2017



The names on this map are not intended to reflect the official name of any school building. They are instead intended to ensure better public understanding based upon familiar reference, particularly in situations where program and school building names differ. This information has been compiled by SPS staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. SPS makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. SPS shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited. Mapfile: urbanVillages_ESA

Figure D

Enrollment projections are the anticipated number of students for a specific time-period and are calculated utilizing a myriad of documents and data points. School enrollment projections are based on the number of state funded students (P-223 count) and created from trending data over past years (including progression ratios, show rates, and the Birth-to-K ratio).

- First, resident enrollment in the district is modeled over the past 10-years and quantifies the number of K-12 students. This modeling includes not only past enrollment data, but also recent birth data for Seattle received from the Washington State Department of Health.
- From the resident projections, enrollment within attendance area schools is modeled, taking into consideration option schools, program choices for students, program eligibility, etc.

In addition, these resident projections take into consideration housing information, major employers, city planning projects, and other socioeconomic factors in Seattle when calculating projections.

Enrollment Planning Department currently produces three types of projections annually:

- the 10-year resident projection, of all students residing and eligible to enroll in the district, but not based on where in SPS they attend;
- the school projection for October of the upcoming school year; and
- the school projection for October of the next 5 years

See details on SPS website for enrollment planning work:

https://www.seattleschools.org/departments/enrollment_planning

As SPS looks to the future, there have been several points of discussion about demographic issues that may affect the District. Perhaps of most concern is how the region's changing demographics and significant growth may affect future student enrollment. Some questions yet to be determined, include:

- Will urban living continue to entice younger generations? Will they determine to raise their family in an urban environment setting or move to the more traditional single-family neighborhood?
- Will all newly constructed and planned multi-family units generate proportional enrollment gains for SPS? Observations and data collected to date suggests otherwise, but it is possible theoretically.
- Will property and housing affordability drive enrollment to the south end schools that have existing available capacity and balance out facility utilization? Again, observations and data collected to date on the increase in multi-family units along Sound Transit's southern portion of the Link light rail corridor do not correlate with an increase in student enrollment.

As time progresses, answers to these questions and others will become increasingly more important. It is worth reiterating that because most enrollment projection models use historical information as the basis for projections, there will be a time lag to identifying when a new trend occurs. Hence, annual projections are essential in capturing the most current data for future capacity planning. These annual updates provide the data to begin answering the questions posed above.

EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS/ MODERN LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Seattle Public Schools has a commitment to ensure a high-quality education for every child. Multiple efforts are employed to ensure consistency across the district so that every classroom offers appropriate content and rigorous instruction with high expectations, presented in a positive, culturally-responsive environment.

With the delivery of a 21st century education in mind, SPS developed educational specifications as written records to communicate the educational vision and goals, the educational program delivery methodology and describe the spatial adjacencies and physical characteristics necessary to support high quality, student centered teaching and learning. These documents guide architects and engineers during the design process for new or renovated school buildings. In addition, SPS utilizes the document as a management tool to confirm that identified facility objectives are being fully realized.

Currently, the elementary educational specifications (2016) consist of two standard elementary school configurations for 500 and 650 students respectively. At the middle school level, the standard educational specification is for 1,000 students and at the high school level, the standard specification is for 1,600 students. Educational specifications are periodically reviewed and updated. The middle school education specification is scheduled to be updated in 2019. The High School education specification is in the process of being finalized.

As Seattle is a city built on hills and surrounded by water on two sides, school sites can be topographically challenging. In addition, Seattle also has many unique neighborhoods that have cultural and environmental sensibilities, therefore, SPS convenes a school design advisory team comprised of stakeholders such as school leadership, teachers and staff, students, parents and neighbors to help guide the selected architect to develop a site specific educational specification that addresses site conditions and community needs and identifies educational programmatic adaptations.

The demands of the modern world differ vastly from those of the past. Preparing students to succeed in today's economy, as well as in the economy of the future, will require buildings that support transformative teaching and learning methodologies. The majority of SPS's school buildings were designed to support older, more rigid approaches to education and require thoughtful, purposeful adaptation.

National trends for school buildings show an increase in the square footage per student allocation over the years. The following chart represents the median square footage per student for school districts in the United States according to School Planning & Management, Annual New School Construction Report 2017.

School type	1970	1987	2006	2014	2015	2016
Elementary	70	90	120	149	188	135
Middle	70	111	146	173	173	180
High	120	153	163	174	180	182

This trend accounts for the more collaborative and experiential learning that is common today. Schools today offer more support spaces that encourage interaction, collaboration and working in small groups. This fact creates challenges to renovations of older buildings built in the 50's, 60's or earlier as the structures don't lend themselves to the modern needs of flexible spaces very well. With a large portion of the district's portfolio being older buildings, costs associated with modernization are substantial in converting the older buildings to modern teaching and learning environments.

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Major Space Area assignment by school type based on current Educational Specifications are listed below:

	Elementary	K-8	Middle	High
Design Capacity	500 – 650	650	1,000	1,600
Core Academic: Gen. Ed. Classrooms (includes science)	26,870 S.F. – 33,970 S.F.	25,400 S.F.	36,000 S.F.	65,040 S.F.
Administration and Counseling	3,600 S.F. – 3,670 S.F.	7,265 S.F.	7,265 S.F.	7,200 S.F.
Health Center	N/A	1,400 S.F.	1,400 S.F.	1,540 S.F.
Child Care / Preschool	2,736 S.F. – 2,796 S.F.	3,090 S.F.	N/A	As needed per location
Special Education:	3,700 S.F.	4,550 S.F.	4,475 S.F.	11,570 S.F.
CTE	N/A	3,900 S.F.	5,300 S.F.	10,350 S.F.
Arts	1,500 S.F.	1,750 S.F.	2,050 S.F.	4,950 S.F.
Music/ Performing Arts	1,250 S.F. – 2,500 S.F.	2,760 S.F.	7,325 S.F.	21,305 S.F.
PE / Athletics	6,820 S.F.	12,960 S.F.	15,570 S.F.	34,960 S.F.
Student Dining/ Food service	5,350 S.F. – 6,170 S.F.	10,265 S.F.	13,245 S.F.	12,746 S.F.
Library/ Media Center (Learning Resource)	2,750 S.F.	7,100 S.F.	7,100 S.F.	8,250 S.F.
Maintenance and Custodian Services	1,390 S.F.	3,525 S.F.	5,855 S.F.	3,160 S.F.
Utility, Restroom and Circulation	24,490 S.F. – 28,070 S.F.	26,869 S.F.	33,787 S.F.	76,513 S.F.
Total Building Area	80,456 S.F. -93,336 S.F.	110,834 S.F.	139,372 S.F.	258,824 S.F.
SQ. FT./ STUDENT	161 S.F.- 141 S.F.	171 S.F.	139 S.F.	162 S.F.

The current SPS Education Specifications can be found at:

Elementary (2016):

https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/EdSpecs/Generic%20Elementary%20Educational%20Specifications.pdf

K-8 schools (2012):

https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/EdSpecs/pk8edspecs.pdf

Middle Schools (2012):

https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/EdSpecs/msedspecs.pdf

High Schools (Draft 2016):

https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/EdSpecs/SPS_draftHSedspecsMay2016.pdf

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Seattle Public Schools has added more than 8,000 students in the past decade. Steady enrollment growth, combined with the 2014 Washington K-3 Class Size Reduction Initiative, has resulted in overcrowding at many of schools despite the opening of new, modernized and expanded buildings to house more students. Measures taken to relieve the short-term capacity crunch include converting spaces (e.g. art or music rooms, computer labs, staff lounges, childcare rooms, etc.) into general education classrooms, adding portable classrooms, relocating programs, changing program delivery models, and adjusting school boundaries. The District anticipates this capacity shortage will continue for the foreseeable future.

The Capital Projects and Planning Department conducts capacity analysis annually. In the 2017-18 school year, two types of capacity analysis were conducted for each school: right-sized capacity and operational capacity. Each type of capacity serves its own purpose.

Right-sized Capacity is the total number of students a permanent school building can house with all appropriately sized (≥ 700 ft²) and configured classroom spaces loaded with the maximum number of students per the negotiated collective bargaining agreement on class size. Portables are excluded in right size capacity. It assumes that class sizes would meet all requirements, and programs such as preschools and before and after care would have adequate space within the school building. Right-sized capacity is used for long-range planning, i.e. BEX V capital levy planning.

Operational Capacity is the total number of students a school can house including existing portable classrooms. It assumes all classroom sized spaces are being used as classrooms (i.e., no dedicated classroom space for community partner preschools, daycares, before and after care, or computer labs). Operational capacity is used for short-term planning, e.g., student assignment or annual capacity management.

Figures G1 and G2 show right-sized and operational capacity for elementary, K-8, middle and high schools for the 2017-18 school year. Figure H indicates estimated operational capacity for elementary, K-8, middle and high schools for the 2018-19 school year. For this coming school year 2018-19, we anticipate right-sized capacity to remain the same as the 2017-18 school year, hence no additional chart is shown.

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

2017-18 Elementary School Right-sized Capacity (for long-range planning)

School Name	2017-18 Permanent Classrooms	2017-18 Portable Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables) Excluded from Capacity Calculation											Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment /Right-sized Capacity
			PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	MS	Art	O					
			Elementary Schools														
Adams	25	4	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	18	396	551	139%	
Alki	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	330	373	113%	
Arbor Heights	38	0	0	2	3	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	25	550	521	95%	
B.F. Day	27	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	352	282	80%	
Bagley	17	8	0	1 ^P	2	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	1+1 ^P	12	264	427	162%	
Beacon Hill	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	18	360	417	116%	
Bryant	28	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	21	462	587	127%	
Cascadia	38	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	25	550	525	95%	
Cedar Park	11	8	2	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	7	154	55	36%	
Coe	25	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	19	418	560	134%	
Concord Int'l	26	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	16	320	347	108%	
Dearborn Park	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	17	340	352	104%	
Decatur	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	13	286	242	85%	
Dunlap	30	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	17	340	270	79%	
Emerson	27	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	17	340	322	95%	
Fairmount Park	27	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	18	396	537	136%	
Gatewood	22	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	330	376	114%	
Gatzert	27	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1 ^P	0	1	15	300	284	95%	
Genesee Hill	38	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	27	594	718	121%	
Graham Hill	21	3	0	2	2	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1	1	0	0	16	320	358	112%	
Green Lake	24	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	330	433	131%	
Greenwood	20	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	330	345	105%	
Hawthorne	25	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	17	340	407	120%	
John Hay	26	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2+1 ^P	18	396	491	124%	
Highland Park	27	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	16	320	319	100%	
E.C. Hughes	17	8															
Kimball	18	9	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	18	360	443	123%	
Lafayette	25	6	1	1	0	1+2 ^P	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	19	418	394	94%	
Latona (John Stanford)	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	418	452	108%	
Laurelhurst	18	4	0	0	1+1 ^P	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	13	286	354	124%	
Lawton	25	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	18	396	453	114%	
Leschi	25	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	17	340	402	118%	
Lowell	33	0	4	0	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	16	352	358	102%	
Loyal Heights (new)	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	26	572	398		
Madrona	28	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	19	380	234	62%	
Magnolia																	
Maple	26	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	19	380	532	140%	
Martin Luther King Jr.	24	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	0	0	16	320	278	87%	
McDonald Int'l	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	17	374	464	124%	
McGilvra	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	12	264	242	92%	
Montlake	8	6	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	154	269	175%	
Muir	25	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	1	2	17	340	367	108%	
North Beach	13	8	1	0	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	10	220	328	149%	
Northgate	16	5	1	0	2	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	0	3 ^P	11	220	255	116%	
Olympic Hills	38	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	26	520	381	73%	
Olympic View	24	3	0	1	2	0	1 ^P	1	0	1	1	0	18	396	449	113%	
Queen Anne	17	4	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	330	352	107%	
Rainier View	13	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	200	243	122%	
Rogers	14	5	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	12	264	349	132%	
Roxhill	15	6	1 ^P	0	2	1 ^P	1	0	1	1	0	2	12	240	270	113%	
Sacajawea	13	5	1 ^P	1 ^P	2	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1+1 ^P	10	220	236	107%
Sand Point	12	7	1	0	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1	1 ^P	0	0	10	220	203	92%	
Sanislo	16	3	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	180	236	131%	
Schmitz Park	12																
Stevens	21	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	12	264	287	109%	
Thornton Creek	40	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	26	572	521	91%	
Thurgood Marshall	28	3	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	18	396	575	145%	
Van Asselt (AAA)	34	0	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	23	460	428	93%	
View Ridge	24	7	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1 ^P	2	1 ^P	18	396	550	139%	
Viewlands	15	12	1	1 ^P	2 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	0	1	2 ^P	10	200	399	200%	
Wedgwood	21	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	2 ^P	15	330	480	145%	
West Seattle Elem	26	5	2	2	2	1	1	0	1+1 ^P	1 ^P	1	0	16	320	434	136%	
West Woodland	24	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1 ^P	18	396	565	143%	
Whittier	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	20	440	495	113%	
Wing Luke	19	2	0	1 ^P	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	320	337	105%	
TOTALS	1470	172											1016	21576	24112	112%	

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

2017-18 K-8 School Right-sized Capacity (for long-range planning)

School Name	2017-18 Permanent Classrooms	2017-18 Portable Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)											Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment /Right-sized Capacity
			K-5 program rooms excluded from Capacity Calculation														
			PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	MS	Art	O					
K-8 Schools																	
Blaine	29	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	595	781	131%	
Boren STEM	39	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	5	24	555	535	96%	
Broadview-Thomson	41	1	2	0	2	3	1 ^p	2	2	1	1	1	29	612	531	87%	
Cooper (Pathfinder)	27	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1 ^p	1	1	21	459	487	106%	
Hazel Wolf	37	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	29	644	736	114%	
Licton Springs	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	160	164	103%	
Monroe (Salmon Bay)	37	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	1	2	1	0	31	684	659	96%	
Seward (TOPS)	26	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	20	437	471	108%	
South Shore	48	0	3	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	33	699	520	74%	
Whitworth (Orca)	27	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	447	391	87%	
TOTALS	321	9											240	5292	5275	100%	

2017-18 Middle School Right-sized Capacity (for long-range planning)

School Name	2017-18 Permanent Classrooms	2017-18 Portable/M odular Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)								Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment /Right-sized Capacity
			K-5 program rooms excluded from Capacity Calculation											
			HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	CTE	O					
Middle Schools														
Aki Kurose	42	2	32	4	2+1 ^p	2+1 ^p	1	0	1	40	868	686	79%	
Denny	53	0	36	7	6	2	1	1	0	53	974	835	86%	
Eckstein	45	7	31+6 ^p	5	6	1	2	0	1 ^p	43	925	967	105%	
Hamilton	45	0	38	4	2	0	1	0	0	44	985	986	100%	
Jane Addams	42	4	35+4 ^p	5	0	1	1	0	0	41	925	916	99%	
Madison	46	0	35	6	1	1	2	1	0	44	970	881	91%	
McClure	30	2	22	4	1+2 ^p	0	2	1	0	29	615	540	88%	
Meany	41	0	30	4	2	0	2	2	1	39	851	492	58%	
Mercer	42	18	35	3+2 ^p	2 ^p	2	2	0	0	40	792	1136	143%	
Robert Eagle Staff	35	0	28	3	1	1	2	0	0	33	752	716	95%	
Washington	40	11	33	3	3+3 ^p	1 ^p	0	1	1 ^p	40	895	712	80%	
Whitman	38	14	25	6	3	1	2	1	2 ^p	36	754	566	75%	
TOTALS	499	58								482	10306	9433	92%	

2017-18 High School Right-sized Capacity (for long-range planning)

School Name	2017-18 Permanent Classrooms	2017-18 Portable/M odular Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)								Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment /Right-sized Capacity
			K-5 program rooms excluded from Capacity Calculation											
			HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	CTE	O					
High Schools														
Ballard	73	4	56+4 ^p	2	5	1	2	7	0	71	1606	1882	117%	
Chief Sealth	64	6	42+5 ^p	4	8+1 ^p	4	0	6	0	64	1289	1015	79%	
Cleveland	48	0	36	2	4	1	1	4	0	47	965	849	88%	
Franklin	68	0	45	6	3	5	3	6	0	65	1398	1284	92%	
Garfield	72	4	56+4 ^p	4	2	2	3	5	0	69	1594	1774	111%	
Ingraham	63	4	42+3 ^p	4	7	3	2	5	1 ^p	61	1196	1342	112%	
Lincoln														
Nathan Hale	57	4	41+2 ^p	5+2 ^p	2	2	0	7	0	57	1096	1189	108%	
Rainier Beach	50	2	31	3	2	4	1	7	2 ^p	50	1088	721	66%	
Roosevelt	82	6	62+6 ^p	4	4	1	3	8	0	82	1719	1840	107%	
The Center School	13	0	10	0	2	0	0	1	0	13	300	229	76%	
West Seattle HS	56	0	39	5	3	2	1	6	0	56	1215	970	80%	
TOTALS	646	30								635	13466	13095	97%	

Figure G1: Right Sized Capacities for 2017-18

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

2017-18 Elementary School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2017-18	2017-18	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)											Net Permanent	Net Portable	Net Portable Capacity	No. of Converted Classrooms/ Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Operational Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment /Operational Capacity
	Permanent Classrooms	Portable Classrooms	Excluded from Capacity Calculation																		
			PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	MS	Art	O									
Elementary Schools																					
Adams	25	4	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	18	4	100	2	50	550	551	100%	
Alki	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	1	25	0	400	373	93%		
Arbor Heights	38	0	0	2	3	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	25	0	0	4	100	625	521	83%	
B.F. Day	27	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	0	0	3	75	400	282	71%	
Bagley	17	8	0	1 ^P	2	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	1+1 ^P	12	5	125	1	25	425	427	100%	
Beacon Hill	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	18	0	0	2	46	414	417	101%	
Bryant	28	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	21	0	0	3	75	525	587	112%	
Cascadia	38	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	25	0	0	4	100	625	525	84%	
Cedar Park	11	8	2	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	7	6	150	3	75	325	55	17%	
Coe	25	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	19	0	0	3	75	475	560	118%	
Concord Int'l	26	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	2	46	368	347	94%	
Dearborn Park	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	17	0	0	2	46	391	352	90%	
Decatur	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	0	0	0	0	325	242	74%	
Dunlap	30	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	17	0	0	3	69	391	270	69%	
Emerson	27	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	17	0	0	2	46	391	322	82%	
Fairmount Park	27	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	18	0	0	3	75	450	537	119%	
Gatewood	22	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	2	50	3	75	425	376	88%	
Gatzert	27	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1 ^P	0	1	15	0	0	3	69	345	284	82%	
Genesee Hill	38	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	27	0	0	2	50	675	718	106%	
Graham Hill	21	3	0	2	2	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1	1	0	0	16	1	23	3	69	391	358	92%	
Green Lake	24	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	2	50	0	425	433	102%		
Greenwood	20	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	0	0	2	50	375	345	92%	
Hawthorne	25	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	17	0	0	2	46	391	407	104%	
John Hay	26	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2+1 ^P	18	3	75	2	50	525	491	94%	
Highland Park	27	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	2	46	368	319	87%	
E.C. Hughes	17	8																			
Kimball	18	9	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	18	2	46	3	69	460	443	96%	
Lafayette	25	6	1	1	0	1+2 ^P	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	19	3	75	1	25	550	394	72%	
Latona (John	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	0	1	25	475	452	95%	
Laurelhurst	18	4	0	0	1+1 ^P	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	13	3	75	1	25	400	354	89%	
Lawton	25	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	18	0	0	3	75	450	453	101%	
Leschi	25	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	17	0	0	2	46	391	402	103%	
Lowell	33	0	4	0	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	1	25	400	358	90%	
Loyal Heights (new)	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	26	0	0	2	50	650	398	61%	
Madrona	28	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	19	0	0	2	46	437	234	54%	
Magnolia																					
Maple	26	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	19	4	92	1	23	529	532	101%
Martin Luther King	24	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	0	0	16	0	0	3	69	368	278	76%	
McDonald Int'l	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	3	75	1	25	500	464	93%	
McGilvra	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	12	0	0	1	25	300	242	81%	
Montlake	8	6	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4	100	1	25	275	269	98%	
Muir	25	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	1	2	17	1	23	2	46	414	367	89%	
North Beach	13	8	1	0	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	10	4	100	1	25	350	328	94%	
Northgate	16	5	1	0	2	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	0	3 ^P	11	0	0	0	0	253	255	101%	
Olympic Hills	38	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	26	0	0	3	69	598	381	64%	
Olympic View	24	3	0	1	2	0	1 ^P	1	0	1	1	0	18	2	50	2	50	500	449	90%	
Queen Anne	17	4	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	2	50	0	425	352	83%		
Rainier View	13	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	6	120	1	25	320	243	76%	
Rogers	14	5	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	12	3	75	0	0	375	349	93%	
Roxhill	15	6	1 ^P	0	2	1 ^P	1	0	1	1	0	2	12	3	69	1	25	345	270	78%	
Sacajawea	13	5	1 ^P	1 ^P	2	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	0	1+1 ^P	10	1	25	1	25	275	236	86%	
Sand Point	12	7	1	0	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1	1 ^P	0	0	10	4	100	1	25	350	203	58%	
Sanislo	16	3	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	3	69	2	46	276	236	86%	
Schmitz Park	12																				
Stevens	21	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	12	0	0	3	75	300	287	96%	
Thornton Creek	40	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	26	0	0	3	75	650	521	80%	
Thurgood Marshall	28	3	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	18	3	75	3	75	525	575	110%	
Van Asselt (AAA)	34	0	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	23	0	0	3	69	529	428	81%	
View Ridge	24	7	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1 ^P	2	1 ^P	18	5	125	0	0	575	550	96%	
Viewlands	15	12	1	1 ^P	2 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	0	1	2 ^P	10	4	92	0	0	322	399	124%	
Wedgwood	21	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	15	4	100	0	0	475	480	101%	
West Seattle Elem	26	5	2	2	2	1	1	0	1+1 ^P	1 ^P	1	0	16	3	69	2	46	437	434	99%	
West Woodland	24	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1 ^P	18	6	150	3	75	600	565	94%	
Whittier	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	20	0	0	3	75	500	495	99%	
Wing Luke	19	2	0	1 ^P	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	23	1	23	391	337	86%	
TOTALS	1470	172											1016	98	2376	114	2760	26970	24112	89%	

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

2017-18 K-8 School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2017-18	2017-18	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)										Net Permanent	Net Portable	Net Portable	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Operational Capacity	2017-18 Enrollment	2017-18 Utilization Enrollment/Operational Capacity
	Permanent	Portable	K-5 program rooms excluded from Capacity Calculation																	
	Classrooms	Classrooms	PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	MS	Art	O								
K-8 Schools																				
Blaine	29	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	7	182	0	0	799	781	98%
Boren STEM	39	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	5	24	0	0	3	78	612	535	87%
Broadview-Thomson	41	1	2	0	2	3	1 ^P	2	2	1	1	1	29	0	0	2	50	668	531	79%
Cooper (Pathfinder)	27	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1 ^P	1	1	21	0	0	2	52	499	487	98%
Hazel Wolf	37	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	29	0	0	2	52	704	736	105%
Linton Springs	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	175	164	94%	
Monroe (Salmon Bay)	37	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	1	2	1	0	31	0	0	2	702	659	94%	
Seward (TOPS)	26	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	20	0	0	2	477	471	99%	
South Shore	48	0	3	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	33	0	0	2	52	761	520	68%
Whitworth (Orca)	27	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	0	0	2	487	391	80%	
TOTALS	321	9											240	7	182	17	440	5884	5275	90%

2017-18 Middle School Right-sized Capacity (for long-range planning)

School Name	2017-18	2017-18	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)										Net Permanent	Net Permanent	2017-18	2017-18				
	Permanent	Portable/M odular															Classrooms	Right-sized Capacity	Enrollment	Utilization
	Classrooms	Classrooms	HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	CTE	O	Classrooms	Right-sized Capacity	Enrollment					Enrollment /Right-sized Capacity			
Middle Schools																				
Aki Kurose	42	2	32	4	2+1 ^P	2+1 ^P	1	0	1	40	868	686	79%							
Denny	53	0	36	7	6	2	1	1	0	53	974	835	86%							
Eckstein	45	7	31+6 ^P	5	6	1	2	0	1 ^P	43	925	967	105%							
Hamilton	45	0	38	4	2	0	1	0	0	44	985	986	100%							
Jane Addams	42	4	35+4 ^P	5	0	1	1	0	0	41	925	916	99%							
Madison	46	0	35	6	1	1	2	1	0	44	970	881	91%							
McClure	30	2	22	4	1+2 ^P	0	2	1	0	29	615	540	88%							
Meany	41	0	30	4	2	0	2	2	1	39	851	492	58%							
Mercer	42	18	35	3+2 ^P	2 ^P	2	2	0	0	40	792	1136	143%							
Robert Eagle Staff	35	0	28	3	1	1	2	0	0	33	752	716	95%							
Washington	40	11	33	3	3+3 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	1 ^P	40	895	712	80%							
Whitman	38	14	25	6	3	1	2	1	2 ^P	36	754	566	75%							
TOTALS	499	58								482	10306	9433	92%							

2017-18 High School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2017-18	2017-18	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)										Net Permanent	Net Portable	Net Portable	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Operational Capacity	2017-18	2017-18					
	Permanent	Portable/M odular																			Classrooms	Classrooms	Capacity	Enrollment	Utilization
	Classrooms	Classrooms	HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	CTE	O	Classrooms	Classrooms	Capacity									Enrollment	Enrollment /Operational Capacity			
High Schools																									
Ballard	73	4	56+4 ^P	2	5	1	2	7	0	71	4	100	2	50	1706	1882	110%								
Chief Sealth	64	6	42+5 ^P	4	8+1 ^P	4	0	6	0	64	6	141	0	0	1430	1015	71%								
Cleveland	48	0	36	2	4	1	1	4	0	47	0	0	1	25	965	849	88%								
Franklin	68	0	45	6	3	5	3	6	0	65	0	0	3	75	1398	1284	92%								
Garfield	72	4	56+4 ^P	4	2	2	3	5	0	69	4	100	3	75	1694	1774	105%								
Ingraham	63	4	42+3 ^P	4	7	3	2	5	1 ^P	61	3	75	2	50	1271	1342	106%								
Lincoln																									
Nathan Hale	57	4	41+2 ^P	5+2 ^P	2	2	0	7	0	57	4	56	0	0	1152	1189	103%								
Rainier Beach	50	2	31	3	2	4	1	7	2 ^P	50	0	0	1	25	1088	721	66%								
Roosevelt	82	6	62+6 ^P	4	4	1	3	8	0	82	6	150	3	75	1869	1840	98%								
The Center School	13	0	10	0	2	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	300	229	76%								
West Seattle HS	56	0	39	5	3	2	1	6	0	56	0	0	1	25	1215	970	80%								
TOTALS	646	30								635	27	621.44			14087	13095	93%								

Figure G2: Operational Capacities for 2017-18

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Estimated 2018-19 Elementary School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2018-19	2018-19	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)											Net Permanent	Net Portable	Net Portable	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Estimated Operational Capacity	2018-19 Projected Enrollment (Feb. 2018)	2018-19 Utilization Projected Enrollment /Operational Capacity
	Permanent	Portable	Excluded from Capacity Calculation																		
	Classrooms	Classrooms	PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	MS	Art	O	Classrooms								
Elementary Schools																					
Adams	25	4	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	18	4	92	2	46	549	540	98%	
Alki	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	1	23	0	0	369	354	96%	
Arbor Heights	38	0	0	2	3	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	25	0	0	4	92	573	543	95%	
B.F. Day	27	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	16	0	3	69	363	307	85%		
Bagley	17	8	0	1 ^P	2	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	1+1 ^P	12	5	115	1	23	407	432	106%	
Beacon Hill	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	18	0	0	2	42	407	401	99%	
Bryant	28	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	21	0	0	3	69	526	564	107%	
Cascadia	38	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	25	0	0	4	92	612	527	86%	
Cedar Park	11	8	2	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	7	6	138	3	69	290	76	26%	
Coe	25	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	19	1	23	3	69	536	567	106%	
Concord Int'l	26	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	2	42	333	350	105%	
Dearborn Park	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	17	0	0	2	42	354	340	96%	
Decatur	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	13	0	0	0	291	252	87%	
Dunlap	30	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	17	0	0	3	63	357	279	78%	
Emerson	27	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	17	0	0	2	42	351	303	86%	
Fairmount Park	27	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	18	0	0	3	69	516	542	105%	
Gatewood	22	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	15	2	46	3	69	386	376	97%	
Gatzert	27	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1 ^P	0	1	15	0	0	3	63	270	277	103%	
Genesee Hill	38	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	27	0	0	2	46	664	692	104%	
Graham Hill	21	3	0	2	2	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1	1	0	0	16	1	21	3	63	391	323	83%	
Green Lake	24	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	2	46	0	0	387	442	114%	
Greenwood	20	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	0	0	2	46	345	311	90%
Hawthorne	25	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	17	0	0	2	42	351	407	116%	
John Hay	26	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2+1 ^P	18	3	69	2	46	458	492	107%	
Highland Park	27	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	2	42	306	308	101%	
Kimball	18	9	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	18	2	42	3	63	408	437	107%	
Lafayette	25	6	1	1	0	1+2 ^P	1	0	1	1 ^P	1	0	19	3	69	1	23	508	398	78%	
Latona (John)	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	0	1	23	437	469	107%	
Laurelhurst	18	4	0	0	1+1 ^P	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	13	3	69	1	23	369	335	91%	
Lawton	25	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	18	0	0	3	69	429	490	114%	
Leschi	25	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	17	0	0	2	42	369	403	109%	
Lowell	33	0	4	0	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	16	0	0	1	23	356	334	94%	
Loyal Heights (new)	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	26	0	0	2	46	572	411	72%	
Madrona	28	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	19	0	0	2	42	390	233	60%	
Magnolia																					
Maple	26	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	19	4	84	1	21	468	548	117%	
Martin Luther King	24	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	0	0	16	0	0	3	63	330	265	80%	
McDonald Int'l	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	17	3	69	1	23	471	485	103%	
McGilvra	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	12	0	0	1	23	278	239	86%	
Montlake	8	6	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4	92	1	23	251	274	109%	
Muir	25	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	1	2	17	1	21	2	42	372	382	103%	
North Beach	13	8	1	0	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	10	4	92	1	23	322	322	100%	
Northgate	16	5	1	0	2	1	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	0	3 ^P	11	0	0	0	0	225	245	109%	
Olympic Hills	38	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	26	0	0	3	63	546	383	70%	
Olympic View	24	3	0	1	2	0	1 ^P	1	0	1	1	0	18	2	46	2	46	458	446	97%	
Queen Anne	17	4	0	1 ^P	0	1 ^P	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	2	46	0	0	390	343	88%	
Rainier View	13	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	6	120	1	23	309	246	80%	
Rogers	14	5	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	12	3	69	0	0	339	335	99%	
Roxhill (E.C. Hughes)	17	8	2 ^P	0	2 ^P	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1 ^P	13	3	63	0	336	255	76%	
Sacajawea	13	5	1 ^P	1 ^P	2 ^P	1 ^P	0	0	0	0	0	0	1+1 ^P	10	1	23	1	23	247	232	94%
Sand Point	12	7	1	0	0	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1	1 ^P	0	0	10	4	92	1	23	302	183	61%	
Sanislo	16	3	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	3	63	2	42	264	203	77%	
Schmitz Park	12																				
Stevens	21	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	12	0	0	3	69	283	248	88%	
Thornton Creek	40	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	26	0	0	3	69	586	584	100%	
Thurgood Marshall	28	3	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	18	3	69	3	69	543	567	104%	
Van Asselt (AAA)	34	0	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	3	63	480	403	84%	
View Ridge	24	7	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1 ^P	2	1 ^P	18	5	115	0	538	536	100%	
Viewlands	15	12	1	1 ^P	2 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	1 ^P	0	0	1	2 ^P	10	4	84	0	0	351	392	112%	
Wedgwood	21	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	15	4	92	0	0	480	473	99%	
West Seattle Elem	26	5	2	2	2	1	1	0	1+1 ^P	1 ^P	1	0	16	3	63	2	42	387	429	111%	
West Woodland	24	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1 ^P	18	6	138	3	69	552	541	98%	
Whittier	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	20	0	0	3	69	471	463	98%	
Wing Luke (OVA)	18	4	0	0	2	0	0	1 ^P	1	0	0	0	15	2	42	0	0	351	336	96%	
TOTALS	1454	169											1016	100	2236	112	2488	25160	23873	95%	

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Estimated 2018-19 K-8 School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2018-19 Permanent Classrooms	2018-19 Portable Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)											Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Capacity (Right-sized)	Net Portable Classrooms	Net Portable Capacity	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Estimated Operational Capacity	2018-19 Projected Enrollment (Feb. 2018)	Est. 2018-19 Utilization Projected Enrollment /Operational Capacity	
			K-5 program rooms excluded from Capacity Calculation																				
			PreK	CC	SC	RS	OT/PT	ELL	Clab	PCP	MS	Art	O										
K-8 Schools																							
Blaine	29	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	26	595	7	146	0	0	779	795	102%	
Boren STEM	39	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	5	24	555	0	0	3	69	576	558	97%	
Broadview-Thomson	41	1	2	0	2	3	1 ^P	2	2	1	1	1	29	612	0	0	2	42	613	529	86%		
Cooper (Pathfinder)	27	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1 ^P	1	1	21	459	0	0	2	46	460	500	109%		
Hazel Wolf	37	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	29	644	0	0	2	46	658	750	114%		
Licton Springs	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	160	0	0	0	0	167	172	103%		
Monroe (Salmon Bay)	37	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	1	2	1	0	31	684	0	0	2	46	685	680	99%		
Seward (TOPS)	26	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	20	437	0	0	2	46	446	493	111%		
South Shore	48	0	3	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	33	699	0	0	2	46	706	524	74%		
Whitworth (Orca)	27	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	447	0	0	2	46	456	414	91%		
TOTALS	321	9											240		7	146	17	387	5546	5415	98%		

Estimated 2018-19 Middle School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2018-19 Permanent Classrooms	2018-19 Portable/M odular Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)										Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	Net Portable Classrooms	Net Portable Capacity	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Estimated Operational Capacity	2018-19 Projected Enrollment (Feb. 2018)	Est. 2018-19 Utilization Projected Enrollment /Operational Capacity
			HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	PCP	CTE	O											
Middle Schools																					
Aki Kurose	42	2	32	4	2+1 ^P	2+1 ^P	1	2	0	1			40	868	2	33	1	24	900	662	74%
Denny	53	0	36	7	6	2	1	1	0	1			53	974	0	0	1	24	949	844	89%
Eckstein	45	7	31+6 ^P	5	6	1	2	2	0	1 ^P			43	925	6	150	2	48	1044	991	95%
Hamilton	45	0	38	4	2	0	1	0	0	0			44	985	0	0	1	24	978	1031	105%
Jane Addams	42	4	35+4 ^P	5	0	1	1	1	0	0			41	925	4	96	1	24	993	926	93%
Madison	46	4	36+4 ^P	3	1	1	2	2	1	2			44	970	4	96	2	48	1039	955	92%
McClure	30	2	22	4	1+2 ^P	0	2	2	1	0			29	615	2	33	2	48	630	546	87%
Meany	41	0	30	4	2	0	2	2	2	1			39	851	0	0	2	48	850	534	63%
Mercer	42	21	35+17 ^P	3+2 ^P	2 ^P	2	2	0	0	0			40	792	21	457	2	48	1171	1185	101%
Robert Eagle Staff	35	4	28+4 ^P	3	1	1	2	0	0	0			33	752	4	96	2	48	846	824	97%
Washington	40	11	33+6 ^P	3	3+3 ^P	1 ^P	0	1	1 ^P				40	895	10	216	0	0	1081	679	63%
Whitman	38	14	25+12 ^P	6	3	1	2	1	2 ^P				36	754	12	289	2	48	1033	576	56%
TOTALS	499	69											482	10306	65	1467	18	433	11514	9753	85%

2018-19 High School Operational Capacity (for short-term planning)

School Name	2018-19 Permanent Classrooms	2018-19 Portable Classrooms	Targeted Use of Program Rooms (Permanent & Portables)											Net Permanent Classrooms	Net Permanent Right-sized Capacity	Net Portable Classrooms	Net Portable Capacity	No. of Converted Classrooms/Potential Conversions	Net Conv. Rm Capacity	Total Estimated Operational Capacity	2018-19 Projected Enrollment (Feb. 2018)	Est. 2018-19 Utilization Projected Enrollment /Operational Capacity
			HR	SC	RS	ELL	Clab	PCP	CTE	O												
High Schools																						
Ballard	73	8	56+8 ^P	2	5	1	2			7	0		71	1606	8	199	2	50	1805	1975	109%	
Chief Sealth	64	6	42+5 ^P	4	8+1 ^P	4	0			6	0		64	1289	6	141	0	0	1430	968	68%	
Cleveland	48	0	36	2	4	1	1			4	0		47	965	0	0	1	25	965	875	91%	
Franklin	68	0	45	6	3	5	3			6	0		65	1398	0	0	3	75	1398	1249	89%	
Garfield	72	1	56	4	2	2	3			5	0		69	1594	1	25	3	75	1619	1769	109%	
Ingraham	63	6	42+5 ^P	3	8	3	2			5	1 ^P		61	1196	5	75	2	50	1330	1336	100%	
Lincoln																						
Nathan Hale	57	8	39+4 ^P	7+3 ^P	1	2+1 ^P	0			7	1		57	1096	8	126	0	0	1225	1160	95%	
Rainier Beach	50	2	31	3	1	3	0			7	2 ^P		50	1088	0	0	1	25	1088	705	65%	
Roosevelt	82	6	62+6 ^P	4	4	1	3			8	0		82	1719	6	150	3	75	1869	1938	104%	
The Center School	13	0	10	0	2	0	0			1	0		13	300	0	0	0	0	300	226	75%	
West Seattle HS	56	0	39	5	3	2	1			6	0		56	1215	0	0	1	25	1215	937	77%	
TOTALS	646	37											635	13466	34	716.06		14244	13138	92%		

Figure H: Operational Capacities for 2018-19

Legend for Figures G1, G2 and H:

- PreK=Preschool classroom
- CC=Childcare classroom
- SC= Special Education Self-contained classroom
- RS= Special Education Resource classroom
- OT/PT=Therapy room
- ELL=English Language Learners classroom
- Clab=Computer lab
- MS=Music room
- O=Others (Interventions, Access/Focus, Bilingual Orientation Center, Community-based Programs, Instrumental Music, etc.)

PCP spaces excluded in elementary capacity
 PreK=Pre-school classroom

Converted Classroom/Potential Conversions include childcare rooms and computer labs
 HR=General education homerooms including core academics, electives & PE
 SC= Special Education Self-contained classroom
 RS= Special Education Resource classroom
 ELL=English Language Learners classroom
 Clab=Computer labs excluded from capacity calculation if were mainly for testing
 CTE=Career & technical education
 O=Others (offices, community partnerships)

Several variables impact capacity, including: the quantity and types of classrooms; the collective bargaining agreement between SPS and Seattle Education Association or staffing ratio per District’s Weighted Staffing Standards (WSS) model, academic programs, and school schedule. Other factors that contribute to capacity impacts, include: community partnerships, e.g., preschool programs and community learning centers located in our facilities, and the collective bargaining agreement limitation of teacher assignments to no more than two teaching stations. More than one teaching station can be assigned only when specific conditions are met.

Class size has a significant impact when calculating a school’s capacity. Below is a table that summarizes various class sizes by grade level for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years as well as class size utilized for long-range BEX V levy planning. As shown, class sizes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 (K-3) have been lowered at all elementary schools throughout the district, both non high-poverty and high-poverty. For BEX V capital levy planning, to make sure we plan for the capacity needed for full implementation of the 2014 Washington K-3 Class Size Reduction Initiative, we utilized a class size of 20 students in grades K-3 at non high-poverty schools and 17 students in grades K-3 at high-poverty schools.

Grade	Non High-Poverty Schools			High-Poverty Schools		
	2017-18 WSS	2018-19 WSS	BEX V Planning	2017-18 WSS	2018-19 WSS	BEX V Planning
K	22	20	20	20	18	17
1	24	20	20	20	18	17
2	25	21	20	21	18	17
3	25	24	20	24	18	17
4 & 5	27	27	27	27	27	27
Average	25	23	22	23	21	20
6-8	30	29	30	30	29	30
9-12	29	29	30	29	29	30

High-poverty schools in the 2017-18 school year are defined by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) as schools with 50% or more students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch rates as of October 1 of the prior year.

The poverty measure used for the 2018-19 staffing allocations is percentage of Free and Reduced-Price Lunch (FRL) students enrolled as of the end of January 2018. The District elected to vary the State funding for K-3 teachers based on individual school poverty rates. If a school has more than 75% FRL students, it is considered very high-poverty; a school with less than 75% and greater than 40% FRL students, high-poverty. To calculate elementary operational capacity for 2018-19, we use the WSS class sizes for high-poverty for all high-poverty schools since the difference in the class sizes is negligible between the two categories.

At elementary schools, spaces excluded from capacity calculation are preparation/conference/planning (PCP), English language learning (ELL) or bilingual orientation centers (BOC), and designated special education rooms. To simplify capacity calculation for elementary schools, an average staffing ratio of grades K-5 is used in lieu of a different ratio for different grade levels. The table above lists average class sizes for both non-high poverty and high-poverty schools.

Capital Projects and Planning Department analyzes elementary school capacities by middle school service area to gain flexibility in solving overcrowding issues within a geographical area. Elementary school boundaries can be adjusted based on capacity needs. An example of this would be the most recent attendance area boundary revisions for Genesee Hill Elementary School and Lafayette Elementary School in the West Seattle Region starting in the 2018-19 school year.

For long-range planning, we utilized the 5-year enrollment projections and 10-year resident projections generated by SPS's Enrollment Planning Department in fall of 2017. A trend analysis was then applied for all grade levels based on historic enrollment (October 2012 to October 2017) and the most current 5-year enrollment projections. Enrollment trend data provide an additional 5-year student population from 2022 to 2026. We then compared the right-size capacity with the resident projections and enrollment trends to assess grades K-5 and 6-8 capacity needs for each middle school service area.

For high school capacity analysis, we examined resident projections, enrollment trend, and right-sized capacity of individual high schools as well as high schools located in South End, North End and Central area.

For detailed analysis and proposed BEX V projects, please refer to Section titled "ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR BEX V" in this Facilities Master Plan Update.

BUILDING CONDITIONS

Seattle Public Schools has 117 properties in its portfolio, with 100 of them operating as schools. There are currently 4 schools that are closed and under construction. The average age of SPS buildings is 60 years. The district also has 29 buildings that are designated City of Seattle Landmarks with another 11 that have the potential for landmark designation. While the district is proud to be the stewards of these buildings, they incur more cost in maintenance, repair and alterations than typical buildings. These historic buildings also present a significant challenge in providing 21st century learning environments for our students.

Decades of deferred maintenance and prior lack of stable capital funding for school facilities has created a maintenance backlog. This maintenance backlog means classrooms and other learning environments have leaking roofs, drafty windows, noisy and archaic mechanical and plumbing systems, poor air flow and temperature control and inadequate electrical systems to support current-day technology. Facilities Backlog of Maintenance and Repair (BMAR) costs were generated by the Meng Analysis 2014 building condition assessment. The cost is generated by using surveyor provided parametric estimates of quantities for deficiencies noted during facility condition assessment and applying difficulty factors to generate parametric estimates that are reflective of market costs in the Seattle area at the time (January 2014). The Meng report estimated a facilities maintenance backlog of more than \$500M (2014 \$).

As part of the BEX IV capital levy, the district focused efforts and was able reduce the maintenance backlog to approximately \$400M in 2018. In that time frame, the district modernized or replaced 10 elementary schools with four more coming on line by 2020, two K-8 schools, two middle schools, and a high school. In addition, SPS addressed critical safety issues (e.g. seismic upgrades), roof replacements, cladding repairs, and mechanical and electrical upgrades to ensure safe and healthy learning environments for all our students.

In preparation for BEX V capital levy planning, the building condition assessment was updated and the existing condition of our portables and playground equipment added to the list of assessed items. A summary of the 2018 building condition assessment is attached in Addendum 1. The 2018 assessment surveyed 92 buildings utilizing McKinstry, an OSPI certified consultant to perform the evaluation.

The building condition assessment meets OSPI requirements. OSPI developed their building condition assessment in conjunction with MGT of America, Inc. with national professional service firms that have track record of objective research and developed value-added procedures. Each building component (uniformat system) is rated into five categories ranging from excellent (100%) to good (90%) to fair (62%) to poor (30%) to unsatisfactory (0%). Three methods are used in rating components: visual assessment, estimation of how much repairs are needed, and estimated reinvestment to system in consideration. The three methods should be balanced when evaluating any component. Generally, code compliance is not considered when rating a component. OSPI has designated some criteria that automatically rates certain components POOR (e.g. single-pane glazing, energy inefficient lighting, door hardware that is not ADA compliant). Note that the 2018 assessment compares the 2014 assessment data in the OSPI database to current data provided by McKinstry. It is not equivalent to the Meng Analysis scores that this plan uses (Meng Report). In general, the building conditions surveyed in 2018 show expected wear and tear in some buildings. The current assessment has added components to the 2014 assessment hence some scores have changed more than the normal wear and tear. Noting that the assessment serves to give the district a general idea of building conditions, it was meant to inform

the district but not recommend any action. After reviewing McKinstry's report, the list of buildings being considered for the BEX V capital levy from a condition perspective remains unchanged.

The weighted condition ranking chart was the starting point of BEX V capital levy planning. The scores are based on the Meng Analysis report in 2014 and is a composite of site and building scores with modified (from OSPI standard) weights on each component as well as educational adequacy and SPS maintenance staff input. It captured facilities that are in the last cycle of their useful life and where a decision needs to be made whether SPS should invest in replacement, disposal or major modernization to re-refresh the buildings. See attached Figure K Facilities Condition Ranking chart.

Out of the 117 buildings in the district's portfolio, 19 are new replacements within the last 5 years and are considered "perfect". If SPS modernizes/replaces the rest (98) at a pace of 10 buildings at every BEX levy cycle, it would take 10 cycles (60 years). At that point, the currently new buildings will need to be replaced/ modernized. This model also assumes that the district performs regular and preventive maintenance throughout the life of the buildings.

A 60-year Building Life Cycle Planning consists of intermediate improvements (preventive maintenance) at 12-year intervals for site, playground equipment, fields and building envelopes. In year 30 or half way through the life cycle, one would need to consider systems upgrades to building systems such as HVAC, electrical, roof, envelopes etc. for the building to perform and remain viable for its life span. See Figure L.

An examination of building conditions of the district's portfolio produced the following list of schools that are under consideration for replacement or modernization:

Elementary and K-8 Schools:

- Alki, John Rogers, North Beach, Montlake, Northgate, McGilvra, Roxhill, Lafayette, Kimball, Sacajawea, Salmon Bay K-8@Monroe, Boren STEM K-8, Schmitz Park

Middle Schools:

- Whitman, Washington, Mercer International, Aki Kurose, McClure

High Schools:

- Ingraham, Lincoln, Rainier Beach, Franklin,

Service Schools:

- North Queen Anne (Cascade Parent Partnership)

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Figure K: Facilities Condition Ranking Chart (2015) (sorted from worst to best)

	Facility	Region	Landmark	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)	Site Area (Acres)	Date of Construction	MENG Analysis Educational Adequacy Assessment	MENG Analysis Facility Condition Assessment	MENG Analysis Backlog of Maintenance & Repairs (BMAR) Ranking	Facilities Department Assessment	Total Weighted Score (25% each assessment type)
E	Alki	WS		45,387	1.4	1954	3.69	3.39	5.00	5.00	4.27
E	Magnolia (closed/vacant)	QA/M	✓	46,320	2.5	1927	3.90	3.62	5.00	4.33	4.21
	Columbia Annex (closed/leased)	SE		7,648	1.0	1944	5.00	3.48	4.00	3.50	3.99
M	Whitman	NW		134,056	14.6	1959	2.48	3.39	5.00	5.00	3.97
E	Rogers	NE		36,196	9.0	1956	3.20	3.83	5.00	3.83	3.96
E	North Beach	NW		35,812	6.9	1958	3.86	3.51	4.00	4.00	3.84
E	Montlake	C	✓	21,403	1.7	1924	4.13	3.38	4.00	3.83	3.84
K-8	Monroe (Salmon Bay)	NW	PL	117,116	4.2	1931	2.62	3.58	4.00	5.00	3.80
K-12	North Queen Anne (CPPP)	QA/M		21,257	2.3	1914	4.28	3.62	4.00	3.25	3.79
E	Northgate	NW		42,299	5.8	1956	2.87	3.35	5.00	3.83	3.76
E	E. C. Hughes (open fall 2018)	WS	✓	45,441	3.7	1926	3.78	3.42	4.00	3.50	3.67
E	McGilvra	C	✓	37,064	2.5	1913	3.67	3.38	3.00	4.33	3.59
E	Roxhill	WS		40,619	2.7	1958	3.60	3.42	3.00	4.33	3.59
M	Washington	C		136,368	10.9	1963	2.29	3.26	4.00	4.50	3.51
E	Lafayette	WS		51,942	4.7	1950	3.45	3.26	3.00	4.33	3.51
E	Schmitz Park (interim site)	WS		35,258	8.9	1962	3.59	3.50	4.00	2.67	3.44
E	Kimball*	SE		41,549	4.8	1971	3.96	3.34	2.00	4.33	3.41
E	Sacajawea	NE		37,600	3.8	1959	3.40	3.06	4.00	3.17	3.41
H	Ingraham	NW	✓	232,099	28.2	1959	2.69	3.39	4.00	3.50	3.39
K-8	Louisa Boren (STEM)	WS		119,514	15.0	1963	3.71	3.14	3.00	3.67	3.38
E	Laurelhurst	NE	PL	52,083	2.7	1928	3.33	3.24	3.00	3.83	3.35
	Old Van Asselt (closed/vacant)	SE	PL	13,681	1.4	1909	3.20	3.40	3.00	4.00	3.40
	Old Van Asselt (admin)	SE		55,545		1950	3.20	3.05	3.00	4.00	3.31
	Columbia (Interagency)	SE	PL	32,332	3.2	1922	3.23	3.13	4.00	3.00	3.34
E	Wedgwood	NE		44,334	4.5	1955	3.30	3.45	3.00	3.50	3.31
M	Mercer International	SE		122,313	8.4	1957	2.28	3.46	3.00	4.50	3.31
E	Decatur	NE		43,040	2.6	1961	3.52	3.21	3.00	3.50	3.31
E	View Ridge	NE		61,831	9.1	1948	3.24	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.31
M	Aki Kurose	SE	PL	171,393	4.8	1952	2.17	3.39	3.00	4.50	3.27
K-8	Blaine (Catherine)	QA/M		101,584	8.0	1952	2.57	3.35	3.00	4.00	3.23
K-8	Broadview-Thomson	NW		129,984	9.3	1963	2.10	3.27	4.00	3.50	3.22
E	Green Lake*	NE		47,903	3.4	1970	2.88	3.21	3.00	3.50	3.15
M	McClure	QA/M		92,727	2.3	1964	2.21	3.34	3.00	3.33	2.97
M	Eckstein	NE	✓	177,977	13.9	1950	1.61	3.38	3.00	3.83	2.96
E	Dearborn Park International*	SE		54,266	9.5	1971	3.34	3.10	2.00	3.33	2.94
E	Lowell	C	PL	73,470	3.9	1919	2.68	3.26	2.00	3.67	2.90
E	Graham Hill	SE		54,410	4.5	1961	2.90	3.29	2.00	3.17	2.84
E	Sand Point	NE		32,433	4.3	1957	3.15	2.81	2.00	3.00	2.74
E	Viewlands	NW		30,423	6.5	1954	3.84	2.36	1.00	3.67	2.72
E	Beacon Hill International*	SE		51,704	1.9	1971	3.46	2.82	1.00	3.33	2.65
E	Maple*	SE		49,730	6.7	1971	3.19	2.93	1.00	3.33	2.61
H	Lincoln	N	✓	257,157	6.7	1907	2.50	2.50	2.00	3.33	2.58
E	B.F.Day	NW	✓	65,188	3.9	1892	1.78	3.00	2.00	3.17	2.49
E	Adams	NW		63,136	3.4	1989	2.30	2.87	2.00	2.67	2.46
E	Rainier View	SE		36,412	8.9	1961	3.65	2.44	1.00	2.67	2.44
E	Sanislo*	WS		40,347	8.5	1970	2.96	2.92	1.00	2.67	2.39
H	Rainier Beach	SE		182,589	21.5	1961	2.33	3.20	1.00	3.17	2.42
H	Franklin	SE	✓	269,201	8.7	1912	1.38	2.97	2.00	3.17	2.38
E	Queen Anne	QA/M	✓	42,446	3.0	1903		2.51	4.00	3.00	2.38
K-8	Whitworth (Orca)	SE		59,505	3.4	1989	2.45	2.71	1.00	3.00	2.29
E	Bailey Gatzert	C		53,001	6.8	1988	2.49	3.00	1.00	2.67	2.29
I	John Marshall (interim site)	NE	PL	87,927	3.2	1927	2.28	2.50	2.00	2.33	2.28
E	Hawthorne	SE		51,170	2.6	1989	2.30	2.66	1.00	3.00	2.24
E	West Woodland	NW		57,474	3.5	1991	2.20	2.87	1.00	2.67	2.19
E	Leschi	C		57,208	3.0	1988	2.14	2.94	1.00	2.67	2.19
M	Jane Addams MS	NE	PL	160,645	18.0	1949	2.00	2.92	1.00	2.67	2.15
E	West Seattle ES	WS		50,701	6.9	1988	2.10	2.63	1.00	2.67	2.10

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

	Facility	Region	Landmark	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)	Site Area (Acres)	Date of Construction	MENG Analysis Educational Adequacy Assessment	MENG Analysis Facility Condition Assessment	MENG Analysis Backlog of Maintenance & Repairs (BMAR) Ranking	Facilities Department Assessment	Total Weighted Score (25% each assessment type)
K-8	Seward (TOPS)	C	<	95,501	1.8	1893	2.18	2.51	1.00	2.67	2.09
E	Olympic View	NE		52,792	4.3	1989	2.18	2.77	1.00	2.33	2.07
E	Lawton	QA/M		53,718	5.0	1990	1.70	2.87	1.00	2.67	2.06
E	John Muir	C		58,339	3.3	1991	1.67	2.81	1.00	2.67	2.04
E	Madrona	C		68,127	1.8	2002	2.35	2.23	1.00	2.50	2.02
E	Gatewood	WS	✓	55,785	3.6	1991	1.54	2.85	1.00	2.67	2.01
E	Thurgood Marshall	C		60,793	4.5	1991	1.88	2.59	1.00	2.33	1.95
E	McDonald International	NE	PL	49,431	2.2	1914	2.42	2.03	1.00	2.33	1.95
M	Meany	C		126,351	4.1	1955	1.51	2.46	2.00	1.67	1.91
E	John Hay	QA/M		51,362	3.2	1989	1.84	2.43	1.00	2.33	1.90
M/H	TT Minor (Seattle World School)	C		51,382	3.0	1941	2.50	2.50	1.00	1.33	1.83
E	Emerson	SE	✓	78,804	1.8	1909	2.09	2.49	1.00	1.67	1.81
E	John Stanford International	NE	✓	60,101	2.2	1906	1.37	2.50	1.00	2.33	1.80
E	Concord International	WS	✓	63,278	3.4	1913	2.00	2.48	1.00	1.67	1.79
E	Bryant	NE	✓	81,256	3.3	1926	1.67	2.76	1.00	1.67	1.77
H	West Seattle High School	WS	✓	208,981	8.0	1917	1.42	2.61	1.00	2.00	1.76
E	Cedar Park	NE	✓	31,312	4.4	1959	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.75
E	Greenwood	NW	PL	63,985	2.8	1909	1.70	2.22	1.00	2.00	1.73
M	Madison	WS	✓	153,517	7.9	1929	1.00	2.91	1.00	2.00	1.73
H	Ballard	NW		242,795	12.3	1999	1.30	2.54	1.00	2.00	1.71
E	Stevens	C	✓	67,267	2.4	1906	1.56	2.27	1.00	2.00	1.71
E	Highland Park	WS		74,192	3.7	1999	1.52	2.26	1.00	2.00	1.69
E	Whittier	NW		70,166	2.7	1999	1.26	2.51	1.00	2.00	1.69
	Memorial Stadium	QA/M	PL	163,290	9.9	1947		3.50		3.25	1.69
E	Van Asselt (African American Academy)	SE		104,830	10.9	2000	1.30	2.38	1.00	2.00	1.67
E	Dunlap	SE	✓	73,068	4.9	1924	1.83	2.38	1.00	1.33	1.64
K-8	Cooper (Pathfinder)	WS		72,861	13.9	1999	1.37	2.10	1.00	2.00	1.62
E	M.L. King Jr.	SE		71,654	3.4	2004	1.10	2.16	1.00	2.00	1.56
H	Garfield	C	✓	244,177	9.0	1923	1.00	2.24	1.00	2.00	1.56
H	Roosevelt	NE	✓	269,297	9.2	1922	1.08	2.12	1.00	2.00	1.55
H	Cleveland	SE	✓	161,731	8.5	1927	1.06	2.10	1.00	2.00	1.54
E	Frantz Coe	QA/M		66,884	2.9	2003	1.33	2.05	1.00	1.67	1.51
H	Nathan Hale	NE		235,078	18.4	1963	1.14	2.42	1.00	1.33	1.47
H	South Lake	SE		29,575		2008	1.08	2.03	1.00	1.67	1.44
M	Hamilton	N	✓	124,865	2.0	1926	1.00	2.24	1.00	1.33	1.39
H	Chief Sealth International	WS		223,154	17.4	1957	1.18	2.00	1.00	1.33	1.38
K-8	South Shore	SE		138,859	11.4	2009	1.06	2.00	1.00	1.33	1.35
E	Bagley	NW	✓	38,380	3.9	1930	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.33
H	Horace Mann (Nova Alt.)	C	✓	48,877	1.76	1902	1.50	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.25
M	David T. Denny International	WS		138,778	17.4	2011	1.00	1.63	1.00	1.33	1.24
	John Stanford Center			350,000	12.1	2002		2.60		2.33	1.23
E	Webster (closed/leased)	NW	✓	56,169	2.0	1908				4.25	1.06
E	Fairmount Park	WS		63,658	3.1	1964	1.00	1.06	1.00	1.00	1.02
E	Arbor Heights	WS		90,763	5.7	2016	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Genesee Hill	WS		91,000	6.8	2016	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
K-8	Hazel Wolf	NE		86,558	3.2	2016	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Loyal Heights	NW	✓	40,988	2.9	1932	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Olympic Hills	NE		89,000	6.5	2017	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Thornton Creek	NE		91,596	7.3	2016	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Cascadia	NW		90,750	5.4	2017	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
M	Robert Eagle Staff	NW		139,400	11.5	2017	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
E	Wing Luke*	SE		50,518	6.9	1971	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Queen Anne Gym (Interagency)	QA/M		35,805	0.95	1961				3.00	0.75



Figure L
Building Life Cycle Planning

MAINTENANCE OF BUILDING SYSTEMS AND MAJOR COMPONENTS

Well maintained and regularly renovated buildings cost less in the long term and require consistent, thoughtfully applied fiscal resources to accomplish the objectives of providing outstanding learning environments for SPS students. The ability to maximize the life cycle of our facilities in a systematic fashion, while minimizing the financial burden on the community is critical to the success of our students.

Seattle Public Schools maintains the district's buildings via three separate categories:

- critical maintenance,
- routine preventative maintenance, and
- major preventative maintenance.

Critical maintenance is a general fund expense and is defined as any unscheduled maintenance or repair activity that is conducted when a system or equipment item breaks down prematurely or is damaged. Critical maintenance requests are scheduled and completed based on a priority system.

Routine preventative maintenance is also a general fund expense. Routine preventative maintenance consists of cleaning, lubricating, adjusting, and replacing minor component parts (i.e., filters, belts, hoses, fluids, etc.) to maximize efficiency and minimize malfunction and breakdown. In addition, regular scheduled completion of routine preventative maintenance tasks increases the service life of district facility assets. Routine preventative maintenance tasks are scheduled on a monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual frequency. Most of the District routine preventive maintenance is conducted by the Custodial Services department (90%). The percent of routine preventive maintenance done by Maintenance Services is 10%.

Major preventative maintenance may be funded through the capital budget using BTA or BEX funds in accordance with Washington State House Bill 1619 (2009-10) which allocates capital expenditure for school districts on "major renovation and replacement of facilities and systems where periodic repairs are no longer economical or extend the useful life of the facility or system beyond its original planned useful life". House Bill 1619 provides some general examples of this type of work, such as "major equipment repair, painting of facilities, or other major preventative maintenance purposes".

POTENTIAL PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR BEX V

BEX V Capital Levy Development Process



The BEX V Capital Levy planning efforts began Spring of 2016. Board Policy 6901, Capital Levy Planning, guided the BEX V capital levy process. Efforts initially focused on developing Master Plans for 15 schools identified as being in the poorest condition in the 2015 Facilities Master Plan. These are the initial proposed Condition Projects. Thirteen additional schools were added to the BEX V Master Planning process utilizing 2017 Enrollment Planning Department 5-Year Enrollment Projections. These are the initial proposed Capacity Projects.


Based upon a list of potential projects selected for building conditions and/or capacity needs, further studies were conducted to begin providing solutions to specific issues (adding capacity; rectifying building deficiencies or both). Through the master plan process, Capital Planning, along with the assistance of Bassetti Architects, has systematically assessed each site for its ability to meet safety concerns, capacity for enrollment growth, site and building conditions, and alignment with the District's Educational Specifications. Site Master Plans were developed to verify that program spaces can effectively work with the site conditions, provide the cost estimator with a building and site layout to price, and provide future design teams with initial information to help inform their design process. The deliverable includes conceptual site and building plans, cost analysis, geotechnical report, civil narrative, mechanical and electrical narratives, and an outline specification for each site assessed. The complete master plans are available for reference.

The following section contains analysis of proposed projects under consideration by middle school service area as well as high schools district wide.

ANALYSIS AND PROPOSED PROJECTS

High School Analysis





A capacity analysis was conducted at the high school level in the 2017-18 school year. Results of the capacity analysis for individual high schools indicate that projected seat shortages are unlikely to happen at these two sites: Franklin and Rainier Beach, both located in the Southeast region of the city. Surplus capacity ranges from 7% at Franklin High School to 39% at Rainier Beach High School for the 2021-22 school year.

Besides the two under enrolled south end high schools, long-term trend and capacity data show enrollment at Chief Sealth High School would less likely exceed its current capacity. Enrollment projections probably remain steady for West Seattle High School. Consequently, the District does not anticipate capacity shortages at these two high schools in the West region of the city.

Student populations are expected to continue to stay below the capacity at the two option high schools – Cleveland and Center School. The District can cap their enrollment in the event of enrollment demand exceeding building capacity. Historically, this is less likely to occur.

Enrollment growth is projected for the next five years for the high schools in the Central and North regions of Seattle. This includes Ballard, Garfield, Ingraham and Nathan Hale high schools. With the opening of the 1600-seat Lincoln High School building, a relief of space constraints will provide Roosevelt High School with an adequate number of seats needed in its attendance area for a few years. Similarly, the new 500-seat addition at Ingraham High School will help meet the capacity needs of the school for some years.

Capital Planning trend analysis of actual enrollment and projections data shows student population upward growth in the Central and North regions of the District including Ballard, Garfield, Ingraham, Nathan Hale, and Roosevelt high schools. Subsequently, a capacity shortfall would likely occur in these five buildings. These results, along with the 10-year resident

projections generated by Enrollment Planning in 2017 point us towards the same direction, that is a continued growth of these two regions of the city.

The District has studied a few options to address projected capacity shortfall at the high schools in Central and North Seattle. These options include placement of portable classrooms at existing sites, construction of new additions to existing buildings, and creation of a new high school. Each of these options possess its own pros and cons. Facilities Master Plan Task Force is recommending further study of these options at this point of time. Capital Planning is waiting for final recommendations from the task force regarding a new high school.

K-5 and 6-8 Analysis


Aki Kurose Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Wing Luke ES:** Replacement (open 2020); Design capacity is 500; Current capacity is 336 adding 164 seats; October 2017 enrollment is 337 and is projected to increase slightly over the next 5 years. The construction of the new Wing Luke ES will impact the Aki Kurose MS Service Area as well as the Mercer MS Service area. Boundary adjustments for Maple ES attendance area will move a portion of the Van Asselt ES attendance area to Wing Luke ES in fall 2020 when the new Wing Luke building opens.

Proposed projects:

- **Rainier Beach HS:** Replacement due to condition; Planned 1,200-student high school; current enrollment 721 with projections decreasing for the next 5 years.
- **Interim School:** Create an interim site in the SE part of the district that could accommodate a secondary school. The current interim site (Old Van Asselt) can only accommodate an elementary school.



The Aki Kurose Middle School service area is comprised of the Othello and Rainier Beach neighborhoods. The City of Seattle developed neighborhood plans for 38 neighborhoods in 1999 to meet the city's commitments under the State's Growth Management Act. Neighborhood plans identify actions needed to ensure that each neighborhood will continue to thrive and improve as Seattle grows. In the years since approval, much progress has been made on implementing the projects identified in the neighborhood plans. This area of the city has seen an increase of residents along the light rail line. However, the City of Seattle has noted a decrease in school age children in the area and this is confirmed with enrollment numbers tracked by SPS. It would be an interesting area to observe in the next 5 to 10 years to see if younger residents will decide to stay and raise their family in this part of town. Consequently, there are no immediate needs for additional capacity in elementary or secondary schools in this service area based on the capacity analysis. Projected seat shortfalls in Rainier View ES and to a lesser extent Graham Hill ES can be accommodated by already on-site portables. An additional net gain of 164 seats will also be available to the area when the new Wing Luke building opens in 2020.

In the Rainier Beach comprehensive plan, the community has highlighted community education as a cornerstone of the plan along with building a better boulevard and commercial core revitalization. "Rainier Beach, unlike many other Seattle neighborhoods, has taken up the challenge of planning for lifelong learning. The community envisions a future where ***Rainier Beach will have an innovative, connected learning system that supports the integration of education into community life at all levels, and for all residents, resulting in the empowerment of the residents and the attainment of sustainable and beneficial changes in the community.***" Improvements to Rainier Beach High School are of the highest priority for the community.

In this service area, there is no projected need for new seats at any grade level. The proposed project at Rainier Beach High School is based on condition of the building.

There is a need for an interim site in the south end of the district that can accommodate a secondary school for future work at various schools in the area.

Capital Planning proposes:

- **Full replacement of Rainier Beach High School:** Capital staff and their consultant had some preliminary conversations with the school and surrounding community about potential improvements to the high school. An in-depth evaluation of the site reveals that the 1961 "square donut" building can be reused with extensive mechanical; electrical and structural upgrades and the 1996 Auditorium is in good shape but needs lighting and aesthetic improvements. Geological challenges exist on the current 21.52-acre site including steep slopes, liquefaction prone and peat settlement prone areas. The consensus was that the school prefers to be on site while new buildings are built. The idea is feasible but will take longer both to design, plan and construct.
- **Create in Interim Site for the SE part of the district:** Alternatives evaluated include modifying the Old Van Asselt building to accommodate a secondary school or replacing it with a new facility. The Old Van Asselt site is an interim elementary school, housing Wing Luke ES for school years 2018-2020. Preliminary investigation indicates that a re-built Van Asselt site is adequate for housing a 1,000-student middle school with all amenities.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.




Denny International Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Arbor Heights ES Replacement:** (opened in fall 2016); Design capacity is 660 (+297); October 2017 enrollment is 521 and is projected to increase in the next 5 years.
- **E.C. Hughes ES Modernization:** Design capacity 350; Roxhill ES will move here in 2018-19 school year; October 2017 enrollment for Roxhill ES is 270 and is projected to be flat over the next 5 years.

Proposed projects:

- **West Seattle ES:** 8-classroom addition (160 seats); Right-sized capacity is 320 (with K-3 class size reduction); October 2017 enrollment is 434 and is projected to climb slightly in the next 5 years; there are 5 portables on site that can handle most of the overflows.
- **Roxhill ES:** replacement due to condition and capacity; Design capacity 650; With K-3 class size reduction and 5 Title 1 schools in the service area, lower class size is used; this service area would need additional 415 seats in 2021.



The Denny Middle School service area includes Westwood, Highland Park and South Park neighborhoods. The Westwood, Highland Park neighborhood lies atop two ridges, with the valley between shared by both. The area has significant public facilities, and regional and local commercial activities provide a variety of choices for its residents, but by vehicle and foot, circulation and access suffer from the topography and diversity of land uses. There are also a couple pockets of areas identified as “village with high risk of displacement and low access to opportunity” by City of Seattle within the service area.

An analysis of capacity and enrollment data reveals that there will be K-5 capacity needs within the service area due to K-3 class size reduction and the number of high poverty schools in the area. Overall K-5 enrollment for the service area is projected to be 2,651 and right-sized capacity is 2,236. Projected enrollment in 2021 shows a deficit of 19% needing 415 more seats. There are currently 14 portables located at 3 elementary schools. Extrapolation of enrollment trend data indicates K-5 seats needed in the attendance areas of West Seattle Elementary and Arbor Heights Elementary schools.

Capital Planning proposes:

- An 8-classroom addition to **West Seattle ES**. West Seattle Elementary School, originally called High Point Elementary, was founded during World War II when Seattle’s shipyards and airplane factories were booming. With the growth of West Seattle housing developments, many families flocked to this area. Years later, the student population decreased and the school was combined with Hughes Elementary. A new 20-classroom, 2-story steel frame with brick veneer building was constructed in 1988. The 6.9-acre site is located in the Gatewood neighborhood of West Seattle just east of the main arterial, Fauntleroy Way SW.
 - The Planning Team and District determined this school is not currently meeting the necessary programmed spaces and is proposing a new addition and interior improvements to meet the 500-student capacity Educational Specification. The new addition would be located on the second level on the east side of the existing building. Improvements to the interior would include a secured entry vestibule, revising the first level toilets and storage near the Library, moving Special Ed to the first floor, and opening up classrooms with no natural light to create Learning Commons.
- Or Replacement of **Roxhill ES** (6 portables on site) that will add approximately 374 seats to the service area. This option, however, will displace two special education programs, BRIDGES and In-Tandem, and an Interagency program that is slated to be housed at Roxhill once the school is relocated to the E.C. Hughes building in 2018-19.
- Roxhill Elementary School is adjacent to the main arterial, SW Roxbury St, and Roxhill Park. The District does not desire to use the park as a play space due to crime in the neighborhood. The geotechnical report stated this site could potentially have peat soils and would be susceptible to liquefaction. A new construction Master Plan option was preferred and a three-story building fit best on the small 2.4-acre site. Considerations and highlights of the design include:
 - new construction option:**
 - The Library is located on the third floor with south daylight and potential views of Mount Rainier.
 - The Commons is well located to serve breakfast for the large percentage of student’s eligible free & reduced-price meals.

- A moderate sized hardscape play area is maintained. Its location provides protection for students from street noise, and adjacency to the park.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.

Eckstein Middle School Service Area




Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Thornton Creek ES** Replacement (opened in fall 2016): Design Capacity 660 (added 255 seats); October 2017 enrollment is 521;
- **Decatur ES** Modernization (opened in fall 2017): Building capacity is 325; October 2017 enrollment is 242; Currently used for highly capable program for students who are tested and eligible; this segment of the student population is projected to grow in the next 5 years;

Both Thornton Creek and Decatur are option schools where enrollment can be capped at building capacity.

Proposed projects:

- **Wedgwood ES:** Replacement for capacity and condition: Design capacity 650 (+ 320); Right sized capacity is 330; October 2017 enrollment is 480 and is projected to decrease slightly over the next 5 years (partly due to Thornton Creek option).
- **Roosevelt HS:** add classrooms to relieve overcrowding (See analysis under high school capacity)



The Eckstein Middle School service area includes a large part of the university (University of Washington) and Roosevelt neighborhoods in Northeast Seattle. While the university district is a designated urban center/ village and experienced rapid growth in recent years, it is still projected to accommodate much of the anticipated development in the pipeline. The Roosevelt area is a transportation hub and attracted investment and developments as well, albeit to a lesser extent. School enrollment in this service area is expected to continue growing as more residents move into denser housing.

With the opening of the new Thornton Creek building in 2016 and the modernized Decatur building in 2017, over 600 K-5 seats were added to the service area. However, the majority of the remaining elementary schools in the area are old and not in the best shape. Ratings for these elementary schools are as follows (1 being superior and 5 being unsatisfactory):

Elementary school	Educational Adequacy score	Building Condition score	SPS maintenance dept. assessment	SPS technology dept. assessment
Wedgwood	3.5	3.45	3.5	5
View Ridge	3.24	3.33	3.7	3
Green Lake	2.88	3.21	3.5	2
Laurelhurst	3.33	3.24	3.8	4
Sand Point	3.15	2.81	3	1
Bryant	1.67	2.76	1.7	1

Capital Planning proposes:

- Replace **Wedgwood ES**. Wedgwood Elementary School was established due to the population growth post World War II. In 1955, the 22-classroom reinforced concrete building was designed by notable architect John Graham & Company. The building has had minor upgrades over the years and many of the building systems are worn out. The 4.5-acre site is located in the Wedgwood neighborhood in northeast Seattle. The building is surrounded by a residential neighborhood.
 - The Planning Team and the District are proposing a new construction option to meet the 650-student Educational Specification. The design includes new classroom clusters and learning commons spaces, Admin with a secure entry vestibule, Childcare, and resource spaces such as a Gym, Commons, Art, and Music.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.




Hamilton Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Lincoln HS (Modernization):** open in fall 2019; Design capacity 1,600; Attendance area high school with boundaries established for 2019 providing some capacity relief for Ballard and Roosevelt High schools.

Proposed projects:

- **West Woodland ES:** 10-classroom addition will add 220 permanent seats; current right-sized capacity is 396; October 2017 enrollment is 565 and is projected to increase slightly; there are currently 7 portables on site; Project is partially funded by legislature in 2017 budget.
- **Lincoln HS:** Modernization of the theater based on condition of the building



The Hamilton Middle School service area includes the Fremont hub and Wallingford residential neighborhood as well as part of the university district urban center. It has seen growth in recent years and the growth is reflected in enrollment trend, particularly at West Woodland ES. Portables have been brought on line to address the capacity issues at this school. The two option schools in the same service area, John Stanford International and McDonald International Elementary schools, have also experienced overcrowding due to the popularity of their language immersion programs, but the District can restrict their enrollment at their building capacity.

Capacity analysis for elementary schools in the service area reveals that for the most part, increase in enrollment can be met with existing portables on site except for West Woodland ES.

Capital Planning proposes:

- **10-classroom addition at West Woodland ES.** West Woodlands' original school building was an Edgar Blair Jacobean-style brick schoolhouse. As the student population continued to grow 1913 and 1925 additions were built. Over the years, the school continued to outgrow its building and site and in 1990, the decision was made to demolish the school as the aging structure had many safety issues. The District acquired adjacent property and built a new school in 1991. The 3.4-acre site in the Phinney Ridge neighborhood has geothermal wells on the existing playfield and a large water and sewer main that bisects the site in the north/south direction.
 - The Planning Team and the District determined a new addition to the west side of the site bridging over the sewer main would help increase student capacity to better align with the 650-student Educational Specifications. Other improvements include adding a new Commons, adding bathrooms to the Kindergarten, creating a larger Library, and adding a Music Room.
- **Finish Lincoln HS by modernizing the theater.**

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.



Jane Addams Middle School Service Area


Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Jane Addams MS (Repurpose):** opened in fall 2014 as an attendance area middle school with highly capable cohort program; Design capacity is 960; October 2017 enrollment is 916 and is projected to increase significantly in the next 5 years; however, this is due to the highly capable program and may be mitigated with relocating that program.
- **Cedar Park ES (open existing):** opened fall 2017, Design capacity is 325; October 2017 enrollment is 55; this is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.
- **Olympic Hills ES (Replacement):** opened fall 2017, Design capacity is 660; October 2017 enrollment is 381 and projected to increase slightly over the next 5 years.
- **Hazel Wolf K-8 at Pinehurst (Replacement):** opened fall 2016, Design capacity is 680; October 2017 enrollment is 736; this is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.

Proposed projects:

- **John Rogers ES:** replacement; Design Capacity 650; Current right-sized capacity is 264; October 2017 enrollment is 349 and is projected to be stable over the next 5 years; there are currently 5 portables on site; Building condition is one of the worst of all district buildings (Meng 2014 and McKinstry 2018 assessment).
- **Sacajawea ES:** replacement; Design capacity 650; Current right-sized capacity is 220; October 2017 enrollment is 236 and projected to stay flat over the next 5 years; there are currently 4 portables on site.
- **Nathan Hale HS:** Addition for capacity (See high school capacity analysis)





The Jane Addams Middle School service area sits at the Northeast corner of city limits. Lake City has seen many iterations of itself, going from sleepy logging and farming community known to some as “Little Germany” to a seedy destination for many city dwellers during the prohibition era. After World War II ended, young families flocked here and the population exploded. Currently, residents are rallying together to focus on environmental issues and on drawing visitors back to its refreshed (and significantly more reputable) business district. The Lake City area is designated urban village in Seattle’s plan for growth.

Capital Planning proposes

- **Replacement of John Rogers ES** due to poor building condition (3.83) and education adequacy (3.2) assessment scores. There is a long list of outstanding major preventive maintenance items that need to be addressed. The site has several challenging factors that were evaluated during the Planning Team’s site visit and due diligence document review. The current playfield has water mitigation issues due to the proximity of Thornton Creek, a retention pond, and a liquefaction zone. Cutting across the playfield in the east/west direction is a 72-inch Seattle Public Utility Storm Drain. The site also has steep slopes designated along the north and northeast side of the site, which will require setbacks. These factors have limited the building placement options on the 9.01-acre site. The Planning Team and District Team determined this site should be a new construction project. Several options were explored to allow for a continuously occupied site, but ultimately the preferred design for program and student safety required a transition site. Considerations and highlights of the design include:

 - New construction option:**

 - The building is sited to take advantage of an existing large grade change and to avoid a major underground storm line, as well as steep slopes to the north and wetland buffers on the south.
 - Main outdoor play areas are located directly adjacent to both the gym and commons, with good sun exposure and proximity to the playfields and covered play, all of which support ease of supervision.
 - On-site bus loop is provided, relocating this existing function from adjacent residential streets and providing safer access to the building.
- **Replacement of Sacajawea ES:** It is also in poor condition although slightly better than John Rogers. The site is directly adjacent to Sacajawea Playground, a park used by the students in the drier months. A play structure on the south side of the site is in good condition and could be

salvaged or left in place. After reviewing the due diligence information and visiting the site, the Planning Team and District Team agreed this project would be new construction to better work with the current Educational Specifications and constraints of a small site. Considerations and highlights of the design include:

New construction option:

- The three-story scheme saves site area for play and parking.
- Existing well-developed outdoor play areas on the protected part of the site adjacent to the natural areas are retained; additional zones for an amphitheater and Childcare play are created to bridge significant grade changes on the site.
- Placement of the Library on the upper floor on the north side optimizes daylighting and views.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.



Madison Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Fairmont Park ES** (open existing), opened fall 2014; Design capacity 500; October 2017 enrollment is 537 and is projected to be flat or decrease slightly over the next 5 years.
- **Genesee Hill ES** (Replacement), opened fall 2016; Design capacity 660 (added 149 seats); October 2017 enrollment is 718 and projected to increase in the next 5 years.

Proposed projects:

- **Lafayette ES:** replacement for conditions and added capacity; Design Capacity 650 (add 232 seats); October 2017 enrollment is 394 and projected to increase in the next 5 years; there are 6 portables on site; Added capacity can help relieve overcrowding at Genesee Hill Elementary in the future; Building could potentially be Landmarked and thus will need to be modernized and added on in lieu of replacement.
- **Alki ES:** replacement for conditions and added capacity; Design capacity 500 (add 148 seats); October 2017 enrollment is 373 and projected to be stable over the next 5 years; there are currently 2 portables on site.
- **Madison MS:** addition for capacity; 6-classroom addition will add approximately 150 seats; current right-sized capacity is 970; October 2017 enrollment is 881 and is projected to increase significantly in the next 5 years; four portables will be placed in 2018 to temporarily address the enrollment growth.



The Madison Middle School service area is in West Seattle covering the waterfronts along Alki point and westward including the planned West Seattle junction urban village. The West Seattle Junction urban village looks to strengthen the commercial core and improve the Fauntleroy Gateway into the junction. Much progress has been made since the plan was envisioned in 1999 and the area has experienced an increase in population as expected. As a result, enrollment has been trending upwards. Even with the opening of Fairmont Park ES and replacement of Genesee Hill ES, the area schools will need to keep up with residential growth in the coming years.

Capital planning proposes:

- **Replace or Modernize Lafayette Elementary school** to a 650-seat school. The Planning Team's on-site review determined this building could potentially be Landmarked because of the prominent local architect and adherence to a distinctive modern style. Regardless of Landmark designation, the building would need to be brought up to numerous current codes and meet ADA accessibility requirements. This east side of the site is zoned at CN2P-40 (Neighborhood Commercial), which would require a street-facing facade along busy California Avenue. The west side of the site is a residential zone and fronts on the outdoor play space. The community frequently uses the large hard surface outdoor play area and small field. Lafayette is also diagonally situated from Hiawatha Park and Playfield, which provides additional greenspace. Following review of preliminary Master Plan options, the Planning Team and capital planning Team determined that two design options would be estimated, resulting in a modernization option and a new construction option. Considerations and highlights for the design include:
 - Modernization option:**
 - + The existing Classroom wing has been reconfigured to incorporate Learning Commons spaces.
 - + The two side wings of the building create a protected hardscape play area for students.
 - + The sawtooth roof monitors were reused to maintain the existing character and continue to provide natural light into the learning spaces.
 - New Construction option:**
 - + Main entry is retained on California Avenue SW, consistent with the pedestrian character of the Admiral Residential Urban Village in which the school is located.
 - + Classrooms are located on the quietest part of the site, and the two-story wing is in scale with the adjacent neighborhood.
 - + The building is located on the north and east edges of the site, maximizing the play areas and optimizing sun exposure.
- **Modernize and Add to Alki Elementary School** to a 500-seat school (small site). Up until 1965, Alki Elementary School had a 1913 three-story brick school flanked on either side by additions, including a large Gymnasium to the east and a Classroom wing to the west. The 1965 earthquake severely damaged the 1913 structure, which was replaced in 1967. To connect all three structures there is one elevator (which only serves a limited number of rooms) and multiple stairwells, making ADA accessibility an issue. The Gymnasium is a joint-use space with the on-site Alki Community Center. The site is very small at 1.4 acres and shares the Alki Playground with Seattle Parks Department. Aside from the challenge of multiple joint-use amenities, this site is a liquefaction zone and has steep slopes along the south and southeast perimeters. The District confirmed that Alki Community Center and the existing Gymnasium need to be retained. The parks department also has plans to renovate the community center and requested that coordination be done so the 2 projects can be constructed in the same time

frame. The preferred design option is a three-story addition. Considerations and highlights of the design are:

Modernization + Addition option:

+ The Art room has pride of place on the third floor with direct access to a sizable roof terrace.

+ The Library is located to take advantage of light and views to the northwest, enhancing its significance and use.

+ With no District owned playfields, a small covered play court was created for easy supervision.

- **Addition to Madison Middle School.** Madison Middle School opened in 1929 and is a 3-story brick building designed by Floyd A. Naramore. This school is a designated Landmarked building. In 2005, major renovations created learning clusters, a multi-use commons, and flexible learning spaces. These additions cascade down the hillside, providing a better connection to the playfields. The 7.92-acre site is located in West Seattle and is currently a very successful site for geothermal wells.
 - The Planning Team and District are proposing a four classroom addition to meet capacity needs. This addition would be connected to the existing classroom wings on the west side of the building.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.



McClure Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Magnolia ES** (Re-open), fall 2019; Design capacity approximately 550-600 including a 6-classroom addition that will open 2021.
- **Queen Anne ES** (Addition): Design capacity 500 (+72 seats); October 2017 enrollment is 352; This is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.
- **Frantz Coe ES** (Addition): 6 classrooms (+132 seats) funded by Legislature 2018 budget; October 2017 enrollment is 560 and is expected to decrease after the opening of Magnolia ES.

Proposed projects:

- **John Hay Elementary ES:** 12-classroom and gym addition with other interior re-configuration (+51 seats); Right-sized capacity is 396; October 2017 enrollment is 491 and is projected to increase significantly in the next 5 years; there are 4 portables on site.
- **New Downtown HS:** build a new high school in conjunction with renovation of Memorial Stadium for capacity (see high school analysis).



The McClure Middle School service area is located to the northwest of the downtown core. It included the Seattle center, part of South Lake Union, Queen Anne and Magnolia neighborhoods and included part of the uptown urban center. As Seattle channels its growth to the urban center, this service area has seen rising enrollment. With Magnolia elementary school scheduled to open in fall 2019, most of the capacity needs can be accommodated for this service area. Capacity needs, however, in the Queen Anne area alone, would not be fully met. Therefore, Capital Planning recommends additions be built at Frantz Coe and John Hay elementary schools to address the capacity issues. Note that Magnolia is scheduled to open with approximately 500 seats, and the legislature has funded a 6-classroom addition which will be available in 2021. A 6-classroom addition is also planned for Frantz Coe elementary which is funded by the legislature in the 2018 supplementary budget.

Capital planning proposes:

- **Addition to John Hay Elementary** to replace the 4 portables on site and to increase capacity in the permanent facility. Preliminary investigations reveal that the site is relatively flat, but the playfield has water issues. The small grassy playfield does not drain well and is muddy through the wetter months of the year. The PTA is currently working on designing a new play structure, which the Planning Team avoided affecting for this assessment. The school is a single loaded corridor without Learning Commons spaces, and the Administration area is not well located for security. The Library is undersized, and several programmed spaces are missing, such as Kindergarten Classrooms, First Grade Classrooms, and a Music room. This school is currently over capacity and looking at potentially using grant money for improvements for K-3 Classrooms. The planning team proposed several options for expansion and the selected master plan enlarges the Library, Administration, and adds an additional Classroom wing.

Considerations and highlights of the design include:

New construction scheme:

- Administration is expanded to have better supervision near the Main Entry.
 - Additional Classroom wing is added with Kindergarten on the ground level with direct access to the exterior.
 - The Library was relocated to a larger, more centralized space.
- **Build New Downtown HS** in conjunction with renovation of memorial stadium for capacity (See high school analysis).

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.




Mercer Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- none

Proposed projects:

- **Kimball ES:** Replacement for Capacity and Condition; Design capacity 650; October 2017 enrollment is 443 and projected to decline slightly in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 360; there are 11 portables on site; Boundary adjustments for Maple ES is approved and should help resolve K-5 capacity issues in this service area.
- **Mercer MS:** Replacement for capacity and Condition; Design capacity 1,200; October 2017 enrollment is 1,136 and is projected to be steady in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 792; there are 19 portables on site.
- **Original Van Asselt ES:** Modify or replace to create an interim site for the SE part of the district.



The Mercer Middle School service area includes a large chunk of territory along Interstate 5 just south of Interstate 90. It includes the greater Duwamish basin industrial area and does not have a large residential area hence enrollment has been steady over the years. Due to the growth in downtown, it is expected that Maple, Hawthorne and Kimball elementary schools will experience shortage of classroom seats by 2021.

Mercer International Middle School has been experiencing growth and overcrowding for the past several years. Nineteen portables have been placed to address capacity issues since 2015. Even with these added portables, many teachers still need to share instructional spaces in the main building as well as in the portables. Furthermore, enrollment projections show this area will not see student population decline in the next five years. Long-term solutions to overcrowding must be sought for this school.

Capital planning proposes:

- **Replacement of Kimball elementary school** with a 650-seat school to relieve the anticipated uptick in enrollment. The steep slopes on the site create many accessibility issues and hidden areas between the portables, which pose security risks. There are limited points of site access due to the steep terrain. The current main entry is very close to busy 23rd Ave S. The site has many exceptional trees that help maintain stable soils. This site has two unique challenges: it is within 250 feet of the Seattle Fault and it is within Airport Height District restrictions. The Planning Team reviewed a design option keeping the 1998 addition, but it was ultimately decided this restricted the building placement on the site and created a challenging layout in meeting the program requirements. A new construction option was preferred. Considerations and highlights of the design include:
 - **New construction option:**
 - Placement of the building bridges the significant changes in grades between the two levels of the sloped site.
 - Placement of classroom groupings within and adjacent to the treed areas of the site maintains a connection to nature that the school values.
 - The site plan optimizes locations for all outdoor play areas, including best sun exposure, protection of students from street and noise, convenient access from the gym and commons, as well as good access for maintenance.
 - The service area has good access from the street.
- **Replacement of Mercer Middle School** with a 1,000-seat middle school. The wedge shaped 8.39-acre site is zoned SF500 for residential. It is located adjacent to a seven-story parking structure for the VA Hospital. This gives precedence for a departure to allow for a taller building on the tight site. A steep slope was identified along the south perimeter along Columbian Way that limits the potential locations for site entry. Currently, students utilize the soccer field at the adjacent park and play on the hardscape between the Classroom and Gym/ Auditorium buildings. Following review of preliminary Master Plan options, the Planning Team and District Team determined that two design options would be estimated, resulting in a modernization option reusing the Auditorium and a new construction option. Considerations and highlights for the design include:
 - **Modernization option:**
 - Reuse of the existing Auditorium. This would require significant system upgrades.
 - The Commons has a north-facing plaza for gathering and passive recreating.
 - **New construction option:**

- The building is sited to the west and south edges to create space for a playfield while still providing good
- Orientation for both passive solar and daylighting of classrooms.
- The gym is located directly adjacent to Jefferson Park and Playfields, and the PE suite has a Fitness Plaza for outdoor classes.
- The student plazas provide protected and purposeful play areas for outdoor student activities.
- **Replacement of Original Van Asselt Elementary School** to create an interim site that can accommodate a secondary school.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.




Meany Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Meany MS** (Open existing/ Reconfigure) opened fall 2017 as an attendance area middle school; Design and right-sized capacity 850; October 2017 enrollment is 492 and is projected to increase steadily;
- **McGilvra lunchroom**: first phase of 2015 master plan to modernize entire school.

Proposed projects:

- **McGilvra ES**: Modernization and addition for capacity and condition; Continual effort in implementing master plan developed in 2015; Designed capacity 500; October enrollment is 242 and is projected to remain flat in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 264.
- **Montlake ES**: Modernization and addition for capacity and condition; Design Capacity 500; October 2017 enrollment is 269 and is projected to increase slightly over the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 154 and there are 6 portables on site.
- **Garfield HS**: Addition for capacity (See high school analysis).



The Meany Middle School service area covers the central business core spanning between Puget Sound and Lake Washington. It is the designated urban center in City of Seattle comprehensive plan, thus receiving most of the growth. It will continue to add residents in mixed use and multi-family housing units. As there is no established pattern on children population yet on these housing types, the district will have to watch closely and see if any pattern emerges.

Capital Planning proposes:

- **Modernization of McGilvra ES.:** McGilvra Elementary School dates back to 1899 with a 2-room wood pavilion. The current brick building was constructed in 1913 with an addition to the building constructed in 1940. A new gymnasium (considered the most modern in the district at that time) was constructed in the rear of the main building in 1972. To bring the current school up the education specifications for 500 students, planned modernization includes addition of 83,194 S.F. to the historic 23,808 S.F. building. Beyond the current Cafeteria building, additions to it and a gymnasium as well as modernization without the historic building envelope will eventually produce a connected building to serve the school community.
- **Modernization and Addition of Montlake ES.:** Montlake Elementary School is one of the smallest sites in the District at 1.80 acres. The historic two-story brick building was built and 1924 as an initial structure with the intent of adding additional flanking wings in the future. These wings were never constructed. Instead, five portables serve to accommodate growth including one that houses a kitchen and lunchroom. The building is a Floyd Naramore design and a designated Seattle Landmark. The extensive Landmarked elements include the entire brick exterior, covered play area, original wood entry doors, built-in wardrobes and storage, slate chalkboards, wood trim, and wood floors. Aside from being a small site, one of the main challenges is the lack of ADA accessibility. The existing structure sits on a ten-foot plinth with stair access only. Once inside the building there is another set of stairs to reach the main level. The cramped interior has required multiple creative uses, such as the front Administration and nurse sharing a space and the OT/PT program utilizing a stairwell. A modernization of the existing building to make it ADA accessible and update it to meet the current Educational Specifications will be necessary. This site will also require a large addition to meet the rest of the program needs. Considerations and highlights of the design include:
 - **Modernization and Addition option:**
 - Main entry from the north creates better accessibility and provides protected parent drop-off with good supervision from the Administration area.
 - The three-story portion of the building is centered within the site, buffering the neighborhood from its scale and shading.
 - The addition is pushed to the edges of the site, creating a protected play court that optimizes sun exposure, protection of students from the street and noise, and convenient access from the Gym and Commons.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.


Robert Eagle Staff Middle School Service Area


Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Robert Eagle Staff MS** (Replacement of Woodrow Wilson Junior High School) opened fall 2017 as an attendance area middle school with the highly capable cohort program, Design capacity 850; October 2017 enrollment is 716 and is projected to increase in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 750; School Board reduced building capacity from 850 to 750 to accommodate the program at Licton Springs in 2017.
- **Licton Springs K-8** (within Robert Eagle Staff bldg.) opened fall 2017; Design capacity 150; capacity increased from 150 to 250 by School Board in 2017; October 2017 enrollment is 164 and is projected to grow in the next 5 years; this is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.
- **Cascadia ES** (New ES) opened fall 2017; Design capacity 660; October enrollment is 525; this is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.
- **Bagley ES** (Modernization/ Addition) opens in fall 2020, Design capacity is 500 (+150); October 2017 enrollment is 426 and is projected to remain flat in the next 5 years; there are 8 portables on site.
- **Ingraham HS** (Addition) opens in fall 2019: Design capacity 1,696 (+500); October enrollment is 1,342 and is projected to increase in the next 5 years.

Proposed projects:

- **Olympic View ES:** 8-classroom addition; Design capacity approximately 570 (+176); October 2017 enrollment is 449 and is projected to increase in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 396; there are 3 portables on site.
- **Northgate ES:** Replacement for capacity and condition; Design capacity 650; October 2017 enrollment is 255 and is projected to increase in the next 5 years; Right-sized capacity is 220; there are 5 portables on site.





The Robert Eagle Staff Middle School service area is in the Northwest corner of the city. It includes the Seattle designated Northgate urban center, Bitter Lake urban village hub and Aurora Licton Springs urban residential village. Current capacity analysis shows shortfalls at Olympic View and Northgate elementary schools in the next 5 years. Licton Springs also shows a deficit in capacity. However, it is a cultural specific academic program that would require more analysis to cater to the needs of program participants.

Capital Planning proposes:

- Replacement of Northgate ES.** Onsite review determined this building could potentially be Landmarked because of the prominent local architect, Paul Thiry. The significant architectural features in the existing school are the classroom wings with exposed concrete post and beam construction. The site is in a residential neighborhood. The two-tiered site supports a playground on the upper terrace and the school building on the lower terrace. The Seattle skyline and Mount Rainier are visible from the upper terrace. The Planning Team and Capital planning determined that pricing two Master Plan options would be required based on the potential for Landmark nomination. The alternatives include a modernization option and a new construction option. Considerations and highlights of the design include:

Modernization option:

- The potentially Landmarked classroom wings have retained their post and beam construction, but the layout has changed to include required programmatic spaces such as Learning Commons, Special Educational, and Childcare.
- The Gym and Commons are the heart of the school and provide access to the upper terrace.

New construction option:

- Proposed Library location optimizes light and views of Mt. Rainier and celebrates the importance of this shared space.
- The Gym and Commons can be easily zoned for after-hours use, with good proximity to parking.
- The building location optimizes locations for all outdoor play areas, including best sun exposure, protection of students from street and noise, convenient access from the gym and commons, as well as good access for maintenance.

- Addition (8-classroom) at Olympic View ES.** Olympic View Elementary has had multiple additions built between 1921-1989. After this facility was deemed a safety risk, a new 2-story

steel framed building with brick veneer was constructed on the east playground. As a part of this new school, a day care facility was attached to the eastern end. The 4.27-acre site is located in the Maple Leaf neighborhood.

- The Planning Team and District are proposing a new addition located on the west side of the building on the existing hardscape play. With this addition the school will increase capacity to be closer to a 650-student Educational Specification and will include improvements to the Library, Sped, Commons/Gym, and Admin Space with a secure entry vestibule.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.



Washington Middle School Service Area

Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- None

Proposed projects:

- **Washington MS:** Replacement for Condition; Design capacity 1,000; Current right-sized capacity is 895; October 2017 enrollment is 712 and is projected to decrease slightly over the next 5 years; there are 14 portables on site.
- **John Muir ES:** 6-classroom addition; Design capacity is approximately +120; Rightsized capacity is 340; October 2017 enrollment is 367 and is projected to increase considerably in the next 5 years; there are 2 portables on site.



The Washington Middle School service area is comprised of a narrow strip between the Meany and Mercer service areas. It includes the Mount Baker and Yesler Terrace neighborhoods.

Capital Planning proposes:

- **Replacement of Washington Middle School.** Located in the Central District, Washington Middle School is a complex site made up of 19 land parcels. The parcel closest to Jackson Street is designated a NC35 (Neighborhood Commercial) requiring a pedestrian street front. The Franz Bakery borders the site to the west and apartments border the site to the east. The building is a two-story concrete structure with its main entry hidden to the west. Parking is located south of the site. This terraced site has several challenges including steep slopes along the eastern edge, SPU drainage and sanitary mains run north/south just east of the center of the site, and a wetland on the southern playfields. This site is also in a high crime neighborhood, which poses security risks to the staff and students. Although John Graham is a notable local architect, the Planning and Design Team felt there were not enough significant architectural features to proceed with a modernization option. A new construction Master Plan option was preferred which could allow the District to consider selling the NC35 parcel. For this reason, the school was sited further south on the site. Considerations and highlights of the design include:
 - **New construction option:**
 - The five-story building is set within the slope and centered within the site, buffering the neighborhood from its scale and shading.
 - Classrooms are grouped in three two-story wings, making the grade levels per floor rather than per wing.
 - The compact plans allow for creating of a full-sized soccer field and running track to the north, as well as retaining the fields on the south, and eliminates any hiding places that would create a security risk.
- **Addition (6 classroom) to John Muir Elementary School.** John Muir Elementary School has seen many transformations over the years. Originally designed as an annex school in 1910, it was expanded with a 1924 Floyd A. Naramore addition to handle overcrowding and renamed John Muir. A second addition was added in 1971. A new 3-story addition was built in 1991, replacing the original 1910 building and 1924 addition. The 3.32-acre site is located near York Playground in the Mount Baker neighborhood of Seattle.
 - The Planning Team and District determined an addition and interior re-work would get the building closer to the 500-student capacity Educational Specifications. A new 2-story addition is proposed at the west side of the building, as well as redesigning the Admin, Gym/Commons, Childcare, and Library. New classroom spaces would also be added above the covered play on the second and third levels.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.


Whitman Middle School Service Area


Projects in BEX IV and BTA IV:

- **Loyal Heights ES:** Modernization/ Addition opens fall 2018; Design capacity 660 (+360); October 2017 enrollment is 398 and is projected to increase substantially in the next 5 years; with class size reduction, right-sized capacity is 572.
- **Webster ES:** (re-open closed school) opens fall 2020; Design capacity is 375; formerly used as Nordic Museum.

Proposed projects:

- **Whitman MS:** Replacement for condition; Design capacity 1,000; Right-sized capacity is 754; October 2017 enrollment is 566 and is projected to increase over the next 5 years; there are 16 portables on site.
- **Viewlands ES:** Replacement for capacity and condition; Design capacity is 660 (+400); Right-sized capacity is 200; October 2017 enrollment is 399 and projected to increase in the next 5 years; there are 12 portables on site.
- **North Beach ES:** Replacement for capacity and condition; Design capacity is 660 (+440); Right-sized capacity is 220; October 2017 enrollment is 328 and projected to increase slightly over next 5 years; there are 8 portables on site.
- **Monroe (Salmon Bay K-8):** Modernization/ Addition for capacity and condition; Design capacity 680; Right-sized capacity is 684; October 2017 enrollment is 659 and projected to remain steady over the next 5 years; this is an option school and enrollment can be capped at building capacity.
- **Ballard HS:** Addition for capacity (See high school analysis).





The Whitman Middle School service area is located to the northwest of Lake Union. It includes the Ballard urban village hub as well as the Crown Hill residential village. Current capacity analysis indicates a need for K-5 capacity in all the remaining elementary schools except Loyal Heights which opens in fall 2018 with a newly modernized and expanded facility.

Capital Planning proposes:

- Replace Whitman MS.** The tract of land that is home to Whitman Middle School used to be an Army base. The single-story steel and concrete building opened in 1959 and captured views of the Puget Sound out to the west. Whitman Middle School is not likely to be a Landmark, but it does have a 711-seat Auditorium that could be reused. This space would require major system upgrades if it is to be reused. The site is currently slated for field upgrades including adding lighting and turf replacement. Both the school and community heavily use these fields as well as the adjacent Soundview Playfields. The school fields are located on a lower portion of the site and the current building is located on the upper terrace with retaining walls separating the two. Following review of preliminary Master Plan options, the Planning Team and District Team determined that two design options would be estimated resulting in a modernization option reusing the Auditorium and a new construction option. Considerations and highlights for the design include:

At the modernized option:

- Reuse of the existing Auditorium. This would require significant system upgrades.
- A compact three-story Classroom wing is organized around a courtyard to provide daylighting to all classrooms and labs.
- The larger resource spaces such as the Commons and Gym are located near the existing Auditorium.

At the new construction option:

- The Library is located on a quiet part of the site that optimizes daylighting from the north as well as views to the west, both of which serve to celebrate the importance of this space.
- The Makerspace is located adjacent to a plaza that can support larger ongoing projects that can be outdoors.
- The existing field locations are maintained, which minimizes costs for grading or replacing these site improvements.

- **Replace Viewlands ES.** Viewlands Elementary School was named for its location, which captures views of Puget Sound and the Olympic Mountains. The school was originally a part of the Shoreline School District, but was annexed into the City of Seattle in 1954. This 1-story concrete block building is located right above Carkeek Park, which has provided the student body with access to nature trails and a connection to the nearby salmon watersheds. The 6.5-acre site is located in the Broadview neighborhood in north Seattle. The school currently has all outdoor circulation and is set down from the main road with limited visibility. This has raised concerns for student safety.

New Construction Option:

- The Planning Team and District propose a new 2-story structure that meets the Elementary 650-student capacity Educational Specification. The new school creates better circulation, a secure point of entry, and learning clusters with learning commons.
- **Replace North Beach ES.** The North Beach Elementary School site has seen many changes over the years. The original site was the Olympic Golf Course until 1950 when the U.S Army purchased the tract of land for use as an anti-aircraft site. The Army later sold the property to the District and in 1958, the North Beach Elementary permanent structure was opened. The site is relatively flat except along the perimeter. To the north, the site captures views of the Puget Sound and Olympic Mountains. During the due diligence site visit, cracking on the asphalt play area and a slumping hillside to the east revealed water seepage issues, which will require proper drainage. An Environmental Site Assessment is suggested for further testing to identify potential hazard materials associated with a former military site. The southern half of the site is designated as a Fish and Wildlife Conservation Area and is within a heron habitat buffer. Although notable architect John Graham designed the building, it does not have many distinguishing architectural features and is an unlikely candidate for Landmark nomination. The Planning Team and District Team proceeded with a new construction option for this site, although a modernization option was evaluated and can be referenced in the appendix of this report. Considerations and highlights of the design include:

New construction option:

- Placement of the Library and Commons celebrates the importance of these shared student spaces and optimizes daylight and views of the Puget Sound.
 - The size of the existing site and the placement of the new building will allow the new building to be constructed without moving students off site. However, a separate construction phase will be required to demolish the existing building and build new play areas and parking in its place.
 - The site plan optimizes orientation for outdoor play areas, including best sun exposure, protection of students from street and noise, convenient access from the gym, and good maintenance access.
- **Modernize Monroe (Salmon Bay K-8).** Salmon Bay K-8 is a fine example of 20th-Century Georgian-style architecture. The Floyd A. Naramore design in the Ballard residential neighborhood does not currently have a Landmark designation, but the classic architectural features and prominent local architect suggest it is a strong candidate. The existing brick building is a three-story rectangle. The center of the building contains an assembly room on the main level and a library addition on the upper level. The building is sited on the lowest of three terraces with the main entry off NW 65th Street. A middle terrace has a hard and soft play space, and the upper terrace is a turf soccer field with a running track. The maintenance access

for the site is currently a narrow alley between the building and middle terrace. This is not only a challenge to access, but also a safety concern for students. The strong likelihood of this building and site being Landmarked meant that the Planning Team only explored modernization Master Plan options. Considerations and highlights for the design include:

Modernization option:

- Placement of the Library at the center of the Atrium provides excellent daylighting for this important shared space.
- The Commons was relocated to the north side for daylighting and better access to outdoor learning and play areas. It is directly adjacent to the new single Gym where an operable wall can provide shared space for large events.
- A new Amphitheater and stair are proposed to bridge the existing “canyon” or “alley” between the building and hardscape play while supporting better supervision.

Supporting material (master plans) on proposed projects are available for review.

AVAILABLE SITES NOT CURRENTLY USED FOR SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The list of sites that are currently owned by Seattle Public Schools and not used for school programs are:

1. Columbia Annex at 3100 S Alaska St., Seattle, 98108,
 - Currently leased to Africatown Center for Education & Innovation
 - Lease expires 8/31/2018
 - Close to Columbia City Link station
 - 1-acre lot zoned LR-2
 - 4,268 S.F. 1- story wood frame bldg. w/ forced air heating units, non-sprinklered.
 - Building currently used as offices
2. Fauntleroy at 4401 SW Director St., Seattle 98136
 - Old Fauntleroy Elementary parking lot leased to West Seattle nursery
 - School transferred to Fauntleroy Community Service.
 - Month to month short term lease
 - 1.4-acre lot zoned SF 5000 (9 separate lots)
3. Lake City at 2611 NE 125th St., Seattle, 98125
 - Land lease terminated in 2018
 - Leased to tenants
 - 2.68-acre lot Zoned NC2P-30
 - 37,500 S.F. 2-story masonry bldg. w/ heat pumps and fully sprinklered
 - Building currently used as professional offices (Lake City Professional Center)
4. Schmitz Park at 5000 SW Spokane St., Seattle, 98116
 - Currently leased to Seattle Parks / ARC program
 - Lease expires 2018 (YMCA) and 2019 (Seattle Parks)
 - 7.56-acre lot Zoned SF 5000
 - 39,199 S.F. 1-story wood framed bldg. w/ hot water heating system and no sprinklers
 - Reserve for interim use in West Seattle area for planned projects

The following are long-term leased properties that are **NOT** available for school programs:

1. West Queen Anne at 1401 5th Ave. W, Seattle, 98119
 - SPS leased land to West Queen Anne Associates
 - Lease expires 2082 w/option for another 99 years
 - 1.69-acre lot Zoned LR-1
 - 4-story masonry bldg. w/49 units of Condominiums.
2. Interlake at 1815 N 45th St., Seattle 98103 (4416 Wallingford Ave. N, Seattle, 98103)
 - SPS leased land to Lorig & Associates
 - Lease expires 2083
 - 1.72-acre lot zoned NC2P-40
 - 52,078 S.F. 2-story wood frame bldg. w/hot water heating, non-sprinklered.
 - Building currently used as mixed-use building with retail on lower floor and apartments on top.

3. Jefferson at 4720 42nd Ave. SW, Seattle, 98116
 - SPS leased land to Kimco Realty
 - Lease expires 2084
 - 3.22-acre lot Zoned NC3P-65
 - 205,095 S.F. 6-story reinforced Concrete bldg. w/ heat pumps and fully sprinklered
 - 77,547 S.F. 4-story reinforced concrete bldg. w/ electric heat and fully sprinklered
 - Buildings currently used as mixed use with apartments and retail in one and offices and retail in the other

4. Oak Lake at 10040 Aurora Ave. N, Seattle, 98133
 - SPS leased land to Oak Tree Village
 - Lease expires 2035
 - 3.41-acre lot Zoned NC3P-40
 - Lot currently used as parking for neighborhood shopping center with grocery store, cinema and other retail

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The BEX V Capital Levy proposal was developed and refined through nine Board work sessions from September 2017 through October 2018; regional community engagement meetings in April and September 2018; feedback from the BEX/BTA Capital Program Oversight Committee, the Facilities Master Plan Task Force, the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), and individual citizens. In addition, a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the BEX V Capital Levy was developed, published and reviewed with the community. The FEIS was published on June 15, 2018, an appeal was filed and later dismissed following a hearing examiner's recommendation.

To help inform the prioritization of capital projects for BEX V, and following the guidance in [Board Policy 6901 \(Capital Levy Planning\)](#), the Board adopted the [BEX V Guiding Principles](#) and district staff developed a scoring and ranking system. This scoring system is based on the Guiding Principles of: Equity; Building condition; Educational adequacy; Health, safety and security; and Right-size capacity.

The scoring methodology was reviewed by a [Facilities Master Plan Task Force](#), and discussed in Board work sessions [May 30](#), [June 25](#), [August 22](#), and [September 26, 2018](#) as well as during the October 4, 2018 Operations Committee meeting. During the September 26 work session, there was discussion regarding the specificity of the equity factor methodology, and the Board inquired about the possibility of alternative equity factor methodology to provide more clarity on the relative ranking of the proposed projects. An additional equity factor methodology and ranking were presented and discussed during the October 4 Operations Committee meeting and was ultimately used to develop the project list proposed to the Board at the October 17, 2018 Board meeting.

Public input was gathered through 13 community meetings and at CapitalLevy2019@seattleschools.org. Public comment was also received at regular Board meetings, and a specific public hearing was scheduled between Board Introduction and Action.

A Project Ranking Matrix, for compliance with School Board Policy 6901 and subsequent Board guiding principles, is prepared for comparison of proposed projects, see Figure M below :

Figure M : Capacity/Condition Projects with Scoring Criteria (Summary chart)

Facility	School Type	Region	Scope of work	Capital Factors SUMMARY SCORES (67% Combined Weight)								Equity Factor (33% weight)		OVERALL SCORE	
				16.75%		16.75%		16.75%		16.75%		33%		100%	
				Educational Adequacy (average of 3 factors)		Building Conditions (average of 4 factors)		Health, Safety & Security (average of 5 factors)		Right Size Capacity (2021-22 projected enrollment / right size capacity)		School Equity Index (based on demographic profile of students enrolled in each school)		OVERALL WEIGHTED SCORE	
				Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Rank ***
Northgate ES	ES	NW	Modernization	3.03	3.24	4.05	4.84	2.64	2.16	1.40	3.37	3.91	4.42	3.74	1
Viewlands ES	ES	NW	Replacement	4.43	5.00	2.51	2.39	2.40	1.75	2.25	5.00	3.34	3.83	3.63	2
Mercer International MS	MS	SE	Replacement	3.10	3.32	3.99	4.75	2.60	2.09	1.39	3.32	3.58	4.08	3.60	3
Kimball ES	ES	SE	Replacement	4.10	4.58	3.17	3.44	3.20	3.12	1.08	2.40	3.09	3.57	3.45	4
John Rogers ES	ES	NE	Replacement	3.53	3.87	3.92	4.64	2.90	2.61	1.22	2.80	2.91	3.37	3.44	5
Montlake ES	ES	C	Addition/ Modernization	4.03	4.50	3.80	4.46	4.30	5.00	1.75	4.41	0.63	1.00	3.41	6
Ingraham (Addition underway)	HS	NW	Modernization	2.87	3.03	3.72	4.33	3.05	2.86	0.90	1.85	3.50	3.99	3.34	7
Aki Kurose MS	MS	SE	Modernization	2.57	2.65	3.72	4.33	2.40	1.75	0.79	1.52	4.36	4.88	3.33	8
Sacajawea ES	ES	NE	Replacement	3.43	3.74	3.31	3.66	3.80	4.15	1.05	2.32	2.56	3.01	3.32	9
Rainier Beach	HS	SE	Replacement	2.70	2.82	3.09	3.32	2.93	2.66	0.61	1.00	4.47	5.00	3.29	10
John Muir ES	ES	C	CR Addition	2.73	2.86	2.37	2.17	3.10	2.95	1.34	3.17	3.72	4.22	3.26	11
West Seattle ES	ES	WS	CR Addition	2.57	2.65	2.08	1.70	2.75	2.35	1.43	3.46	4.03	4.54	3.20	12
Washington MS	MS	C	Replacement	2.77	2.91	3.94	4.67	2.46	1.85	0.73	1.35	3.69	4.19	3.19	13
Alki ES	ES	WS	Replacement	3.43	3.74	4.10	4.92	4.05	4.57	1.03	2.25	1.33	1.74	3.17	14
Whitman MS	MS	NW	Replacement	2.77	2.91	3.85	4.53	3.25	3.21	0.98	2.08	2.42	2.86	3.08	15
Lafayette ES	ES	WS	Modernization	3.60	3.95	3.40	3.81	2.75	2.35	1.05	2.29	2.00	2.43	2.88	16
Wedgwood ES	ES	NE	Replacement	3.53	3.87	3.49	3.95	3.35	3.38	1.29	3.02	1.13	1.52	2.88	17
North Beach ES	ES	NW	Replacement	3.50	3.83	3.88	4.58	2.75	2.35	1.61	3.98	0.71	1.09	2.83	18
Salmon Bay K-8 at Monroe	K-8	NW	Modernization	2.83	2.99	4.14	5.00	3.15	3.03	1.12	2.51	1.13	1.52	2.77	19
McGilvra ES	ES	C	Addition/ Modernization	3.83	4.25	3.68	4.25	3.20	3.12	0.94	1.97	0.85	1.23	2.68	20
Garfield	HS	C	CR Addition	1.27	1.02	2.56	2.48	2.06	1.18	1.31	3.09	3.44	3.93	2.60	21
John Hay ES	ES	QA/M	CR Addition	2.83	2.99	1.94	1.49	2.85	2.52	1.52	3.70	1.94	2.37	2.57	22
Olympic View ES	ES	NW	CR Addition	2.60	2.70	1.78	1.22	2.44	1.82	1.37	3.27	2.76	3.22	2.57	23
West Woodland ES	ES	NW	CR Addition	2.87	3.03	2.14	1.80	3.40	3.46	1.39	3.32	1.00	1.39	2.40	24

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Facility	School Type	Region	Scope of work	Capital Factors SUMMARY SCORES (67% Combined Weight)								Equity Factor (33% weight)		OVERALL SCORE	
				16.75%		16.75%		16.75%		16.75%		33%		100%	
				Educational Adequacy (average of 3 factors)		Building Conditions (average of 4 factors)		Health, Safety & Security (average of 5 factors)		Right Size Capacity (2021-22 projected enrollment / right size capacity)		School Equity Index (based on demographic profile of students enrolled in each school)		OVERALL WEIGHTED SCORE	
				Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Raw Score	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Min-Max Normalization (1-5 scale) *	Rank ***
Nathan Hale	HS	NE	CR Addition	1.43	1.23	1.69	1.09	2.10	1.24	1.15	2.59	3.58	4.08	2.37	25
Madison MS	MS	WS	CR Addition	1.43	1.23	1.73	1.15	2.20	1.41	1.08	2.38	2.64	3.09	2.05	26
Ballard	HS	NW	CR Addition	<i>1.17</i>	1.00	1.64	1.00	1.96	1.00	1.19	2.73	2.17	2.60	1.82	27
Roosevelt	HS	NE	CR Addition	<i>1.10</i>	1.00	1.78	1.23	2.05	1.15	0.92	1.92	2.00	2.43	1.69	28
Roxhill Building/Denny Service Area Site	ES	WS	Replacement	3.40	3.70	3.69	4.27	2.80	2.44			3.74	4.23		
Lincoln (under Construction)	HS	N	Gym. Modernization	3.27	3.53	2.61	2.56								
Original Van Asselt MS	MS	SE	New/ Replacement	1.60	1.44	3.35	3.73	3.20	3.12						
Downtown High School	HS	QA/M	New												
Memorial Stadium	HS	QA/M	Replacement												
Parking (~800 stalls)	HS	QA/M	Replacement												
			Raw Score Min**	1.25		1.64		1.96		0.61		0.63			
			Raw Score Max**	4.43		4.14		4.30		1.95		4.47			
			Raw Score Range	3.18		2.51		2.34		1.34		3.85			

* Raw scores were adjusted to a common 1 to 5 scale, where the lowest score is a 1.00 and the highest score is a 5.00 for each measure. This scale adjustment was performed using a **Min-Max normalization** calculation, whereby the transformed value (Y) is calculated from the raw score (X) using the formula: $Y = ((X - \text{Raw Score Min}) / (\text{Raw Score Max} - \text{Raw Score Min})) * 4 + 1$

** In three cases, *statistical outliers (red italicized numbers)* were capped at the upper or lower limits of the outlier definitions: Lower Limit = 1st Quartile – (1.5* IQR); Upper Limit = 3rd Quartile + (1.5* IQR)

***Equity Index serves as tiebreaker if overall weighted scores are equivalent (rounded to two decimal points)

Based on the scoring criteria and consideration for interim sites available for construction, the resultant project list is proposed for BEX V:

**SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BUILDING EXCELLENCE BEX V CAPITAL LEVY
RECOMMENDED OPTION PROJECT LIST**

BEX V PROPOSED BUILDING PROJECTS	TOTAL:	\$ 1,400,000,000
CAPACITY/ CONDITION PROJECTS		
Elementary Schools		
Alki Elementary School: School Replacement Retaining Existing Gym	\$ 53,297,010	
John Rogers Elementary School: School Replacement	\$ 74,620,191	
Kimball Elementary School: School Replacement	\$ 74,773,277	
Montlake Elementary School: Historical Modernization/Addition	\$ 51,610,003	
Northgate Elementary School: School Replacement	\$ 78,163,081	
Viewlands Elementary School: School Replacement	\$ 69,880,250	
Sacajawea Elementary School: Design Only	\$ 4,000,000	
West Seattle Elementary School: 8 Classroom Addition	\$ 21,961,020	
Middle Schools		
Aki Kurose: Design Only (Potential Landmark)	\$ 8,000,000	
Mercer Middle School: School Replacement	\$ 118,075,313	
Original Van Asselt; Interim Site: 30 Classroom Addition	\$ 40,000,000	
High Schools		
Rainier Beach High School: School Replacement Retaining Existing Theater	\$ 194,886,815	
Short and Intermediate Term Capacity/Portable Management	\$ 6,000,000	
TOTAL CAPACITY/ CONDITION PROJECTS		\$ 795,266,959
PROPERTY ACQUISITION & INFRASTRUCTURE		\$ 30,000,000
BUILDING SYSTEMS REPAIRS & REPLACEMENTS (BSR&R)		
Site Improvements	\$ 5,029,554	
Playground Equipment	\$ 3,140,000	
Exterior Cladding (Joint Repointing, Caulking, Water-Repellant/Anti-Graffiti Coating)	\$ 13,040,778	
Exterior Doors	\$ 1,698,180	
Exterior Windows	\$ 14,802,729	
Roof	\$ 29,919,840	
Seismic Improvements (Earthquake Safety)	\$ 30,628,764	
Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)	\$ 6,433,506	
Occupant Controlled Ceiling Fans	\$ 6,960,000	
Electrical Services	\$ 15,827,205	
Fire Alarm Systems	\$ 2,124,379	
TOTAL BUILDING SYSTEMS REPAIRS & REPLACEMENTS		\$ 129,604,936
BEX V ONE OFF PROJECTS		
Add Parent Drop-off and Sidewalks at Sanislo ES	\$ 516,117	
Security Gates for Lock Down at Chief Sealth International HS	\$ 150,000	

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Sound Attenuation for Open Plan Concept Schools	\$	1,350,000
Lincoln HS CTE and Theater Improvements	\$	3,000,000
West Woodland ES Repurpose Existing Gym & Construct Multi-Purpose Room	\$	8,000,000
Playfields at Fort Lawton/Discovery Park (2 Fields)	\$	8,098,300
Maintenance Equipment	\$	1,000,000
Grounds Equipment	\$	500,000
Food Service Equipment	\$	1,500,000
Lunch Room Tables	\$	500,000
Building and Site Security Equipment	\$	10,000,000
BEX V Move Costs/Levy Planning Costs/Election Costs	\$	5,500,000
TOTAL BEX V ONE OFF PROJECTS	\$	40,114,417
MAJOR PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	\$	30,000,000
MANAGEMENT & STAFFING	\$	24,000,000
CAPITAL ELIGIBLE PROGRAM LOAN REPAYMENT	\$	1,000,000
DEBT SERVICE PAYMENT	\$	10,100,000
SUBTOTAL BEX V PROPOSED BUILDING PROJECTS	\$	1,060,086,312
SUBTOTAL BEX V BUILDING PROJECTS LEVY ESCALATION @ 17% (2020 - 4% ; 2021 - 4%; 2022 - 4%; 2023 - 4%)	\$	144,006,117
BEX V BUILDING PROJECTS PROGRAM CONTINGENCY @ 3%	\$	31,959,453
TOTAL BEX V PROPOSED BUILDING PROJECTS		\$ 1,236,051,882
BEX V PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS		
INFRASTRUCTURE	\$	44,041,000
DISTRICT SYSTEMS	\$	45,114,000
STUDENT LEARNING	\$	62,543,000
TOTAL BEX V PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS		\$ 151,698,000
BEX V PROPOSED ACADEMICS/ATHLETICS PROJECTS		
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS	\$	1,500,000
CORE 24 GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS (Science & Computer Labs)	\$	1,500,000
PROGRAM PLACEMENT	\$	1,500,000
ATHLETIC FIELDS/FIELD EXTERIOR LIGHTS	\$	7,750,118
TOTAL BEX V PROPOSED ACADEMICS/ATHLETICS PROJECTS		\$ 12,250,118
TOTAL BEX V CAPITAL LEVY		\$ 1,400,000,000

End

ADDENDUM 1

TO

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

Executive Summary

McKinstry was selected by Seattle Public Schools in April of 2018 to conduct an update of the district's 2014 Building Condition Assessment as the district prepares for the Building Excellence (BEX) Levy V. This update will capture any changes in condition since the last study and ensure that Seattle Public Schools will have a strong foundation of data to guide their levy planning.

McKinstry's deliverables include:

1. Preliminary equipment pricing on select equipment
2. Individual assessment reports
3. A combined dataset of all component scores and their changes
4. The FCA Viz, McKinstry's data visualization tool

We are excited for the opportunity to continue to partner with Seattle Public Schools to ensure that this study is valuable to the district and helps make data-driven capital planning decisions.

PROCESS

From April to June of 2018, McKinstry's teams visited 93 schools, administrative buildings and leased spaces to assess the condition of the site, main buildings, auxiliary buildings and portables. District staff guided our teams through each location.

Our teams assessed 16,082 components at these schools according to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) condition guidelines. These scores were compared to the 4,068 scores listed in the Inventory and Condition of Schools (ICOS) database from the most recent assessment. Many components were previously given a score of N/A or the building had no assessment, which lead to McKinstry assessing 12,014 components without a previous score. McKinstry did not upload any new scores to ICOS.

SCORING

The scoring criteria, provided by OSPI, are as follows:

Score	Asset Condition	Rating
1	Excellent Preventative Maintenance New or easily restorable to "like new" condition.	100 %
2	Good Routine Maintenance Component aging but exhibits no damage.	90%
3	Fair Minor repairs Minor component damage or repairs needed.	62%
4	Poor Major Repairs Component is in need of major repairs, not operating, or close to the end of its expected useful life.	30%
5	Unsatisfactory Replacement Major damage, complete failure, or in need of replacement.	0%



Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

Overview of Findings

546 components changed scores from the 2014 report, 376 of which for the worse. 64 components went down by two or three points. Of those, McKinstry has provided pricing estimates for 26 components that we had enough data to allow us to create preliminary replacement pricing.

McKinstry also calculated the rolled-up score for each building with weighting factors provided by OSPI. Many schools saw their scores change from the previous report due to deterioration or investments since 2014. However, in some cases scores increased due either improvements since 2014 or the addition of component scores that were not included in the previous survey.

SCHOOL SCORES

Below is the rolled-up score of all main buildings at each school. This does not include scores for any auxiliary buildings, portables or the site. The scores are calculated by weighted factors provided by OSPI.

School Type	School Name	Previous Score	New Score	Change
Elementary	Adams	62.93	71.82	8.88
Elementary	African American Academy	76.12	75.59	-0.53
Elementary	Alki	50.73	52.76	2.03
Elementary	B.F. Day	62.83	48.45	-14.38
Elementary	Beacon Hill International	67.21	48.92	-18.29
Elementary	Bryant	67.75	64.31	-3.44
Elementary	Cedar Park	35.35	88.74	53.88
Elementary	Frantz Coe	90.00	87.22	-2.78
Elementary	Columbia Interagency	58.70	54.08	-4.62
Elementary	Concord International	67.19	71.64	4.45
Elementary	Dearborn Park International	61.72	59.89	-1.83
Elementary	Decatur	54.67	57.89	3.22
Elementary	Dunlap	78.78	78.28	-0.50
Elementary	Emerson	74.60	72.97	-1.63
Elementary	Gatewood	63.45	67.67	4.22
Elementary	Bailey Gatzert	62.17	55.97	-6.19
Elementary	Graham Hill	53.60	62.99	9.38
Elementary	Green Lake	55.03	52.88	-2.15
Elementary	Greenwood	83.35	76.51	-6.85
Elementary	Hawthorne	70.27	68.52	-1.74
Elementary	Queen Anne (John Hay)	73.54	78.95	5.41
Elementary	Highland Park	79.77	73.66	-6.12
Elementary	Kimball	53.88	43.63	-10.26
Elementary	Lafayette	58.69	64.00	5.31

Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

School Type	School Name	Previous Score	New Score	Change
Elementary	John Stanford International (Latona)	69.31	66.85	-2.46
Elementary	Laurelhurst	57.16	53.58	-3.58
Elementary	Lawton	66.73	69.85	3.12
Elementary	Leschi	62.11	63.56	1.45
Elementary	Lowell	50.81	46.50	-4.31
Elementary	Maple	55.08	59.88	4.79
Elementary	Martin Luther King	85.25	74.69	-10.56
Elementary	McDonald International	76.48	74.73	-1.76
Elementary	McGilvra	47.04	45.32	-1.72
Elementary	Montlake	52.39	40.85	-11.55
Elementary	John Muir	65.87	63.69	-2.18
Elementary	North Beach	54.91	47.36	-7.55
Elementary	North Queen Anne	41.47	42.00	0.53
Elementary	Northgate	52.67	53.02	0.34
Elementary	Olympic View	74.31	72.70	-1.61
Elementary	Rainier View	79.27	73.90	-5.37
Elementary	John Rogers	31.70	38.84	7.14
Elementary	Roxhill	49.87	58.27	8.41
Elementary	Sacajawea	58.55	54.82	-3.73
Elementary	Sand Point	67.70	66.39	-1.32
Elementary	Sanislo	61.88	48.63	-13.25
Elementary	Stevens	80.45	75.02	-5.44
Elementary	Van Asselt (Old)	57.29	49.84	-7.44
Elementary	View Ridge	54.64	54.67	0.02
Elementary	Viewlands	80.37	79.27	-1.09
Elementary	Wedgwood	46.25	41.60	-4.65
Elementary	West Seattle Elem	71.19	69.18	-2.00
Elementary	West Woodland	61.28	67.33	6.05
Elementary	Whittier	77.94	76.05	-1.89
Elementary	Thurgood Marshall	N/A	55.06	N/A
Elementary	B.F. Day Fremont Art Council	N/A	42.76	N/A
Elementary	Schmitz Park	N/A	60.68	N/A
K-8	Catharine Blaine	51.28	39.73	-11.55
K-8	Louisa Boren (STEM)	57.27	56.01	-1.26
K-8	Broadview-Thomson	57.13	63.60	6.47
K-8	Cooper (Pathfinder)	83.43	77.92	-5.51
K-8	Madrona	82.56	81.07	-1.50

Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

School Type	School Name	Previous Score	New Score	Change
K-8	Monroe (Salmon Bay)	41.21	47.50	6.29
K-8	South Shore	88.75	86.96	-1.79
K-8	Whitworth (ORCA)	66.02	68.00	1.98
K-8	Seward (TOPS)	75.06	60.20	-14.86
Middle School	Aki Kurose	48.81	49.05	0.24
Middle School	Denny International	93.67	91.29	-2.39
Middle School	Eckstein	42.86	43.54	0.68
Middle School	Hamilton International	80.33	78.94	-1.38
Middle School	Madison	62.53	65.36	2.83
Middle School	John Marshall	60.43	64.58	4.15
Middle School	McClure	57.21	50.59	-6.62
Middle School	Mercer International	44.38	43.11	-1.27
Middle School	Washington	55.14	48.13	-7.01
Middle School	Whitman	50.13	39.95	-10.18
Middle School	Jane Addams	60.37	60.59	0.22
High School	Ballard	73.14	74.96	1.82
High School	Chief Sealth International	88.64	87.45	-1.19
High School	Cleveland	88.89	77.89	-10.99
High School	Franklin	63.45	59.27	-4.19
High School	Garfield	81.40	69.61	-11.79
High School	Mann (Nova)	54.39	55.20	0.82
High School	Ingraham International	45.37	47.68	2.31
High School	Nathan Hale	73.62	73.84	0.21
High School	Rainier Beach	63.16	55.42	-7.74
High School	Roosevelt	88.81	81.63	-7.18
High School	South Lake	88.25	87.99	-0.26
High School	West Seattle HS	73.02	70.60	-2.42
High School	Old Queen Anne High School Gym	N/A	83.14	N/A
Miscellaneous	John Stanford Center for Educational Excellence	N/A	68.51	N/A
Miscellaneous	Athletic Administration Office	N/A	59.62	N/A
Miscellaneous	Columbia Annex	N/A	20.21	N/A
Miscellaneous	Memorial Stadium	N/A	12.66	N/A

Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

SCORE CHANGES

Six of the lowest-scored ten schools have changed since the 2014 report, although the order has changed. Most of those scores stayed within a relatively close range of their 2014 scores, though their scores may have changed in part due to the addition of previously unscored components.

Previous Lowest 10 Schools			Previous Score
	School Type	School Name	
1	Elementary	John Rogers	31.70
2	Elementary	Cedar Park	35.35
3	K-8	Monroe (Salmon Bay)	41.21
4	Elementary	North Queen Anne	41.47
5	Middle School	Eckstein	42.86
6	Middle School	Mercer International	44.38
7	High School	Ingraham International	45.37
8	Elementary	Wedgwood	46.25
9	Elementary	McGilvra	47.04
10	Middle School	Aki Kurose	48.81

Current Lowest 10 Schools			Current Score
	School Type	School Name	
1	Elementary	John Rogers	38.84
2	K-8	Catharine Blaine	39.73
3	Middle School	Whitman	39.95
4	Elementary	Montlake	40.85
5	Elementary	Wedgwood	41.60
6	Elementary	North Queen Anne	42.00
7	Middle School	Mercer International	43.11
8	Middle School	Eckstein	43.54
9	Elementary	Kimball	43.63
10	Elementary	McGilvra	45.32

The average score change was **-2.18** (excluding the outlier of Cedar Park).

Seattle Public Schools

Building Condition Assessment Update

Recommendations

We are excited to demonstrate McKinstry's Viz Tool to dive into the data and make sense of Seattle Public School's facility needs. In addition to these planned capital replacements, we also have several recommendations for how Seattle Public Schools can improve their schools.

LED LIGHTING

There is a significant portfolio-wide opportunity to convert lighting into LED. The payback for retrofitting fixtures to LED is short and decreasing, and the light quality offers a better learning environment in the classroom and increases safety.

AIR BALANCING

Several schools had air balancing issues that caused comfort complaints. Air balancing can help address pressurization issues like slamming or hard-to-close doors, high volumes of airflow that make students uncomfortable, or not enough ventilation in classrooms. Our teams noticed these issues at several schools, including Ingraham International, Sand Point, Lawton, McGilvra and John Muir, among others.

RETRO-COMMISSIONING

Retro-commissioning (or existing-building commissioning) is a systematic "tune-up" of the building to look for low- and no-cost improvements that save energy, streamline operations and improve comfort. Retro-commissioning often saves 5-15% of energy consumption and has a short payback. Seattle Public Schools can select schools for retro-commissioning either by looking for schools that use the highest amount of energy relative to similar schools, or by schools that have the most comfort complaints.

PERFORMANCE OPTIMIZATION

This study did not examine energy consumption, but our teams found identified multiple energy-saving opportunities at every school. Seattle Public Schools has the opportunity to build on the work of the district's in-house resource conservation managers by unlocking building data and finding building-by-building performance optimization opportunities. These might include simple analytics such as finding equipment that is running out of hours, or could drill down to discover equipment that is nearing failure. Performance optimization blends technology and people to run your buildings more efficiently.

MAINTENANCE STRATEGY

There is significant deferred maintenance across the Seattle Public Schools portfolio. The district's maintenance teams do an admirable job of maintaining over 100 facilities (not including the hundreds of portables) spread out across the city, but the district has the opportunity to shift into a more proactive mode of operations. Reactive, emergency repairs always cost more than proactive, planned maintenance, and a thoughtful strategy to help the district start transitioning into best-in-class maintenance operations will save taxpayer dollars and benefit the learning environment.

ADDENDUM 2

TO

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

McKinstry Assessment Dashboard

Building Type	Facility/ School name	Standard Foundation	Slabs on Grade	Roof Construction	Exterior Walls	Exterior Windows	Exterior Doors and Grilles	Roofing	Interior Construction	Interior Finishes	Plumbing	Heating Systems	Cooling Systems	Facility HVAC Distribution	Fire Protection	General Purpose Electrical Power	Electrical Services and Distribution	Lighting	Data Communications	Voice Communications	Audio-Video Communications	Access Control and Intrusion	Detection and Alarm	Integrated Automation	Entertainment and Recreational	Fixed Furnishings	Movable Furnishings	Average building score	Site Communications	Sanitary Sewerage Utilities	Water Utilities	Athletic, Recreational and Condition of Hard Surface play area	Condition of Play Equipment	Condition of safety material under	Landscaping	Parking Lots	Pedestrian Plazas and Walkways	Roadways	Site Development	Average Site Score			
E	Adams	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.80	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.72	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.70		
E	Alki	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.60	2.67	4.00	NA	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.33	
E	B.F. Day	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.25	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.40	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.80		
E	Bailey Gatzert	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.20	2.75	2.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.16	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.91		
E	Beacon Hill Int'l	4.00	NA	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.20	3.50	2.67	4.00	NA	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.06	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	NA	4.00	2.90			
E	Bryant	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.40	2.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.86	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.90		
E	Cedar Park	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	NA	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.92	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.55		
E	Concord Int'l	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.20	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.43	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.58		
E	Dearborn Park Int'l	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	2.60	3.40	3.33	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.97	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.27		
E	Decatur	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.00	3.40	2.63	3.00	3.00	NA	4.00	2.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.12	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	NA	4.00	2.70		
E	Dunlap	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.20	2.80	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.35	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.50	
E	Emerson	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.27
E	Frantz Coe	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.11	2.11	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.12	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	NA	NA	3.00	3.00	2.00	NA	3.00	2.75			
E	Gateway	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	3.40	3.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.68	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.58	
E	Graham Hill	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.74	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.33	
E	Green Lake	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.40	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.46	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	NA	4.00	3.11			
E	Greenwood	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.20	2.67	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	NA	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.49	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.64			
E	Hawthorne	2.00	2.33	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.63	3.33	2.33	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.68	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00		
E	Highland Park	2.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.20	2.33	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.40	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.33		
E	John Hay	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.67	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	NA	2.00	2.00	NA	NA	3.00	3.00	2.48	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	NA	2.00	2.73			
E	John Muir	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.20	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.93	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.27		
E	John Rogers	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	3.80	3.25	3.33	5.00	NA	5.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	4.00	3.47	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00			
E	John Stanford Int'l (Latona)	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.56	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	NA	2.00	2.40			
E	Kimball	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.25	3.33	3.00	NA	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.52	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	NA	4.00	3.50			
E	Lafayette	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.67	3.00	NA	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.73	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00		
E	Laurelhurst	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.83	3.78	3.00	3.50	NA	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.21	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	NA	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.30		
E	Lawton	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.83	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.00	4.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.64	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.55			
E	Leschi	3.00	3.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.20	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.89	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.82			
E	Lowell	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.40	4.20	4.00	3.00	NA	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	NA	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.35	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	NA	4.00	3.18		
E	Madrone	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.60	2.75	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.21	3.00	3.00	3.00	NA	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	NA	2.00	NA	2.00	2.33			
E	Maple	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.20	3.25	2.67	3.00	NA	3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.92	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.58		
E	Martin Luther King Jr.	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.17	2.25	2.67	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.27	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.33		
E	McDonald Int'l	3.00	3.00	3.00</																																							

ADDENDUM 3

TO

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Portable Scores (McKinstry Assessment 2018)

School Type	School Name	Building	Weighted Score (2018)
Elementary	Adams	Portable 1 & 2	83.22
Elementary	Adams	Portable 3 & 4	83.10
Elementary	Alki	Portable 1 & 2	54.84
Elementary	Bailey Gatzert	Portable 1	75.83
Elementary	Cedar Park	Portable A & B	100.00
Elementary	Cedar Park	Portable C, D, E, & F	100.00
Elementary	Cedar Park	Portable G & H	100.00
Elementary	Columbia Interagency	Portable 4	67.28
Elementary	Gatewood	Portable 1 & 2	90.00
Elementary	Gatewood	Portable 15	90.00
Elementary	Graham Hill	Portable 1	90.00
Elementary	Graham Hill	Portable 2	90.00
Elementary	Graham Hill	Portable 3	86.25
Elementary	Green Lake	Portable 5	63.00
Elementary	Green Lake	Portable 7	89.34
Elementary	John Hay	Portable 1	88.15
Elementary	John Hay	Portable 2	88.21
Elementary	John Hay	Portable 3	88.21
Elementary	John Hay	Portable 4	88.21
Elementary	John Muir	Portable 1	79.15
Elementary	John Muir	Portable 2	79.15
Elementary	John Rogers	Portable 1	41.56
Elementary	John Rogers	Portable 2 & 3	88.21
Elementary	John Rogers	Portable 4	90.00
Elementary	John Rogers	Portable 5	90.00
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 1	59.63
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 2	59.63
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 3	60.54
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 4	59.38
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 5	59.67
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 6	59.65
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 7	59.54
Elementary	Kimball	Portable 8	59.64
Elementary	Lafayette	Portable 27	65.72
Elementary	Lafayette	Portable 30	65.72
Elementary	Lafayette	Portable 31 & 32	83.73
Elementary	Lafayette	Portable 33 & 34	90.00
Elementary	Laurelhurst	Portable 1 & 2	36.71
Elementary	Laurelhurst	Portable 3	36.83
Elementary	Laurelhurst	Portable 4	50.56
Elementary	Maple	Portable 1	86.92
Elementary	Maple	Portable 2	90.00
Elementary	Maple	Portable 3	90.00

Portable Scores (McKinstry Assessment 2018)

School Type	School Name	Building	Weighted Score (2018)
Elementary	Maple	Portable 4	90.00
Elementary	Martin Luther King	Portable 1	90.00
Elementary	McDonald International	Portable 3	56.67
Elementary	McDonald International	Portable 4	81.62
Elementary	McDonald International	Portable 5	83.10
Elementary	McDonald International	Portable Daycare 106	65.20
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 1	51.36
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 2	51.45
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 3	51.45
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 4	51.45
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 5	51.45
Elementary	Montlake	Portable 6	56.03
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 1	61.11
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 2	55.17
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 3	60.52
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 4 & 5	79.61
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 6	81.58
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 7	43.38
Elementary	North Beach	Portable 8	75.48
Elementary	Northgate	Portable 1	34.17
Elementary	Northgate	Portable 2	39.22
Elementary	Northgate	Portable 4	69.51
Elementary	Northgate	Portable 5	67.18
Elementary	Northgate	Portable 19	24.62
Elementary	Olympic View	Portable 1 & 2	89.97
Elementary	Olympic View	Portable 3	58.22
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 1	68.87
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 2	68.87
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 3A	83.50
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 3B	83.50
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 3C	83.50
Elementary	Rainier View	Portable 3D	83.50
Elementary	Roxhill	Portable 4	73.79
Elementary	Roxhill	Portable 18	49.62
Elementary	Roxhill	Portable 19 & 20	76.15
Elementary	Roxhill	Portable 21 & 22	47.78
Elementary	Sacajawea	Portable 1	34.24
Elementary	Sacajawea	Portable 2 & 3	60.79
Elementary	Sacajawea	Portable 4 & 5	87.88
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 1	57.78
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 2	55.92
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 3	61.95
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 4	56.07

Portable Scores (McKinstry Assessment 2018)

School Type	School Name	Building	Weighted Score (2018)
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 5	63.56
Elementary	Sand Point	Portable 6 & 7	88.42
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 1 & 2	15.44
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 3	58.59
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 4	49.53
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 7	51.82
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 12 & 13	87.08
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 14 & 15	87.08
Elementary	Schmitz Park	Portable 16 & 17	87.08
Elementary	Thurgood Marshall	Portable 1	74.16
Elementary	Thurgood Marshall	Portable 2	74.16
Elementary	View Ridge	Portable 1A & 1B	28.90
Elementary	View Ridge	Portable 2	34.02
Elementary	View Ridge	Portable 3 & 4	35.98
Elementary	View Ridge	Portable 5	60.29
Elementary	View Ridge	Portable 6	62.07
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 1	66.62
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 2	67.14
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 3	79.10
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 4	56.86
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 5	55.82
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 6	61.47
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 7	90.00
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 8 & 9	90.00
Elementary	Viewlands	Portable 10 & 11	66.20
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 1	29.66
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 2	36.42
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 3	62.44
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 4	89.93
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 5	87.80
Elementary	Wedgwood	Portable 6	87.75
Elementary	West Seattle Elem	Portable 1 and 2	90.00
Elementary	West Seattle Elem	Portable 3	90.00
Elementary	West Seattle Elem	Portable 4	90.00
Elementary	West Seattle Elem	Portable 5	90.00
Elementary	West Woodland	Portable 1 & 2	89.93
Elementary	West Woodland	Portable 3 & 4	89.93
Elementary	West Woodland	Portable 5	62.00
Elementary	West Woodland	Portable 6 & 7	82.99
K-8	Broadview-Thomson	Portable 1	68.44
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 1	87.79
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 2	87.86
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 3	87.83

Portable Scores (McKinstry Assessment 2018)

School Type	School Name	Building	Weighted Score (2018)
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 4	87.86
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 5	85.79
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 6	85.79
K-8	Catharine Blaine	Portable 7	85.79
K-8	Cooper (Pathfinder)	Portable P-1	90.00
Middle School	Aki Kurose	Portable 1	82.70
Middle School	Aki Kurose	Portable 2	84.11
Middle School	Eckstein	Portable	26.00
Middle School	Jane Addams	Portable 1 & 2	89.37
Middle School	Jane Addams	Portable 3	89.37
Middle School	Jane Addams	Portable 4	89.37
Middle School	McClure	Portable 1 & 2	20.56
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 314A and 314B	70.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 315 and 316	90.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 317 and 318	90.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 319	86.84
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 320	86.83
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 321	89.94
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 326	90.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 401 and 402	80.44
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 403	79.27
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 404	81.61
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 405	81.38
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 406	90.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 407 and 408	90.00
Middle School	Mercer International	Portable 409	90.00
Middle School	Washington	Portable 1	43.39
Middle School	Washington	Portable 2	50.41
Middle School	Washington	Portable 3	49.02
Middle School	Washington	Portable 4	59.45
Middle School	Washington	Portable 5	50.09
Middle School	Washington	Portable 8	66.38
Middle School	Washington	Portable 9	67.80
Middle School	Washington	Portable 10	77.30
Middle School	Washington	Portable 11	77.30
Middle School	Washington	Portable 12	77.30
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 14 & 15	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 16	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 17	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 18 & 19	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 20	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 21	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 22	26.07

Portable Scores (McKinstry Assessment 2018)

School Type	School Name	Building	Weighted Score (2018)
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 23	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 24 & 25	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 26	26.07
Middle School	Whitman	Portable 28	27.02
High School	Ballard	Portable 101 & 102	100.00
High School	Ballard	Portable 201	100.00
High School	Ballard	Portable 202	100.00
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 1	87.86
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 2	89.38
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 3	89.38
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 4	89.38
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 5	89.38
High School	Chief Sealth International	Portable 6	89.31
High School	Garfield	Portable 1	88.55
High School	Garfield	Portable 2	94.17
High School	Garfield	Portable 3	94.17
High School	Garfield	Portable 4	94.17
High School	Ingraham International	Portable 1 & 2	90.00
High School	Ingraham International	Portable 3	90.00
High School	Ingraham International	Portable 4	90.00
High School	Nathan Hale	Portable 1 & 2	45.42
High School	Nathan Hale	Portable 3 & 4	90.00
High School	Nathan Hale	Portable 5 & 6	90.00
High School	Rainier Beach	Portable	63.02
High School	Roosevelt	Portable 1 & 2	88.89
High School	Roosevelt	Portable 3	87.11
High School	Roosevelt	Portable 4	82.90
High School	Roosevelt	Portable 5	63.43
High School	Roosevelt	Portable 6	66.45

ADDENDUM 4

TO

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2018

Facilities Master Plan Task Force Report September 12, 2018

I. Overview

The Facilities Master Plan Task Force (FMPTF) was formed to support the school board's oversight of capital planning by reviewing elements of the District's long-range Facilities Master Plan. Per School Board Policy 6901, Capital Levy Planning, the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) should be approved by the school board, as the FMP is the basis for development of the District's capital levy programs. Seattle Public Schools plans to submit to the Building Excellence V (BEX V) capital levy to voters in February 2019.

The FMPTF committee had a series of five meetings during July/August 2018 that worked towards identifying areas of the district where enrollment and capacity analysis project the most pressing building capacity needs. In addition, the FMPTF provided validation of the scoring and relative ranking methodology of proposed projects in the Facilities Master Plan. Task Force members spent several hours prepping for the meetings, reviewing documents provided by staff and 17 hours in meetings analyzing the data and reports presented, discussing issues and building consensus on final recommendations for the Seattle School Board.

II. Committee Member Selection

Seeking a broad, diverse committee from communities throughout the city of Seattle, the District advertised for members to serve on the Facilities Master Plan Task Force. In addition, applicants were sought from the District's existing and prior committees, including: BEX/BTA Oversight Committee, the Seattle Partnership Technical Team, High School Boundaries Task Force, Capacity Management Task Force and Facilities and Capacity Management Advisory Committee. A total of 40 applications were received and Directors Eden Mack, Jill Geary and Betty Patu; Associate Superintendent, Flip Herndon and Capital Projects and Planning Director, Richard Best met to review applications and select members to participate on the FMPTF. Members were selected based upon prior experience reviewing complex technical data and analysis and to provide a broad representation of communities throughout the city.

Members selected included: Julie Slocum Bennani, Heidi Bennett, Thadeus Brown, Amalia Cody, Tim Collins, Meg Diaz, Michael George, Anjali Grant, Marc Greenough, Susan Hall, Kellie LaRue, Joshua Mullen, Ammom McWashington, Rebecca Penkala, Osama Quotah, Kathleen Richardson, Scott Ryan, Stephanie Stone, Richard Wielbruda and Michael Hubner with the City of Seattle- Office of Planning and Community Development.

III. Meetings Summary

Meeting #1 – July 9, 2018: Review of the FMPTF charge as well as board policies 6901 (Capitol Planning) and 0030 (Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity); discussed equity awareness and implicit bias in data and identified issues for future discussion and took data requests.

Meeting #2 – July 16, 2018: Review of Seattle Public Schools Missions, Vision and Core Values, as well as the history and status of BEX/BTA levies. There was an overview of the enrollment projection and capacity analysis methodologies.

Meeting #3 – July 30, 2018: Overview of how to utilize the “equity tool-kit” to address explicit equity outcomes in the decision-making process. There was a review of enrollment projections and capacity analysis for elementary and middle schools. This discussion led to the generation of questions, comments and potential recommendations.

Meeting #4 – August 6, 2018: Continuation of enrollment projections and capacity analysis review for middle and high schools. There was also an overview of the equity tiers methodology and a review of scoring criteria leading to more questions, comments and potential recommendations.

Meeting #5 August 13, 2018: The Task Force reviewed the potential recommendation captured at previous meetings, finalized language and voted on them.

Meeting #6 September 10, 2018: The Task Force reviewed the potential recommendation captured at previous meetings, reviewed the poll conducted after Meeting #5, finalized language and confirmed scoring criteria.

IV. Depth of Discovery

The FMPTF reviewed many documents over the course of their charge. The depth of discovery included but was not limited to the following information that were prepared for the Task Force by Seattle Public Schools Staff:

Policies/Principles	Reports/Presentations	Data Maps
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board Policy 6901 2. Board Policy 0030 3. BEX V Guiding Principles 4. School Board Guiding Principles 5. FMPTF Charge 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Levy Process and Timeline 2. 2018 Enrollment Projections and Capacity Analysis (for all SPS service areas) 3. Current and Past Facilities Master Plans 4. 2014 Facilities Condition and Educational Adequacy Assessment (“Meng Report”) 5. Equity Tool-kit 6. Draft Scoring Criteria Overview 7. Equity Tiers Method Overview 8. Addressing Implicit Bias 9. Seattle Public Schools Early Learning School Sites List 10. Portables data report 11. Seattle Schools Summary 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Free and Reduced Lunch Rates by Attendance Area Elementary and Option Schools 2. Residence Density, Non-white Students by Elementary Attendance Area 3. Residence Density, Non-white Students by High School Attendance Area 4. Landmarked Schools Locations

V. Task Force Recommendations

The following are the recommendations that were passed by the FMPTF. Additional recommendations regarding high school capacity and scoring criteria were captured by a survey of FMPTF members.

Over-arching Recommendations	Vote
1. In order to be transparent, when replacing a school, the facilities master plan should include a transition narrative for housing students at an interim site, using consistent naming conventions	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
2. Develop a “dashboard” index where it is easy to compare all the schools in one place, showing enrollment and condition status with proposed solutions	13 for – 0 against – passed
3. In the face of demand, consider adding portables at Options Schools	12 for – 1 against – 1 abstention; passed
4. Add “as of” date for data and footnotes for major changes (e.g., Magnolia school re-opening, BTA IV funding, and legislative funding, etc.)	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention passed
5. From a facilities and equity perspective there should be a professional staff analysis of the South East schools that includes but is not limited to: why students are not attending.	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention passed
6. We want transparency in how we handle transitions in the facilities master plan with relation to identifying options and interim sites	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
7. Add rough timeline to proposed projects to aid clarity in comparisons to capacity needs	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
8. We need an interim site in the South East	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
9. On a short timeline, we need more community input on the development of a South East interim site	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
10. There is an equity issue that impacts building in the South East	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed

11. Recommend negotiations with the City of Seattle to extend Landmark status beyond 25 years for schools	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
---	---

Elementary School Recommendations	Vote
1. Pre-school enrollment should be made visible in the capacity analysis	11 for – 2 against – 1 abstention; passed
2. An equity lens using Free and Reduced Lunch status should be applied when considering pre-school placement	12 for - 1 against – 1 abstention; passed
3. Add E.C. Hughes to the Denny Service Area and change the naming to Roxhill at E.C. Hughes	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
4. The rebuilding of Wing Luke will affect Maple and Van Asselt, impacting the Mercer service area in addition to the Aki Kurose Service Area. Add this information to the Mercer and Aki Service area narrative.	11 for – 2 against – 1 abstention; passed

Middle School Recommendations	Vote
1. Each Middle School service area should have a footnote about which Options or K-8 schools are being included for enrollment and capacity calculations	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
2. Consider swapping Catherine Blaine and McClure because of site constraints, in order to add elementary capacity in Queen Anne and increase middle school capacity at McClure	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed
3. Cost compare building an addition vs building a new middle school, in the Madison service area	10 for – 3 against – 1 abstention; passed


High School Recommendations	Vote
1. Renovation or replacement of Rainier Beach High School is a top priority	13 for – 0 against – 1 abstention; passed

VI. Task Force Survey Results


The survey was opened on Friday 8/17/18 and closed on Friday 8/31/18. There was a total of 13 responses collected

Full Results:


Choose all the options that best describe your recommendation: SPS should address projected over-capacity of high schools in the North End by: (13 answered – 0 skipped, multiple selections possible)




It will be important to develop an elementary and middle school "feeder plan" that would support a new 12th high school. (13 answered – 0 skipped)




It will be important to see how an analysis of private and charter school capture could inform a new 12th high school. (13 answered – 0 skipped)




With a Rainier Beach High School rebuild/renovation, consider upgrades that add educational program attractions. (13 answered – 0 skipped)




Add a measurement criteria for air quality and fire safety to the "Health, Safety and Security" score. (12 answered – 1 skipped)



Weight the "equity tiers" score separately from the "capital facilities" scores. (11 answered – 2 skipped)



Choose all the options that best describe your recommendation: SPS should address the scoring of portable classrooms by: (12 answered – 1 skipped, multiple selections possible)



VII. Final Meeting Review

The FMPTF held their 6th and final meeting on September 10th, 2018. The Task Force members reviewed the results of the survey and highlighted potential recommendations with broad consensus that were not voted on.

Positions of broad consensus

1. The scoring and relative ranking methodology is beneficial to the Facilities Master Planning process. The scoring will help guide the board decision making, especially relative to equity.
2. A rebuild of Rainier Beach High School will resolve not only equity issues, but also capacity challenges, based on past evidence of enrollment increases at new High Schools.
3. The scoring process works for existing facilities but there is a gap in giving the board input on the need for new facilities. As the City of Seattle continues to grow rapidly, this will be an increasingly important factor.
4. It would be helpful to invest in data that shows a “before” and “after” picture of how new and existing projects will add benefits across the school system and give a more comprehensive picture of the return on investment.

5. There needs to be a standalone conversation on the merits of downtown schools.