



**Mukilteo**  
School District

## **MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 6**

### **CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN 2020 – 2025**

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

John Gahagan  
Kyle Kennedy  
Shaun Olsen  
Judy Schwab  
Michael Simmons

#### **SUPERINTENDENT**

Dr. Alison Brynelson

For information regarding the Mukilteo School District Capital Facilities Plan, contact the Office of the Superintendent, Mukilteo School District, 9401 Sharon Drive, Everett, Washington 98204. Telephone: (425) 356-1220.

**Board Approved: D-R-A-F-T**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Section 1 - Introduction.....	3
Section 2 – District Educational Program Standards.....	5
Section 3 – Capital Facilities Inventory.....	7
Section 4 – Student Enrollment Projections.....	11
Section 5 – Capital Facility Needs.....	13
Section 6 – Six Year Financing Plan.....	14
Section 7 – School Impact Fees.....	16
Appendices A-C.....	19
Appendix A – Student Generation Rate Study .....	19
Appendix B – Impact Fee Calculation Detail .....	22
Appendix C – OSPI Enrollment Projections .....	23
Appendix D – Mukilteo School District Map .....	24

## SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

### Purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) outlines 13 broad goals including the adequate provision of necessary public facilities and services. Public Schools are among these necessary facilities and services. Public school districts adopt capital facilities plans to satisfy the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 and to identify additional school facilities necessary to meet the educational needs of the growing student populations anticipated in their districts.

The Mukilteo School District (District) has prepared this six-year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) in accordance with the Washington State Growth Management Act and the codes of Snohomish County, City of Mukilteo, and City of Everett. This CFP is intended to provide these jurisdictions with a description of projected student enrollment and school capacities at established levels of service over the six-year period, 2020-2025.

The District prepared its original CFP in 1994 based on the criteria set forth in the GMA. When Snohomish County adopted its GMA Comprehensive Plan in 1995, it addressed future school capital facilities plans in Appendix F of the General Policy Plan. Appendix F established the criteria for future updates of the District's CFP.

In accordance with the Growth Management Act and the Snohomish County School Impact Fee Ordinance, this CFP contains the following required elements:

- Future enrollment forecasts for each grade span (elementary, middle, and high schools).
- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by the District showing the locations and capacities of the facilities.
- A forecast of the future needs for capital facilities and school sites. The proposed capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.
- A six-year plan for financing capital facilities within projected funding capacities which identifies sources of public money for such purposes. The financing plan separates projects and portions of projects that add capacity from those which do not, since the latter are generally not appropriate for impact fee funding.
- A calculation of impact fees to be assessed and support data substantiating said fees.

In developing this CFP, the District followed the guidelines set forth in Appendix F of the General Policy Plan:

- Information must be obtained from recognized sources, such as the U.S. Census or the Puget Sound Regional Council. School districts may generate their own data if it is derived through statistically reliable methodologies. Information must be consistent with Office of Financial Management (OFM) population trends. Student generation rates must be independently calculated by each school district.
- The CFP must comply with RCW Chapter 36.70A (the Growth Management Act).
- The methodology used to calculate impact fees must comply with RCW Chapter 82.02. In the event that impact fees are not available due to action by the state, county, or cities within the District, future CFP's would identify alternative funding sources.

When the County adopted its School Impact Fee Ordinance in November 1997, it established the specific criteria for the adoption of a CFP and the assessment of impact fees in the County. Section 3 of the ordinance defines the requirements for the biennial CFP updates. Table 1 of the ordinance outlines the formulae for determination of impact fees.

Snohomish County’s Countywide Planning Policies direct jurisdictions in Snohomish County to “ensure the availability of sufficient land and services for future K-20 school needs.” Policy ED-11. The District appreciates any opportunity for cooperative planning efforts with its jurisdictions.

### **Overview of the Mukilteo School District**

Twenty-six square miles in area, the Mukilteo School District encompasses the City of Mukilteo, portions of the City of Everett, and portions of unincorporated Snohomish County. The District is bordered on the north and east by the Everett School District and by the Edmonds School District to the south.

The District serves a student population of 15,289 (October 2019) with one kindergarten center, twelve elementary schools (grades K-5), four middle schools (grades 6-8), two comprehensive high schools (grades 9-12), and one small choice high school (grades 10-12). For the purposes of facility planning, this CFP considers grades K-5 as elementary, grades 6-8 as middle school, and grades 9-12 as high school. For purposes of this CFP, enrollment in the Sno-Isle Skills Center is not included as the Skills Center is a regional career and technical education partnership serving students from 14 different school districts and does not have space that can be utilized by Mukilteo School District for its traditional K-12 education purposes.

The most significant issues facing the District in terms of providing classroom capacity to accommodate existing and projected demands are:

- Capacity needs during the six-year period of the plan at the elementary and high school grade spans.
- Uneven growth rates between geographic sectors within the District. These uneven growth patterns result in some schools reaching maximum capacity sooner than others and this will increase the difficulty of maintaining stable school service area boundaries. The District will need to continue to transfer students from higher population areas to schools with capacity until new facilities are built to absorb growth.

These issues are addressed in greater detail in this CFP.

## **SECTION 2 - DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS**

## Primary Objective

To best optimize student learning, Mukilteo School District establishes a service standard for classroom capacity utilization. This requires a constant review and assessment of curriculum and instructional changes, student learning behaviors, learning environments, technological innovations and program development. Additional variables include changes in mandatory requirements issued by the state such as the implementation of full day kindergarten, Core 24 graduation requirements, and reduction in class size ratios. These elements as well as demographic projections are weighed when determining service levels. School facility and student capacity needs are determined by the types and amounts of space required to accommodate the District's adopted educational program. The educational program standards that typically drive facility space needs include grade configuration, optimum facility size, class size, educational program offerings, classroom utilization and scheduling requirements, and use of relocatable classrooms (portables). These elements, as well as demographic projections, are weighed when determining standard of service levels.

In addition to student population, other factors such as collective bargaining agreements, government mandates and community expectations also affect classroom space requirements. Traditional educational programs are often supplemented by programs such as special education, bilingual education, preschool and daycare programs, computer labs, and music/performing arts programs. These programs can have a significant impact on the available student capacity of school facilities.

## District Educational Program Standards.

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

Advanced Placement (high school)	Library/Media Centers
Special Education (resource or specialized)	Speech Language Pathologists
Special Education (early childhood)	Performing Arts
Summer School	Health & Fitness
Highly Capable Program (grades 3-8)	Science Labs
English as a Second Language (ESL)	OT/PT
English Language Learner (ELL)	Career Centers (High School)
World Languages	Student Stores (High School)
Community-Based Transition Program	Learning Assistance Programs (LAP)
ECEAP	Mukilteo Behavioral Support Center
Music Programs	Career and Technical Education
Computer & Technology Labs	College in the High School
Title 1 Support	Opportunity Day School

The above programs affect the capacity of some of the buildings housing these programs. Special programs usually require space modifications and frequently require lower class sizes than other, more traditional programs; this affects available school capacity as it results in greater space requirements. These requirements affect the utilization of rooms and result in school capacities varying from year to year (as programs move or grow, depending on space needs, capacity can change or decline in a school).

District educational program standards may change in the future as a result of various external or internal changes. External changes may include mandates and needs for special programs or use of technology. Internal changes may include modifications to the program year, class sizes, and grade span configurations. Changes in physical aspects of the school facilities could also affect educational program standards. The school capacity inventory will be reviewed periodically and adjusted for any changes to the educational program standards. These changes will also be reflected in future updates of this CFP.

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

**Educational Program Standards for Elementary Schools**

- Planning class size for Kindergarten is 21 students per classroom
- Class size for Kindergarten cannot exceed 25 students
- Planning class size for grades 1-3 is 22 and grades 4 and 5 is 23 students per classroom
- Class size for grades 1-5 cannot exceed 30 students
- Special Education for some students is provided in self-contained classroom at 12 students or less per classroom
- Music and physical education instruction will be provided in a separate classroom
- Schools should have a room dedicated as a computer lab
- It is not possible to achieve 100% utilization of all regular teaching stations throughout the day. Therefore, classroom capacity is adjusted using a utilization factor of 85%

**Educational Program Planning Standards for Middle and High Schools**

- Planning class size for middle school grades is 25 students per teacher
- Class size for middle school grades 6-8 cannot exceed 30 students
- Planning class size for high school grades is 27 students per teacher
- Class size for high school grades 9-12 cannot exceed 33 students
- The ACES high school program limits capacity to 200 students
- It is not possible to achieve 100% utilization of all regular teaching stations throughout the day. Therefore, classroom capacity is adjusted using a utilization factor of 85%
- Identified students will also be provided other programs in classrooms designated as computer labs, resource rooms and other program specific classrooms (i.e., music, drama, art, family and consumer science, special education, career and technical education and English Language Learner).

**Minimum Level of Service**

Planning class sizes are used to determine school capacities, they are not a measure of the District’s minimum level of service. The minimum level of service is defined as the maximum level of enrollment the District can accommodate at any given time. The minimum level of service is not the District’s desired level for providing education. At current program offerings and within existing permanent and portable facilities, the District’s minimum level of service is:

Grade Level	# of Scheduled Teaching Stations	Min. Level of Service	2017-18 Level of Service	2018-19 Level of Service
K-5	313	25	23.0	22.9
6-8	166	30	21.9	22.5
9-12	161	33	26.9	27.6

**SECTION 3 - CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY**

Under the GMA, a public entity must periodically determine its capacity by conducting an inventory of its capital facilities. Table 3.1 summarizes the permanent facility capacity owned and operated by the District. Information is also provided on relocatable classrooms (portables), school sites and other district owned facilities or land.

School facility capacity was inventoried based on the space required to accommodate the District’s adopted educational program standards.

**Schools**

The District operates a kindergarten center, twelve elementary schools, four middle schools, two comprehensive high schools, a small choice high school, and the Sno-Isle Skills Center. Elementary schools accommodate grades K-5; middle schools serve grades 6-8; high schools provide for grades 9-12; ACES high school and the Sno-Isle Skills Center serve grades 10-12.

School capacity is determined based on the number of classrooms within each building and the space requirements of the District’s currently adopted educational program. It is the capacity calculation that is used to establish the District’s baseline capacity, and to determine future capacity needs based on projected student enrollment.

The Sno-Isle Skills Center is not included in capacity calculations or student enrollment projections for the purposes of capital facilities planning within the District. The Skills Center is a regional career and technical education partnership serving students from 14 different school districts and does not have space that can be utilized by Mukilteo School District for its traditional K-12 education purposes. Relocatable classrooms (portables) are not viewed by the District as a solution for housing students on a permanent basis. Therefore, these facilities were not included in the school capacity calculations provided in Table 3.1.

Capacities will change from year-to-year based on changes to existing instructional programs, projected future programs and the resulting required space needed to deliver the instructional model at each specific site. Capacity takes into consideration the specific programs that actually take place in each of the rooms and the required service levels previously listed. Because of the need to provide planning time and space for teacher preparation or other required services, some facilities will only support a capacity utilization of 85%. Capacities are updated in each CFP to reflect current program needs and classroom utilization.

**Table 3.1 – Permanent Facility Inventory**

School	Site Size (Acres)	Bldg Area (Sq. Feet)	Year Built/ Modernized	Permanent Capacity
Challenger	10	50,022	1987	464
Columbia	9.6	65,219	1989	486

Discovery	9.3	42,708	1988/2017	442
Endeavour	9.4	53,376	1994	376
Fairmount	15	66,189	1952/1999	520
Horizon	19	56,162	1989	550
Lake Stickney	9.8	77,542	2016	638
Mukilteo	9.8	41,727	1981	352
Odyssey	10.9	62,127	2003	572
Olivia Park	9.5	49,881	1956/1992	528
Pathfinder*		62,700	2017	506
Picnic Point	10	39,271	1981	376
Serene Lake	10	49,230	1969/1994	396
<b>Total K-5</b>		<b>716,154</b>		<b>6,206</b>
Explorer	29.5	129,539	1972/2005	941
Harbour Pointe	17.8	110,400	1993	880
Olympic View	25.2	114,541	1955/2017	951
Voyager	16	106,954	1992	881
<b>Total 6-8</b>		<b>461,434</b>		<b>3,652</b>
ACES	5.8	19,833	1985/1997	0
Kamiak	60.7	255,478	1993/2002	1,675
Mariner	37.1	276,668	1971/2003	1,964
<b>Total 9-12</b>		<b>551,979</b>		<b>3,639</b>

\*Shared site, acreage included in Fairmount Elementary

\*\*ACES capacity is entirely in relocatable classrooms not considered permanent capacity.

### Relocatable Classrooms (Portables)

Relocatable classrooms (portables) provide interim classroom space to house students until funding can be secured to construct permanent classrooms. The District currently uses 115 relocatable classrooms at various school sites throughout the District to provide additional interim capacity. Current use of relocatable classrooms throughout the District is summarized in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 – 2019-20 Portable Classroom Inventory**

School	Classroom Portables	Interim Capacity
Challenger	11	154

Columbia	0	0
Discovery	14	264
Endeavour	6	88
Fairmount	4	22
Horizon	7	154
Lake Stickney	0	0
Mukilteo	10	156
Odyssey	4	56
Olivia Park	3	22
Pathfinder	0	0
Picnic Point	6	66
Serene Lake	4	22
<b>Subtotal K-5</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1,004</b>
Explorer	4	64
Harbour Pointe	1	21
Olympic View	0	0
Voyager	0	0
<b>Subtotal 6-8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>85</b>
ACES	13	200
Kamiak	16	316
Mariner	12	371
<b>Subtotal 9-12</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>887</b>
<b>TOTAL K-12</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1,976</b>

*\*The District's portable classrooms are in good condition and with ongoing maintenance have an indeterminate remaining useful life. Portables are calculated at 895 square feet per classroom.*

### Schools Closed to Out of District Transfers

Schools continue to add capacity when portable classrooms are added and/or computer labs and other flexible spaces are converted to classroom spaces. However, this practice is not a long-term solution for capacity needs because the core facilities of the building do not support the additional enrollment. Therefore, the District calculates capacity for out-of-district transfers at the lesser of:

- The sum of permanent capacity and portable capacity, or
- 700 students for elementary schools; 825 students for middle schools; and 1,900 students for high schools.

In addition, any school that transfers kindergarten students to Pathfinder Kindergarten Center to provide space for first-through-fifth grade instruction is determined to be over capacity for the purposes of out-of-district transfers.

### Support Facilities

In addition to schools, the District owns and operates additional facilities that provide operational support functions to the schools. An inventory of these facilities is provided below:

Facility	Address	Building Area (Square Feet)	Site Size (Acres)
Administration	9401 Sharon Dr., Everett	26,608	9.15
Grounds/Maintenance	525 W. Casino Rd., Everett	22,800	4.0

Service Center	8925 Airport Rd., Everett	37,677	10.0
----------------	---------------------------	--------	------

<b>Table 3.4 – Other Facility Inventory</b>			
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Building Area (Square Feet)</b>	<b>Site Size (Acres)</b>
Sno-Isle Skills Center	9001 Airport Rd., Everett	74,024	15.0

**Land Inventory**

The District owns one undeveloped site:

- A one-acre site in Mukilteo Heights which is restricted for development by covenants and site size.

The District does not own any sites that are developed for uses other than schools and/or which are leased to other parties.

**SECTION 4 - STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS**

**Projected Student Enrollment 2020-2025**

Enrollment projections are generally most accurate for the initial years of the forecast period. Beyond the 5-6 year range, projected assumptions about economic or demographic trends may prove false, resulting in an enrollment trend that is quite different from the projection. For this reason, it is important to monitor birth rates, new housing construction, and population growth on an annual basis as part of facilities management.

The District has contracted with a consultant to develop a methodology for enrollment projections. The consultant has a thirty year history of working with local school districts in projecting enrollment and demographics, including seven years as the demographer for the Seattle Public Schools and twenty-two years as an independent consultant providing long-range projections for a number of school districts including; Bellevue, Bethel, Bremerton, Edmonds, Everett, Federal Way, Highline, Monroe, Northshore, Olympia, Puyallup, Seattle, Tacoma, Tukwila, South Kitsap, and Mukilteo. The methodology employed by the consultant is a variation of the cohort survival method. Cohort survival compares enrollment at a particular grade in a specific year, to the enrollment at the previous grade from the prior year. For example, enrollment at the second grade is compared to the previous year's first grade enrollment. The ratio of these two numbers (second grade enrollment divided by first grade enrollment) creates a "cohort survival ratio" providing a summary measure of the in-and-out migration that has occurred over the course of a year. This ratio can be calculated for each grade level. Once these ratios have been established over a period of years they can be averaged and/or weighted to predict the enrollment at each grade.

Cohort survival works well for every grade except kindergarten where there is no prior year's enrollment to use for comparison. At the kindergarten level, enrollment is compared to the county births from five years prior to estimate a "birth-to-k" ratio. This ratio, averaged over several years, provides a method for predicting what proportion of the birth cohort will enroll at the kindergarten level. The District's percentage of this cohort has varied over the past seven years from a high of 12.6% to a low of 12.1%. Future forecasts assume that the District will enroll over 12% of the County births.

Cohort survival is a purely mathematical method, which assumes that future enrollment patterns will be similar to past enrollment patterns. It makes no assumptions about what is causing enrollment gains or losses and can be easily applied to any enrollment history.

Despite these advantages, cohort survival can produce large forecast errors because it does not consider possible changes in demographic trends. New housing, especially, can produce enrollment gains that might not otherwise be predicted from past trends. Or, alternatively, a district may lose market share to private or other public schools. It is also possible that a slowdown in population and housing growth will dampen enrollment gains. Changes in the housing market between 2007 and 2011 and the accompanying recession, for example, caused many districts to see a decline in their enrollment during that time period.

For the Mukilteo School District forecast, the demographer combines the cohort survival method with information about market share gains and losses from private schools, information about population growth from new housing construction, and information about regional trends. The population/housing growth factor reflects projected changes in the housing market and/or in the assumptions about overall population growth within the District's boundary area. The enrollment derived from the cohort model is adjusted upward or downward to account for expected shifts in the market for new homes, to account for changes in the growth of regional school age populations, and to account for projected changes in the District population.

Table 4.1 shows the enrollment forecast that combines cohort survival methodology with information about new housing development and the "birth-to-k" ratio methodology mentioned above (the "Modified Cohort Survival Projections"). This model results in District enrollment reaching 15,828 by

2025. Because of the known information regarding new development in the pipeline and associated growth, as well as the length of time it takes to initiate new school construction projects to address growth, this plan uses the projections in Table 4.1 to determine facility needs during the six-year time frame of the Capital Facilities Plan.

**Table 4.1 – Modified Cohort Enrollment Projections** (including housing permit data and birth rate data)

Grade	Actual 2019	Projections					
		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
K	1,184	1,215	1,256	1,235	1,219	1,240	1,220
1	1,188	1,195	1,227	1,281	1,266	1,250	1,271
2	1,185	1,189	1,199	1,232	1,289	1,271	1,258
3	1,163	1,191	1,197	1,210	1,247	1,302	1,286
4	1,158	1,170	1,200	1,206	1,222	1,256	1,314
5	1,224	1,162	1,176	1,205	1,214	1,227	1,264
6	1,228	1,193	1,135	1,152	1,182	1,188	1,203
7	1,292	1,240	1,207	1,149	1,169	1,198	1,206
8	1,168	1,285	1,237	1,209	1,153	1,170	1,201
9	1,181	1,177	1,298	1,245	1,219	1,160	1,180
10	1,245	1,175	1,174	1,294	1,244	1,215	1,159
11	1,064	1,131	1,076	1,081	1,194	1,146	1,122
12	1,009	1,039	1,112	1,071	1,079	1,190	1,144
<b>Total K-5</b>	<b>7,102</b>	<b>7,122</b>	<b>7,255</b>	<b>7,369</b>	<b>7,457</b>	<b>7,546</b>	<b>7,613</b>
<b>Total 6-8</b>	<b>3,688</b>	<b>3,718</b>	<b>3,579</b>	<b>3,510</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>3,556</b>	<b>3,610</b>
<b>Total 9-12</b>	<b>4,499</b>	<b>4,522</b>	<b>4,660</b>	<b>4,691</b>	<b>4,736</b>	<b>4,711</b>	<b>4,605</b>
<b>District Total</b>	<b>15,289</b>	<b>15,362</b>	<b>15,494</b>	<b>15,570</b>	<b>15,697</b>	<b>15,813</b>	<b>15,828</b>

### Snohomish County/OFM Projections

Another projection, based on Office of Financial Management (OFM) population projections for Snohomish County, was also produced. Using the OFM/County data for the years 2000 through 2019 and the District’s corresponding actual enrollment, the District’s enrollment averaged 2% of the OFM/County Population estimates. Further, District enrollment averaged 15.38% of the OFM/County population residing within Mukilteo School District boundaries. Assuming that these average percentages remain constant, the District’s enrollment would grow as shown in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 – Projected Enrollment - 2035 OFM Estimates\***

Grade Level	Actual	% MSD Population		% County Population	
	2019	2025	2035	2025	2035
<b>Elementary</b>	7,102	7,863	8,033	8,237	9,045
<b>Middle School</b>	3,688	3,854	3,937	4,037	4,433
<b>High School</b>	4,499	4,879	4,984	5,111	5,613
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,289</b>	<b>16,596</b>	<b>16,955</b>	<b>17,386</b>	<b>19,091</b>

\*Assumes that percentage per grade span will remain constant through 2035.

Note: Snohomish County Planning and Development Services provided the underlying data for the 2035 projections.

For the purposes of this Capital Facilities Plan, the District relies on the Modified Cohort Survival Projections as this projection provides a more detailed grade-specific projection which, when combined with district-specific new housing development trends, allows for better planning across the six-year period.

## SECTION 5 - CAPITAL FACILITIES NEEDS

Projected available student capacity is derived by subtracting projected student enrollment from existing student capacity (excluding relocatable classrooms) for each of the six years in the forecast period (2020-2025). A long-term projection of un-housed students and facilities needs is shown in Table 5.1. On February 11, 2020 voters approved a six-year, \$240 million capital bond. Planned new capacity improvements included in that bond are represented below, through 2025. The District considers relocatable (portable) classrooms to be temporary/interim space and bases its new capital facilities needs from permanent capacity. (Information on relocatable classrooms and interim capacity can be found in Table 3.2.) However, relocatable classrooms are a part of the District’s interim capacity solution. Table 5.1 does not include relocatable classrooms that may be added or adjusted during the six-year planning period.

**TABLE 5.1 – School Enrollment & Classroom Capacity Needs**

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
<b>Elementary Enrollment</b>	7,102	7,122	7,255	7,369	7,457	7,546	7,613
Permanent Capacity - Existing	6,206	6,206	6,206	6,206	6,506	6,606	6,706
New Permanent Capacity				300	100	100	100
Interim Capacity (Portables)	1,004	1,004	1,004	1,004	1,004	1,004	1,004
TOTAL Capacity incl. Interim	7,210	7,210	7,210	7,510	7,610	7,710	7,810
<b>Permanent Capacity over/(short)</b>	<b>(896)</b>	<b>(916)</b>	<b>(1,049)</b>	<b>(1,163)</b>	<b>(951)</b>	<b>(840)</b>	<b>(907)</b>
<b>Total Capacity (w/portables)</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>(45)</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>Middle School Enrollment</b>	3,688	3,718	3,579	3,510	3,504	3,556	3,610
Permanent Capacity - Existing	3,652	3,652	3,652	3,652	3,652	3,652	3,652
New Permanent Capacity							
Interim Capacity (Portables)	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
TOTAL Capacity incl. Interim	3,737	3,737	3,737	3,737	3,737	3,737	3,737
<b>Permanent Capacity over/(short)</b>	<b>(36)</b>	<b>(66)</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Total Capacity (w/portables)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>High School Enrollment</b>	4,499	4,522	4,660	4,691	4,736	4,711	4,605
Permanent Capacity - Existing	3,639	3,639	3,639	3,639	3,639	3,639	3,774
New Permanent Capacity						135	
Interim Capacity (Portables)	887	887	887	887	887	887	887
TOTAL Capacity incl. Interim	4,526	4,526	4,526	4,526	4,526	4,661	4,661
<b>Permanent Capacity over/(short)</b>	<b>(860)</b>	<b>(883)</b>	<b>(1,021)</b>	<b>(1,052)</b>	<b>(1,097)</b>	<b>(1,072)</b>	<b>(831)</b>
<b>Total Capacity (w/portables)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>(134)</b>	<b>(165)</b>	<b>(210)</b>	<b>(50)</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>TOTAL ENROLLMENT</b>	15,289	15,362	15,494	15,570	15,697	15,813	15,828
Total Permanent	13,497	13,497	13,497	13,497	13,797	13,897	14,132
Total New Permanent				300	100	235	100
Interim Capacity	1,976	1,976	1,976	1,976	1,976	1,976	1,976
TOTAL Capacity incl. Interim	15,473	15,473	15,473	15,773	15,873	16,108	16,208
<b>Permanent Capacity over/(short)</b>	<b>(1,792)</b>	<b>(1,865)</b>	<b>(1,997)</b>	<b>(1,773)</b>	<b>(1,800)</b>	<b>(1,681)</b>	<b>(1,596)</b>
<b>Total Capacity (w/portables)</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>(21)</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>380</b>

## SECTION 6 – SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN

### Planned Improvements

In the event that planned construction projects do not fully address space needs for student growth and a reduction in interim student housing, or that voter approved funding could not be secured, the Board could consider various courses of action, including, but not limited to:

- Alternative scheduling options
- Changes in the instructional model
- Grade configuration change
- Purchasing portable classrooms
- Busing
- Increased class sizes; or
- A modified school-year calendar

The six-year financing plan includes projects adding elementary and high school classroom capacity. In addition, the District may continue to add and use portable classrooms as part of the capacity solution. It is anticipated that additional interim capacity via portable classrooms will be needed until additional permanent capacity beyond what was included in the voter approved February 2020 capital bond measure can be determined.

Funding for planned improvements is typically secured from a number of sources including voter approved bonds, state school construction assistance matching funds, and impact fees. Each of these funding sources is discussed in greater detail below.

## **Financing for Planned Improvements**

### *General Obligation Bonds*

Bonds are typically used to fund construction of new schools and other capital improvement projects. A 60% voter approval is required to approve the issuance of bonds. Bonds are then retired through collection of property taxes.

### *Capital Projects Levy*

The District has passed a six-year capital projects levy that runs through 2022. Capital project levy dollars will be dedicated to additional modernization and major system upgrades or modernization of buildings and grounds.

### *State School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP)*

State School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP) funds come from the Common School Construction Fund. Bonds are sold on behalf of the fund, and then retired from revenues accruing predominantly from the sale of renewable resources (i.e., timber) from State school lands set aside by the Enabling Act of 1889. If these sources are insufficient to meet needs, the Legislature can appropriate funds or the Superintendent of Public Instruction can prioritize projects for funding.

School districts may qualify for SCAP funds for specific capital projects based on a qualification and criterion system. The District is currently eligible for SCAP funds for capital projects at the high school level and for some modernization/new in lieu at the elementary level. State match does not cover all costs of construction and each district has a different matching ratio based on the state's formula. Because SCAP funds are received at the end of a project, it is necessary for school districts to plan to finance the complete project with local funds. Site acquisition and site improvements are not eligible to receive matching funds.

### *K-3 Class Size Reduction Grants*

The 2015 Washington State Legislature provided limited funding for the construction of elementary classrooms to assist in the effort to provide space for full day kindergarten and to lower class sizes in K-3 grades. The District applied for this grant and a 24 classroom need was determined, but grant funds were not awarded.

#### Land Sales

The District currently has no property for sale.

#### Impact Fees

Impact fees are a means of supplementing traditional funding sources for construction of public facilities needed to accommodate new development. School impact fees are generally collected by the permitting agency at the time plats are approved or building permits are issued.

The six-year financing plan shown on Table 6.1 demonstrates how the District intends to fund new construction and improvements to school facilities for the years 2020-2025. The financing components include a capital projects levy, funds from a voter approved capital bond measure in February 2020, impact fees and SCAP (“state match”) funds.

**Table 6.1 – Six-Year Financing Plan – estimated** (costs in millions)

PROJECTS ADDING CAPACITY	2019	ANTICIPATED YEAR						Total Cost	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE		
		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025		Bonds/ Levy	SCAP (State)	Impact Fees
Discovery Elementary Addition		1.5	12.8	14.5	1.1	0.1		30.0	X		X
Challenger Elementary Addition			0.2	0.7	4.3	9.5	0.3	15.0	X		X
Horizon Elementary Addition			0.8	6.4	7.6	0.2		15.0	X		X
Mariner H.S. Addition			1.2	3.0	7.7	12.3	0.8	25.0	X		X
Explorer M.S. Replacement (Ph1)			0.1	0.7	2.0	10.0	16.5	29.3	X	X	
Serene Lake E.S Replacement (Ph1)				0.1	1.1	6.7	11.7	19.6	X	X	X
Mukilteo E.S. Replacement (Ph1)				0.5	1.0	8.5	14.2	24.2	X	X	X
Interim (portable) Capacity	0.1	1.3	1	.5				3.8	X		X
<b>TOTAL CAPACITY PROJECTS</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>161.0</b>			

PROJECTS NOT ADDING CAPACITY	2019	ANTICIPATED YEAR						Total Cost	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE		
		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025		Bonds/ Levy	SCAP (State)	Impact Fees
MA Women’s Locker room	1.3 <sup>1</sup>	0.3						1.6	X	X	
Districtwide Security Improvements		0.4	1.5	7.2	2.1	1.1		12.3	X		
Districtwide Field Improvements			7.1	5.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	13.3	X		
Performing Arts Center Improvements			4.3	5.6	0.1			10.0	X		
Facility System Improvements		4.6	12.3	20.6	3.0	0.1	1.6	42.2	X		
<b>TOTAL Non-CAPACITY PROJ.</b>	<b>1.3<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>38.7</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>79.4</b>			

<sup>1</sup>Does not include project expenditures from prior years

## SECTION 7 - SCHOOL IMPACT FEES

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) authorizes cities and counties that plan under RCW 36.70A.040 to collect impact fees to supplement funding of additional system improvements

(e.g., public facilities including schools) needed to accommodate growth from new development. Impact fees cannot be used for the operation, maintenance, repair, alteration, or replacement of existing capital facilities used to meet existing service demands.

### **School Impact Fees**

The Snohomish County General Policy Plan sets certain conditions for school districts wishing to assess impact fees:

- The district must provide support data including an explanation of the calculation methodology, a description of key variables and their computation, and definitions and sources of data for all inputs into the fee calculation.
- Such data must be accurate, reliable and statistically valid.
- Data must reflect projected costs in the six-year financing plan.
- Data in the proposed impact fee schedule must reflect expected student generation rates from the following residential unit types:
  1. single family
  2. multi-family/1-bedroom or less; and
  3. multi-family/2-bedroom or more.

The Snohomish County impact fee program requires school districts to prepare and adopt Capital Facilities Plans meeting the specifications of the GMA. Impact fees are calculated in accordance with the formula, which are based on projected facility costs necessitated by new growth and are contained in the District’s CFP.

### **Methodology and Variables Used to Calculate School Impact Fees**

Impact fees have been calculated utilizing the formula in the Snohomish County Impact Fee Ordinance (SCC 30.66C). The resulting figures are based on the District’s cost per dwelling unit to purchase land for school sites, make site improvements, construct schools and purchase/install relocatable facilities (portables) that add capacity needed to serve new development. As required under the GMA, credits have also been applied in the formula to account for SCAP (“state match”) funds to be reimbursed to the District and for projected future property taxes to be paid by the dwelling unit.

#### ***Site Acquisition Cost Element***

1. Site Size – Acreage needed to accommodate each planned project.
2. Average Land Cost Per Acre – based on current estimates of land costs within the District.
3. Facility Design Capacity – number of students each planned project is designed to accommodate.
4. Student Factor – Number of students generated by each housing type – in this case, single family dwellings and multi-family dwellings. A student generation rate study was conducted to determine the updated generation rate for this CFP. See Appendix A for the study information. Current student generation rates for the district are shown below:

***Table 7.1 – Student Generation Rates\****

<b>Grade Span</b>	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Multi-Family (1bdm/less)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (2+bedroom)</b>
Elementary (K-5)	.248	.000	.342
Middle School (6-8)	.102	.000	.133
High School (9-12)	.096	.000	.143
<b>Total (K-12)</b>	<b>.446</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.619</b>

*\*Full study info included in Appendices*

### **School Construction Cost Variables**

1. Current Facility Square Footage – used in combination with the “Existing Relocatable Square Footage” to apportion the impact fee amounts between permanent and interim capacity figures
2. Estimated Facility Construction Cost – based on planned costs or on actual costs of recently constructed schools. Facility construction costs also include the off-site development costs. Costs vary with each site and may include such items as sewer line extension, water lines, off-site road and frontage improvements. Off-site development costs are not covered by State Match Funds. Off-site development costs vary and can represent 10% or more of the total building construction cost.

### **Relocatable Facilities Cost Element**

Impact fees may be collected to allow acquisition of relocatable classrooms needed to serve growth on an interim basis. The cost allocated to new development must be growth related and must be in proportion to the current permanent and interim space ratios in the District.

1. Cost Per Unit – The average cost to purchase and install a relocatable classroom.
2. Relocatable Facilities Cost – The total number of needed units multiplied by the cost per unit.

### **School Construction Assistance Credit Variables**

1. Construction Cost Allocation – Currently \$238.22 for new construction projects approved in July of 2020.
2. State Funding Assistance Percentage – Percentage of School Construction Assistance Program funds from the state that the District expects to receive. For new construction and additions, the District is currently eligible to receive a maximum state match of 49.21% of *eligible* costs (as defined by the state).

### **Tax Credit Variables**

1. Interest Rate (20-year General Obligation Bond) – interest rate of return on a 20-year General Obligation Bond derived from the Bond Buyer index. Because of current market volatility, the District is using the February 2020 average interest rate of 2.44%
2. Bond Levy Rate – The current bond levy rate is \$.89 per \$1,000 in assessed value.
3. Average Assessed Value – based on estimates made by the County’s Planning and Development Services Department utilizing information from the County Assessor’s files. The current average assessed value is \$529,572 for single family dwelling units; \$160,556 for one-bedroom multi-family dwelling units; and \$228,123 for two or more bedroom multi-family dwelling units.

## **Proposed Mukilteo School District Impact Fee Schedule**

Using the variables and formula described, impact fees proposed for the District are summarized below. See Appendix B for the impact fee calculation detail.

**Table 7.2 – School Impact Fees\***

<b>Housing Type</b>	<b>Impact Fee Per Unit</b>
Single Family	\$5,048
Multi-Family (1 bedroom or less)	\$0
Multi-Family (2+ bedroom)	\$8,924

*\*Table 7.2 reflects a 50% adjustment to the calculated fee as required by local ordinances.*

## APPENDIX A

### STUDENT GENERATION RATE STUDY



DOYLE  
CONSULTING

ENABLING SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO MANAGE AND USE STUDENT ASSESSMENT DATA

---

## Student Generation Rate Study for the Mukilteo School District

4/16/2020

This document describes the methodology used to calculate student generation rates (SGRs) for the Mukilteo School District, and provides results of the calculations.

SGRs were calculated for two types of residential construction: Single family detached, and multi-family with 2 or more bedrooms. Attached condominiums, townhouses and duplexes are included in the multi-family classification since they are not considered “detached”. Manufactured homes on owned land are included in the single family classification.

1. Electronic records were obtained from the Snohomish County Assessor’s Office containing data on all new construction within the Mukilteo School District from January 2012 through December 2018. As compiled by the County Assessor’s Office, this data included the address, building size, assessed value, and year built for new single and multi-family construction. The data was “cleaned up” by eliminating records which did not contain sufficient information to generate a match with the District’s student record data (i.e. incomplete addresses).
2. The District downloaded student records data into Microsoft Excel format. This data included the addresses and grade levels of all K-12 students attending the Mukilteo School District as of April 2020. Before proceeding, this data was reformatted and abbreviations were modified as required to provide consistency with the County Assessor’s data.

3. **Single Family Rates:** The data on all new single family detached residential units in County Assessor's data were compared with the District's student record data, and the number of students at each grade level living in those units was determined. The records of 1,260 single family detached units were compared with data on 16,103 students registered in the District, and the following matches were found by grade level(s)\*:

GRADE(S)	COUNT OF MATCHES	CALCULATED RATE
K	44	0.035
1	56	0.044
2	65	0.052
3	54	0.043
4	51	0.040
5	43	0.034
6	39	0.031
7	50	0.040
8	39	0.031
9	35	0.028
10	36	0.029
11	21	0.017
12	29	0.023
K-5	313	0.248
6-8	128	0.102
9-12	121	0.096
K-12	562	0.446

4. *Large Multi-Family Developments:* Snohomish County Assessor's data does not specifically indicate the number of units or bedrooms contained in large multi-family developments. Additional research was performed to obtain this information from specific parcel ID searches, and information provided by building management, when available. Information obtained included the number of 0-1 bedroom units, the number of 2+ bedroom units, and specific addresses of 0-1 bedroom units. If specific addresses or unit numbers of 0-1 bedroom units were not provided by building management, the assumption of matches being 2+ bedroom units was made. This assumption is supported by previous SGR studies.

*Small Multi-Family Developments:* This method included all developments in the County Assessor's data containing four-plexes, tri-plexes, duplexes, condominiums and townhouses. This data contained information on the number of bedrooms for all townhouses and condominiums. Specific parcel ID searches were performed for duplex and larger units in cases where number of bedroom data was missing.

5. **Multi-Family 2+ BR Rates:** The multi-family 2+ BR SGR's were calculated by comparing data on 2+ BR multi-family units with the District's student record data, and the number of students at each grade level living in those units was determined. The records of 894 multi-family 2+ BR units were compared with data on 16,103 students registered in the District, and the following matches were found by grade level(s)\*:

GRADE(S)	COUNT OF MATCHES	CALCULATED RATE
<b>K</b>	47	0.053
<b>1</b>	48	0.054
<b>2</b>	49	0.055
<b>3</b>	52	0.058
<b>4</b>	51	0.057
<b>5</b>	59	0.066
<b>6</b>	36	0.040
<b>7</b>	40	0.045
<b>8</b>	43	0.048
<b>9</b>	39	0.044
<b>10</b>	31	0.035
<b>11</b>	33	0.037
<b>12</b>	25	0.028
<b>K-5</b>	306	0.342
<b>6-8</b>	119	0.133
<b>9-12</b>	128	0.143
<b>K-12</b>	553	0.619

6. **Multi-Family 0-1 BR Rates:** Research indicated that 156 multi-family 0-1 BR units were constructed within District boundaries during the time period covered by this study. These units were compared with the data on 16,103 students registered in the District. No specific unit number matches were made.

7. **Summary of Student Generation Rates\*:**

	<b>K-5</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>9-12</b>	<b>K-12</b>
<b>Single Family</b>	.248	.102	.096	.446
<b>Multi-Family 2+ BR</b>	.342	.133	.143	.619

\*Calculated rates for grade level groups may not equal the sum of individual grade rates due to rounding.

## APPENDIX B – SCHOOL IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

### MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 6

JURISDICTIONS: SNOHOMISH COUNTY, CITY OF MUKILTEO, CITY OF EVERETT

SCHOOL IMPACT FEE CALCULATION PREPARED: April 2020

#### School Site Acquisition Cost:

*((Acres x Cost per Acre) / Facility Capacity) x Student Generation Factor*

	Facility Acreage	Cost/Acre	Facility Capacity	Student Factor SFR	Student Factor MFR (1)	Student Factor MFR (2+)	Cost/ SFR	Cost/ MFR 1	Cost / MFR 2+
Elementary	10	\$ -	600	0.248	0.000	0.342	\$0	\$0	\$0
Middle	20	\$ -	750	0.102	0.000	0.133	\$0	\$0	\$0
High	40	\$ -	1,600	0.096	0.000	0.143	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

#### School Construction Cost:

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

	% Perm/Total Sq. Ft	Facility Cost	Facility Capacity	Student Factor SFR	Student Factor MFR (1)	Student Factor MFR (2+)	Cost/ SFR	Cost/ MFR 1	Cost/ MFR 2+
Elementary	91.32%	\$44,243,223	600	0.248	0.000	0.342	\$16,700	\$0	\$23,030
Middle	98.94%	\$ -	0	0.102	0.000	0.133	\$0	\$0	\$0
High	93.18%	\$ -	0	0.096	0.000	0.143	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>\$16,700</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$23,030</b>

#### Temporary Facility Cost:

*((Facility Cost/Facility Capacity) x Student Generation Factor x (Temporary/Total Sq. Ft)*

	% Temp/Total Sq. Ft.	Facility Cost	Facility Capacity	Student Factor SFR	Student Factor MFR (1)	Student Factor MFR (2+)	Cost/ SFR	Cost/ MFR 1	Cost/ MFR 2+
Elementary	8.68%	\$130,000	24	0.248	0.000	0.342	\$117	\$0	\$161
Middle	1.06%	\$130,000	27	0.102	0.000	0.133	\$5	\$0	\$7
High	6.82%	\$130,000	30	0.096	0.000	0.143	\$28	\$0	\$42
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>\$150</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$210</b>

#### State School Construction Funding Assistance Credit:

*CCA x OSPI Sq Footage x District Funding Assistance% x Student Factor*

	Current CCA	OSPI Sq. Footage	Funding %	Student Factor SFR	Student Factor MFR (1)	Student Factor MFR (2+)	Cost/ SFR	Cost/ MFR 1	Cost/ MFR 2+
Elementary	\$238.22	90	49.21%	0.248	0.000	0.342	\$2,617	\$0	\$3,608
Middle	\$238.22	108	0.00%	0.102	0.000	0.133	\$0	\$0	\$0
High	\$238.22	130	0.00%	0.096	0.000	0.143	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>\$2,617</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,608</b>

#### Tax Payment Credit Calculation:

Average Assessed Value	\$529,572	\$160,556	\$228,123
Capital Bond Int. Rate	2.44%	2.44%	2.44%
Years Amortized	10	10	10
Property Tax Levy Rate	\$0.89	\$0.89	\$0.89
<b>Tax Payment Credit</b>	<b>\$4,138</b>	<b>\$1,255</b>	<b>\$1,782</b>

#### Impact Fee Calculation Summary:

Site Acquisition Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0
Permanent Facility Cost	\$16,700	\$0	\$23,030
Temporary Facility Cost	\$150	\$0	\$210
State SCAP Credit	\$(2,617)	\$0	\$(3,608)
Tax Payment Credit	\$(4,138)	\$(1,255)	\$(1,782)
<b>Fee As Calculated</b>	<b>\$10,096</b>	<b>\$(1,255)</b>	<b>\$17,849</b>
50% Required Discount	\$(5,048)	\$(627)	\$(8,924)
<b>Impact Fee</b>	<b>\$5,048</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$8,924</b>

## APPENDIX C

### OSPI ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS



**ICOS**

School Facilities and Organization  
 INFORMATION AND CONDITION OF SCHOOLS  
 Enrollment Projections (Report 1049)

**MUKILTEO**

Grade	--- ACTUAL ENROLLMENTS ON OCTOBER 1st ---						AVERAGE % SURVIVAL	--- PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS ---					
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Kindergarten	1,075	1,020	1,081	1,146	1,185	1,184		1,226	1,257	1,289	1,320	1,352	1,384
Grade 1	1,229	1,209	1,137	1,157	1,187	1,188	106.95%	1,266	1,311	1,344	1,379	1,412	1,446
Grade 2	1,238	1,255	1,199	1,144	1,159	1,185	100.37%	1,192	1,271	1,316	1,349	1,384	1,417
Grade 3	1,200	1,270	1,249	1,206	1,152	1,163	100.74%	1,194	1,201	1,280	1,326	1,359	1,394
Grade 4	1,139	1,226	1,315	1,240	1,222	1,158	101.36%	1,179	1,210	1,217	1,297	1,344	1,377
Grade 5	1,225	1,161	1,218	1,303	1,255	1,224	100.34%	1,162	1,183	1,214	1,221	1,301	1,349
<b>K-5 Sub-Total</b>	<b>7,106</b>	<b>7,141</b>	<b>7,199</b>	<b>7,196</b>	<b>7,160</b>	<b>7,102</b>		<b>7,219</b>	<b>7,433</b>	<b>7,660</b>	<b>7,892</b>	<b>8,152</b>	<b>8,367</b>
Grade 6	1,132	1,203	1,181	1,173	1,270	1,228	98.30%	1,203	1,142	1,163	1,193	1,200	1,279
Grade 7	1,146	1,161	1,230	1,159	1,191	1,292	101.23%	1,243	1,218	1,156	1,177	1,208	1,215
Grade 8	1,106	1,160	1,161	1,213	1,186	1,168	100.04%	1,293	1,243	1,218	1,156	1,177	1,208
<b>6-8 Sub-Total</b>	<b>3,384</b>	<b>3,524</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>3,545</b>	<b>3,647</b>	<b>3,688</b>		<b>3,739</b>	<b>3,603</b>	<b>3,537</b>	<b>3,526</b>	<b>3,585</b>	<b>3,702</b>
Grade 9	1,117	1,114	1,155	1,154	1,252	1,182	100.50%	1,174	1,299	1,249	1,224	1,162	1,183
Grade 10	1,138	1,120	1,118	1,130	1,163	1,247	99.76%	1,179	1,171	1,296	1,246	1,221	1,159
Grade 11	1,489	1,475	1,427	1,394	1,368	1,403	124.67%	1,555	1,470	1,460	1,616	1,553	1,522
Grade 12	1,487	1,506	1,550	1,490	1,444	1,412	103.48%	1,452	1,609	1,521	1,511	1,672	1,607
<b>9-12 Sub-Total</b>	<b>5,231</b>	<b>5,215</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>5,168</b>	<b>5,227</b>	<b>5,244</b>		<b>5,360</b>	<b>5,549</b>	<b>5,526</b>	<b>5,597</b>	<b>5,608</b>	<b>5,471</b>
<b>DISTRICT K-12 TOTAL</b>	<b>15,721</b>	<b>15,880</b>	<b>16,021</b>	<b>15,909</b>	<b>16,034</b>	<b>16,034</b>		<b>16,318</b>	<b>16,585</b>	<b>16,723</b>	<b>17,015</b>	<b>17,345</b>	<b>17,540</b>

Notes: Specific subtotalling on this report will be driven by District Grade spans.

School Facilities and Organization

Printed Apr 09, 2020

