

5, b-1. The Task Force recommends the district continue using their existing building condition assessment programs and methodology.

5, b-2. The Task Force recommends the district incorporate a mechanism to share the assessment program methodology and results with the community and district staff.

### 5, c. Reduce Some of the Need for New Schools

To reduce the need for new schools, the district should strongly consider the following strategies, where viable, to provide additional classroom space in the district's current schools.

- Build additions at the schools identified by the district as having the ability to accommodate additional classrooms
- Rent or lease space for preschool classes
- Remodel existing facilities, such as the Old Redmond Schoolhouse for preschool classes
- Offer double-shifting at choice middle and high schools to increase available seats and to extend the option of choice schools to more students

### 5, d. Increase Funding Options Long-Term

**Background:** The Task Force learned and discussed how the district funds construction. School construction projects are funded through a combination of local and state sources. To receive state funding, the district must be eligible and be able to provide local capital funding, usually through voter approval of a bond measure.

The Task Force recommends the following in terms of funding these needs:

5, d-1. The district should consider pursuing an increase in the amount of school impact fees generated under the current impact fee formula implemented by King County.

5, d-2. The district should continue to urge legislators to increase the state's outdated construction funding assistance methodology by updating the state's school construction standards and formula and the construction cost factors set by the legislature.

5, d-3. The district should urge state legislators to remove sales tax from school construction costs.

5, d-4. The district should seek private funding, including donations and/or naming rights, as consistent with district policy and law, to support the capital funding program where viable.

5, d-5. The district should consider selling undevelopable and/or excess parcels, at fair market price, as a source of capital funding. For excess sites, the district could also attempt to trade the parcel for a site more advantageous to the district's needs. (See Appendix L for a map of the district's current facilities and undeveloped properties.)

## WHEN WE BUILD

---

**Background:** The Task Force prioritized additional classroom capacity over addressing aging facilities (with some caveats). While encouraging efficiency and economy, it recommends the mid-range funding option with principles designed to reduce costs where possible without sacrificing cost/quality tradeoffs or reducing square footage per student. The Task Force also advises to prioritize building on school sites with the least development costs.

### 5, e. Select Projects that Increase Capacity

The Task Force recommends the district build new schools at the mid-range (current) investment level to address lack of classroom capacity (including cost reduction and other design principle measures as detailed in 5, f.).

### 5, f. Create Quality Design that Reduces Costs

**Background:** The Task Force considered different ways to reduce the cost of building new schools. It recognized the need for cost-cutting, but after tradeoff discussions, the Task Force determined it did not support reducing costs by means that could affect student outcomes, such as reducing square footage per student specifications. The group also did not want the district to use cost-cutting measures to reduce up-front costs, e.g., lower durability construction materials that might end up costing the district more over the lifespan of the building.

The Task Force recommends the following in terms of reducing cost:

5, f-1. The district should continue pre-design work to help identify ways to lower costs, test concepts and help the community understand what is being proposed with a new school building. If needed, some of the previously approved unsold bond capacity could be used to fund this work.

**5, f-2. The district should explore best practices around school building and lean principles for designing schools** (e.g., a focus on practical solutions, build less instead of more, etc.). The district should continue to learn from other school districts that have had success with cost-effective design.

**5, f-3. The district should use the following design principles (detailed in Appendix F) to be as cost-effective as possible without sacrificing cost/quality per square foot or square footage per student.**

**TABLE 6. DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

Design principle	Description
Stacking buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate or minimize one-story designs</li> <li>Change designs to increase number of stories</li> </ul>
Efficient and simple design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings designed in more compact manner, i.e., box/cube shaped</li> <li>Utilize quality systems, i.e., mechanical, lighting, controls, that are simple to use and maintain</li> </ul>
Aesthetic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasis on aesthetics that are pleasing and fit with neighborhood context but not on design awards</li> </ul>
Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear standards for design teams to ensure commonality in construction documents and building/systems solutions</li> </ul>
Accountability of design teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>System of accountability for design teams with respect to district standards, short-term/long-term value and educational goals</li> </ul>
Proto-parts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-using portions of designs or design concepts across projects</li> </ul>
Grouping multiple projects to the extent possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider combining projects together using same design team and/or contractor</li> </ul>

**5, f-4. The district should evaluate the design of choice schools.** There is significant demand for the option as evidenced by the oversubscription rate. The Task Force heard from the community that there is not unanimous support for expansion of the choice school model. In particular, some community and Task Force members were concerned about equity at choice schools. Therefore, the Task Force strongly recommends that any expansion of choice schools via new programs or new buildings only be undertaken while considering how to mitigate barriers of access to choice schools, in keeping with the community value of equity.

Choice schools can serve a purpose by providing increased capacity on a smaller footprint and lower cost than a traditional school. While some of the issues related to barriers to choice schools for families of Special Education/ELL/Low Income students are outside the scope of this Task Force, the Task Force felt strongly that these issues could not be omitted from its recommendations since there is such a strong demand for choice schools to be a part of the district’s long-term strategy. (See Appendix M for additional considerations regarding barriers to access to choice schools.)

**5, f-5. The district should continue to explore the economic viability and effectiveness of refurbishing versus rebuilding on a school-by-school basis. These results should be shared with the community as part of the ongoing engagement with the community on each project.**

**5, f-6. The district should consider a number of strategies that improve the ability of the school to provide educational performance over the long-term.**

- Continue to leverage natural light (as required by the state), and other concepts proven to have a positive impact on learning environment.
- Examine the successes/failures of innovations introduced in the last several rounds of school builds to determine where they are contributing/detracting from learning (e.g., pod approach).
- Wherever possible, new schools should be designed to accommodate future additions. Look for design considerations that aid with building use flexibility, e.g., movable internal walls, to support changes in use and near-term flexibility to be able to react to interim or unanticipated growth.

- Make design decisions and select systems that improve the ability to maintain buildings.
- Put design emphasis on durability to help schools have a longer lifespan and build life extension strategies into design to improve the durability of buildings.
- Continue to emphasize school safety aspects of facilities design for remodels and rebuild, e.g., flow of entry in buildings.

### 5, g. Build in Best Locations

**Background:** The Task Force reviewed the district’s school siting criteria to understand how the site can affect the development of new schools. There are many criteria that go into siting a new school other than whether the district needs to purchase the site or already owns it. The district already has a methodology to determine if a site supports the district’s educational plan: review a site’s characteristics, i.e., size, shape, jurisdictional zoning and codes; conduct site studies; determine the cost and funding; and consider the surrounding area and environment, i.e., zoning, traffic and air quality.

#### 5, g-1. The Task Force recommends the district continue to use the existing methodology to determine where new schools are located.

**5, g-2. When planning for new school sites,** the district should consider detailed demographics, growth trends and projections to ensure schools are sited best to meet long-term population needs. Additionally, when siting schools, careful consideration should be given to population density, the intent of Puget Sound Regional Council’s Vision 2040 long-range growth management strategy and the district’s parcel portfolio, i.e., parcel site and size, to help locate new schools in close proximity to where the need is.

**5, g-3. While planning for new school site purchases and/or design,** the district should consider, when possible after balancing against other criteria, prioritizing sites 1) with the greatest potential to accommodate new buildings, e.g., limited topographical variation and critical areas, and 2) that require less site preparation, e.g., grading, in order to maximize investment and minimize additional site development costs.

**5, g-4. While planning for new school site locations,** the district evaluates local traffic patterns and works with local municipalities and the community to ensure that other zoning and siting decisions as well as community traffic concerns are evaluated in the context of the school that is/will be sited there. The district

should put a strong emphasis on this effort, as traffic concerns were frequently mentioned by the community. In addition, where appropriate, the district should also look at locations that leverage transportation alternatives (e.g., siting near public transit, near Cross Kirkland Corridor).

### 5, h. Recommended Projects to Address Lack of Classroom Capacity and Aging Facilities

In line with its recommended “Build new schools” approach, the Task Force examined needed capacity and aging facilities by learning community to inform project recommendations. The Task Force recommends the School Board select from the following new and/or remodeled project options to meet 2021-22 and 2029-30 capacity needs. The expectation is that the implementation of these projects would be staged, as necessary, over the next 15 years. During that time, growth projections for the near- to mid-term will become even more refined. As time passes and the planning horizon extends, projects may need to be differently sized or staged to accommodate new longer-range growth projections (beyond 2029-30).

The Task Force believes these are the most reasonable means to address the lack of capacity issues.

The Task Force acknowledges this list does not address all aging facilities. Recognizing the urgency of capacity needs, the Task Force prioritized addressing aging facilities that could also add capacity when remodeled or replaced.

Assumptions incorporated into this table:

- All capacity needs reflect the reduced K-3 class sizes as prescribed in the McCleary decision. See Table 4 for data on school capacity and needs scenarios.
- The Task Force also recommended additional non-build strategies the district should consider to help meet the need. The projects in the table are designed to be used in conjunction with those non-build strategies that are implementable. See Recommendation 5, c.
- As stated in Recommendation 5, a-3, the Task Force did not consider portables as a long-term solution. The table assumes permanent capacity needs.

The Task Force recommends the capital projects by learning community summarized in Table 7 and detailed in 5, h-1:

**TABLE 7. PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECTS NEEDED THROUGH 2029-30**

	Juanita Learning Community	Lake Washington Learning Community	Redmond Learning Community	Eastlake Learning Community
<b>Capacity shortfall by 2021-22 &amp; 2029-30</b>	403   487	571   846	182   523	176   17
<b>High school</b>	<b>Remodel or replace</b> Juanita HS, increasing capacity to 1,800 (↑ 504)	<b>Build</b> an addition at Lake Washington HS, increasing capacity to 1,985 (↑ 500) <b>AND</b> <b>Add</b> a new choice HS with capacity of 600	<b>Add</b> a new choice HS with capacity of 600, in one of these two learning communities <b>OR</b> <b>Add</b> an addition to Redmond HS increasing capacity to 2241 (↑ 372)	
<b>Capacity shortfall by 2021-22 &amp; 2029-30</b>	181   162	166   240	730   902	27   42
<b>Middle school</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Remodel or replace</b> Kamiakin MS, increasing capacity to at least 900 (↑ 321), including a choice school</li> <li>- <b>Build</b> an addition at Finn Hill MS, increasing capacity to 800 (↑ 125) through the 2029-30 horizon if needed</li> </ul>	<b>Additional project</b> may be needed to meet capacity needs for 2029-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Build</b> a new school with capacity of at least 900</li> <li>- <b>Remodel or replace</b> Evergreen MS*, increasing capacity to at least 900 (↑ 104)</li> </ul>	
<b>Capacity shortfall by 2021-22 &amp; 2029-30</b>	379   430	1275   1541	1815   2204	531   645
<b>Elementary school</b>	<b>Additional project</b> may be needed to meet capacity needs through 2029-30 horizon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Build</b> 1 or 2 new schools, with capacity of 550 each</li> <li>- <b>Remodel or replace</b> Kirk ES, increasing capacity to at least 550 (↑ 190)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Build</b> 3 new schools, capacity of at least 550 each</li> <li>- <b>Replace, refurbish, or relocate</b> Explorer**</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Remodel or replace</b> Mead ES, increasing capacity to at least 550 (↑ 158)</li> <li>- <b>Remodel or replace</b> Alcott ES (↑ 190) or Smith ES (↑ 170) with a capacity of at least 550 may be needed to meet capacity needs through 2029-30</li> </ul>
<b>Capacity shortfall by 2021-22 &amp; 2029-30</b>	Included in elementary needs		Included in elementary needs	
<b>Preschool</b>	<b>Consider building or repurposing</b> a purchased structure		<b>Consider building or repurposing</b> a purchased structure (e.g., remodel Old Redmond School House)	

Each number indicates the projected capacity shortfall for the 2020-21 and 2029-30 school years, respectively. When the second number is smaller, this indicates that, based on projected future enrollment, the capacity shortfall is projected to be less for 2029-30.

\*Evergreen Middle School is a split feeder pattern school, meaning it feeds into both Redmond and Eastlake high schools.

\*\*Explorer Community School relies on portables for its long-term capacity; however, these portables are aging and will need to be replaced in the planning horizon. Northstar and Renaissance middle schools use modular buildings to form the school facility community. Modular buildings are different from portables in that they sit on permanent foundations and are designed for long-term use.

Additional information about the table:

1. *McCleary Impact on School Size.* Currently, new school capacity calculations are based on a planned 24 regular classrooms. Resource, music and art rooms are in addition, and not included in this capacity number. Under reduced class size called for in the McCleary decision, 28 classrooms will be needed for elementary schools in order to maintain 550 student capacity. Secondary capacity is not affected by the McCleary decision, so current class size calculations are used.
2. *Geographic Limitations.* King County's school siting task force has required future schools to be sited within the growth management area. The Task Force's planning assumptions assume compliance with this requirement, as well as compliance with all of the existing limitations that might impact the ability to develop particular parcels the school district may have in its portfolio. The implications of this assumption are that parcel availability and cost are the biggest economic constraints to manage in new school siting.
3. *Potential Parcel Limitations and Choice Schools.* The partial limitation identified in the previous item will have an impact on the district's ability to pursue large school footprints outside of existing parcels and schools in the district's portfolio. The state recommended size for a comprehensive high school is 40 buildable acres allowing for inclusion of athletic fields and other requirements in addition to the physical structure. Choice high schools allow for a smaller land parcel, since students interested in athletics access the facilities and programs at their home school. Choice middle and elementary schools can also use smaller footprints than traditionally sized schools. While community support for choice schools is not unanimous, there is strong support as evidenced by choice oversubscription and the comments heard from the community during this Task Force process. However, as discussed in Recommendation 5, f-4, some are concerned about equitable access to choice school programs for all students. Therefore, many of the Task Force project recommendations look at the potential for locating choice school programs within existing or expanded school facilities, and to move away from the strategy of only standalone choice schools, which limit access for students with varying support needs due to small building populations and facility size.
4. *Portables' Impact on Capacity Needs.* The capacity requirements also reflect a decision made by the Task Force around portables. As identified in an earlier recommendation,

the Task Force made a decision early in the process that portables are not a viable long-term solution to capacity issues. Portables have become a de facto long-term solution in many locations. The Task Force learned that roughly 13.6 percent of the district's total school capacity is in portables. While portables do address capacity issues in a less-expensive fashion, depending on the quality and age of the portables, they also have a number of negative aspects. These include weather exposure as students transition from one classroom to another (especially in middle and high schools), a lack of running water and/or bathroom facilities, and security concerns of free-standing classrooms. As a result of these and other concerns, the Task Force determined that portables are not an appropriate long-term strategy to meet capacity needs. The Task Force acknowledges, however, that portables may provide necessary transitional (gap-bridging) solutions for addressing capacity. It should also be noted that portables have been used by the district as a specific longer-term strategy to house some smaller-sized choice schools. Both the intent and practice of limiting the use of portables is reflected in the capacity requirements outlined for the long term.

**5, h-1. The Task Force recommends the School Board** consider the following project options to meet 2021-22 and 2029-30 capacity needs as the most reasonable means to address the lack of capacity and aging school issues. In addition to these projects, the Task Force also requests the district consider the innovative/alternative approaches identified in Section 5, h-2.

#### **I. Juanita Learning Community Projects**

##### **High School - Capacity Needs**

Capacity shortfall of 403 high school seats for the 2021-22 school year, and capacity shortfall of 487 high school seats by 2029-30 is projected for the Juanita Learning Community.

##### **High School - Solutions**

*Rebuild/Remodel Juanita High School.* Built in 1971, Juanita HS is the oldest school in the district and is currently facing many aging school challenges. It is assessed as "fair" in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria. There are currently eight portables in use on campus, assessed in quality from "fair" to "poor." The school does not align with the district's current educational design specifications. Remodeling or fully replacing Juanita HS would address the aging issues, and increasing the capacity to 1,800 would provide an additional 504 seats, bringing it in line with the size of other high schools in the district. To meet the needs expressed

by that learning community, the district should also look at retaining the Field House as feasible, and explore the possibility of including performing arts capacity similar to other high schools. Juanita High School is over 30 years old, qualifying it for state construction funding assistance to modernize or replace the school.

### Middle School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 181 middle school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, and remains relatively level at 162 middle school seats needed by 2029-30.

### Middle School - Solutions

*Remodel or replace Kamiakin MS.* Kamiakin was built in 1974, and has been assessed as “fair” in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria. The school has seven portables that are all more than 20 years old. The school also does not align with educational design specifications. A revision to the school (either through a remodel or replacement) could increase capacity to 900, adding 321 seats. Kamiakin is over 30 years old, qualifying it for state construction funding assistance to modernize or replace the school.

*Migrate or Establish a Choice School at Kamiakin MS.* The remodel of Kamiakin could be considered in conjunction with one or two of the choice middle schools being relocated to this campus as necessary to alleviate capacity issues facing Rose Hill Middle School. Alternatively, an additional choice school could be developed to work on the campus, which would help create smaller learning communities within the now larger school.

*Build an addition at Finn Hill.* When Finn Hill was modernized in 2011, it was designed to accommodate an addition to the existing building. This addition would increase capacity by 125 seats to 800 total. While Finn Hill does not have capacity issues, this added capacity could provide relief to other middle schools in the learning community.

### Elementary School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 379 elementary school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, growing to 430 by 2029-30.

### Elementary School - Solutions

*Project to Add Capacity.* An additional project may be needed to meet capacity needs through the 2029-30 horizon if sufficient space is not made available by the following preschool strategy.

*Move Preschool to Acquired/Rebuilt/Rented/Leased Space.*

Existing preschool classes at Bell, Juanita, Muir, and Sandburg elementary schools take classroom space that could be used for meeting K-5 elementary capacity needs. Alternatives could include capital projects, i.e., purchasing or building facilities, or they could also include renting or leasing space from other organizations to house these programs, similar to other districts in the area. The Task Force learned that renting or leasing space could not be funded with capital funding due to state law. Rather, funding for lease or rent would come from the district’s operations budget.

## II. Lake Washington Learning Community Projects

### High School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 571 high school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, growing to a total of 846 high school seats by 2029-30.

### High School – Potential Solutions

*Addition to Lake Washington High School.* When Lake Washington High School (LWHS) was modernized in 2011, it was designed for additions to the existing building. Adding classrooms at LWHS could increase capacity to 1,985, adding 500 seats. This addition would provide most of the projected capacity needs by 2021-22, and would cover more than half of the needs projected by 2029-30.

*Create a New Choice High School.* The addition of a new standalone choice high school could address the remaining capacity requirement, equity, cost effectiveness and the demand for additional choice school seats. A choice school sited in the Lake Washington learning community could provide up to an additional 600 seats to help cover the current gap between expansion of LWHS and the overall 846 seat requirement projected for 2029-30. The implementation of a choice school could also help manage the fluctuating capacity demands between Juanita and Lake Washington Learning Communities.

### Middle School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 166 middle school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year growing to 240 seats needed by 2029-30.

### Middle School – Potential Solutions

*Project to Add Capacity.* An additional project may be needed to meet capacity needs for 2029-30.

### Elementary School - Capacity Needs

Needed capacity of 1,275 elementary school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, growing to a need of 1,541 by 2029-30.

### Elementary School – Potential Solutions

*Build one or two new schools.* One to two new schools will likely be required with capacity of 550 each. These schools could be used to alleviate the crowding currently impacting other elementary schools across the learning community that is being met by portables.

*Remodel or Replace Kirk ES.* Kirk ES was built originally in 1975, is currently assessed as “fair” in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria and does not meet the current educational design specifications. There are currently three portables that are 19 to 28 years old. The school could be remodeled or replaced in a manner that increases the school’s capacity to at least 550, adding another 190 seats. Kirk is over 30 years old, qualifying it for state construction funding assistance to modernize or replace the school.

*Move Preschool to Acquired/Rebuilt/Rented/Leased Space.* Existing preschool classes at Rush ES take classroom space that could be used for meeting K-5 capacity needs. Alternatives could include capital projects, i.e. purchasing or building, or they could also include renting or leasing space from other organizations to house these programs, similar to other districts in the area. The Task Force learned that renting or leasing space could not be funded out of capital funding due to state law. Rather, funding for lease or rent would come from the district’s operations budget.

### III. Redmond Learning Community Projects

Given the feeder patterns of the Redmond and Eastlake learning communities, some of the projects for these communities will be outlined in both sections. Potential solutions that could serve one or both communities are indicated with abbreviations after the project header.

### High School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 182 high school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, and 523 high school seats for the 2029-30 school year.

### High School – Potential Solutions

*Add a choice high school in the Redmond or Eastlake learning community.* The addition of a new choice high school addresses

capacity and the demand for additional choice school seats. A typical comprehensive high school requires 40 buildable acres to accommodate athletic fields in addition to the physical structure. A choice high school allows for a smaller land parcel, since students interested in athletics access the facilities and programs at their home school. A choice school sited in the Redmond/Eastlake learning communities could provide the needed additional seats projected for 2029-30, and could provide the capacity for the high-demand program within the communities. The implementation of a choice school, in lieu of an addition to Redmond High School, would help manage the fluctuating capacity demands projected between the two learning communities. Eastlake has a significant moderate-term need which are projected to decrease by the 2029-30 horizon.

*Addition to Redmond High School (RHS).* Adding classrooms at RHS could increase capacity to 2,241, adding 372 seats. This addition would provide for needed capacity by 2021-22 and over half of the need by 2029-30. An addition to the existing school on the current site adds capacity without requiring additional land purchase. Any addition would need to address core facilities (e.g., cafeteria, library, etc.) and concerns expressed by the community over the ability of the core facilities to meet the needs of the student population.

### Middle School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 730 middle school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, growing to needed capacity of 902 seats for the 2029-30 school year.

### Middle School – Potential Solutions

*Build a new middle school.* An additional middle school with a capacity of 900 students is recommended. This moderate-term need would create a third middle school within the Redmond learning community.

*Remodel or replace Evergreen Middle School (RLC/ELC).* Evergreen is a split-feeder school, meaning that students may move on to either Redmond High School or Eastlake High School, depending on their residence within the school boundaries. Evergreen was originally built in 1983. It is currently assessed as “fair” in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria and does not meet the current educational design specifications. There are currently nine portables 24 to 26 years old and four new portables are being added. The school could be remodeled or replaced in a manner that increases the school’s capacity to at least 900, adding another 104 seats. Evergreen is more than 30 years old, qualifying it for state construction funding assistance to modernize or replace the school.

## Elementary Schools - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 1,815 elementary school seats is projected by 2021-22, growing to 2,204 seats needed by 2029-30.

### Elementary – Potential Solutions

*Build three new elementary schools (RLC).* Three new elementary schools, each able to house 550 students, will be needed.

*Replace, refurbish, or relocate Explorer.* Explorer choice school consists of several portables grouped together. These portables range in age from 25 to 29 years, and are assessed as poor in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria. The Task Force recommends addressing this issue by replacing the portables, refurbishing them, or relocating the Explorer School to another facility.

*Move Preschool to Acquired/Rebuilt/Rented/Leased Space.* Existing preschool classes at Rockwell and Dickinson elementary schools take classroom space that could be used for meeting K-5 capacity needs. Alternatives could include capital projects, i.e., purchasing or building, or they could also include renting or leasing space from other organizations to house these programs, similar to other districts in the area. The Task Force learned that renting or leasing space could not be funded out of capital funding due to state law. Rather, funding for lease or rent would come from the district's operations budget. In these learning communities, one alternative could be to remodel the Old Redmond School House for a shared preschool for both Redmond and Eastlake. The Old Redmond School House is owned by the district and leased to the City of Redmond.

## IV. Eastlake Learning Community Projects

Given the feeder patterns of the Redmond and Eastlake learning communities, some of the projects for these communities will be outlined in both sections. Potential solutions that could serve one or both communities are indicated with abbreviations after the project header.

### High School - Capacity Needs

For the 2021-22 school year, there is a projected capacity shortfall of 176 high school seats. This need is expected to decline slightly to a capacity shortfall of 17 high school seats for 2029-30, indicating flat or declining enrollment between 2021-22 and 2029-30.

## High School – Potential Solutions

*Add a choice high school in the Redmond or Eastlake learning community.* The addition of a new choice high school addresses capacity and the demand for additional choice school seats. A typical comprehensive high school requires 40 buildable acres to accommodate athletic fields in addition to the physical structure. A choice high school allows for a smaller land parcel, since students interested in athletics access the facilities and programs at their home school. A choice school sited in the Redmond/Eastlake learning community could provide the needed additional seats projected for 2029-30, and could provide the capacity for the high-demand program within the communities. The implementation of a choice school, in lieu of an addition to Redmond High School, would help manage the fluctuating capacity demands projected between the two learning communities. Eastlake has a significant moderate-term need which are projected to decrease by the 2029-30 horizon.

### Middle School - Capacity Needs

Capacity shortfall of 27 middle school seats is projected for the 2021-22 school year, and 42 seats are needed for the 2029-30 school year.

### Middle School – Potential Solutions

*Remodel or replace Evergreen Middle School (RLC/ELC).* Evergreen is a split-feeder school, meaning that students may move on to either Redmond High School or Eastlake High School, depending on their residence within the school boundaries. Evergreen was originally built in 1983. It is currently assessed as “fair” in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria and does not meet the current educational design specifications. There are currently nine portables 24 to 26 years old and four new portables are being added. The school could be remodeled or replaced in a manner that increases the school's capacity to at least 900, adding another 104 seats. Evergreen is more than 30 years old, qualifying it for state construction funding assistance to modernize or replace the school.

### Elementary Schools - Capacity Needs

Additional needed capacity of 531 elementary school seats is projected by 2021-22, and 645 seats needed by 2029-30.

### Elementary – Potential Solutions

*Remodel or replace Mead/Smith/Alcott (ELC).* The Task Force's recommendation reflects that a remodel/replacement could be equally appropriate at Mead, Smith or Alcott in the long-term. Mead became eligible for state construction fund assistance

in 2009. Smith and Alcott both become eligible in 2016. Mead was built in 1979; Smith and Alcott were built in 1986. All schools are currently assessed as “fair” in accordance with the State Asset Preservation Program criteria and do not meet the current educational design specifications. Mead has six portables from 24 to 28 years old, Smith has eight portables from 19 to 28 years old, and Alcott has eight portables from 7 to 28 years old. An additional four new portables are being added to Alcott.

#### *Move Preschool to Acquired/Rebuilt/Rented/Leased Space.*

Existing preschool classes at Blackwell ES take classroom space that could be used for meeting K-5 capacity needs. Alternatives could include capital projects, i.e. purchasing or building, or they could also include renting or leasing space from other organizations to house these programs, similar to other districts in the area. The Task Force learned that renting or leasing space could not be funded out of capital funding due to state law. Rather, funding for lease or rent would come from the district’s operations budget. In these learning communities, one alternative could be to remodel the Old Redmond School House for a shared preschool for both Redmond and Eastlake. The Old Redmond School House is owned by the district and leased to the City of Redmond.

## **5, h-2. The Task Force encourages the district to evaluate and consider these alternative size, program and building/built project possibilities over the planning period.**

**Background:** A number of ideas emerged that the Task Force did not have time to fully discuss or vet. These ideas arose because of constraints on available parcels, concerns raised by some Task Force and community members over the growing size of schools, and the desire of some to challenge the district to think towards the future when considering educational facilities. As they were not fully explored by the full Task Force, they are included here for the district’s consideration. The Task Force strongly recommends the district balance the urgency of addressing capacity needs with a commitment to looking for and seriously considering innovative and creative ideas to address these issues over time.

Most of the ideas described build from the best aspect of “choice” schools: their flexibility. Choice schools can differ by size, governing curriculum concept, hours of operation, location, virtual/standard learning environment hybrid, and other factors. Many of the project ideas listed here leverage this flexibility. The ideas are based on the assumption that, as opposed to pursuing a traditionally-sized and -located school for every new project listed in the table, the

district could pursue multiple smaller choice schools with available parcels or acquire/lease existing built facilities where economical. These ideas open up more location options while also addressing some community concerns about schools becoming too large. These ideas are not mutually exclusive; in fact, many of them could be considered in combination. The “Urban School” idea located in the specific project suggestions is an example of a project that leverages many of these ideas. The Task Force recommends that the educational benefits and economic feasibility of these ideas should be evaluated and shared with the community.

## **Explore Non-Traditional Locations and Alternatives**

- *Consider Leasing or Converting Commercial Facilities.* The district should be open to other approaches beside the traditional capital build model. This could include renting facilities, or finding existing space that could be refurbished for use for a school. This could be cost prohibitive in some circumstances, but should be considered a viable option for exploration, even where it involves pursuing alternative sources of funding (e.g., renting or leasing cannot, by law, be funded through a capital projects bond).
- *Partnerships with Public/Private Entities.* As part of these approaches, looking at ways to collaborate with municipalities or others on projects will be important. Ideas here varied from looking at joint capital projects with municipalities around sports facilities to sharing space with existing groups by renting unused community space.
- *Multi-Building Campus Opportunity.* One example of an innovative approach to building that leverages these ideas is the notion that not all facilities for a school need to be located on one campus. Especially in the case of schools located in more dense urban areas, using other facilities available outside of the main school location (e.g., King County Library system or municipal pool facilities) could be considered.

## **Explore Innovative Program Approaches**

- *Leveraging Virtual, Online and Off-Campus Programs.* In order for Running Start, online learning and other options to be effective options for reducing lack of classroom capacity, they need to do two things. These strategies need to reduce the students’ presence at a school for a couple of hours during the day, and they need to predictably and consistently reduce the total number of students at the school at any one time.
- *Multi-Age Schools.* The projects outlined in Table 7 provide each school level with its own facilities. Opportunities for multi-age campuses of any and all combinations could

be considered (e.g., Kamiakin could be rebuilt to house elementary and middle school students). This is currently done in the district at the International Community and Community schools, covering grades 1-12 on the same campus.

- *Home School Support.* The Task Force suggests the district continue to observe long-range trends in home schooling and other alternative school choices. The district should ensure that appropriate support is provided for families enrolled in the district Parent Partnership Program at Emerson K-12, since growth in these programs could reduce the overall capacity need required to serve the community.

This would support those families or students who find that tempo more attractive. It would also provide the district some meaningful experience with multi-tracking to better understand the impacts and implications.

- *Multi-Track + Online Choice High School.* The second innovative idea raised by community members involved a multi-track option with a much shorter cycle (weekly). In this example, 1/5 of the students in the school would work from home one day per week. In this case, it would increase the capacity by 20 percent and provide an alternative path for students who enjoy independent work as part of their curriculum.
- *Fifth Comprehensive High School/New Model for Comprehensive High School.* A full comprehensive high school was not included in the list of projects provided by the district. The district had previously considered a fifth comprehensive high school as part of moving to a 9-12 high school system. At that time, a decision was made to add high school capacity through the addition of a choice high school rather than a comprehensive high school. This was because 1) the capacity needed at the time was less than that of a full comprehensive high school and 2) the associated costs with a comprehensive high school needing a 40-acre parcel. Some community members have suggested the district consider a fifth comprehensive high school. Some Task Force members suggested considering whether a different sized (smaller) comprehensive high school is feasible.

## Specific School Projects

- *Urban School.* Combining many of these ideas could support the notion of more “urban” schools located in more densely populated areas. An urban school could be rightsized for the number of students supported. These students could attend school at the main location as well as other nearby facilities. The main location could be located in a leased facility or a built facility with a smaller footprint. This facility could be developed in conjunction with others (e.g., the municipality) and could be available for other community use after school hours. Using downtown Kirkland as an example, students could take classes at the main facility, at the nearby library, or in the Kirkland Performance Center (all of which are not in full use during school hours). The school could leverage the existing sports facilities where appropriate. This model could be applied to any level of school, or could be used to create a multi-level school (e.g., grades 6-12).
- *Double-Shifted Choice High School.* While the option of double shifting was met with resistance by the community, creating a single double-shifted choice high school was suggested by some. If done in combination with some online learning to shorten the school day for each shift, this option could provide flexibility for high school students who prefer a particular schedule. This could support different learning styles and the desire for some students to work or participate in alternative activities. In the case of those parents who work later shifts, it also provides some families more opportunities for time together if their work and their student’s school schedules are more in alignment.
- *Multi-Track Choice High School.* While converting the entire district at all levels to a year-round multi-track schedule is not a popular option, some community and Task Force members found the idea of a multi-track, choice high school attractive.