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MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 14, 1996

TO: David Steele

FROM: Pete Kerl

SUBJECT: Drohman Property Purchase

I am recommending that the district purchase 62.1 acres of property off Marvin Rd. NE from Robert Drohman. A meeting was held on April 30, 1996 to receive public comment regarding the purchase. It is the district's intent to work with residents to mitigate concerns raised at the April 30 meeting when a school facility is constructed on the property.

I am requesting Board approval of the purchase of 62.1 acres of property located on the East 65 acres of that part of the South half of the Northeast quarter of Section 34, Township 19 N, Range 1 WWM, excepting therefrom the South 61 feet.
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 15, 1996

TO: David Steele

FROM: Pete Kerl

SUBJECT: Background Information Regarding the Drohman Property Purchase

I am including as background information for the Board to review regarding the Drohman property purchase the following:

1. A memo from Gary Larson regarding property costs and appraisal.
2. A memo and attachments from Jeff Greene, district planning consultant, regarding site acquisition.
3. A memo regarding the S.E.P.A. checklist.
4. A Memorandum Addendum to S.E.P.A. checklist, which responds to the major issues raised at the April 30, 1996 Informal Public Work Session.
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Enclosures
For your information, I have spoken with Bob Drohman and he is willing to sell the District approximately 62.1 acres of property per our original agreement. The south 61 feet would be retained by seller. The actual purchase price would be based at $15,000 per acre.

Anderson Appraisal, Inc., has completed an appraisal and site inspection of the property and support our purchase offer of $931,500 for 62.1 acres. Please note the Tumwater School District paid $12,944 per acre in 1994 for their new high school site; Yelm School District paid $24,472 per acre in 1995; and Olympia School District paid $34,796 per acre in 1992 for its new elementary school site located on Morse-Merryman Road.

A representative from Anderson Appraisal will be available at the May 20 Board meeting to answer any questions, if necessary.

At this time, this office is recommending that we purchase the subject property and enter into contract closing. I will be present at the May 20 Board meeting.
May 1, 1996

TO: Pete Keri
FROM: Jeff Greene

REGARDING: PROPOSED SITE ACQUISITION ON MARVIN

Although we did not participate in site acquisition for the proposed high school site, we support acquisition for the following reasons:

1. It adjoins the urban growth area and can be annexed without affecting neighboring properties. It appears that it must be annexed to become available as a high school site. Water and sewer extensions will be required to the site. It appears to be across the street from a major water storage tank.

2. Three major planned communities; Meridian Campus, Hawks Prairie and Woodland Green are planned in the immediate vicinity.

3. Zoning supports the conclusion that over 1000 additional high school students may live in new residences north of Interstate 5 and east of Carpenter Road.

4. Marvin Road is the main arterial in the area.

5. Due to limited access north and south across freeway east of Carpenter, we would prefer to locate facilities to service students residing in the northeast section of the school district within that area.

cc: Gary Larson
    Myrna Lance
North Thurston School District  
New Development Profile

Date: 4.30.96

Project Name: HAWES PRAIRIE PLANNING AREA - NEW HIGH SCHOOL

Case or File No.: ____________________ Jurisdiction: ____________________

Location: ____________________

Number of Lots: ___________ Single Family: ___________ Multi Family: ___________

Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Rated Capacity:</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment*:</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Enrollment:</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 1/2 kindergarten, kindergarten is a 1/2 day program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Single Family (Blended)</th>
<th>Multi-Family (Blended)</th>
<th>Estimated No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>.483 1754</td>
<td>.244 715</td>
<td>2469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>.11734 479</td>
<td>.06134 180</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.21167 863</td>
<td>.10633 311</td>
<td>1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portable units Required

Total Students ___________ /25 students per unit = ___________ unit(s)

Cost per Unit $41,431 as of June, 1992

Total Financial Impact (units x cost) $

Total cost $________________ x 3 years / 20 years = $

Land Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Required / Unit</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost = $

(Cost per acre approximately $30,000 with sewer and water availability.)

Total Anticipated Mitigation

Portable Cost $________________ + Land Cost $________________ = Total $________________
Table 12
Allocation Breakdown of Zoned Properties by Number of Acres, Developed and Undeveloped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAWKS PRAIRIE PLANNING AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LACEY ZONING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial/Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY ZONING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRR 1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Residential 4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Industrial Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dept. of Ecology and Agencies with Jurisdiction
FROM: Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services
RE: Site acquisition of approximately 60- to 65-acre parcel of land on Marvin Road
DATE: May 13, 1996

The North Thurston School District has responded to all inquiries and concerns on the S.E.P.A. Checklist for the above-referenced project per the attached Memorandum Addendum and the Public Work Session held April 30, minutes of which are also attached.

After review of the checklist and related comments, the North Thurston School District finds a "Declaration of Non-Significance" applicable for this project.

nw
attachments
INTRODUCTION:

On April 18, 1996, the North Thurston School District elected to use the S.E.P.A. process to publicly notify the local community that the district had entered into a purchase and sale agreement to acquire a 60-to 65-acre parcel of property located on Marvin Road N.E. While the actual purchase of potential school property does not require the district to complete an environmental checklist for non-permit/non-project actions, we used this so the North Thurston School District could better understand issues and concerns if future district facilities were constructed, with a strong potential for a comprehensive high school facility.

After a 15 day waiting period and informal public work session on April 30, 1996, the North Thurston School District’s Superintendent, Dave Steele; Assistant Superintendent, Pete Kerl; Director of Construction/Design, Gary Larson; and Planning Consultant, Jeff Greene, reviewed all comments, both written and oral, and have issued a Final Determination of Nonsignificance for purchase of the property. Staff will be making their recommendation to purchase the land at the May 20, 1996, Board of Directors meeting to be held at the Administration Office, 305 College St. NE, Lacey, Washington.

The major issues raised and discussed were as follows:

- ADEQUATE BUFFERS
- WETLANDS
- INCREASED TAX BURDEN
- TRAFFIC IMPACTS ON MARVIN ROAD AND I-5 OVERPASS
- INCREASED NOISE
- REQUIRED ANNEXATION WITH CITY OR THE URBAN GROWTH AREA
- INCREASE IN CRIME/VANDALISM
- GROUNDWATER/WELL PROTECTION

In response to potential environmental issues, we offer the following comments to support the final DNS declaration.
RESIDENTIAL BUFFERS

The District is sensitive to the issue and intends to buffer any residential neighbors adequately when facilities are completed.

WETLANDS

The District is fully aware of the small wetlands on the site and intends to preserve or mitigate by relocation in accordance with jurisdictional authority. We additionally feel this site and associated wetlands offer unique possibilities to the environmental science program offered in an educational curriculum.

INCREASED TAX BURDEN

The District recognizes subject property would be exempt from property tax when purchased, and thus has the potential to add additional tax burden on school taxing district. However, this cost should be offset by the cost-effective purchase. Also the School Board is sensitive to the sale of capital bonds so as not to increase bond sale taxes to an unreasonable level.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

We recognize any future development would be subject to a traffic analysis. Marvin road is a main arterial and is currently being studied for improvements because of adjacent proposed developments, along with correction of the I-5 overpass. The purchase does not itself create an L.I.D.

INCREASED NOISE

The district recognizes there is potential for increased noise associated with any type of school development. With appropriate site planning, buffer zones, and scheduling of extremely noisy activities, this concern should be minimized.

REQUIRED ANNEXATION WITH CITY OR THE UBA LINE

Purchase does not in itself cause the proposed site to become incorporated or annexed to the City. The North Thurston School District clearly intends to pursue inclusion within the City of Lacey growth boundaries when an established need is defined. This can be accomplished without affecting neighboring properties since property has a common boundary with Marvin Road and Urban Growth Area.

CRIME/VANDALISM

To minimize crime and vandalism the school site will be entirely fenced from residential properties. Furthermore, the District will do everything in their power to control crime. Currently the District and local Lacey police and County sheriff's department work closely and have many effective programs in place. Current high school campuses have full-time security staff during school hours.
GROUNDWATER AND WELL PROTECTION

The District has developed good management practices for application of fertilizer, pesticides and herbicides to prevent potential contamination of ground water and wells. Future storm water run-off from parking lots will be treated prior to release into the groundwater aquifer, or stored in detention/retention facilities. Any future development of the site will require engineered stormwater design approved by local jurisdictions before permits will be issued.

The North Thurston School District, as the Lead Agency under the SEPA rules, WAC 197-11 SEPA ,RCW 43.21C, thus approves the DNS for site acquisition of future school property. Also attached are the meeting minutes from the informal public work session held on April 30, 1996.

All written comments are on file in the North Thurston School District Construction/Design SEPA file.

Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent
Administrative Services
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Greetings and introductions were given by Gary Larson, Director of Construction/Design. He also advised that minutes will be sent to those who sign the sign-in sheet. Present from the North Thurston School District were: Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services; Jeff Greene, Consultant; and Norma Wallace, Staff Member. Chuck Namit, Board Member, was in the audience.

Gary Larson advised that the meeting would be kept informal and that two written comments had been received and that he would discuss the key items from each in the hope of answering some of the questions and concerns of the property owners in attendance.

He explained that the North Thurston School District was approached by a real estate agent for Bob Drohman and his wife Rita regarding the site. A Purchase and Sale Agreement has been signed with intentions of building a high school on the site, but it is possible it would be used for a middle school or an elementary school. He showed maps of the site and explained the wetland reconnaissance study done by Watershed Dynamics. The on-site geotechnical work was done after the record rains in February, which led the school district to feel a reconnaissance study would be useful.

He went on to explain that the notification of adjacent property owners was not required by State law, but that the school district had followed the S.E.P.A. (State Environmental Policy Act) guidelines. The North Thurston School District is the lead agency and the environmental checklist was completed on a non-project basis. After the fifteen-day comment period the checklist and all comments will be reviewed. This same process would be followed when and if a building project is initiated. He compared this project to River Ridge High School, where the school district worked with the surrounding neighbors and built the school and parking lots as far from the residential neighbors as possible.

Gary Larson addressed items from a letter from Dennis and Robin Jones. In answer to the question of why the school district is acquiring property outside the Lacey growth area when there are already three proposed sites available inside the Hawks Prairie Lacey growth area, he explained that the school district is looking for a high school site north of the I-5 freeway. The
school district projects a need for a high school in this area when vacant residential land is
developed. The Hawks Prairie sites were too small for a high school site. The school district
will work with the City and County to change the urban growth boundary line so we could
have access to water and sewer. The school district is not seeking a permit to build at this time,
but only property acquisition. There would be no effect on the water table if the property is on
City water and sewer. Regarding improvements to Marvin Road, we recognize the need for a
Marvin Road/Martin Way interchange improvement. The school district does not know at this
time what improvements to Marvin Road would be necessary, although constructing one
entrance to the property and possibly a second emergency entrance would be expected. A
traffic signal may also be required if it is used as a high school site. We are aware that no
permits will be issued until the Marvin Road/Martin Way intersection is resolved. If the
property is annexed, it is possible there would be an LID; this property is being studied in
connection with the Marvin Road/Martin Way overpass. The timeline for construction is hard
to predict. We have estimated 8 to 15 years as noted in the checklist, but this depends on
student enrollment; it could be sooner or later. The district is aware of stormwater runoff and
its impacts; all proposed designs would require jurisdictional approval within the current
regulations at the time of permitting. There is no expected effect from stormwater on
surrounding wells. We have not done a traffic study; this will be done prior to receiving a
building permit. The term "probable significant adverse impact" was used per S.E.P.A.
guidelines. Only the adjacent property owners were notified because we followed the S.E.P.A.
policy of notifying the adjacent property owners within 300 feet. The list of these property
owners was supplied by Thurston County. The property was also posted and a legal
advertisement was placed in The Olympian.

Pete Kerl then read from the sign-in sheet, asking each one if they wished to speak. The first
speaker was Dennis Jones. He explained that he and his neighbors were not opposing schools
since most of them have children; however, they didn't want a school next door but would
prefer it inside the urban growth boundary. He suggested the use of the three areas inside the
urban boundary to save additional taxes, or building an elementary school instead of a high
school. Pete Kerl answered that this piece of property was cost efficient to the school district as
the price was more reasonable than the other sites within the urban growth boundary; also, a
high school site is needed and the other sites are too small. A 50- to 60-acre high school site
requires the school district to go on the open market.

Bill Bennett then spoke, stating that a school on this property forces an LID on street, water and
sewer improvements. He is nearing retirement and wants to keep the status quo. He is
supportive of the school district and has voted for levies in the past but doesn't feel this is
justified.

Craig Cameron voiced his concern with a high school so close, affecting the quality of life,
community, traffic and safety. He was concerned about undisciplined students in the
neighborhood. He agreed a high school would be advantageous, but questioned how much
taxes would increase. Pete Kerl responded that the bond issue passed in 1991 was for
additional schools as needed and that the School district works with our bonding agent to keep
the cost at approximately $2 per $1,000. Dennis Jones asked if this cost would come out of the
Informal Public Work Session
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Maintenance and Operations Levy and Pete Kerl answered that this was not the case, it would be Capital Projects funds.

Michelle Cameron asked the timeframe on 11,000 students. Jeff Greene answered that it is actually 1,100 and depends on the buildout of the area. She then asked if they would be included in the urban growth area and would their taxes increase. Gary Larson replied that the school district would only request that school district property be annexed inside the urban growth boundary.

Thelma Mosebar stated that she is very supportive of the school district but did have a concern about incorporation into the City. She also pointed out that according to the map, no test holes were done north of where they live; there is a wet area there September through June and a seasonal creek. Also, she felt that a 10- to 20-foot buffer zone is not adequate and that we could have a natural buffer if the trees were left; she doesn't want to see the lights from the fields. Gary Larson responded that the map was for a wetland reconnaissance, a wetland study and mapping has not been done yet. However, the reconnaissance indicated that approximately 3/4 to 1 acre would be classified as wetland, associated with previous logging activity. It has not been identified as a critical area by Thurston County. Regarding the buffer zone, we learned from Komachin that a larger buffer would be good. The school district feels it is advantageous to have buffers and natural habitat as an educational experience for students. Regarding urban growth, he again stated that only the school district property would be annexed.

Ken Nolan then expressed concern about traffic, asking if information is available on recent schools to show the impact on traffic. Gary Larson replied that River Ridge High School is the only one. A study being done for the Marvin Road/Martin Way interchange would include this. Ken Nolan asked how the names were determined for notification. Gary Larson replied that Thurston County prepared the list of names for us, probably including more than 300; the School district also posted the property and placed an advertisement in The Olympian. Ken Nolan then asked would the notification area be larger if a high school were built. Gary Larson advised the community would be well informed and planning committees set up once the project needs are defined.

Barbara Buechel pointed out that they didn't get written notification. She is concerned about an increase in traffic, having noted that as the area built up the traffic on Marvin Road increased. She asked if we would resell the property; Gary Larson answered that we would not. Tom Buechel noted that a non-smoking site sends the students off the property to smoke; the School district would need to prevent encroachment on neighboring property by the students, perhaps by a fence. He also has a problem with being annexed into Lacey.

Maggie Bell-McKinmon pointed out that the site cannot be built upon without annexation and that the school district made a determination of nonsignificance without a complete wetland study. Gary Larson answered that the school district is aware of the wetland area but it is not necessary to do an environmental impact study. He pointed out that River Ridge High School is on a 40-acre site and we would like a bigger site for the next high school so we could have...
better buffers. Regarding annexation, it has been informally discussed with the City of Lacey and they do not object at this point. Maggie Bell-McKinnon asked if it was normal for the lead agency to prepare the checklist and make the determination. Gary Larson replied that this is the normal procedure; all jurisdictions were notified and allowed to comment. Maggie Bell-McKinnon then asked what the next step is. Gary Larson responded that the staff will review the checklist and all comments, and either prepare a declaration of nonsignificance or drop the project; the school board makes the final decision. Pete Kerl announced that the public is welcome to present questions at the Board meeting.

Thelma Mosebar stated that many things were worse than schools as a neighbor but felt that the impacts were minimized on the checklist including emissions from cars and buses. The checklist stated a 150 people working on the site and she asked why the 1,200 students weren't included. She also felt noise and lights were minimized and that we should be more accurate and precise. Gary Larson responded that the checklist asks how many people will work on the site so students were not included. The agencies had commented in the past that the school district was too wordy on the checklists so this one was kept more brief. He agreed there will be some emissions, but a high school will be built somewhere in that area so the emissions would occur whether it is built on this site or another.

Dennis Jones also felt that the school district minimized some impacts on the checklist. It was stated on the checklist that there was no wetland but the reconnaissance indicates there is some wetland area. Gary Larson pointed out that the reconnaissance study was included with the checklist as an attachment and that the school district was not trying to hide anything. We must go through a permitting process which requires further studies.

Gary Larson advised that the minutes will be mailed to all who sign up. Written comments are due by May 3, 1996. Ken Nolan asked if there will be follow-up meetings. Gary Larson stated that the School district staff will evaluate the comments and present a staff recommendation to the school board at the May 20, 1996, board meeting; this is an opportunity for the public to speak. Ken Nolan stated that he requested the City of Lacey be present to explain annexation procedures. Pete Kerl responded that it probably wouldn't occur for approximately 5 years.

Gary Larson thanked everyone for coming and felt that the property owners had made some good comments and asked good questions. Written comments are on file at the Construction/Design office.
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Section 501 – Site Selection

High Performance Schools

The High Performance Public Buildings Act, RCW 39.35D, requires school districts to build using one of these sustainable design protocols: The Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol (WSSP), LEED Silver, or LEED for Schools.

The site is a crucial element in determining the overall sustainability of the school design. Sites are sometimes purchased years in advance, and some of these design credits may be out of the control of the districts and/or designers at the time the school is being built. Districts that are considering multiple sites can substantially lower the environmental impact of the school by choosing centrally located sites, sharing parks or facilities with community organizations, preserving open space, and protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

It is important to choose sites that protect students and staff from outdoor pollution and minimally impact the environment. Development should be channelled to centrally located areas with existing infrastructure. This helps protect undeveloped land, minimize transportation requirements, and preserve habitat and natural resources.

There are 17 points in the Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol related to SITE:

### Site: 17 Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection &amp; Use</th>
<th>S1.0 Code Compliance</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S1.1 Sensitive Areas</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S1.2 Greenfields</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S1.3 Central Location</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S1.4 Joint Use of On-Site Facilities</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>S1.5 Joint Use of Off-Site Facilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S1.6 Minimal Footprint</th>
<th>1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>S2.1 Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S2.2 Bicycles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S2.3 Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>S3.0 Temporary Sedimentation and Erosion Control</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S3.1 Onsite Infiltration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S3.2 Runoff Treatment or Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S3.3 Enhanced Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Surfaces</td>
<td>S4.1 Heat Island Reduction Through Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S4.2 Heat Island Reduction Through Roof Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEED Silver has a similar point structure for site.

### Site Selection Team

The site selection team is assembled and directed by the appropriate school official to review site selection criteria. Potential sites are identified and examined. After evaluation of all sites, the selection team recommends one or more sites for purchase to the school district’s board.

Each parcel of land identified as a potential school site should be thoroughly examined to determine its suitability in terms of educational plan, accessibility, cost, size, environmental impact, and numerous other criteria. Environmentally sensitive or important spaces should be avoided. Each site and surrounding property should be evaluated upon both its present and possible future uses. In evaluating the property, the following questions should be addressed:

### Site Characteristics
- Is the site the right size and shape? Does it allow for a minimal building footprint?
- Will the site support the educational program?
- Is the site expandable in the future or will it support expansion of facilities in its present configuration?
- Is the topography conducive to desired site development?
- Does the land drain properly? Will it comply with storm water management requirements?
- Have tests been made to determine underground conditions particularly as to suitability for building foundations?
- Does the site have desired trees and other natural vegetation?
- Is the site considered important farmland, undeveloped land, or does it provide habitat for endangered species?

### Legal Requirements
- Sections 504, 505, and 506
- Will a variance or rezone be required?
- Is the site in a flood plain or other such hazardous area?
- Are there any easements of any nature affecting the use of the site?
- Is the site available and free of all encumbrances?

### Location Considerations
- Is the site located conveniently for the majority of pupils?
- Is the site near other community services such as library, parks, and museums?
- What is the relation of the site to existing educational facilities?
- How is surrounding land zoned—will its development enhance the school site?
- Can the land be shared with other community facilities and organizations, such as parks?
- Will the site provide desirable open space where it is needed by the community?
- Is the general environment aesthetically pleasing?

### Infrastructure Considerations
- Are adequate services for water (for fire flow and domestic use) and sewer available at the site?
- What energy sources are available and is there the potential for alternative energy use and/or shared use?

### Site Access
- Is the site easily accessible for vehicles?
- Are the road and traffic patterns surrounding the site suitable?
- Is it served by public transportation?
- Will it be able to accommodate bicycle traffic?

### Health and Safety
- Is the site safe?
- Is the air quality healthful?
- Is the site free of industrial and traffic noise?
- Is the site served by public agencies: police, fire department, public transit, etc.?
It may not be possible to locate a site that will totally accommodate all needs. The selection committee and community should discuss priorities and agree on what qualities are indispensable.

Section 502 – Site Review by OSPI

Site recommendations for projects receiving state match funding are described in WAC 392-342-020.

OSPI conducts an on-site review and evaluation of the proposed site. An OSPI regional coordinator will meet with a member of the district’s administrative staff to visit the site and respond to the questions on the OSPI Site Review Study (Exhibit 5A).

Section 503 – Site Review by Local Code Agencies

Before a new school facility is constructed, an addition is made to an existing facility, or an existing school facility is remodeled, the district shall consider completing a site review or presession conference with all appropriate local code agencies in order to determine design constraints. At a minimum, such a review should include building, fire, and health officials.

Concerns of the health department with respect to site approval include:
- Adequacy of water supply
- Adequacy of sewage disposal
- Site size
- Acceptable noise levels
- Presence of environmental contaminants such as radon, toxic substances, and air pollution

Present health regulations stipulate maximum acceptable noise levels from any sources at proposed new school construction sites. Sites exceeding these sound levels are not considered acceptable unless an appropriate plan for sound control reduction is included in the new construction proposal and is approved by the health officer.

Section 504 – State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA)

The Washington State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA), RCW 43.21C.120, and the SEPA rules, WAC 197-11-904, require all state and local governmental agencies to consider environmental values for their own actions and when licensing private proposals. The act also requires that an environmental impact statement (EIS) be prepared for all major actions significantly affecting the quality of the environment.

A portion of WAC 197-11-960 comprises an environmental checklist which must be answered as completely as possible in order that the agencies involved may determine whether or not a proposed school facility is a major action which would require the preparation of an environmental impact statement. This form does not supersede or void application forms required under any other federal or state statute or local ordinance.

The district may ascertain if it is the appropriate lead agency having jurisdiction over the proposed facility (action) and may decide if a project is exempt from SEPA requirements. If a district determines it does not have exempt status, it may have its architect/engineer or consultant complete the environmental checklist. The lead agency must consider the checklist information and ascertain whether or not the action will have a significant effect upon the quality of the environment.

If a threshold determination by the lead agency declares the proposal to be non-significant and there are no appeals, the district may proceed with the project. A copy of the determination of nonsignificance and a copy of the completed environmental checklist must be transmitted to the Environmental Review section, Department of Ecology, for permanent recording of the determination.

If a determination of significance is issued by the lead agency, a draft EIS and a scoping form must be prepared, reviewed by all appropriate authorities and published.

Occasionally, public hearings must be conducted on the EIS, and a final EIS with public comments would be required. Guidelines for preparation and review of the EIS are available from the Environmental Review section, Department of Ecology.

Section 505 – Growth Management Act (GMA)

The Growth Management Act (GMA) has significant importance to districts in the counties which are planning under the act. Districts will obtain maximum benefit from the GMA by actively participating in the planning process with the city or county planning authority.

Growth management planning may benefit districts by providing information and location of planned growth in the community, guidance in locating school sites, and, perhaps, financial assistance for new school construction in the form of impact fees. Disadvantages of growth management planning are that districts may find themselves restricted in locating new schools and in obtaining necessary zoning approvals.

The GMA requires cities and counties to designate urban growth areas (UGAs) as limits of services such as water, sewer, and streets. Locating school facilities within the UGAs may be limited either directly through land use regulations or indirectly through restrictions on utilities. School facilities outside UGAs that require water and/or sewer service may need extraordinary measures such as service lines dedicated solely to (and paid for by) the district. School facilities not listed in the capital facilities element of the local comprehensive plan may not be approved.

At least two of these elements, land use and capital facilities plan, are critical to school districts. The GMA requires comprehensive plans to include:

1. A land use element designating the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land for public facilities, which includes schools.

2. A capital facilities plan element consisting of:
   - An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations of facilities and their present level of service
   - A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities based on their proposed level of service
   - The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities

The district’s compliance with the requirements of chapter 197-11 WAC must be certified to OSPI.
Early site acquisition during a period of an expanding and inflationary economy is a prudent activity for all districts to consider. Effective selection of a site prior to the identification of a specific building program requires availability of funds for acquisition, availability of suitable land, and considerable confidence in the advance planning process discussed in Chapter 3. Early identification of school sites can reduce the design and construction time involved in the implementation of a school building project, thus tending to reduce costs.

At the time of development:

In districts where enrollment conditions and projections do not justify early acquisition, selection and purchase of sites can be accomplished on the basis of known needs. A more astute site selection can normally be made under these conditions because educational specifications will have been developed and the architect/engineer for the project may have been selected and be available for participation in the evaluation of prospective sites.

Section 509 – Site Acquisition Funding

With the exception of land secured on lease from the State of Washington, title to the real property of the site shall be vested in the school district, with any or all encumbrances clearly stated in the title documents. Any title that contains encumbrances should be accompanied by certification from the district’s legal counsel stating that such encumbrances will not interfere detrimentally with the construction, operation, and useful life of the school facility.

State financial assistance is not available to aid in funding site acquisition or other associated costs, including geotechnical reports and boundary or site surveys.

Sources of funding for site acquisition available to districts include:

- Passage of a capital levy
- Passage of a bond issue for site acquisition
- Transfer of funds from the general fund to the building fund
- Outside sources (developer dedication, growth impact fees, or mitigation payments)
- Sale of district-owned surplus property
- Non-voted debt

Section 510 – Survey of Essential Site Data

Prior to design studies for site utilization and building placement, a survey of the physical site characteristics and a title search are necessary. This site survey must be performed by a land surveyor registered in the State of Washington. The site survey, a responsibility of the district, should contain the following information for the architect/engineer:

1. Title of survey, property location, certification, and date
2. Scale and compass orientation
3. Tract boundary lines, courses, and distances, including all easements
4. Names of abutting property owners
5. Benchmark with assumed elevation
6. Names and locations of all existing road right-of-ways on or near the tract
7. Location of roads, drives, curbs, gutters, steps, walks, paved areas and the like, indicating types of materials or surfacing
8. Road elevation for all improved roads on or adjacent to property improved gutter elevations on property line side. Survey should include opposite side of adjacent street.

9. Location, type, size, and flow of all existing storm and sanitary sewers on or contiguous to the tract, including top and invert elevations of all manholes and inlet and invert elevations of other drainage structures.

10. Location, type, and size of all water and gas mains, meter boxes, hydrants, and other appurtenances.

11. Location of all utility poles; natural gas and utility pipelines; and cable TV, telephone, and power lines, with indication of nearest leads either on-site or off-site, pertinent information and ownership of all utilities.

12. Location of all existing structures on the site, including buildings, foundations, bridges, wells, walls, fences, and rock outcroppings.

13. Location of all swamps, springs, streams, drainage ditches, wetlands, lakes, and other bodies of water and line of maximum flood plain if applicable.

14. Outline of wooded areas; location of trees, identification of trees by type, identification of trees with trunks over 8 inches in diameter at waist height, and location and identification of any other significant flora and fauna.

15. Elevations throughout the site sufficient to develop a complete and thorough contour map for site improvements.

16. Construction of permanent property corners such as concrete monuments.

---

### Exhibit 5A - Site Review Checklist

**State of Washington**

**SITE REVIEW STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT:</th>
<th>COUNTY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED SCHOOL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>(enter county name)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION OF SITE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>(enter name and dist. no.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE SIZE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>GRADE LEVEL:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EST. NO. STUDENTS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>DATE APPROVED:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQD. SITE SIZE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS**

1. Is the site size and shape adequate for grades to be served?.............
2. Will the site support the educational program?..........................
3. Is the site located conveniently for the majority of pupils?.............
4. Is the site near other community services such as library, parks and museums?........................................
5. Is the site located near existing educational facilities?.............
6. Will the surrounding zoning and development enhance the school site?....
7. Can the site be shared with other community facilities (parks)?..........
8. Is the site expandable in the future or will it support expanded facilities?........................................
9. Is the topography conducive to desired site development?..................
10. Is the general environment aesthetically pleasing?......................
11. Does the land drain properly and are other soil conditions good?........
12. Does the site have desired trees and other natural vegetation?..........%
13. Have tests been made to determine underground conditions (geotech)?....
14. Is the site easily accessible for service vehicles?......................
15. Are the road and traffic patterns surrounding the site suitable?........
16. Is the site safe?...................................................................
17. Is the air quality healthful?.................................................
18. Is the site free of industrial and traffic noise?..........................
19. Is the site served by public agencies (police, fire dept. etc.)?.........
20. Are adequate water and sewer services available at the site?..........
21. Are there any easements of any nature affecting the use of the site?...
22. Will site development costs be excessive?..............................
23. Are any of the following energy sources available at the site?........
   - Gas
   - Electricity
   - Solar
   - Geothermal
   - Other

**GENERAL EVALUATION OF SITE** (Including explanation of any negative responses above)

---

**SITE APPROVED:**

**DATE:**

**BY:**

**YES** **NO**

Facilities and Organization
22 March 1996

Mr. Gary Larson, P.E., Director 
North Thurston School District 3 
Construction and Design 
305 College Street N.E. 
Lacey, Washington 98503

Subject: Preliminary evaluation of subsurface soil conditions at the proposed school site on the west side of Marvin Road, and south of 44th Avenue N.E.

Dear Mr. Larson:

As requested, we have observed the soil conditions exposed in 24 test pits that were excavated on 15 February by an 892 John Deere excavator. These test pits were logged for soil type and apparent ground water levels. All test pits were loosely backfilled after completion of the work. A stake marked with the test pit number was placed at each test pit location so that the survey crew could accurately locate the test pit on the property survey.

The property is located on the outwash plain of the Vashon glacier. It is of low relief with a gentle rise to the west. In the west center area of the property there is an undulating surface on the highest area. The general slope of this area is once again to the west. This center upland area divides the drainage on the site. The eastern half of the property drains to the east and southeast and the western half to the west and southwest. The undulating surface in the upland area traps seasonal storm water which forms small ponds.

Principal vegetation on the site is Douglas fir, western red alder and scattered other species of mixed hard and soft woods. Grasses, Scotch broom, salal, and Oregon grape form the major low vegetation. Near Marvin Road we found on the surface at several locations refuse from domestic sources.
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Two principal soil units are found on the site. The upper soil unit is associated with the Vashon recessional outwash plain, and consists predominantly of sand and gravel mixes that were fluvially deposited on the plain. There are also scattered pockets of coarsely laminated silts which represent small ponds that formed on the outwash plain. These silts are lacustrine in origin. Underlying the Vashon recessional outwash deposits, we found the very dense and highly overconsolidated Vashon subglacial till. Subglacial till is deposited at the base of the advancing ice sheet and is a mixture of silt, sand, and gravel. Loading by the ice sheet, which is thought to have been about one-half to one mile thick in this area, has resulted in a soil mass with engineering properties similar to those of lean concrete. This soil unit is for all practical purposes impermeable. In this area we have found the subglacial till to exceed 30 feet in thickness. Test pits were terminated once we were into unweathered subglacial till.

The buried surface of the subglacial till undulates gently. In the undulations, seasonal trapped storm water pockets can develop forming perched water tables of varying volumes. As the undulations fill with water, they overtop with the flow of ground water on the surface of the subglacial till to the next undulation. The general slope of the subglacial till surface usually mimics the surface elevations.

Ground water on the site should not affect its development, especially if the site grading work occurs during the dry season. Excavation of trenches may encounter bodies of trapped or perched water. We expect that these flows would be of short duration and that the flows could be controlled by standard pumps to dewater the trenches.

During the rainy season, flows of ground water on the surface of the subglacial till will increase. Excavation to the interface of the recessional outwash soils that are permeable and the subglacial till will find seepage or flow of ground water. These flows may affect deep excavations, with continuous dewatering efforts required.
Site soils are suitable for support of standard spread footings and paving sections. Safe bearing values for the recessional outwash units will vary with grain size distribution with typical design ranges of 2000 to 4000 psf. The subglacial till offers excellent support for standard footings, with a typical design value of 5000 psf being used.

After clearing and grubbing of the site, the recessional outwash soils and subglacial till may be used for the construction of structural fill sections. The subglacial till contains plastic fines and control of moisture content will be required to achieve a uniform compaction. Deep cuts into the subglacial till will require the use of suitable construction equipment because of the cementing of this soil.

We did not find soils that are prone to liquefaction during our field work. A seismic design site coefficient of $S_2$ may be used. We expect the sediment depth below the site may exceed 400 feet. Because of loading by the Vashon glacial mass, we expect that these soils are well consolidated at depth.

It is our opinion, based on our observations of the site soils, that this is a suitable site for the construction of a new school facility. We did not observe any soil condition that would limit development of a facility using standard foundation systems.

We understand that this site will be developed at some time in the future. We expect that domestic water and sanitary sewer will be provided to the site by the time of the proposed development. There are on the site areas where the recessional outwash soils are thick enough so that infiltration of storm water can be accomplished either by ponds or infiltration galleries.

BRADLEY-NOBLE GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

David C. Strong
Engineering Geologist

Enclosures: Test Pit Logs
TEST PIT LOGS

Test Pit One:
- 0 to -2.5 feet: Reddish brown topsoil which is saturated over a pebbly silty sand.
- -2.5 to -4.2 feet: Yellow brown silty sand with seepage at the bottom.
- -4.2 to -4.8 feet: Dense gray subglacial till.

Test Pit Two:
- 0 to -1.0 feet: Topsoil and forest debris.
- -1.0 to -2.3 feet: Reddish brown pebbly silty sand.
- -2.3 to -3.3 feet: Light yellow pebbly sand.
- -3.3 to -7.7 feet: Gray silty pebbly sand, weathered subglacial till, becoming firmer with depth.

Test Pit Three:
- 0 to -0.5 feet: Topsoil and forest debris.
- -0.5 to -1.5 feet: Light brown silty pebbly sand.
- -1.5 to -6.8 feet: Gray silty cobbly sands, weathered subglacial till, becoming firmer with depth.

Test Pit Four:
- 0 to -1.0 feet: Topsoil and forest debris.
- -1.0 to -2.4 feet: Yellow brown pebbly sand.
- -2.4 to -7.4 feet: Gray sandy gravel becoming cemented below 6 feet, weathered subglacial till.

Test Pit Five:
- 0 to -0.6 feet: Topsoil and forest debris.
- -0.6 to -3.6 feet: Yellow brown pebbly sand.
- -3.6 to -7.6 feet: Gray weathered subglacial till, becoming dense below 5 feet.
## Test Pit Logs
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### Test Pit Six:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.9 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.9 to -2.3 feet</td>
<td>Reddish brown slightly silty pebbly sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.3 to -7.5 feet</td>
<td>Gray sandy gravel becoming cemented below 7 feet, weathered subglacial till. Seepage at 7.1 feet at an estimated rate of 2 gallons per minute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Pit Seven:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.9 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.9 to -2.7 feet</td>
<td>Reddish brown pebbly sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.7 to -8.0 feet</td>
<td>Gray silty gravelly sand and gravelly sands, some cementing, weathered subglacial till.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Pit Eight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.9 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.9 to -1.6 feet</td>
<td>Reddish brown pebbly sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.6 to -8.0 feet</td>
<td>Gray weathered till.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Pit Nine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.8 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.8 to -1.7 feet</td>
<td>Yellow brown pebbly sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.7 to -8.0 feet</td>
<td>Gray silty sandy gravels and gravelly sands, some cementing, weathered subglacial till.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Pit Ten:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.8 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and sod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.8 to -3.3 feet</td>
<td>Reddish brown pebbly sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.3 to -9.0 feet</td>
<td>Gray sandy gravels weakly cemented, weathered subglacial till.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Pit Logs
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Test Pit Eleven:
0 to -0.5 feet  Topsoil.
-0.5 to -2.1 feet Reddish brown pebbly sand.
-2.1 to -7.1 feet Gray sandy gravels becoming
cemented below 5 feet, weathered
subglacial till.

Test Pit Twelve:
0 to -0.3 feet Forest debris.
-0.3 to -2.3 feet Yellow brown slightly silty
pebbly sand.
-2.3 to -4.2 feet Gray pebbly sand, iron stained at
the bottom with some seepage.
-4.2 to -5.5 feet Very dense gray subglacial till.

Test Pit Thirteen:
0 to -0.6 feet Topsoil and forest debris.
-0.6 to -3.3 feet Yellow brown silty pebbly sand.
-3.3 to -5.8 feet Very dense gray subglacial till.
   Slight seepage at -3.3 feet.

Test Pit Fourteen:
0 to -0.6 feet Topsoil and forest debris.
-0.6 to -4.0 feet Light brown pebbly slightly silty
   sand. Moist bottom foot.
-4.0 to -5.2 feet Very dense gray subglacial till.

Test Pit Fifteen:
0 to -0.9 feet Topsoil and forest debris.
-0.9 to -3.0 feet Reddish brown pebbly slightly silty
   sand.
-3.0 to -9.1 feet Gray weathered subglacial till,
becoming moist below 8 feet.
Test Pit Logs
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Test Pit Sixteen:
0 to -0.7 feet
-0.7 to -3.3 feet
-3.3 to -5.9 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Moist silty pebbly reddish brown sand.
Weathered till becoming very dense below four feet. Some seepage at -3.3 feet.

Test Pit Seventeen:
0 to -1.4 feet
-1.4 to -3.1 feet
-3.1 to -4.0 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Saturated pebbly silty sand.
Very dense subglacial till.
Seepage at -3.1 feet.

Test Pit Eighteen:
0 to -0.8 feet
-0.8 to -3.2 feet
-3.2 to -6.9 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Yellow brown pebbly sand.
Gray subglacial till, weathered in upper few feet becoming dense with depth.

Test Pit Nineteen:
0 to -0.6 feet
-0.6 to -3.5 feet
-3.5 to -4.0 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Gray pebbly sand.
Gray very dense subglacial till.

Test Pit Twenty:
0 to -0.8 feet
-0.8 to -3.8 feet
-3.8 to -5.0 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Light brown pebbly silty sand.
Gray subglacial till, weathered on surface, becoming denser with depth. Seepage at -3.8 feet.

Test Pit Twenty One:
0 to -0.7 feet
-0.7 to -3.2 feet
-3.2 to -5.0 feet
Topsoil and forest debris.
Moist/saturated yellow brown pebbly silt.
Gray subglacial till, weathered on surface, becoming denser with depth. Fast seepage at -3.2 feet.
Test Pit Logs
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Test Pit Twenty Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Interval</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -2.5 feet</td>
<td>Reddish brown cobbly pebbly sand with large cobbles at bottom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.5 to -7.0 feet</td>
<td>Dense gravelly coarse sands with few fines. Moist/saturated at bottom with seepage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Pit Twenty Three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Interval</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -0.5 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5 to -2.2 feet</td>
<td>Brown gravelly sand with cobbles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.2 to -5.2 feet</td>
<td>Gray sand under coarse gravelly sands. Bottom of test pit was firm-dense. Flow of ground water below 4.5 feet at a estimated rate of 3 gallons per minute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Pit Twenty Four:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth Interval</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to -1.0 feet</td>
<td>Topsoil and forest debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0 to -2.5 feet</td>
<td>Saturated yellow brown silty sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.5 to -4.0 feet</td>
<td>Gray slightly silty pebbly sand. Rapid inflow of ground water below -2.5 feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 25, 1996

Gary Larson
North Thurston School District Number 3
620 Sleater Kinney Road NE
Olympia, Washington 98506

RE: Proposed High School
60-65 acres m/l Marvin Road NE

Dear Mr. Larson:

This letter is in response to the public notice posted along Marvin Road N.E. between 44th Avenue NE and 40th Court NE soliciting comments, questions and concerns regarding the above referenced proposed high school. We would like these questions addressed during the public meeting on April 30, 1996. We would also like minutes of the public meeting addressing our concerns mailed to the address below as well as any other documentation available as soon as possible after the meeting.

Our questions and concerns are as follows:

1) What data and statistics are being used to justify the need for a high school in the area directly outside the Lacey Urban Growth area?

2) Why is the NTSD acquiring property outside the Lacey Growth area when there are already three proposed sites available inside the Hawks Prairie Lacey Growth area?

3) What is the permit that you are basing the SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance on? Determination of Non-significance does not stand alone without a permit.

4) What are your intentions for supplying water and sewer for the proposed high school if it cannot be provided by the City of Lacey as the proposed project is outside the Lacey Growth area?
5) How does the proposed high school affect our local water table and supply?

6) What improvements to Marvin Road are scheduled to be done?

7) Where will those improvements begin and end along Marvin Road?

8) Is the NTSD aware that building permits are not being issued in the Hawks Prairie Lacey Growth area until the I-5 Marvin interchange improvements are completed?

9) Does the NTSD intend to apply for annexation to the City of Lacey? What would this mean in terms of a possible LID to the NTSD?

10) What is the time frame before building is scheduled to begin?

11) What is to be done about storm water run off and the effects it will have on surrounding well systems?

12) Has the NTSD conducted a traffic model and projected the effects of the project on local residences?

13) According to the memo sent April 18, 1998 to adjacent property owners, the NTSD has determined that the "project does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment." What is your definition of "probable?" What would be the specific adverse impacts for this project?

14) Why did the NTSD choose only to notify property owners directly adjacent to the property being considered? Why not the entire subdivisions adjoining the property, such as Prairie Ridge Subdivisions 1, 2, and 3?

Thank you for addressing these questions in the upcoming meeting. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Dennis and Robin Jones
7032 44th Avenue NE
Olympia, WA 98516
360-923-9001
CONSTRUCTION
APR 29 1996

DESIGN

7232 40th Court N.E.
Olympia, Washington 98516
April 27, 1996

Gary Larson, P.E.
Director, Construction/Design
North Thurston School District
305 College Street N.E.
Lacey, Washington 98516

Dear Mr. Larson:

RE: North Thurston School District Land Acquisition

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed acquisition of property for a future North Thurston High School. While it is impossible to attend the April 30 meeting because of prior scheduled events, we want our comments entered into the record.

We own 2 acres along the southern boundary of the proposed site. (See highlighted map.) Your "Determination of Nonsignificance" is not at all insignificant to us. The area in which we and 15 other families live has a distinctly rural feeling. We purchased our property specifically because it is at the end of the road and some distance from our neighbors. It is quiet and different than the usual suburban developments of high density housing. The trees and landscaping create a peaceful scene. While we were aware of the close proximity of our house to the boundary line when we purchased the property, we hope to retain the beauty and serenity of our location through good communication with the owners of the land next to us as a development plan is created. You are invited to come and observe our site, so that you may see what we mean.

Here are our comments on the Environmental Checklist:

2. a. Types of emissions resulting from the proposal: You do not indicate the anticipated emissions from the roughly 400-500 automobiles and school buses traveling to and fro twice a day, 5+ days a week; 9-10 months out of the year. Considering the level of traffic now, this is a significant increase.

3. a.2) Will there be any work over, in, or adjacent to the wetland? According to the enclosed drawing, the wet area is in the center of the property. It seems it would be a challenge to avoid this area entirely as you state. We, also, wonder why the wet area that runs from the proposed site onto our property is not indicated on the map?

3. a.4) Would the diversion of surface drainage water increase the water flowing through our seasonal creek?

4. d. You indicate that buffer zones along residential property are anticipated. Specifically how wide do you plan those zones to be? We are very concerned about this because it is the only thing that will preserve our lifestyle and allow us to retain privacy and protection from bright lights, noise and other intrusions created by a school site.
4. d. Continued:

We noticed that the District clear cut the Komachin site several years ago. The buffer left was very thin and, in our opinion, would be totally inadequate here. Location of that school completely altered the surrounding area. We would not want that to occur here!

6. a. Regarding energy sources. We would hope that with rapidly advancing technology, the school district would leave options open for solar or other forms of clean energy.

7. a. Environmental health hazards. High schools typically have chemistry, physics and photography laboratories, all of which contain potentially dangerous chemicals. While infrequent, toxic chemical vapors, fires, etc. do occur as laboratory accidents.

7. b.2) You indicate that “normal school activity type of noise” will occur. Since we live in a relatively “rural”, quiet area, noise from a school this size would be anything but normal! It is crucial that planning is done to minimize the effect of this noise on the neighbors. Your plan to mitigate this is “planting or leaving greenbelt buffer zones”. We do not see “planting” as a good option, because of the time it takes them to grow. Leaving the existing small brush and mid-size trees is critical to us.

8. l. The number of people working in the completed project is shown at 150. This is misleading. While that is the approximate number of school district employees, there will also be 1200+ students there 9-10 months out of the year; a considerable difference!

10. b. While not pertaining to us, some residents along Marvin Road do have a view of Mt. Rainier. It may be beneficial to check with residents of 44th Court for any impact.

11. a. Will this high school have a lighted athletic field? A stadium? Most do. We are concerned about the negative impact particularly during the football season, not only of the lights, but the added noise, automobiles, etc. created by large numbers of spectators. You indicate providing a recreational site for many activities. This emphasizes the need to leave a wide buffer of existing trees and brush to shield us.

14. f. While the number of vehicular trips may not be at the peak work force travel time, many workers do leave their residences around 7 am, thus creating an impact. A backlog of traffic will result on a two lane road, especially one that is a major connection with Interstate 5.

We would be against any attempt by the City of Lacey to charge landowners such as ourselves for road improvements for developments we have not sought and would prefer to avoid. We would oppose any move to include our area into the City of Lacey.

15. a. Impact of the school on police manpower would be significant. There are currently few patrol cars in this area. With the large number of residences and a 1200
student school planned for this area, there will be a large requirement for police surveillance. The same is true for aid cars, fire protection, etc.

Concerning the evaluation of soil conditions:

We would like to know why there are no test holes near the center of the southern boundary, which is nearest our property?

The wetland mapping indicates that it failed to identify any wetland or stream area within or immediately adjacent to the project site, and then, later in the report proceeds to identify the wetland area as being in the center of the property. Why is this? The report also failed to mention at all the wetland area that drains into our property! We do not want to see the seasonal creek we enjoy damaged by development of this property.

An additional concern, that we are sure is shared by our neighbors, is that of keeping our property in Thurston County instead of the City of Lacey. While we understand that is not in your jurisdiction, it is an important consideration, since Lacey water, sewer, police, etc. will be serving the school.

In summary, our major concern is retaining the privacy and life style enjoyed by the families in our area. We want a wide buffer of natural plants and trees left so that the school facilities are not visible to us. This will help minimize the effects of lights and noise from usual traffic and sporting events, etc. and keep the student population from our back fence. We want to work with the school district to achieve a plan satisfactory to all of us.

We anticipate hearing from you soon. Thank you for reviewing our comments.

Sincerely,

Thelma I. Mosebar

Robert S. Mosebar
TO: Adjacent Property Owners

North Thurston School District #3

RE: Site acquisition of approximately 60- to 65-acre parcel of land located on the East 65 acres of that part of the South half of the Northeast quarter of Section 34, Township 19N, Range 1WWM, EXCEPTING therefrom the South 61 feet

DATE: April 18, 1996

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The North Thurston School District #3, as Lead Agency, has determined that the above referenced project does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. This decision was made after evaluation of a completed Environmental Checklist and other information on file with the North Thurston School District. This information is available for your review, upon request.

We are accepting written comments before May 3, 1996, for reconsideration of the proposed "Determination of Nonsignificance". An informal public work session is scheduled for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 30, in the Bower Center at 620 Sleater-Kinney Road NE, Lacey, Washington.

Please contact Gary Larson at (360) 412-4500 for additional information and/or questions.

nw
attachment: vicinity map

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES - EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES
April 30, 1996

TO: Gary Larson, Director, Construction and Design
North Thurston School District #3
305 College Street N.E.
Lacey, WA 98516

RE: Land Acquisition and Environmental Impact Statement of 4/18/96 of land parcel on the East
65 acres of that part of the South half of the Northeast quarter of Section 34, Township
19N, Range IWWM.
"Determination of Nonsignificance"

As an adjacent property owner, I must take issue with the District's intent to acquire the above
property for purposes of developing a high school, while minimizing the probable impact on the
environment and the surrounding community. I also have a concern that very few persons in the
area have been properly informed by the District, which appears to be in a rush to make this
acquisition that will indeed drastically change the community.

The Environmental Impact Statement is neither accurate nor complete, regardless of the statement
of the person who signed it. Sections which are poorly addressed include:

2. Air
c. After construction phase, atmospheric changes from clearcutting,
deisel fuel from buses, exhaust fumes from vehicles

3. Water
a. Surface
   (1) Wetlands on the acreage, as reported by Watershed Dynamics, Inc.,
       4/17/96
   (2) not addressed
   (3) not addressed
b. Ground
   (2) number of humans the system will serve, not addressed
      What City? What sewer? Not a part of a city, nor is it served by a
      sewer.

4. Plants
a. Wet soil plants (14 species), as reported by Watershed Dynamics, Inc.
   4/16/96

5. Animals
c. The site is indeed part of a migration route for birds.

7. Environmental Health
a. Deisel fumes from buses, exhaust fumes from all other vehicles.
b. Noise
   (2) Long term high noise activity:
      school, community and sports activities, both indoors and outdoors,
      weekdays and weekends daytime and evenings;
      high levels of increased vehicle traffic.
   (3) Greenbelt buffer zones are inadequate to mitigate loud noise.
8. Land and Shoreline Use
   g. This site is part of the Henderson Inlet Watershed Drainage Area, ignored by the report.
   h. Contains a wetland area.
   i. plus 1500 students

14. Transportation
   f. Inaccurate. Normal high school traffic patterns begin during peak traffic periods and continue throughout the day and evening. Traffic on Marvin Road and vicinity would be drastically impacted by the 400 or so vehicles as reported in section 14, plus evening and weekend traffic for sporting and community activities.
   g. not addressed

15. Public Services
   a. The assumption that existing police and fire protection would be adequate is unrealistic and obviously not researched.

16. Utilities
   Poorly researched. Does the District have an agreement with the city of Lacey to receive water and sewage services outside of the city?

Since the above considered property is currently zoned for one single family residence per five acres, I would consider a single usage permit for a high school complex to be drastically different to the intended use, and definitely detrimental to the nature of the surrounding community.

Rather than for the District to consider clearcutting 50 acres of existing woodland, I would suggest negotiations with the owners of the property on the east of Marvin Road, which is already clearcut with some of the land designated for schools.

Thank you for considering my views and those of my neighbors.

Fran Gorton
7433 44th Avenue NE
Olympia, WA 98516

cc North Thurston School Board
Mr. and Mrs. Bob Drohman
TO: Bob Drohman, Gary Larson, David Steele

FROM: Thelma Mosebar

DATE: October 28, 1997

RE: Proposed Road

The purpose of our meeting is to discuss solutions that can meet all of our needs.

Mr. Drohman needs a road.

The school district has a fairly long time frame before they will be ready to plan and build the proposed high school. But, looking to the future the district may save money and also demonstrate that they have an interest in maintaining good PR with residents. They would have access to the back of the school via a road.

We (and our neighbors) need to preserve the rural atmosphere in our community as much as possible in the face of all the development in the area, which will undermine the quality of our life. The proposed road impacts us, the Mosebars, and one other neighbor the most because our homes are positioned so close to the boundary line. However, two others have expressed keen interest in the issue. We need to buffer ourselves from the noise, cars, lights and intrusion of the public’s eyes to preserve the nature of our property.

Possible solutions:

Create a green belt/buffer zone of natural brush and trees by:

1. NTSD and the Drohmans trading 61” of right away such that a natural buffer is left between the boundary line and the proposed road

2. NTSD and the Drohmans trade only the width needed to provide the green belt/buffer zone called for during the hearings to acquire the property.

In either case the result is that the buffer would benefit the neighborhood. It would fulfill the school district’s promise of providing a buffer to insulate the neighborhood from cars, school lights, noise, and students without having to plant lawn and trees. (The natural foliage would be substantial by the time the school is built.) And, the road would be directly adjacent to the proposed school for ease of access instead of on the south side of the buffer. The road would also provide access to the new development being created.

The buffer would be esthetically pleasing to drivers by maintaining the rural atmosphere. Moving the road north would minimize noise and cause less impact on the wetlands that drain into our property. An unsightly fill and culvert in the road bed would not be as visible to us.
Board of Directors  
North Thurston School District  
Administrative Offices  
Lacey, Washington 98506  

Dear Directors:

RE: 65 Acre Property Acquisition off Marvin Road

I am aware that the Board will consider whether or not to purchase the Marvin Road property this evening. We are a strong supporter of quality schools and appreciate the long term planning schools have to do to ensure adequate acreage and location for the residential areas sure to come.

We want to be sure the Board is aware of the expectations of neighbors immediately adjacent to the property, if this property becomes a high school site. These are topics of concern:

- We expect the school to develop the property in a way that retains the rural feeling of our area. Lots range in size from 1-5 acres. Most of us specifically live here to avoid the usual suburban type of development. Our 2 acre parcel lies on the southern border of the proposed site. The location is beautifully landscaped and quiet.

- Adequate natural boundaries to shield our property from the field lights, noises, potential students' trespassing (cigarette breaks, etc.), cars, etc. that will occur. After pacing it off, at least 100 feet would be needed. To clear cut and replant is not acceptable. There are tall firs and alders there, thick underbrush and wet areas that will shield us far better than a planted green belt. Students would not cross a thick, natural boundary as easily.

- We do not want our property annexed to the City of Lacey even though the school district plans to petition Lacey to annex for water, sewer, etc.

- We expect to be fully informed, when the time comes, concerning environmental impacts. We felt the study done so far was rather cursory and minimized a number of issues a school of this size will impact. There is a significant wet area on our boundary, for example, that aerial reconnaissance missed. Exact information will go a long way to enhance community trust.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. You can reach me at 360-459-0728.

Sincerely,

Thelma Mosebar
DESCRIPTION:
THE SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, W.M. EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EAST 30 FEET, THE WEST 452.05 FEET, AND THE SOUTH 51 FEET.
Dear Bob:

We appreciate that you have been keeping the neighborhood informed of the potential road just north of our property line.

My husband, Bob, and I are very concerned about having a county road exactly against our line fence. As you know, our home sits very close to the fence. The lights, road noise, etc. will be very noticeable in our primary living areas which face the fence, i.e. family room, kitchen, computer room and master bedroom. And secondly, but of no less importance, is that the road will detract from the esthetics of our landscaped, two acre property.

When the school district held hearings about purchasing the 65 acre tract, I, and others, spoke at some length about the importance of maintaining the rural atmosphere of our neighborhood, since we obviously chose to live here because it was not developed. The school district appeared very sincere in describing the intent to provide our neighborhood with a “buffer” of trees, etc. to shield us from the lights and activity of a large high school. They are interested in being good neighbors and creating good will. So, with some relief, we thought we could avoid large scale development for just a few years more.

You had indicated your plan to develop some property to the west of us, and using 44th and other routes for access. We were aware that you held an easement across the North Thurston School District Property, but did not realize it would be turned into a county road; certainly, not so soon.

So, with all this in mind. You need a road, we need to maintain some type of privacy and rural atmosphere, and the school district eventually needs a road, but also needs to maintain good will and its intent to provide a “buffer” for our neighborhood.

I am writing to request that the three parties, Drohman Developing, the North Thurston School District, and the Mosebars, work together to come up with something that addresses the needs of all of us in the best possible way. Possibly, the road right of way can be shifted to the north and leave a buffer between the road and our fence. There are some wetlands that lie next to our fence that could perhaps be accommodated into some type of design. Or, could the road be built off center to leave at least a fringe of protection? Since I am not well acquainted with development standards and the possibilities like you and Gary Larson from the school district, I would invite us to brainstorm together for a workable solution.

Thank you for your willingness to discuss and act on this. I am very hopeful that a creative, mutually beneficial solution can be reached.

Sincerely,

Thelma Mosebar
360-459-0728 or rmosebar@cco.net

cc: Gary Larson, Director of Construction & Design, North Thurston School District
May 16, 1996

School Board Members
North Thurston School District
305 College Street NE
Lacey, WA 98506

Subject: Possible Purchase of a Site West of Marvin Road NE for a Future High School

Dear Board Members:

During the Thurston Regional Planning Council's (TRPC) May 3 meeting, Regional Council members briefly discussed a newspaper article that had appeared in The Olympian the previous day. The article described your proposal to buy land west of Marvin Road NE for a future high school. Because the site is outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), members had some concerns about implications for regional growth and service delivery. They also wondered about implications for the District if the property is purchased, but the UGB is not moved later to include the site.

After the TRPC meeting, I spoke with Superintendent Steele to learn more about the process you have gone through so far in considering future sites, and the factors important to the school district. He has offered to attend TRPC's June 7, 1996 meeting to share this information with the Regional Council. We appreciate this opportunity for dialogue. Our aim is to understand your needs and process, and to further develop common understanding about factors important in considering any change to the UGB.

TRPC has three areas of responsibility relevant to your proposal. First, as you may know, under the Growth Management Act (GMA) the County Commission makes final decisions on UGBs. As part of that process, under countywide policies adopted by the county and cities in 1992, TRPC is responsible for reviewing proposed boundary changes in relation to contiguous and orderly urban development, and the capacity for provision of necessary urban services. TRPC then provides comments to the County Commission before final action is taken. Such TRPC review and comment occurred regularly during 1993 and 1994, when most work was done by cities and the county in initially meeting Growth Management act requirements.
School Board Members
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Second, TRPC's transportation responsibilities relate to where and how urban growth occurs. As the Federal and State-designated regional transportation planning organization, TRPC adopts a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and certifies local jurisdiction transportation plans, for consistency with the RTP. Those plans provide the basis for approving funding for transportation projects of regional significance, and for prioritizing project proposals for funding consideration/competition at the State level.

Finally, in broader terms, TRPC's mission is to "Provide visionary leadership on regional plans, policies and issues." Part of that is building intergovernmental consensus on regional issues and advocating local implementation. While you are probably familiar with our mission and functions statement, a copy is enclosed for your reference.

Because you have been so far-sighted in your planning for the future, we understand that any requests for expansion of the UGB and annexation would be years away. We also understand that the District has not yet made a final decision about the Marvin Road site. Your open, public exploration of this site gives the community, affected jurisdictions and appropriate interjurisdictional agencies such as TRPC the opportunity to analyze potential effects before irrevocable commitments have been made.

We look forward to talking with Dr. Steele at the June 7 TRPC meeting.

Sincerely,

Judy Wilson, Chair
Thurston Regional Planning Council

Enclosure

cc: TRPC Members
Dr. David Steele, Superintendent, North Thurston School District
Harold Robertson, Executive Director, Thurston Regional Planning Council
THURSTON REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MISSION AND FUNCTIONS

The Thurston Regional Planning Council is a 14-member intergovernmental body, comprised of the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, Tenino, Tumwater, and Yelm; the Towns of Bucoda and Rainier; Thurston County government; Intercity Transit; the Port of Olympia; the Griffin, Tumwater and Yelm School Districts; and the Washington State Capitol Committee.

Our Mission is to:

Provide Visionary Leadership on Regional Plans, Policies and Issues.

Our Primary Functions are to:

1. Develop regional plans and policies for transportation (as the federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization and state recognized Regional Transportation Planning Organization), growth management, environmental quality and other topics determined by the Council;

2. Provide data and analysis to support local and regional decision making;

3. Build community consensus on regional issues, through information and citizen involvement;

4. Build intergovernmental consensus on regional plans, policies and issues, and advocate local implementation; and

5. Provide planning and technical services on a contractual basis.

Today, over 190,000 people live in Thurston County. Over the next twenty years, we are expecting 96,000 new residents. Growth presents our community with a combination of risk and opportunity. Our environmental quality, economic well-being and preferred lifestyles are at stake.
Local governments continually make important decisions that help shape our future. Each jurisdiction or agency has some responsibility for balancing human use and the natural environment; for guiding development of compact, thriving urban areas, surrounded by rural countryside; for enabling an efficient and balanced transportation system; for promoting sustainable economic prosperity; for helping assure housing for all economic segments of the community; and for providing essential public facilities and services.

A strong community consensus about our choices for the future must be forged and kept alive. Local governments must cooperate to achieve that future--one agency cannot do it alone. But many crucial issues are regional in nature; they relate to the responsibilities and authorities of many jurisdictions. Such issues are best addressed through a "community of jurisdictions". The Thurston Regional Planning Council fills this role.

Members of the Thurston Regional Planning Council have dedicated themselves to a new mission of visionary leadership: Taking a long-term perspective. Considering the broad public interest. Helping people to decide what they want their future to be. Bringing together citizens and their governments in pursuit of that future. Promoting awareness of our interdependence and advocating cooperative action. Being the advocate for future generations.

Thurston Regional Planning Council:

Visionary Leadership on Regional Plans, Policies and Issues.

December 11, 1992, Revised March, 1994
Population figures updated April, 1995.
MINUTES

Thurston Regional Planning Council
Friday, June 7, 1996 - 8:30 a.m.
Conference Rooms A and B, Second Floor
2404 Heritage Court, S.W. #B
Olympia, Washington 98502-6031

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m by Chair Judy Wilson. The Chair welcomed Mr. Reggie Wells, Vice Chairman, Nisqually Indian Tribe, as a new member to the Regional Council.

Members present:

City of Lacey: Councilmember Bill Bush
City of Olympia: Councilmember Mark Foutch
City of Tenino: Mayor Steve Lycan
                    (rep. Councilmember Pettit)
City of Tumwater: Councilmember Chris Parsons/
                   Mr. Michael Matlock
City of Yelm: Mayor Kathryn Wolf
Intercity Transit: Mr. Ken Back
Nisqually Indian Tribe: Mr. Reggie Wells
Olympia School District Ms. Mary Farrington
Port of Olympia: Port Comm. Robert Van Schoorl
Thurston County: Commissioner Judy Wilson
Tumwater School District: Mr. Jim Brown
Yelm Community Schools: Mr. John Thomson (rep. Mr. Carpenter)

Members absent:

Griffin School District: Mr. Keith Clark
State Capitol Committee: Ms. Mary Alice Grobins
Town of Bucoda
Town of Rainier: Councilmember Dennis McVey

The Evergreen State College: Ms. Carolyn Dobbs
Charter Member Emeritus
Guests/Observers:

Mr. Joseph Bourgeois,
Tumwater Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Steve Cato,
Moss Bay Consulting Partnership

Mr. Roger Dean, Intercity Transit

Mr. Jay Eaton, City of Tumwater

Mr. Stefan Fabian-Marks, Intercity Transit

Mr. Jeff Greene, North Thurston
School District

Mr. Martin Hoppe, City of Lacey

Ms. Thelma Jackson, North Thurston
School District Board

Mr. Pete Kerl, North Thurston School District

Ms. Jackie Ketman, Thurston County

Mr. Gary Larson, North Thurston
School District

Mr. Jerry Litt, City of Lacey

Mr. Subir Mukerjee, City of Olympia

Ms. Barbara Roder

Ms. Lynn Scroggins, Nisqually Indian Tribe

Dr. David Steele, North Thurston
School District

Staff present:

Ms. Black, Ms. Dorian, Mr. Robertson,
Ms. Boileau

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

3. Approval of Minutes

The May 3, 1996 minutes were approved as presented.

4. Public Comment Period - None

(Mayor Wolf joined the Regional Council meeting.)
5. **High School Site, North Thurston School District (NTSD)**

Dr. David Steele, Superintendent, NTSD, advised that Chair Wilson had called him to advise that the Regional Council had expressed concern at the May 3 meeting over the school district's proposed purchase of a high school site in the Hawks Prairie area that is outside the Urban Growth Management boundary. Dr. Steele advised that the NTSD staff and the President of the School District Board would present background information and an overview of the site acquisition.

Dr. Steele advised that the NTSD has developed a long-range plan for the school district, which is the largest in the county with 13,000 students. The NTSD has been very active in its quest for school sites because Lacey, and more particularly the North Thurston portion of the county, is predicted to grow dramatically. The school district has been looking for a high school site in the Hawks Prairie area for many years. An important criterion is to have at least 60 acres to provide a buffer between the school and the surrounding neighbors and to meet stormwater management guidelines.

One of the main issues is the Hawks Prairie interchange. All development has been placed on hold until work occurs on the interchange. Lacey has expressed the hope that they will have a ULID by December for an overpass. Growth will be dramatic in the area once the overpass is constructed. The NTSD has tentative plans for four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. The high school site is across the street from the Urban Growth Management boundary and costs $1 million. The cost of a site inside the boundary is between $4 to $6 million.

Dr. Steele advised of the concern that was expressed that the boundary was violated; however, he noted that the high school may not even go to the drawing board for at least six to ten years. The school district is aware that they will need to make other choices if the boundary line does not change. Therefore, the school district is exploring other options for high school sites. He advised that the largest growth at present is from the Yelm Highway area. He noted that because the school district could double in size over the next 10-15 years, they need to be prepared to meet development by planning well in advance.

Mr. Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services, advised that when the school district first considered the Hawks Prairie site, he and Ms. Matlock met with representatives from Lacey, the County, and the Regional Council's Executive Director, to learn what the process would be if the school district purchased a site outside the Urban Growth Management boundary. The representatives raised several issues of concern (e.g., sewer lines) and offered suggestions for property inside the boundary.
They were advised of the Comprehensive Plans for Lacey and the County and the process that would be required of the school district to petition for a boundary change.

Mr. Gary Larson, Director of Construction and Design, advised that when the school district expressed interest in purchasing the site, the SEPA process was followed. All the adjacent property owners were notified of the school district's intent to purchase the 62.1 acres as a future high school site. They followed the SEPA check list by circulating the document in accordance with the regulations and held an informal public hearing on April 30, which was attended by 24-30 people. Concerns were expressed over the issues of traffic, provision of buffer zones, etc. The Board was apprised of the public's concerns. Geotechnical work was undertaken during the time that the NTSD had an Intent to Purchase Agreement with the property owner. Flooding was observed during the month of February. A wetland biologist did field reconnaissance, and it has been determined that one acre of the 62 acres has been identified as a potential wetland.

Mr. Jeff Greene, Planning Specialist, advised of the three major communities that are planned in the area of the high school site: Meridian Campus, Hawks Prairie, and Woodland Green. It is projected that the three developments will generate more than 700 high school students. The zoning in Lacey's adopted Comprehensive Plan supports more than 1,200 high school students in the urban growth area. The NTSD's policy is 1,250 students per high school. Therefore, the school district is supportive of locating a high school north of the freeway and east of Carpenter Road. Mr. Greene advised of the process used to develop the growth projections and future student counts. If accurate, the NTSD will need two new high schools, eight elementary schools, and two middle schools by 2015. Another study by the state shows that an additional high school will be needed between 2005 and 2010. Because of the three major proposed developments and the large State Farm and Intel installations in Dupont on the north side of the Nisqually River, there could be a dramatic increase in the population. The school district needs to be prepared to provide the school facilities to serve the area.

(Port Comm. Van Schoorl joined the Regional Council meeting following Mr. Greene's presentation.)

Dr. Steele noted that the demographics of North Thurston will change dramatically because many of the employees of the new businesses in Dupont will purchase homes in the Lacey area.
Ms. Thelma Jackson, President of the Board, NTSD, advised that in accordance with State requirements, the school district cannot proceed with school construction plans until 85 percent of the students are physically present. This is the reason why new schools open on the first day with portables. By the time the school is built, the student population has exceeded the projections. This presents a dilemma for the school district because construction takes between two to three years. Another factor is that the school district cannot predict where growth will occur.

Ms. Jackson advised that the school board became very concerned three to four years ago when it was learned that all school district property had either been built out or no longer would serve the purposes anticipated when purchased as potential sites. Therefore, the Board directed staff to be very aggressive in searching for parcels of land of specific acreage in an attempt to be as visionary as possible. She assured the Regional Council that the school district has undergone a very long and deliberate process in the purchase of the high school site. She noted that nothing may happen for the next 15-20 years; however, if the proposed developments occur as a result of the interchange construction, this could change dramatically. The school district is trying to position itself to be ready to provide the best possible educational program for the students in the community.

Ms. Farrington confirmed Ms. Jackson’s statement over the state mandate that a school district cannot build until the students are physically present. She advised that the schools in Olympia have been overfilled by the time they open.

Councilmember Foutch observed that he appreciated having the opportunity to learn about some of the drivers behind the potential expansion of the urban growth boundary and the considerations that Lacey and the County will face at the appropriate time. He feels they are lucky that it is a school district considering such a proposal. Councilmember Foutch noted that North Thurston had many issues to address with the projected population increases. He offered that they are doing a good job of planning.

Councilmember Foutch advised that the urban growth boundary was established in 1988 to preserve the natural, agricultural, and forest lands in order to produce a compact growth pattern and to provide an efficient use of the land and delivery of urban services to reduce urban sprawl. A tertiary objective of the Growth Management Act was that growth would move into areas that were economically disadvantaged as the costs of growth became more expensive within the growth area. Any commercial developer would feel that it is less expensive to buy property that is outside the urban growth boundary than to meet the community’s growth goals and buy land inside the boundary that is more expensive. The Growth Management Act has forced the community to
consider the tradeoffs. Councilmember Foutch noted that the school district has raised the possibility that the growth boundary may be expanded in a specific area, in a specific way, by a specific amount. He expressed his appreciation for the school district’s presentation and response to the Regional Council’s concerns.

Dr. Steele expressed appreciation to the Regional Council for giving them the opportunity to present the reasons for the school district’s purchase of the high school site.

6. **Use of Excess Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds**

Ms. Black reviewed the background information and the issues outlined in the May 31, 1996 memorandum. She advised that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed the issue and considered the two options on Monday. The Committee focused on the issue of intent, noting that it was difficult to define on such short notice. They cast five votes in favor of the second option and two votes in favor of the first option. The Policy Board met on Wednesday morning and focused more on the policy implications. The Board pointed out that the process needs to have flexibility and be responsive to jurisdictional needs, having the ability to accommodate changes between the time of drafting the project and implementation. The Board also noted that there was an inadequate amount of time to consider the long-term implications. A question was raised as to whether this was the appropriate time to change policy; this decision relates directly to the integrity of the current funding process. The Policy Board voted in favor of the second option and acknowledged that the issue should be addressed during the next funding process, allowing adequate time to address the implications.

Councilmember Bush moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council require that excess regional STP funds be returned to the STP pool and reallocated in the next competitive process; Mr. Thomson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Foutch felt that the issue had raised a policy question on the importance of how excess funds would be expended by a jurisdiction that saved the money versus a project of another jurisdiction that is high on the priority list. Another issue is whether they are "demotivating" jurisdictions to look for the most efficient ways to use their STP funds if they decide to require that excess STP funds be returned for reallocation. Councilmember Foutch noted also the recommendation from the TAC and the Board in support of the second option.
Councilmember Parsons advised that Tumwater is just starting the project work and has come before them to advise of the potential of excess funds. When Tumwater evaluated the project alternatives within the original scope of work, lighting was identified as an important factor for aesthetic and safety reasons; another was to complete a half mile of road instead of a quarter mile. However, she advised that Tumwater was willing to withdraw its request. In order to form a policy direction for the future, Councilmember Parsons recommended that the issue be addressed from the standpoint of incentives to be offered to a jurisdiction to do the best job within the original scope of work to save money.

Mr. Eaton reiterated that work on the project has not yet begun and that Tumwater is exploring the options because they feel that there will be excess funds. Tumwater is considering other alternatives to enhance the project, proposed to be completed by the end of August 1996.

The motion carried; two members voted against the motion.

7. TRPC Strategic Planning Questionnaire

Mr. Robertson provided background information and referenced the draft questionnaire that was sent to the members in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Cato was invited to join the meeting to facilitate the Regional Council’s review of the questionnaire and discussion of the survey.

Port Comm. Van Schoorl spoke in support of the draft questionnaire as a starting point for the strategic planning process.

Chair Wilson offered that a person may have difficulty responding to the questions if they are not familiar with the Regional Council. Mr. Cato stated that it was his understanding that background information on the Regional Council would be sent in advance of the questionnaire for the purpose of advising the people on the list to anticipate the questionnaire. The members discussed whether it would be advisable to send the background information, noting that it may act as a prompt when responding to the questions or that it would not help them find out what people actually know about the Regional Council.

(Upon Councilmember Parsons’ departure, Mr. Michael Matlock represented the City of Tumwater.)
Councilmember Bush raised a concern over the complexity of responding to the questions on pages four through eight, noting that they may stifle any original responses. He recommended that the sixth question be revised to ask for ideas and to revise the following pages accordingly. He recommended that the respondent be given an opportunity to provide input by not limiting the space for a response. Otherwise, he felt that it would prejudice the Regional Council’s role. Councilmember Bush felt that emphasis should be placed on the respondent’s view of a regional planning organization rather than confining their remarks to the limitations of the list. Councilmember Foutch agreed that sufficient space should be provided for an essay response.

Chair Wilson recommended that a "should not be involved" response be added.

Port. Comm. Van Schoorl moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve the draft questionnaire in concept and move forward with the strategic planning process by sending the documents, with editorial revisions to questions 6 and 7; Councilmember Foutch seconded the motion.

Councilmember Bush moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council amend the motion to delete the instructions and the list on page five. The motion died for lack of a second.

The motion carried to approve the draft questionnaire in concept with editorial changes and to proceed with the strategic planning process; Councilmember Bush voted against the motion.

Mr. Thomson raised a concern that a person on the list from a small entity may forward the questionnaire to the member represented on the Regional Council with a request that the member respond to the questions. He noted that this would skew the responses if the member completed two questionnaires. Therefore, he suggested that there be one questionnaire for the Yelm School District.

The Regional Council reviewed the draft distribution list and offered several additions, as follows: the Thurston County Board of Realtors, the North Thurston School District, the Mayors of Tenino, Bucoda, Rainier, and Yelm (in addition to the Councilmembers); Yelm’s planner, the Rochester and Yelm Chambers of Commerce, prior Regional Council members, the jurisdictional park directors, the PUD, Tanglewild Parks District, Rochester Parks District, jurisdictional public works directors, members of "Leadership Thurston County" classes, a large scale developer, the Community Action Council, and a media retiree.
There was member agreement to send a letter and background information on the Regional Council to the revised list, in advance of the questionnaire. Mr. Robertson provided a draft of background information on the Regional Council.

8. **Upcoming Economic Summit**

Port Comm. Van Schoorl provided background information, advising that the Regional Council and *The Olympian* sponsored an economic development summit two years ago. It was recommended that there be an annual forum, with the Port taking the lead. He advised that it has been two years since the last summit and the Port proposes to host the event in late September/early October to address some of the community economic development issues. One of the key issues will be transportation, which will be timely with the Regional Transportation Plan update. Port Comm. Van Schoorl advised that the Port is seeking co-sponsors. The Thurston County Economic Development Council has agreed to be a co-sponsor. In a meeting with the Chair and the Executive Director, the Port indicated its desire that the Regional Council be a co-sponsor; *The Olympian* will be approached as well to be a co-sponsor. Port Comm. Van Schoorl advised that he would present a formal proposal at the July meeting by asking the Regional Council to co-sponsor the Economic Development forum in early fall.

9. **Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNRC)**

Port Comm. Van Schoorl moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve the draft letter to the Washington State Department of Transportation, recommending that the "Prairie Line" be dropped from further environmental review; Mayor Wolf seconded the motion.

Mr. Brown noted that Councilmember Pettit had outlined the reasons why Tenino did not support the Prairie Line going through Tenino. Mr. Robertson advised that the intent of her comments was included in the draft letter.

Chair Wilson recommended that "given up" in the last line of the second indented paragraph on page three be changed to "forfeited." She also recommended that a paragraph be added on the "Rails-to-Trails" issue, noting Tenino's investment in their park and the fact that the "Prairie Line" would go through the park. There was member agreement to a friendly amendment to add a statement that the City of Tenino does not support the proposal and to note that letters had been received from Tenino that they do not support the proposal.

The motion carried to accept the draft letter, as amended.
10. RESOLUTION 96-5, 1996-1998 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #2 and #3

Ms. Black reviewed the May 31, 1996 memorandum and advised that the amendments had not come before the Policy Board. She advised, however, that the Board had approved the projects for inclusion in the RTIP. She noted her intent to work around time constraints. The Regional Council's approval at this time would avoid further delay in the jurisdictions receiving their funds. She advised that Policy Board approval of projects in the future would include a recommendation to approve the accompanying RTIP amendment.

Councilmember Bush moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve Resolution 96-5 for RTIP Amendments #2 and #3, to include the revisions requested by Intercity Transit, Lacey, and Olympia, as outlined in the May 31, 1996 memorandum; Mr. Back seconded, and the motion carried.

11. Federal Functional Classification Changes

Ms. Black reviewed the May 31, 1996 memorandum and advised that the amendment had not come before the Policy Board due to a staff oversight. It was her understanding that this was an administrative issue.

Councilmember Bush moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve the proposed revisions to the Federal Functional Classification System, as described on the table attached to the May 31, 1996 memorandum; Port Comm. Van Schoorl seconded, and the motion carried.

12. RESOLUTION 96-4, Unified Planning Work Program Amendment #2

Councilmember Bush moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve Resolution 96-4, amending the Unified Planning Work Program to reflect the changes identified in the May 31, 1996 memorandum; Councilmember Foutch seconded, and the motion carried.

13. TRPC Alternate to the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) Transportation Policy Board

Port Comm. Van Schoorl moved that the Thurston Regional Planning Council appoint Councilmember Foutch as the Regional Council's alternate to the PSRC Transportation Policy Board; Mr. Thomson seconded the motion.
There was member agreement to amend the motion to appoint Council-member Foutch as alternate and Mr. Argersinger as second alternate.

The motion carried, as amended, to appoint Councilmember Foutch to serve as the Regional Council's alternate member and Mr. Argersinger as the second alternate to the PSRC Transportation Policy Board.

14. Exchange of Information

Mr. Robertson advised that Regional Council staff has been meeting with the Washington State Department of Transportation (DOT) to further their working relationship. He advised of the proposal to have DOT staff work at Regional Planning two to three days a week beginning in August for several months to a year in a mutually-beneficial arrangement. DOT staff would learn the technical, policy, and public involvement needs of the RTPOs and also provide staff support on the Regional Council's transportation program.

Mr. Robertson advised of the increasing interest in the RTP update at the time of public input on the scenarios and review of the tradeoffs and costs benefits. He advised of an emerging technique called "least-cost planning." Regional Council staff has collaborated with DOT and has submitted an application to the Federal Highways Administration for a $25,000 grant that would enable them to hire a consultant to apply the technique through public participation.

Mr. Robertson also advised that the grant application by the Regional Council and the Economic Development Council has been submitted. The purpose is to enhance the industrial site inventory and create a framework for use by Kitsap, Jefferson, and Pierce Counties, and ultimately for use statewide. He advised that they will know the outcome of the grant decision by the July 12 meeting.

Mr. Robertson reminded the members of the Western Councils of Governments conference, from July 24--July 27, at the Skamania Lodge. Mr. Robertson reviewed the conference topics, as outlined in the brochure, as attached. He advised that the cost for members to attend the conference would be borne by the jurisdictional/agency budgets. The Chair, or an alternate, would be covered under the Regional Council budget. He asked the members to advise him of their interest in attending the conference.
Mr. Robertson advised that he, Chair Wilson, Mayor Nancy Peterson, Chair of the Transportation Policy Board, and Mr. Mike Harbour, Intercity Transit, had attended an editorial board meeting at The Olympian. He noted the newspaper’s coverage on the editorial page regarding the importance of transportation, per the attached editorial and other articles that were distributed to the members at the meeting.

Mayor Wolf advised that she and the Executive Director had attended the Transportation Policy Institute forum at Pacific Lutheran University on May 30. She advised that Mr. Demich of WSDOT had raised the issue of the Hawks Prairie interchange as being a predominant need. She felt that the forum was well attended and that it had been beneficial for the Regional Council to have offered comment. Mr. Robertson noted the excellence of Mayor Wolf’s presentation. The Chair thanked the Vice Chair for representing the Regional Council and for her presentation.

The Chair welcomed Mayor Lycan to the Regional Council meeting.

15. Adjournment

Prior to adjournment, the Chair reminded the members that the Regional Council’s next meeting had been rescheduled to Friday, July 12. Vice Chair Wolf advised that she would be able to preside at the meeting in the Chair’s absence.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

_________________________
Chair

_________________________
Ex-Officio Secretary
THURSTON COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEPARTMENT REPORT

HEARING EXAMINER HEARING

May 15, 2000

CASE: PLAT/PRRD/SEPA 990926, Prairie Ridge Division 4

APPLICANT: Robert and Rita Drohman

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting preliminary plat and planned rural residential development (PRRD) approval to divide 41.33 acres into 12 single-family residential lots with 30.17 acres designated as a resource parcel. A portion of the resource parcel is intended to be used as a residential lot and a stormwater detention basin. The project lies on the south side of 44th Avenue NE, west of Marvin Road in the Rural Residential/Resource – One Dwelling Unit Per Five Acres Zoning District.

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Applicant: Robert & Rita Drohman
   4411 Marvin Road NE
   Olympia, WA 98516

B. Location: Legacy Drive NE

C. Legal Description: The property is located within Section 34, Township 19 North, Range 1 West, W.M.; known as Tax Parcel Numbers. 11934240100 and 11934240200.

D. Land Area: Approximately 41.33 Acres

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to subdivide 41.33 acres into 12 single-family residential building lots and a Resource Use Parcel. The clustered 12 residential building lots will average 44,193 square feet in size with the smallest lot being 34,102 square feet. Access to the lots will be provided by Legacy Drive NE, a County maintained roadway. There is an existing single-family residence on the property and is being proposed as one of the lots (Lot 2) of the subdivision. The proposed project density is one unit per 3.44 acres.
The Resource Use Parcel will be 30.17 acres in size and will be located on the west side of the property and encompass the forested portion of the property and contains a Class 5 Stream. Proposed use of the Resource Use Parcel is forestry, a residential lot and a stormwater detention basin.

The proposed lots will be served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems and Prairie Ridge public water system. The minimum lot size, in conjunction with the overall size of the property, is related to each lot being served by individual on-site septic systems.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is zoned Rural Residential Resource – One Dwelling Unit Per Five Acres (RRR 1/5) and is located within the rural designated portion of the County. The property is not within a 100-year floodplain or within the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Master Program.

Topographically, the property is gently rolling to mostly level. The property is forested where the residential development is being proposed and a dense forest encompasses the resource use parcel. Surrounding land use consists of the following: developed single-family residential property zoned Rural Residential 1 unit per 1 acre to the northeast along 44th Avenue NE and Forest Park Equestrian horse ranch to the northwest. The property to the south was developed prior to the adoption of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance with a large moderate density single-family development. The property directly to the west is a dense forestland that is designated as a resource parcel from a prior subdivision.

NOTIFICATION

Written notice of the public hearing was sent to all property owners within 500 feet of the site on May 2, 2000 and was published in The Olympian on May 5, 2000, at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. Notice was posted on-site on May 4, 2000.

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

A Mitigated Determination of NonSignificance (MDNS) was issued on April 11, 2000. The environmental determination became final on April 25, 2000. The MDNS is attached and made part of this report.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE THURSTON COUNTY LAND USE REGULATORY CODES

Thurston County Zoning Ordinance: Chapters 20.09A and 30A.

Thurston County Platting and Subdivision Ordinance: Chapters 18.04, 18.12 and 18.40.
DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS

A. Zoning

The subject property is zoned Rural Residential-One Dwelling Unit Per Five Acres (RRR 1/5) (TCC 20.09A). The RRR 1/5 zone outright permits single-family residences, agriculture and forest practices. The use of the proposed lots of this project for single-family residences complies with the RRR 1/5 zone. The RRR 1/5 zone allows a base density of up to one unit per five acres (TCC 20.09A.040). Planned Rural Residential Developments (PRRD), described in TCC 20.30A, are allowed in the RRR 1/5 zone.

B. Planned Rural Residential Development (PRRD)

Chapter 20.30A, the County’s PRRD alternative for platting in the rural areas of the County is intended to provide for flexibility in the design of the plats. The PRRD standards have built in incentives to create plats that have large undeveloped tracts (resource parcels) as an integral part of the development proposal. The intention behind promoting the creation of Resource Parcels through the platting process is to allow for the preservation of open areas in which resource-related activities can continue, or which can contain and protect environmentally sensitive areas from being encroached upon by development.

The applicant proposes to create, through a Plat and Planned Rural Residential Development (PRRD) allowances, 12 single-family building lots and a 30.17 acre Resource Use parcel, identified as Lot 12 of the proposed development. The proposed use of theResource Use Parcel is forestry, one (1) single family residence and a stormwater detention basin. The use of the proposed Resource Parcel of this project is consistent with TCC 20.30A.040(3).

C. Density Bonus

The PRRD ordinance includes design criteria and allows for a density bonus in the RRR 1/5 zone on properties of 7.5 acres or greater (TCC 20.09A.040 and 20.30A.020). The density bonus enables developments to realize a greater density than is normally allowed by the RRR 1/5 zone (TCC 20.30A.060). PRRD design criteria requires a Resource Use parcel to be set aside, the side of which is equal to or greater than 60 percent of the overall property. The basic density bonus granted to plats undergoing the PRRD process is 35 percent (TCC 20.30A.060(1)). Applicants can increase the density bonus by increasing the size of the Resource Use Parcel (TCC 20.30A.060(2)). For each percent increase in the resource parcel size a corresponding increase in the density bonus is allowed.

In the present case the applicant has proposed a resource parcel of 30.17 acres or 72 percent of the 41.33 acres being developed.
Size of original parcel = 41.33 acres  
Proposed Resource Parcel = 30.17 acres  
Bonus Density = 47 percent

The density bonus is calculated by first dividing the acreage of the original parcel by the maximum lot size (5 acres) allowed by the underlying (RRR 1/5) zoning district, then multiplying the quotient by the allowed density bonus (47 percent). The formula for this particular proposal appears as follows:

\[
\frac{41.33 \text{ acres (original parcel)}}{5 \text{ acres (maximum density of RRR 1/5 zone)}} = 8.27 \\
8.27 \times 1.47 \text{ (density bonus)} = 12.15 \text{ dwelling units}
\]

The number of residential lots allowed for this project is 12.

D. State Environmental Policy Act

The Mitigated Determination of NonSignificance (MDNS) (Attachment i) conditions establish requirements for forestry activity, erosion control, stormwater requirements, critical areas protection, water supply, traffic and school facility mitigation. The Development Services Department believes the mitigating measures should become conditions of approval if the preliminary plat is approved.

E. Review Agency Comments

The Thurston County review agencies have submitted their comments and recommendations, which are, attached (Attachments j and k) and made part of this report. There are no comments that would require substantial amendment of the project as proposed.

F. School Impacts

The project is located within the North Thurston School District. In order for a plat to be approved, there must be a finding that there is, currently, adequate capacity to accommodate the students generated by this subdivision. Staff believes the subdivision can be approved conditioned on the applicant reaching agreement with the District concerning school impact mitigation.

G. Platting and Subdivision Ordinance

With proper conditions the proposed subdivision will conform with the requirements of the Platting and Subdivision Ordinance. The public use and interest will be served.
H. **Findings**

RCW 58.17.110 requires that findings be made in order to approve a preliminary plat. Those findings are as follows:

"Appropriate provisions must be made for the public health, safety and general welfare and such open spaces, drainage ways, streets or roads, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, potable water supplies, sanitary waste, parks and recreation, playgrounds, schools and school grounds and all other relevant facts including sidewalks and other planning features that assure safe walking conditions for students that only walk to and from school."

The Roads and Transportation Services Department requirements satisfy the stormwater, streets and roads for this rural area plat. The plat must comply with the health code thereby assuring adequate provision for domestic water supply and sanitary waste disposal. An open space dedication is not required for this proposal. Transit service is not available and school children are bussed to North Thurston School District school sites. A mitigation agreement between the School District and the developer will ensure that adequate school facilities are available. Parks and Recreation are not required for this rural density project. All findings can be met for the public health, safety and general welfare.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:**

Based upon the above analysis, the Development Services Department recommends **approval** of the preliminary plat subject to the following conditions:

A. Prior to final plat approval, all requirements of the February 18, 2000 Thurston County Environmental Health Department comment letter and the December 22, 1999 Thurston County Roads and Transportation Services Department comment memoranda shall be met.

B. Comply with all conditions of the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance dated April 11, 2000.

C. Street addresses, lot size and dimensions for each lot shall be shown on the final plat.

D. The final design of this subdivision shall conform with all minimum standards of the Zoning Ordinance (i.e. lot size, lot dimension, setbacks, etc.) and the Platting and Subdivision Ordinance. Based on the current design and size of the Resource Use parcel the maximum number of dwelling units is 12.
E. The following notes shall be shown on the final plat map:

1. This subdivision has been approved through provisions of the Planned Rural Residential Development (PRRD) ordinance (TCC 20.30A). Lot 12 of this subdivision is the resource use parcel required by the PRRD ordinance. Lot 12 is approved for one single-family residence and accessory structures within the building envelope. Further division of the resource use parcel is not permitted. These restrictions on use of the Resource Use parcel shall remain in effect until the property is annexed to a city or town.

Tony Kantas
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Attachment a  Notice of Public Hearing
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Attachment d  Environmental Checklist Application
Attachment e  Notice of Application dated December 23, 1999
Attachment f  January 3, 2000 Letter from North Thurston School District
Attachment g  Zoning/Site Map
Attachment h  Aerial Photograph of Site
Attachment i  Mitigated Determination of NonSignificance issued April 11, 2000
Attachment j  December 22, 1999 Memorandum from Roads and Transportation
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## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

For the Thurston County Hearing Examiner

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Thurston County Hearing Examiner will hold a public hearing on **May 15, 2000** during the **morning** session beginning at **10:00 a.m.** regarding the following project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Case:</strong></th>
<th>PLAT/PRRD/SEPA 990926, Prairie Ridge Division 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Robert and Rita Drohman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request:</strong></td>
<td>The applicant is requesting preliminary plat and planned rural residential development (PRRD) approval to divide 41.33 acres into 12 single-family residential lots with 30.17 acres designated as a resource parcel. A portion of the resource parcel is intended to be used as a residential lot and a stormwater detention basin. The project lies on the south side of 44th Avenue NE, west of Marvin Road in the Rural Residential/Resource – One Dwelling Unit Per Five Acres Zoning District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Legacy Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description:</strong></td>
<td>A portion of Section 34, Township 19 North, Range 1 West, W.M.; known as Tax Parcel Numbers 11934240100 and 11934240200.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting place is Room 152 of the Thurston County Courthouse Complex, Building #1 - Administration, 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington.

All interested persons are invited to present testimony relevant to the above-requested action(s). If unable to attend, written statements may be submitted by e-mail at nortons@co.thurston.wa.us or by mail to the Thurston County Development Services Department, Building #1, 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington 98502. **Verbal testimony is only accepted at the hearing, phone calls to staff are not considered part of the hearing record.** Citizens with disabilities requiring special accommodations at the hearing should call (360) 754-4001 and ask for the ADA Coordinator at least three days prior to the hearing. Citizens with hearing impairments may call the County's TDD line at (360) 754-2933. For other questions regarding the hearing, call the Land Use Clerk at (360) 754-3355 x6348.

Copies of the staff report regarding this project are available one week prior to the hearing and can be picked up at the Permit Assistance Center, located on the second floor of Building One of the Thurston County Courthouse Complex.

---

**DO NOT PUBLISH BELOW THIS LINE**

**Publish:** The Olympian - May 5, 2000

I certify this notice was published on the date noted above:

I certify this notice was mailed to the applicant, adjacent property owners, subarea 3, Fire District 8, and the North Thurston School District: **on 5/2/00**
### 1. OWNER(S):
**NAME:** Robert J. & Rae Dinkham
**MAILING ADDRESS:** 4111 - Martin Rd NE
**CITY AND STATE:** Olympia, WA 98502
**DAYTIME TELEPHONE:** 360-459-9510
**FAX:** 360-438-9273

I hereby affirm and certify, under penalty of perjury, that I am one (or more) of the owners or owners under contract of the described property, and I believe that the following statements and answers are in all respects true and correct on my information and belief as to those matters.

### 2. APPLICANT: (IF DIFFERENT THAN OWNER)
**NAME:** Same
**COMPANY:**
**MAILING ADDRESS:**
**CITY AND STATE:**
**DAYTIME TELEPHONE:**
**FAX:**
**SIGNATURE:**

### 3. POINT OF CONTACT: (IF DIFFERENT THAN OWNER)
**NAME:**
**COMPANY:**
**MAILING ADDRESS:**
**CITY AND STATE:**
**DAYTIME TELEPHONE:**
**FAX:**
**SIGNATURE:**

NOTE: The point of contact will be the person receiving all County correspondence regarding this application.

### 4. NAME OF PLAT: Prairie Ridge Day 4

### 5. PROPERTY LOCATION:
**SECTION:** 34
**TOWNSHIP:** 19N
**RANGE:** 15E
**ASSISER PARCEL NO(S):** 11932420, 11932424
**PROPERTY ADDRESS:**
**COMPANY:**
**MAILING ADDRESS:**
**CITY AND STATE:**
**ZIP:**
**DAYTIME TELEPHONE:**
**FAX:**
**SIGNATURE:**

### 6. PROJECT INFORMATION:
**Number of Lots:**
- Single-Family: 12 Including Proposed
- Duplex
- Multifamily
- Commercial
- Industrial

**Smallest Lot Area:** 30,492

**Average Lot Area:** 44,193.6

**Total Acreage:** 41.33

- Acreage in Open Space: 30.17
- Acreage in Parks: 0

**Total Length of Public Streets:** 1333.33
**Total Acreage of Public Streets:** 1.92
**Total Length of Private Streets:** 0
**Total Acreage of Private Streets:** 0
**Designated Commercial Acreage:** 0
### UTILITIES:

1. **WATER SUPPLY**: (name of Utility, if applicable)
   - **EXISTING**: Prairie Ridge Water
   - **PROPOSED**:

2. **SEWAGE DISPOSAL**: (name of Utility, if applicable)
   - **EXISTING**: Individual Septic
   - **PROPOSED**: Individual Septic

### ACCESS:

1. **EXISTING ACCESS**: Condorhoop III

2. **PROPOSED ACCESS**: 49th Ave. N.E.

3. If property to be divided is accessed by a private road, how many other parcels have access by this road? (Include vacant parcels)

### SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

The supplemental information listed in Sections 18.10.050(1) and (3) of the Thurston County Platting and Subdivision Ordinance (copy of list attached) must be submitted with this application form. Twenty-four (24) full size copies and one (1) 11" x 17" reduced copy of the preliminary map/site plan shall be submitted. The full size copies must be folded, not rolled, and must be at a scale of not more than fifty (50) feet to the inch nor less than two hundred (200) feet to the inch (using a standard interval of an engineer scale).
NOTICE OF APPLICATION
Mailed On December 23, 1999

Project Name & Location: Plat located south of 44th Avenue NE and west of Marvin Rd NE, Olympia, WA

Land Use Case: PLAT990926, PRRD990926

An application for the project listed above was submitted to Thurston County on November 30, 1999 by Robert Drohman, 4411 Marvin Rd. NE, Olympia, WA 98516. The application was deemed to be complete for the purpose of beginning the project review on December 22, 1999. This application and any related documents are available for public review during normal business hours at the Permit Assistance Center on the second floor of Building #1, Thurston County Courthouse, 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Olympia, Washington. For additional information, please contact Amy Kurtenbach at 360-786-5472.

Project Description: The applicant proposed to subdivide 41.33 acres of land into 12 residential lots with Lot 12 being a resource use/open space parcel totaling 30.17 acres. The average lot size will be 4,193.60 square feet. The property is located within the Rural Residential-Resource 1/5 zoning district. The lots are proposing to connect to Prairie Ridge Water system and individual on-site sewage systems.

Permits Requested by the Applicant: Preliminary Plat Other permits that must be obtained, to the extent known by the County, include: None at this time.

Environmental and Other Documents Submitted with the Application: Planned Rural Residential Development Application, Environmental Checklist, Wetland Reconnaissance (from June 24, 1996), Site Plan, Letter dated 11/03/99 from Robert Drohman, Residential Traffic Generation Worksheet


No preliminary determination of consistency with County development regulations has been made. At minimum, this project may be subject to the following plans and regulations: Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance (Title 20), Critical Areas Ordinance (TCC 17.15), Stormwater Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (TCC 15.05), Uniform Building Code (TCC 14), State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Ordinance (TCC 17.09), Road Design Standards (TCC 15.05), Forest Lands Conversion Ordinance, and the Shoreline Master Program.

Thurston County invites your comments early in the review of this proposal. Comments should be in writing and directed to Tammy Trager at the address listed below.

THE 20-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDS AT 5:00 PM ON JANUARY 12, 2000

This notice has been provided to appropriate local and state agencies, tribes, sub-area project list subscribers, and property owners within 500 feet of the project site. These recipients, and any others who submit a written request to be placed on the mailing list, will also receive the following items when available: Environmental Threshold Determination and Notice of Public Hearing. The Hearing Examiner decision will be mailed to all those who participate in the public hearing and to anyone else requesting the decision in writing. Additionally, there will be a 14-day public comment period when the environmental determination is issued. Opportunities for appeal occur within seven (7) days of the end of the environmental comment period for those who submit written comments and within fourteen (14) days of the Hearing Examiner decision for any aggrieved party.
January 3, 2000

Tammy Trager
Thurston County Development Services
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502-6045

RE: NORTH THURSTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
COMMENTS CONCERNING PLAT99-0926, Drohman

Dear Ms. Trager:

North Thurston School District has had the opportunity to review the proposed subdivision. In response to your request for comments, the District provides the following:

First, the proposed subdivision will create 12 residential lots within North Thurston School District boundaries. The District’s schools are anticipated to be over capacity at all levels as a result of the cumulative effect of previously approved development. We estimate the proposed housing units will generate approximately .78 FTE students per single family lot and .39 FTE per multi-family unit. The estimate is based on multipliers derived from U.S. Census data as presented in Demographic Multipliers for Common Configurations of Standard Housing Types for School Age Children from U.S. Department of Commerce.

Second, a minimum of one portable classroom unit is required for each 25 students. Consequently, each single family residence will require 0.0324 units and .0162 per multi-family unit. The district last purchased portable units in 1992 for $41,431 including moving fees, setup fees and permits. This does not include an increase to cover inflation to the time when this development will necessitate the purchase of additional units.

The district typically cannot use a portable for more than 20 years. It is estimated that the units will be needed for this development for a minimum of three years until permanent facilities may be constructed. Three years of required need equals a minimum of $194.00 for temporary classroom space for each single family lot and $99.00 per multi-family unit.

The district does not own sufficient land for projected additional schools. Recent land purchases with water and sewer availability and future site acquisitions to house children anticipated from these residences, the district estimates land costs at $791.00 per each single family lot and $407.00 per multi-family unit.

The State Subdivision Act, in RCW 58.17.110(2), requires that the permitting jurisdiction find that proposed plats adequately provide for schools and school grounds. Similarly, the State Environmental Policy Act requires proposed developments to mitigate impacts on the environment, which includes public schools.

The district believes that mitigation measures are needed to lessen the impact of increased student growth this development will generate on its schools and students. Provision of temporary classroom space and land for permanent space will cost the district a minimum of $985.00 per single family lot and $506.00 per multi-family unit in 1999 dollars. The District requests that the developer and school district execute a voluntary mitigation agreement prior to final plat approval. We request that the agreement include an adjustment for inflation to date of payment. Please note any mitigation measures in the staff report and on the face of the plat when recorded.

Finally, we would appreciate it if you would promptly provide us notice of the date and time of any preliminary plat hearing on this proposal and a copy of any environmental determination made concerning this proposed project.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES - EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES
Thank you for your inclusion of the above information and for the opportunity to respond concerning this proposed subdivision application. Please call me at 412-4424 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey L. Greene
Planning Consultant

pc:  James E. Koval, Superintendent
     Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent
     Gary Larson, Construction & Design
     Myrna Lance, Director of Transportation
     Alan Hoover, Principal of South Bay Elementary
     Robert R. Drobman
     4411 Marvin Road NE
     Olympia, WA 98516
January 3, 2000

Robert R. Drohman
1 Marvin Road NE
Olympia, WA 98516

RE: NORTH THURSTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
REQUEST FOR MITIGATION MEASURE CONCERNING
PLAT99-0926, Drohman

Dear Mr. Drohman:

North Thurston School District requests that all developers pay a proportional amount of the District's costs for acquiring land for future schools and the cost of purchasing and moving portables. As an applicant for subdivision of property, you are a "developer." The additional lots that you are requesting allow construction of additional residences which we expect will lead to more students and eventually more schools. If you file a formal application for subdivision, the District will request that you sign an agreement that requires the eventual home builder to make payment at the time a building permit application is made. This agreement is called a "Voluntary Mitigation Agreement" because Washington State statutes authorizing these agreements use that language. If your property is restricted in a manner that precludes residential construction or residential construction with no school age children, you may request the District waive its request. I would be happy to discuss the District's position concerning this matter at your convenience.

The district would like to obtain an agreement with you concerning these proposed mitigation measures.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey L. Greene
Planning Consultant

cc: Tammy Trager, Thurston County Development Services

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES - EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES
January 3, 2000

Robert R. Drohman
4411 Martin Road NE
Olympia, WA 98516

Subject: Draft Mitigation Agreement

Dear Mr. Drohman:

I am enclosing three copies of a draft mitigation agreement for a residential development. After you review the agreement, please advise me of any concerns.

Once you sign and return two copies of the agreement, the agreement will be given to the North Thurston School District Board of Directors for their action during a board meeting. The board meets twice a month. A signed and recorded copy will be returned to you following the meeting.

Please call me at 412-4424 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey L. Greene
Planning Consultant

pc: James E. Koval, Superintendent
    Pete Kerl, Assistant Superintendent
    Tammy Trager, Thurston County Development Services
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SCHOOL DISTRICT: N-THURSTON
SHORELINE DESIGNATION: NONE
JURISDICTION: COUNTY
WITHIN A WATER SERVICE AREA: UNKNOWN
WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREA: UNKNOWN
SANITARIAN: 1
PLANNING SUB AREA: 3
PLANNER: 2
CONTAMINATION SITE: NO
NITRATES: NO
CRITICAL BUFFERS: NO
LONG TERM AGRICULTURE BUFFER: NO
MINERAL LANDS BUFFER: NO
LONG TERM FORESTRY BUFFER: NO
HOTSPOT AREA: NO
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MITIGATED DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Proponent: Robert and Rita Drohman
7009 - 44th Avenue NE
Olympia, WA 98516

Description of Proposal: Subdivision of 41 acres into 11 lots and one homesite on the 30-acre resource parcel. Timber harvesting is proposed on twelve acres of the 41-acre parcel along with conversion of the property from forestry to a residential subdivision. Approval of a preliminary plat/planned rural residential development and a forest land conversion permit is required before the property can be developed. The property is zoned Rural Residential/Resource - 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.

Location of Proposal: 4101 NE Marvin Road, Olympia

Section/Township/Range: Section 34 Township 19 North Range 1 West, W.M.

Tax Parcel Number: 11934240200 and 11934240100

Threshold Determination: Thurston County Development Services has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact upon the environment. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C). This decision was made after review of a completed Environmental Checklist and other information on file with Thurston County Development Services. This information is available to the public on request.

Conditions/Mitigating Measures: See page 2

Jurisdiction: Thurston County
Lead Agency: Development Services
Responsible Official: Gary Cooper, Environmental Review Official

Date of Issue: April 11, 2000
Comment Deadline: April 25, 2000

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 15 days from the date of issue. No permits may be issued, and the applicant shall not begin work until after the comment and any appeal periods have expired and any other necessary permits are issued. If conditions are added, deleted, or modified during the 15-day review period, a modified DNS will be issued. Otherwise, this DNS will become final after the expiration of the comment deadline and appeal period, if applicable.

APPEALS: Threshold determinations may be appealed pursuant to TCC 1709.160 if: (1) a written notice of appeal, meeting the requirements of TCC 17.09.160(4), and the appropriate appeal fee is received by the Thurston County Development Services Department within fourteen calendar days of the date of issuance of the threshold determination or, if there is a comment period under WAC 197-11-340, within seven calendar days of the last day of the comment period; and (2) the person filing the appeal meets the requirements of TCC 17.09.160(2).

NOTE: The issuance of this Determination of Nonsignificance does not constitute project approval. The applicant must comply with all applicable requirements of Thurston County Departments and/or the Hearing Examiner prior to receiving permits.

Thurston County Development Services, Linda Whitcher
Building #1, Administration
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502 (360) 754-3355 ext. 7662

cc: Department of Ecology (2)
Adjacent Property Owners
Tammy Trager
Department of Natural Resources

Sub-Area # 3
Thurston Co Roads & Transportation
Tony Kantas
1. Forestry activity shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. to minimize noise impacts on adjacent properties.

2. Erosion and sediment control practices shall be used on the site and adjacent areas to prevent upland sediments from flowing off the property. All areas disturbed or newly created by logging activities shall be seeded, vegetated, or given some other equivalent type of protection against erosion.

3. Lacey Municipal Code, chapter 14.21, and the Joint Memorandum of Understanding between Lacey and Thurston County require mitigation of off-site traffic impacts. The City of Lacey will determine final fees at the time of payment. The mitigation fees must be paid before final plat approval.

4. All requirements of Roads and Transportation Services Department relating to road standards, frontage improvements, and drainage and erosion control requirements must be met prior to final plat approval. This includes meeting the requirements of the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region for both temporary erosion control and permanent stormwater facilities.

5. All requirements of Environmental Health, including septic and water systems and an integrated pest management plan, must be met prior to final plat approval.

6. In accordance with the Washington State Growth Management Act, the applicant must mitigate the impact of additional students on schools serving Prairie Ridge Division 4. Mitigation must be negotiated with the North Thurston School District. Before building permits are issued, Development Services must receive notification from the school district stating that a mitigation agreement has been completed.

7. Due to the sensitive nature of the aquifer in this area, an Integrated Pest Management Plan must be developed by the applicant for use in educating the residents and homeowners within Prairie Ridge Division 4. It should identify how weeds and other pests will be controlled on the site while minimizing the risk to ground and surface waters.

Note: The applicant must post a Forest Land Conversion Permit before logging begins. This permit will be issued after the environmental decision is final.
Chapter 6, Capital Facilities Plan
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A. Facilities of Other Public Entities. Inclusion of public facilities of other public entities in this section is for information only, in compliance with the Growth Management Act, which says the capital facilities element is to include summary information on "capital facilities owned by public entities." Table 6-15 includes the major public facility improvements planned by those public entities that responded to Thurston County's request for information to include in this Comprehensive Plan.

The following public entities either declined to apprise the County of their Capital Facilities Plans or responded that they do not have any capital facilities planned for the coming six-year period:

- Fire Districts not listed in Table 6-15
- School districts not listed in Table 6-15
- Grand Mound/Rochester Park & Recreation District
- Tanglewilde Park and Recreation District
- Cemetery Districts #1 and #2
- Other special districts not listed above

Thurston County cannot control the planning or construction of capital facilities by other public entities within its borders, such as school districts, fire districts, port districts and transit entities. However, the capital facilities planned by these other entities must, under the Growth Management Act, be part of the County's Capital Facilities Plan. Inclusion of the capital facilities planning by these other entities will promote consistent and unified capital facilities planning throughout the County. However, the inclusion of their plans does not imply County approval or disapproval of the plans or the levels of service, which they adopt. Rather, their inclusion insures compliance with the GMA and enables a consistent approach to capital facilities planning throughout the County, taking into consideration the Capital Facilities Plans of all public entities in the County. Most of the public entities referenced in Table 6-15 have adopted their own 6 and 20 year Capital Facilities Plans. For more information, please refer to those adopted Capital Facilities Plans. For goals and policies related to schools and coordinated planning with other public entities, see below.
### Table 6-15
Facilities of Other Public Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>6 Year Costs</th>
<th>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rainier School District #307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Capital Project Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainier School District Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Thurston School District #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Classrooms purchase (5 per year) and relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,590,000</td>
<td>Secured and Unsecured Bonds (Voluntary mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Addition and Modernization</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>$18,650,000</td>
<td>Secured and Unsecured Bonds, matching funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Addition and Modernization</td>
<td>North Thurston H.S.</td>
<td>$52,800,000</td>
<td>Secured Bonds and matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Upgrades / Asset preservation</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond, Mitigation fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Middle School – 1 new and planning another</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,250,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond, matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Elementary School – Early Phase only</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,140,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond, matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,875,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond &amp; Mitigation Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Thurston School District Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$174,055,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympia School District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Middle School Modernization</td>
<td>2200 Conger Ave.</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Elementary School Modernization</td>
<td>326 Plymouth St. NW</td>
<td>$20,400,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and impact / mitigation fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build New Intermediate Middle School</td>
<td>2637 45th Ave. SE</td>
<td>$33,100,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and impact / mitigation fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia Regional Learning Academy</td>
<td>Boulevard and 15th Ave. SE</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Replacements or Renovations</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security Measures</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site and Building Improvements or Renovations</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Deficiencies</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other small works</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds and levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiencies</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>Secured local bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympia School District Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,730,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester School District #401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2014 study and survey for a new elementary school</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Mitigation and impact fees and capital project funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Mitigation and impact fees and capital project funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rochester School District Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumwater School District #33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acquisition &amp; Development</td>
<td>Various sites</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>Mitigation fees and impact fees and secured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Classrooms</td>
<td>Various sites</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>Mitigation and impact fees and secured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/G Schmidt Elem. Replacement</td>
<td>225 Dennis Street SE</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured local bonds and state match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlerock Elem. Bldg. “A”, “C”, &amp; “E” Remodel</td>
<td>12710 Littlerock Rd SW</td>
<td>$8,500,00</td>
<td>Unsecured local bonds and state match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumwater Hill Elem. Remodel</td>
<td>3120 Ridgeview Ct. SW</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured local bonds and state match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Olympia Elem. Remodel</td>
<td>8700 Rich Rd. SE</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured local bonds and state match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market Skills Center Capital Improvements</td>
<td>7299 New Market St. SW</td>
<td>$24,400,00</td>
<td>State grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Elementary No. 7 Building</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured local bonds, state match, and impact mitigation fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and infrastructure projects</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>Secured and unsecured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Safety &amp; Security Projects</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>Secured and unsecured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; Grounds Enhancements</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Secured and unsecured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc. Capital Projects</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Secured and unsecured local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tumwater School District Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$125,950,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Yelm Community Schools District #2               |           |                          |                                      |
| Construct 1 New Elementary Schools              | To be Determined | $16,000,000 | Proposed Bond |
| Support Operations Center Phase II               | 404 Railroad St. | $1,400,000 | Secured local funds |
| <strong>Yelm Community Schools Total</strong>                |           | <strong>$17,400,000</strong> |                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>6 Year Costs</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Griffin School District #324</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-roofing a portion of the school</td>
<td>6530 33rd Ave. NW</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Capital Projects Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Griffin School District Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Thurston Regional Fire Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovating Station #1-4</td>
<td>2640 Trevue Ave. SW</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>Local bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total West Thurston Regional Fire Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East Thurston Fire Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station #21 Remodel</td>
<td>708 Mill Road</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station #22 Rebuild</td>
<td>17213 153rd Ave. SE</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station #41 Upgrade</td>
<td>12506 133rd St. Rainier</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Unsecured Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East Thurston Fire Authority Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #5 &amp; #9, McLane/Black Lake Fire Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Olympia Fire District #6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #8, South Bay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Fire Training Center Phase II</td>
<td>3349 South Bay Rd. NE</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New North-end Fire Station</td>
<td>7804 Henderson Rd. NE</td>
<td>$2,701,000</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #8, South Bay Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,001,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #16, Rochester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #17, Bald Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 17-1 Remodel</td>
<td>16306 Bald Hill Rd. SE</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 17-2 Upgrades</td>
<td>17701 Lawrence Lake Rd. SE</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Station</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District #17 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port of Olympia (2013 only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Projects</td>
<td>Olympia Regional Airport</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants and local funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina and Boatworks</td>
<td>Swantown Marina and Boatworks</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants and Local funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Terminal Projects</td>
<td>Port Marine Terminal</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants &amp; Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Program</td>
<td>Various Port Properties</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants &amp; Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Projects</td>
<td>Various Properties</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Local funds and third party reimbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Pole Groundwater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>Cascade Pole Site, Port Peninsula</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants and local funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port of Olympia Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,900,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercity Transit (2013 – 2018)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Transit Centers</td>
<td>Service District</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>Federal and Local Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Rides</td>
<td>Service District</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>State and Local Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercity Transit Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$29,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Utility District #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewilde Source Development</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$1,328,180</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund and Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewilde Reservoir Replacement</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$2,970,662</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund and Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Water System Upgrades and Facility Replacements</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$250,500</td>
<td>Municipal Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6 Year Costs</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Acres consolidation of Class B Water System into a Class A System</td>
<td>Yelm, WA</td>
<td>$87,219</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Meter Replacement</td>
<td>Multiple Sites</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well and Booster Pump Replacement</td>
<td>Multiple Sites</td>
<td>$37,620</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lew’s 81st Consolidation of Class B Water System into a Class A System</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>$374,432</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund with loan forgiveness of 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Arsenic Treatment</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>$213,876</td>
<td>Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund with loan forgiveness of 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Vista / Fir Tree #2 – Drill New Well</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy Acres Decommissioning Well not in use</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>$37,620</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewilde replacement of isolated valves</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$660,275</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewilde replacement of 6 in. steel pipe</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$2,071,625</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewilde backflow prevention installation and replacement</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$70,154</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>6 Year Costs</th>
<th>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowder Road mainline replacement</td>
<td>Unincorporated Thurston County</td>
<td>$96,800</td>
<td>Public Works Board Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Utility District #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,359,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Public purpose lands and essential public facilities.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that comprehensive plans address both lands for public purposes and siting essential public facilities. The GMA states that the county:

- Shall identify lands useful for public purposes;
- Will work with the state and cities within its borders to identify areas of shared need for public facilities;
- Shall prepare with other jurisdictions a prioritized list of lands necessary for the identified public uses;
- Include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities; and
- No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude siting essential public facilities in their jurisdiction.

Confusion often arises as to the distinction between lands for public purposes and essential public facilities. Essential public facilities can be thought of as a subset of public purpose lands. The following table illustrates the distinctions.

#### Table 6-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS</th>
<th>ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS: Lands needed to accommodate public facilities.</td>
<td>FOCUS: Facilities needed to provide public services and functions that are typically difficult to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS</td>
<td>ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands needed to provide the full range of services to the public provided by government, substantially funded by government, contracted for by government, or provided by private entities subject to public service obligations.</td>
<td>Those public facilities that are usually unwanted by neighborhoods have unusual site requirements or other features that complicate the siting process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Examples include:  
  - Utility Corridors\(^1\)  
  - Transportation Corridors\(^2\)  
  - Sewage Treatment Facilities  
  - Stormwater Management Facilities  
  - Recreation  
  - Schools  
  - Other Public Uses | Examples include:  
  - Large-scale Transportation Facilities  
  - State Educational Facilities  
  - State and Local Correctional Facilities  
  - Solid Waste Handling Facilities  
  - Airports  
  - Inpatient Facilities Such As:  
    - Substance Abuse Facilities  
    - Mental Health Facilities  
    - Group Homes  
    - Secure Community Transition Facilities |

*Note: See Chapter 2, Land Use, for an inventory map of public purpose lands.*

1. Addressed in the Utilities Chapter.
2. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.

C. Coordinated Public Purpose Lands:

The GMA calls for coordination among the cities, the State and the County, to identify and prioritize lands needed for public facilities. This provides the opportunity to also identify areas of shared need, and possibly, shared use or other efficiencies. The County is currently coordinating public facility needs (including land needs) with the cities and towns through the joint planning process. Additional coordination and prioritization should be pursued through a regional consultation process. A partial list of shared needs identified to date is presented in Table 6-17.
### Table 6-17
Interjurisdictional Shared Needs for Public Purpose Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Serving Shared Needs</th>
<th>Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>Cities or Towns</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Port of Olympia</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Re-Use of Closed Landfill (Park &amp; Ride Facility)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallard Pond Phase II</td>
<td>RS – SWU</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT Green Cove Creek Basin Project-Land Acquisition</td>
<td>RS-SWU - Parks</td>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mound – WSDOT SRA Sewer Connection</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSDOT Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARC HazoHouse Replacement</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARC Closed Loop Park</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSU Master Growers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chehalis Western Trail (coordinated recreation use/stormwater retention/utility corridor)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey and Olympia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WDFW WSDOT DNR TRPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelm – Tenino Trail (coordinated recreation use/stormwater retention/utility corridor/highway access/potential future rail use)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Yelm, Rainier, and Tenino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSDOT TRPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Serving Shared Needs</td>
<td>Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>Cities or Towns</td>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>Port of Olympia</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate to Belmore Trail (coordinated recreation use/potential future rail use)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Tumwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Transit (future)</td>
<td>Parks RCO WDFW Ecology TRPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Athletic Fields</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Acquisitions</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Lacey Olympia Tumwater, Yelm, Tenino, and Rainier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNR, WSDOT, and Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacial Heritage Preserve</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Harbor Boat Ramp</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Lawrence Park (coordinated recreation use)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife; and DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Siting Essential Public Facilities:

The County-Wide Planning Policies for Thurston County provide the following requirements for siting essential public facilities (refer to Appendix C for a description of County-Wide Planning Policies):

Each city and town will:

- Cooperatively establish a process for identifying and siting county and state-wide public capital facilities having a potential impact beyond jurisdictional boundaries;
- Include public involvement at early stages; and
• Base siting decisions on the jurisdiction’s adopted plans, zoning and environmental regulations, particularly as they affect critical areas, resource lands, and transportation facilities.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council provided the Interjurisdictional forum for developing the required process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. A process endorsed by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in January 1994 is included in the Special Use Chapter of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance and below:

**DESIGNATION OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:**

Essential public facilities are public facilities and privately owned or operated facilities serving a public purpose that are typically difficult to site. They include:

1. State education facilities; state or regional transportation facilities; prisons, jails and other correctional facilities; solid waste handling facilities; airports; and inpatient facilities such as group homes, mental health facilities and substance abuse facilities; sewage treatment facilities; and communication towers and antennas.

2. Facilities identified by the State Office of Financial Management as essential public facilities, consistent with RCW 36.70A.200; and

3. Facilities identified as essential public facilities in the county's zoning ordinance.

**SITING ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:**

Essential public facilities may be allowed as permitted or conditional special uses in the zoning ordinance. Essential public facilities identified as special uses in the applicable zoning district shall be subject, at a minimum, to the following requirements.

1. Classify essential public facilities as follows:
   a. Type One: Multi-county facilities. These are major facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one county. These facilities include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities, such as regional airports; state correction facilities; and state educational facilities.
   b. Type Two: These are local or inter-local facilities serving or potentially affecting residents or property in more than one jurisdiction. They could include, but are not limited to, county jails, county landfills, community colleges, sewage treatment facilities, communication towers, and inpatient facilities (e.g., substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group
homes). [NOTE: Such facilities which would not have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located would be Type Three facilities.]

c. Type Three: These are facilities serving or potentially affecting only the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located.

In order to enable the county to determine the project's classification, the applicant shall identify the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare, emissions, or other environmental impacts.

2. Provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:

a. Type One and Two facilities. At least 90 days before submitting an application for a Type One or Type Two essential public facility, the prospective applicant shall notify the affected public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposal, identify sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and identify opportunities to comment on the proposal. Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete in the absence of proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least 90 days prior to the submission of the application.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdiction(s) with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this 90-day period.

(The purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternative sites for major facilities before the project sponsor has made their siting decision.)

b. Type Three facilities. Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the county’s standard notification requirements for special uses.

3. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for lineal
facilities, such as highways, where no feasible alternative exists (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(a)).

4. Major public facilities which generate substantial traffic should be sited near major transportation corridors [adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(b)].

5. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:
   a. An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;
   b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
   c. The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger; and
   d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites that meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts.
   e. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.

6. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and other county regulations.

7. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS SECTION:

GOAL 2: EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD HAVE SAFE AND CONVENIENT ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 2-A: Schools - Mechanisms and procedures should be established and maintained to ensure that new school facilities are coordinated with growth and their impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.
POLICIES:

1. All development proposals should consider enrollment impacts on schools.

2. Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites meeting school district standards such as topography, acreage requirements, location, and soil quality. Such sites should be dedicated for school use under terms negotiated by the developer and the school district.

3. Schools should be sited to consider transportation and health needs as follows:
   a. Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads in order to minimize potential conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Where the school district finds that siting on arterials is the most practical, school development should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
   b. Availability of sewer and water facilities should also be considered in siting schools, as well as location in areas not subject to exposure from hazardous/dangerous materials, poor air quality or safety hazards.

4. School siting and expansion should avoid prime agricultural land.

5. The County should notify affected school districts of new subdivision proposals, and new schools should be reviewed by the county through a site plan review zoning process where impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

OBJECTIVE 2-B: Shared Facility Use with Schools - The County, school districts, and other governmental agencies should coordinate the use of facilities and operation of programs in order to use facilities efficiently and avoid duplication of public expenditures.

POLICIES:

1. Shared use of school facilities by the general public should be encouraged.

2. The county and the school district should cooperate in the planning and utilization of school and recreational facilities.

GOAL 3: TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE, WELL-LOCATED PUBLIC LANDS AND FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 3-A: Identify, in advance of development, appropriately sited lands needed for public purposes, including essential public facilities.
POLICIES:

1. The County should obtain or secure (e.g., by obtaining a right of first refusal for desired property) sites needed for County public facilities as early as possible in the development of an area, to ensure that the facilities are well located to serve the area and to minimize acquisition costs.

2. The County should support regional coordination efforts in identifying shared needs for lands for public purposes to maximize the efficient use of public capital resources.

3. The County should ensure that its development regulations do not preclude the siting of essential public facilities, subject to reasonable development standards and mitigation measures, within Thurston County.

4. The County should identify and site essential public facilities in accordance with the County-wide Planning Policies.

Staff Note: We do this at the long range planning level.
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The Capital Facilities Plan was adopted by the North Thurston Public Schools Board of Directors on August 6, 2013. If you have questions or would like additional information, please contact the Planning Department at 412-4424 or visit NTPS website at www.nthurston.k12.wa.us.
Welcoming, well-maintained and safe schools are vital to providing the positive student learning environment that our entire community deserves. Accountable and collaborative planning for the future of our public school system is a responsibility we owe to our taxpayers and citizens. This Capital Facilities Plan is a road map for ensuring that our students and staff have the inviting and productive space they need to succeed.

As the largest school district in Thurston County, we continue to grow with an enrollment forecast of over 16,500 students by 2033. We continue to be the largest school district in Thurston County, with steady growth predicted in years to come. Our community has continued to support local funding measures for schools and educational programs not funded by the state. The 2006 bond included a new elementary school, major facility improvements to five existing schools, and modernization of Timberline High School.

The North Thurston Public Schools Facilities Advisory Committee comprised of community representatives, students, parents, and staff, met to develop facility planning recommendations for our growing school district to the board of directors. Recommendations included facility needs, priority projects and funding input for future projects. Included in this list was a new middle school, several modernizations including North Thurston High School, Evergreen Forest Elementary, Pleasant Glade, technology infrastructure, and safety improvements for all schools, as well as the funds necessary to maintain or upgrade critical building systems at existing sites.

Our students deserve schools that are warm, safe and dry which can support our comprehensive learning programs including Career & Technology Education, Special Education, Visual and Performing Arts, core academics and Athletics. I am confident that if we continually put students at the center of each decision we make, our community can help ensure that every child in North Thurston Public Schools has the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in academics and in life.

Our children are a valuable resource for our future -- let's give them the support and tools they need, as well as quality facilities and school buildings, to be successful in a diverse and ever changing global world!

Sincerely,

Raj Manhas,
Superintendent
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Fast Facts about North Thurston Public Schools

NORTH THURSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS: About Our District

Being the largest district in the county, North Thurston Public Schools educates over 14,000 students each year, with 13 elementary schools, 4 middle schools (including a performing arts magnet school), 3 comprehensive high schools and one high school of choice.

Our District

- NTPS is Washington's 23rd largest school district, out of 295 total school districts.
- We currently serve over 14,000 students per year. Enrollment at NTPS is expected to increase to over 16,500 by the year 2033.
- One hour south of Seattle, NTPS serves Lacey and northeastern Thurston County, encompassing 74 square miles.
- Founded in 1953, NTPS is 13 years older than the City of Lacey. NTPS is the most ethnically-diverse school district in the South Sound region, serving African American, Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American, Hispanic and other populations.

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: A simple, practical approach to annual planning

Our approach is both wholesome and grounded in reality. The following elements guided the creation of our framework which includes several key focus areas:

- Make student learning the center of everything we do.
- Support the needs of the whole child.
- Strengthen community engagement to support student learning.
- Develop a trusting work culture through effective leadership.
- Use public resources efficiently and be accountable.

Our Students, Teachers, and Volunteers: The Heart of the District

Employment

We are proud to employ more than 1,700 staff.

NTPS also has one of the highest percentage of National Board Certified teachers in the state among larger districts. The majority of our teachers also have advanced degrees.
Scholarships

Nearly $9.4 million in college scholarships were offered last year to our graduating seniors.

Alumni

More than 100 North Thurston Public Schools staff members are also NTPS alumni.

ESL

Our English as a Second Language (ESL) program serves students who speak more than 20 different languages at home.

Volunteers

Last year, more than 2,400 active parent and community volunteers gave nearly 65,000 hours of their time in support of student achievement in our classrooms.

Our Programs and Classes

- Gifted Education: NTPS offers a self-contained elementary Talented & Gifted program at Lakes Elementary (grades 3-5) and the Challenge Academy at Aspire Middle School for the Performing Arts (grades 6-8).
- Special Education: NTPS offers a continuum of services designed to help our special needs students (birth to age 21), including speech and language therapy, occupational and physical therapy, vision/hard-of-hearing and deaf education, augmentative communication services, and academic and behavioral interventions.
- Advanced Placement: Enrollment in our high school Advanced Placement classes was more than 1,400 last year, in courses ranging from Physics to World History.
- Career & Technical Education students have work-based learning opportunities and have won numerous state and national awards. They may also take classes at New Market Skills Center in Tumwater or earn college credits through South Puget Sound Community College.
- Visual and Performing Arts: NTPS offers art and music instruction in grades 1-12. A large percentage of secondary students also participate in our award-winning performing arts and music programs, including band, orchestra, theatre and choir.
- Activities: NTPS offers a variety of extra-curricular activities and clubs starting in elementary school, including chess, drama, chorus and Kiwanis K-Kids. Secondary clubs are diverse as well, including International, Academic Decathlon, Anime, Social Justice and even Break Dancing clubs.
- Athletics: Each year more than 3,000 secondary students participated in NTPS interscholastic athletic programs. Our most recent athletic addition is a Girls' Gymnastics program.
- **Our Facilities and Services** NTPS buses safely transport approximately 9,140 students a total of 7,860 miles each day to and from school. Several of our bus drivers have won regional safety awards.
- NTPS is Thurston County's largest food-service operation, serving approximately 2,100 breakfasts and 7,400 lunches each school day.
- All NTPS facilities - school buildings, playing fields, swimming pools - are used by a wide range of community groups almost every day of the year.
- Our 2006 bond included major modernization and construction projects at Timberline High School, South Bay and Woodland Elementary Schools, and Chinook and Nisqually Middle Schools, and the newest school, Chambers Prairie Elementary.
District Mission Statement

COMMITTED TO EXCELLENCE:
Providing every student the academic and life skills necessary to succeed in a diverse world

School Board Priorities

• Make student learning the center of everything we do
• Support the needs of the whole child
• Strengthen community engagement to support student learning
• Develop a trusting work culture through effective leadership
• Use public resources efficiently and be accountable

Portrait of a North Thurston Graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Resilient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinker</td>
<td>Strong Communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Self Disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Globally Aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Facilities Mission Statement

North Thurston Public Schools Facilities Department will work to develop collaborative and accountable relationships among our staff, students and the community to ensure a positive and safe learning environment. In support of the district’s mission and priorities, we believe all district facilities shall be:

- Inviting, accessible and welcoming to all
- Safe, warm and dry
- Supportive of student learning and the whole child
- Sustainable, energy efficient and economical
- Available as community resources
- Technologically progressive
HISTORY OF NORTH THURSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

North Thurston Public Schools, encompassing the northeastern portion of Thurston County, has four high schools, four middle schools, and thirteen elementary schools housing over 14,000 students.

The district, formed in 1953 with South Bay and Lacey elementary schools, immediately made plans for construction of a high school. North Thurston High School opened in September 1955 with grades 7 through 12, and in December of that year plans were underway for construction of Mt. View Elementary school and a five room addition to South Bay Elementary School, both completed in 1957.

Lydia Hawk Elementary School opened its doors in 1959 and Chinook Middle School started classes in 1961. Construction of Lakes Elementary School relieved the space crunch when it opened in 1964. Nisqually Middle School opened in 1967, with grades six through nine included at both middle schools in an attempt to keep up with the continued growth of the district. The old Lacey school was closed to students in 1967 and converted into the district office. The new Lacey Elementary School opened in 1968 and both Olympic View Elementary School and Timberline High School opened in the fall of 1970. That year the ninth grade was included in the high schools relieving the squeeze at the middle schools.


A new district office facility opened in 1986. Puget Sound High School was established in the fall of 1987; a new school building for this alternative school opened in 1990. In the fall of 1990, New Century High School, a night high school located on Timberline High School's campus, and Seven Oaks Elementary School opened their doors for students. Komachin Middle School and Horizons Elementary School opened in the fall of 1992. A new concept in high schools was adopted for River Ridge High School which opened in the fall of 1993. New Century High School was relocated to this campus. In 1998, New Century High School was relocated to Puget Sound High School and in 2000 New Century and Puget Sound were combined as South Sound High School.
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major district-wide technology improvements. The district also sold the old district office site to QFC in 1999. In 2002, the Administration Offices were upgraded, the Bower Center was renovated into a District Technology Center and the Service Center was remodeled to accommodate support service departments.

In 2006, the citizens of North Thurston Public Schools approved a $112 million dollar capital facilities bond. The replacement and modernization of Timberline High School began in the summer of 2006 and was completed in 2009. A new South Sound High School opened in 2007. The old South Sound High School facility was temporarily renamed Horizons Intermediate School and for two years housed the 5th and 6th grades of an overcrowded Horizons Elementary. When the new Chambers Prairie Elementary was complete and occupied in the fall of 2009, this facility was remodeled and commissioned as Aspire Middle School for the Performing Arts. The modernization and additions to Nisqually Middle School, Woodland and South Bay Elementary Schools were completed in 2009. The modernization and addition of Chinook Middle School was completed in 2010. The district is in the process of acquiring sites for new facilities anticipated to be required within the next twenty years.

The thirteen elementary schools; Chambers Prairie, Evergreen Forest, Horizons, Lacey, Lakes, Lydia Hawk, Meadow, Mt. View, Olympic View, Pleasant Glade, Seven Oaks, South Bay and Woodland offer basic programs in language arts, reading, mathematics and other programs for students in grades Kindergarten through 6th. Specialists in art, music and PE are provided in each elementary school. Chinook, Komachin, and Nisqually Middle schools offer state required and elective courses for students in grades seven and eight. Aspire, our magnet middle school for Performing Arts offer courses for students 6th through 8th grades. North Thurston, River Ridge, Timberline and South Sound High schools serve students in grades nine through twelve. Twenty-two credits are required for graduation with emphasis on academics, fine arts, career exploration and preparation, and physical education. Various vocational learning opportunities are offered. Special education programs and services are available to special needs students, and the district operates an educational program for hearing impaired students. In anticipation of a district wide K-5 and 6-8 grade configuration model in 2016, the Chinook zone will become the initial phase starting in the fall of 2013.

A fleet of over 100 buses transported students to and from school and traveled over 1,000,000 miles last school year.

The district serves over 1.4 million meals every year. In addition, a la carte lunches are offered at the high schools and middle schools, and breakfast is offered at all the schools.

The district employs over 1,700 employees of which 850 are teachers and has an annual budget greater than $120 million. It is the largest employer in the City of Lacey and fourth largest in Thurston County.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The NTPS Capital Facilities Plan is a six year plan intended to be revised each year for the succeeding six years.

The Capital Facilities Plan is developed with the knowledge of the development and population implications of the City of Lacey and Thurston County Comprehensive Plans and Generalized Land Use Plans. The district is committed to planning in a manner consistent with the community’s vision of its future as represented in these and other development policy documents. The district uses these long-range growth planning and demographic tools to determine and respond to the future facility needs for students within its boundaries. Long-range plans and acquisitions of sites to meet those long-range plans are required to allow appropriate time for prudent facility construction and financial planning.

The plan assesses the ability of district facilities to assist in the delivery of the educational program adopted by the district. Capacity is reviewed and modified periodically as the district revises programs, policies, staffing formulas, schedules and as facilities are modified. The plan projects future enrollments in order to evaluate the demand for future facilities.

State funding formulas have a significant impact on capacity. Currently the state is considering funding all day kindergarten. If funded, this will also change the capacity calculation significantly.

The Six Year Finance Plan addresses the type of facilities required, and the timing of providing those facilities. The plan is constructed in order to minimize long term costs to the district and tax rates for its citizens, as well as to maximize state funding assistance and meet enrollment and program demands.

In addition to state and local funding, consistent with Board Policy 9220 and other board planning policies, the district negotiates Voluntary Mitigation Agreements with residential developers. The funds paid under these agreements are used to pay for (1) projects reasonably related to and benefiting the new housing development, (2) projects necessary to provide adequate schools or school grounds to serve such new residential housing, or (3) projects reasonably necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts of such new housing development on the district’s educational facilities and programs. The district is committed to acquiring appropriate residential mitigation from developers, including dedication of future school sites, at the time of plat/subdivision or SEPA approval consistent with its evaluation of the ultimate build-out of the district.
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A 2006 capital facilities bond approved by the citizens of North Thurston Public Schools funded modernization and additions to Timberline High School completed in 2009, new Chambers Prairie Elementary School opened in 2009, and new South Sound High School opened in 2007. The old South Sound High School was recommissioned as Aspire Middle School and opened in the fall of 2009. Modernizations and additions to South Bay and Woodland Elementary Schools were completed in 2009. Modernization and additions to Nisqually Middle School were completed in 2009 and modernization and additions to Chinook Middle School were completed in 2010. Many smaller district projects were also completed using these funds.

The district continues to improve its facilities utilizing remaining proceeds from the 2006 Bond Issue. Asset Preservation thru Infrastructure Maintenance is an ongoing program to protect the public investment of tax dollars in North Thurston Public School facilities. To fund the planned and predicted maintenance or upgrade of critical building systems, as well as the ability to respond to “emergent needs”, requires the regular public support of bonds and levies. Remaining 2006 funds are being judiciously allocated to address current and projected needs until the next bond or levy is passed.

During the six years covered by this plan, the district anticipates that enrollment growth will require new facilities to meet increased capacity demands. Based on current growth projections, a new middle school and elementary school is planned to be added within the next six years. The district is also planning to reconfigure to K-5 elementary schools, 6-8 middle schools and 9-12 high schools within the next six years, which will provide additional capacity at the elementary level. Finally, in response to age and condition, and in keeping with state Construction Assistance Program criteria, up to four existing NTPS facilities are planned for modernization within the same time frame. Further, because these plans are based upon estimates and projections, the district anticipates the need to and will continue to evaluate, update, and revise its plans annually. To meet capacity gaps at locations with particular demand, the district will utilize portable facilities until such time as it is able to replace those temporary facilities with permanent facilities that enable the district to fully utilize the space for its educational programming purposes. As necessary, the district will also reconsider other programming or planning alternatives to meet student needs.
I. SUMMARY

Purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan

This Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is a six year rolling plan. It is intended to be revised each year for the succeeding six years, using the best available information. It provides the District, the City of Lacey, Thurston County, the State of Washington, other jurisdictions, and the community with a description of facilities which will be needed to accommodate projected student enrollment at acceptable levels of service over the next 20 years, and a more detailed schedule and financing program for capital improvements over the next six years (2013-2019). This CFP has been prepared by North Thurston Public Schools with the input of citizens and staff members. This plan was prepared based upon enrollment information available in October 2012. This plan is consistent with current North Thurston Public Schools policies and procedures. The plan addresses the anticipated capital facility needs through the 2019 school year.

In accordance with the Growth Management Act, this CFP contains the following required elements:

- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by NTPS, showing the locations and capacities of the facilities;
- A forecast of the future needs/demand (i.e., student enrollment) for capital facilities owned by NTPS;
- The proposed capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; and
- A six-year plan for financing capital facilities within projected funding capacities, which clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes.

This CFP also identifies (a) deficiencies in school facilities serving existing development, and the means by which existing deficiencies will be eliminated within a reasonable period of time and (b) additional school facilities required to serve new development.

North Thurston Public Schools bases its enrollment projections on data from the OSPI as well as growth projections from Thurston Regional Planning Council, state and national census and demographic data. Because school facilities are capital facilities included within coordinated growth planning under the Growth Management Act, the district will provide this CFP to local jurisdictions within the district's boundaries. The district periodically reviews its capacity to house projected student enrollment. Where appropriate, it adjusts its school attendance boundaries in order to match student capacity with projected enrollment.

This plan consists of a summary of existing school buildings (building and site sizes, and addresses), capacity of existing facilities, a list of potential capital projects and a six year finance plan for capital projects. The list of potential capital projects includes site acquisition, new construction, modernization, preservation of existing facilities through the major repair and
upgrade of critical building systems, temporary facilities, and other site modifications as well as a rough estimate of the potential cost for each item.

**Overview of North Thurston Public Schools**

North Thurston Public Schools is located in Thurston County, Washington. It is bordered by the Nisqually River and Pierce County line on the east and Puget Sound on the north. It encompasses nearly all of the City of Lacey Urban Growth Area, portions of the City of Olympia and portions of unincorporated Thurston County on the north, east and south borders, serving both urban and rural areas.

Based upon October 2012 enrollment data, North Thurston Public Schools serves a student population of over 14,300, with 13 elementary schools, three middle schools, one small special focus middle school, three comprehensive high schools and one smaller high school of choice. The elementary schools primarily provide educational programs for students in kindergarten through grade six. Middle schools serve grades seven and eight, and high schools offer educational programming for students in grades nine through twelve.

The district intends to reconfigure grades during the six years covered by this plan. Elementary schools will serve grades K-5 and middle schools will serve grades 6-8 and high schools 9-12.

If the state provides funding for all day kindergarten, this grade reconfiguration will help provide capacity at the elementary grade level to house the additional program.

**Significant Issues Related to Facility Planning for North Thurston Public Schools**

The enrollment projections prepared by North Thurston Public Schools indicate significant increases in the enrollment of NTPS in the next twenty (20) years. Increases in enrollment are projected at all grade levels within the next six (6) years.

North Thurston Public Schools currently projects that enrollment increases will require construction of at least one new elementary school, and two new middle schools and an additional high school with capacity within the next twenty years. This new construction will maintain the current educational program and the planned reconfiguration to a K-5, 6-8, 9-12 structure. NTPS anticipates construction of one new middle school within the next six years.

The district is committed to constructing neighborhood schools for elementary schools. This policy supports City of Lacey land use policies.

The district is committed to maximizing the opportunity for students to walk to school. This policy supports Thurston County development requirements.
In cooperation with the City of Lacey, land use policies have been established that plan additional elementary school sites as part of residential developments and/or village centers.

Acquisition of new school sites in advance of enrollment needs is critical to preparing the school district to meet the challenge of increasing enrollment. Since it is uncertain how or when land will ultimately be developed or how the district may deliver services in the future, the district anticipates that it may acquire more sites than the minimum supported by enrollment projections. The district currently owns five potential elementary school sites, four potential middle school sites and one potential high school site. However, as growth occurs and both development regulations and educational programming are modified over time, these sites may not ultimately be suitable for development at the time when construction is needed. Sites that become unsuitable for development may later be surplused or exchanged for sites more suitable or in different geographic locations.

To address existing facility deficiencies, the district plans to continue its programs of preventive maintenance and building system upgrade, a.k.a. the Asset Preservation Program (APP). The district has also pursued a program of building modernization (funded by the 1991 and 2006 bond issues and matching funds provided by the State Construction Assistance Program). The district has regularly improved facilities, responding to new programs, technology changes and safety concerns using the capital funds generated by bond measures and state assistance, and will continue to do so.

Enrollment changes due to residential development have led the district to make use of temporary facilities and to review school attendance boundaries periodically. The district believes that the potential to adjust enrollment through future changes in contiguous boundaries is limited. Future reliance on more extensive bussing is a more likely scenario, creating increased needs for additions to the district’s bus fleet. Voluntary mitigation agreements may be used to address such impacts of new development.

Assumptions

This plan will help guide the modernization and maintenance of existing facilities as well as the development of new facilities. The following assumptions were used in developing this CFP:

1. The district will continue to seek state and federal money to the maximum extent available to supplement its own financial resources (See Policies 9100 and 9220).

2. The state will fund new facilities using the following space allowance:

   Grades K-6  
   Grades 7-8  
   90 square feet per pupil  
   117 square feet per pupil
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Grades 9-12 130 square feet per pupil
Classrooms for students 144 square feet per pupil
with disabilities

(See WAC 392-343-035)

3. School design and planning capacity shall be:

   Elementary School  - 550 + special education space
   Middle School      - 750 + special education space
   High School        - 1250 + special education space

(See Policy 9100)

4. The Board will continue to provide educational services through temporary facilities or rental of facilities as a transitional space to accommodate shifting enrollment (See Policy 9112).

5. The district will attempt to acquire building sites in advance of construction needs (See Policy 9210).

6. The district will continue to maintain the district's facilities (See Policy 9300).

7. Budget recommendations shall be made each year to repair, maintain and recondition facilities as warranted to operate facilities in a safe and healthful condition (See Policy 9300).

8. To receive approval from OSPI for new facilities the district will attempt to comply with all applicable statues and regulations.

9. The minimum acreage per school site will be 5 usable acres plus one usable acre for each 100 students, plus an added 5 usable acres if the school includes any grade above grade 6. (See WAC 392-342-020). The district ultimately determines the size of site necessary to facilitate the educational program that the district chooses to site at a certain location, applying the site evaluation criteria set forth in the OSPI School Facilities Manual. Given the district's educational programming standards, the average site acreages by school type are: 12 acres for elementary schools; 20 acres for middle schools; and 40 acres for high schools.

10. New sites will not be accepted if the attendance policies for the new site will create a racial imbalance within the district (See WAC 392-342-025).

11. Sites will be accepted only if all local health, zoning, building and other regulations may be met.
12. The district determines educational program standards in accordance with adopted policies, other relevant factors, and is not constrained by the state-rated capacity. Primary determinants of capacity are building configuration and classroom enrollment policies (policy or teacher contracts), and educational programs.

13. The district believes that reasonable residential mitigation fees voluntarily made by developers of new residential housing in accordance with legal requirements are an appropriate source of funds for (1) projects reasonably related to and benefiting the new housing development, (2) projects necessary to provide adequate schools or school grounds to serve such new residential housing, or (3) projects reasonably necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts of such new housing development on the district's educational facilities and programs. The district seeks such residential mitigation fees from all residential developers whose projects are anticipated to add students within the district's boundaries (See Policy 9220).

14. This plan assumes that all district school buildings will be maintained in good repair.

14. As portions of the district's Strategic Plan are implemented, the district's policies and procedures may be amended. As a result, changes may be made to this list of assumptions and to this plan.

16. The draft revised plan will be reviewed by the Board during a public meeting and will be adopted or approved by the Board.
II. STUDENT ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

Historic Enrollment Trends
The school district has reviewed historical enrollment trends. Since 1973, district enrollment has fluctuated between periods of no enrollment growth and periods of rapid enrollment growth. The overall trend is up as total district enrollment has nearly doubled in thirty years. District enrollment declined between 1973-1975 before growing about 20% between 1976 and 1981. Enrollment declined again between 1981 and 1983 before growing about 50% between 1983 and 1993. Enrollment declined slightly between 1993 and 2001. Since 2001 enrollment has been growing. The district projects that enrollment will continue to increase until the late 2020’s (see Chart 1).

Recent Enrollment Trends
Recent enrollment data suggests that the district is in a period of enrollment growth. Even prior to the acceleration of residential development from 2005-2007, enrollment in elementary schools was increasing. The trend is expected to accelerate and extend to increases in middle and high school enrollment within the next decade. The growth is consistent with the projected growth of the student aged population state-wide due to the echo of the baby-boom population (OFM Research Paper No. 30) and will be reinforced by the construction of residential units within the district.

The regions of the district showing the largest growth in enrollment are those areas having the greatest number of new homes occupied.

Projected Student Enrollment
All forecasting is based on the assumption that past trends predict future trends. The shorter the forecast, the more likely that underlying assumption is accurate. The enrollment modeling utilized by North Thurston Public Schools has, so far, remained consistent in its predictions of enrollment growth.

OSPI 2013-2019 Student Enrollment Projection
OSPI generates enrollment projections for each school district in the state using a six-year forecast period. The state office uses the cohort survival methodology to project student enrollment for grades 1-12. Kindergarten enrollment is projected using a linear regression analysis of actual kindergarten enrollment over the previous six years. This methodology
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assumes that enrollment trends which have occurred over the previous six years will continue through the next six years. OSPI updates these projections annually. Due to the incorporation of Wa He Lut Indian School enrollment in North Thurston Public Schools reports in 2011, the OSPI projection is distorted. We have removed the new data and run a “modified” OSPI projection. Based on the modified OSPI enrollment projection, a total of 2212 (headcount) students would be expected to be added to the district by the year 2019, an increase of approximately 15.5% over existing enrollment levels. The OSPI student enrollment projections by grade level for the six-year forecast period (2012-2019) are provided in Table 1. OSPI’s projections are significant because they are one of the factors in determining eligibility for state matching funds.

**NTPS Student Enrollment Projection**

The enrollment projection model adopted by North Thurston Public Schools is different from that utilized by OSPI. The district has adopted a model to forecast enrollment.

The NTPS model uses the same October headcount data utilized by OSPI, but the NTPS model also utilizes residential construction data, information about probability of students in residences from study of recent NTPS records and a statistical study of national demographic (census) data, average family size data from TRPC, birth rates assumptions from analysis of Washington State population data, and population projections provided by Office of Financial Management (OFM) to create a student enrollment projection that is consistent with the planning projections with which the district is required to plan. NTPS tests and calibrates its model with census data (1990, and 2000), updates from TRPC and OFM, and other demographic information as it becomes available. It is adjusted to correspond to the OSPI projections for the next six years.

Charts 2 and 2A and the associated Tables 2 and 2A present the district’s projection.

The NTPS model projects additional 1771 (headcount) students, a 12.4% growth in school enrollment between October 2012 and October 2019. (See Table for Chart 2).

A moderate rate of residential construction over the next few years is projected to increase enrollment at all grade levels. Beyond the year 2018, enrollment growth is projected to increase moderately for the next 20 years, even if new construction rates decline. (See Chart 2A and Table 2A).

A comparison of the total enrollment projections derived using the forecast methodologies discussed above is provided in Table 3.
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Table 3
Comparison of Student Enrollment Projections
North Thurston Public Schools 2012-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>14,508</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>15,054</td>
<td>15391</td>
<td>15744</td>
<td>16,115</td>
<td>16,505</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPS</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>14,537</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>15,010</td>
<td>15,316</td>
<td>15,593</td>
<td>15,836</td>
<td>16,064</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district’s enrollment projection will be used in evaluating near term (six-year) facility needs as part of this CFP. Based on the district’s model, student headcount enrollment is projected to increase by 492 students at the elementary grade level (K-6), 194 students at middle school (7-8) and 14 students at high school (9-12). Projected student FTE enrollment by grade span based on the district’s model is provided in Table 4.

Table 4
Projected Student Headcount Enrollment by Grade Span
North Thurston Public Schools 2012-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>7767</td>
<td>7939</td>
<td>8172</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>8583</td>
<td>8834</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td>9022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (7-8)</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>4405</td>
<td>4483</td>
<td>4485</td>
<td>4540</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>4525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>14,537</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>15,010</td>
<td>15,316</td>
<td>15,593</td>
<td>15,836</td>
<td>16,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Student Enrollment 2013-2033

Twenty-year student enrollment projections are used by the district in determining its long-range (twenty-year) facility plan.

Student enrollment projections for the year 2033 are based on the NTPS enrollment model. This information is provided in Chart 2A. The total enrollment estimate, using twenty-year population projections provided by OFM, is broken down by grade span to evaluate long-term site acquisition needs for elementary, middle, and high school facilities. Projected enrollment by grade span for the year 2020, 2026 and 2033 is provided in Table 5. Grade spans have been reconfigured to K-5, 6-8, 9-12 for this table.
Table 5
North Thurston Public Schools
Year 2020, 2026 and 2033 Projected Headcount Enrollment by Grade Span
(Grade Spans are reconfigured)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>Projected Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>6652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6-8)</td>
<td>3305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Total (K-12)</td>
<td>14,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the population projections prepared by TRPC, with grade reconfiguration, NTPS estimates that it will construct at least one new elementary school in the next 20 years, two new middle schools and a new high school or additional high school capacity.

If the district adopts a full day kindergarten, approximately two additional kindergarten rooms will be required at each elementary school or the capacity equivalent of two additional elementary schools will have to be provided. Grade re-configuration provides sufficient capacity to house the additional FTE student count initially, deferring the need for an additional elementary school until the early 2020’s. Housing the additional kindergarten load may require modernization of existing facilities to provide for the program requirements of kindergarten students.

NTPS studies the number of students residing in new residential developments. That information is provided in Table 6. TRPC provides population projections for NTPS, see Table 7. TRPC projections of average people per residence are used to convert the projected population to residential construction, and that residential construction as input to the enrollment model. TRPC projections and maps of Lacey and UGA Residential Developments (see attached) are used to guide property acquisitions. (Table 8 and Map 1)

This CFP is consistent with the County's allocation of planned urban and rural growth based on OFM's 20-year projections. Based on the OFM-projected population growth to be allocated to the area served by the district under Thurston County's comprehensive plan for the succeeding twenty-year period, the district will serve the educational needs of children in such developments by a combination of both existing and additional new facilities (including use of portables to meet temporary needs and construction of new or expanded facilities to meet permanent educational programming needs).
Use of Student Enrollment Projections for Capital Facilities Planning

The district's enrollment projections summarized in this section are used to evaluate future school capacity needs. Analysis of future facility and capacity needs is provided in Sections IV-VIII of this Capital Facilities Plan.

Ethnicity and Race Enrollment Trends

Chart 3 shows ethnicity and race enrollment trends since 1983. The trend to a more diverse student population is continuing.

Recently, the number of ethnicity and race classifications has been expanded. There are currently 9 classifications for Hispanic subpopulations, 16 classifications for Asian, and 9 for Pacific Islander and 31 for American Indian. Within a few years our discussion of subpopulations may be revised considerably.

During the period covered by this plan, we anticipate continued increase in the number of categories by which we identify ourselves.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 1</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1.06861227</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 2</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1.02742490</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 3</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1.01705214</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 4</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1.01247181</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 5</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1.01406302</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-5</td>
<td>6047</td>
<td>6204</td>
<td>6304</td>
<td>6509</td>
<td>6480</td>
<td>6652</td>
<td>6879</td>
<td>7117</td>
<td>7387</td>
<td>7630</td>
<td>7905</td>
<td>8196</td>
<td>8501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-5 FTE</td>
<td>5618</td>
<td>5706</td>
<td>5807</td>
<td>5968</td>
<td>5932</td>
<td>6059</td>
<td>6246</td>
<td>6440</td>
<td>6644</td>
<td>6867</td>
<td>7080</td>
<td>7314</td>
<td>7588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1-5</td>
<td>5189</td>
<td>5207</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>5428</td>
<td>5384</td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>5763</td>
<td>5920</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>6254</td>
<td>6431</td>
<td>6615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>0.99661265</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-6</td>
<td>7132</td>
<td>7263</td>
<td>7327</td>
<td>7613</td>
<td>7568</td>
<td>7767</td>
<td>7892</td>
<td>8144</td>
<td>8409</td>
<td>8688</td>
<td>8977</td>
<td>9282</td>
<td>9693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-6 FTE</td>
<td>6703</td>
<td>6765</td>
<td>6830</td>
<td>7072</td>
<td>7020</td>
<td>7174</td>
<td>7258</td>
<td>7467</td>
<td>7685</td>
<td>7913</td>
<td>8151</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1-6</td>
<td>6274</td>
<td>6266</td>
<td>6332</td>
<td>6530</td>
<td>6472</td>
<td>6581</td>
<td>6624</td>
<td>6790</td>
<td>6962</td>
<td>7140</td>
<td>7325</td>
<td>7517</td>
<td>7717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1.00121461</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1.00923356</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 6-8</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>3182</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>3243</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>3243</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>3323</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 7-8</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>2159</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1.03913669</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 7-9</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>3204</td>
<td>3196</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>3284</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td>3391</td>
<td>3427</td>
<td>3484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 10</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>0.99570271</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 11</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>0.98661967</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 12</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1.03757785</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 9-12</td>
<td>4283</td>
<td>4282</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>4368</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>4338</td>
<td>4387</td>
<td>4462</td>
<td>4484</td>
<td>4618</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>4698</td>
<td>4639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 10-12</td>
<td>3221</td>
<td>3201</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3329</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>3406</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-12</td>
<td>13491</td>
<td>13668</td>
<td>13695</td>
<td>14063</td>
<td>14051</td>
<td>14293</td>
<td>14508</td>
<td>14734</td>
<td>15054</td>
<td>15391</td>
<td>15744</td>
<td>16115</td>
<td>16505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-12 FTE</td>
<td>13062</td>
<td>13170</td>
<td>13198</td>
<td>13642</td>
<td>13603</td>
<td>13700</td>
<td>13876</td>
<td>14067</td>
<td>14331</td>
<td>14618</td>
<td>14918</td>
<td>15233</td>
<td>15562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1-12</td>
<td>12833</td>
<td>12871</td>
<td>12700</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>12865</td>
<td>13107</td>
<td>13241</td>
<td>13380</td>
<td>13607</td>
<td>13845</td>
<td>14092</td>
<td>14350</td>
<td>14619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINDERGARTEN</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 1</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 2</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 3</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 4</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 5</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 10</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 11</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 12</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>7132</td>
<td>7203</td>
<td>7327</td>
<td>7613</td>
<td>7668</td>
<td>7757</td>
<td>7939</td>
<td>8172</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>8583</td>
<td>8634</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td>9022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 MIDDLE</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>2159</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 HIGH</td>
<td>4283</td>
<td>4282</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>4358</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>4405</td>
<td>4483</td>
<td>4485</td>
<td>4540</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</td>
<td>13491</td>
<td>13568</td>
<td>13652</td>
<td>14083</td>
<td>14051</td>
<td>14293</td>
<td>14537</td>
<td>14742</td>
<td>15010</td>
<td>15316</td>
<td>15593</td>
<td>15836</td>
<td>15064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE FOR CHART 2
#### GRADES RECONFIGURED TO K-5, 6-8, 9-12
#### WITHOUT WA HE LUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KINDERGARTEN</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 1</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 2</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 3</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 4</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 5</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 10</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 11</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 12</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8 MIDDLE</td>
<td>8047</td>
<td>6204</td>
<td>6304</td>
<td>6599</td>
<td>6489</td>
<td>6652</td>
<td>6903</td>
<td>7033</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>7472</td>
<td>7675</td>
<td>7860</td>
<td>7761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 HIGH</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>3182</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>3253</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>3777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</td>
<td>13491</td>
<td>13658</td>
<td>13695</td>
<td>14083</td>
<td>14051</td>
<td>14293</td>
<td>14537</td>
<td>14742</td>
<td>15010</td>
<td>15316</td>
<td>15593</td>
<td>15836</td>
<td>16064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINDERGARTHEN</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 1</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 2</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 3</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 4</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 5</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 10</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 11</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 12</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6 ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>9123</td>
<td>9231</td>
<td>9322</td>
<td>9378</td>
<td>9391</td>
<td>9389</td>
<td>9318</td>
<td>9235</td>
<td>9142</td>
<td>9040</td>
<td>8943</td>
<td>8848</td>
<td>8763</td>
<td>8687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 MIDDLE</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>2694</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>2724</td>
<td>2728</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>2673</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 HIGH</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>4846</td>
<td>5005</td>
<td>5133</td>
<td>5239</td>
<td>5178</td>
<td>5238</td>
<td>5324</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>5485</td>
<td>5532</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>5543</td>
<td>5510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</td>
<td>18377</td>
<td>18588</td>
<td>18838</td>
<td>17055</td>
<td>17239</td>
<td>17201</td>
<td>17246</td>
<td>17276</td>
<td>17284</td>
<td>17251</td>
<td>17181</td>
<td>17076</td>
<td>16951</td>
<td>16821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE FOR CHART 2A
GRADES RECONFIGURED TO K-5, 6-8, 9-12
WITHOUT WA HE LUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KINDERGARTEN</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 1</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 2</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 3</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 4</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 5</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 10</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 11</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 12</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K-5 ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7872</td>
<td>7963</td>
<td>8031</td>
<td>8063</td>
<td>8054</td>
<td>8013</td>
<td>7956</td>
<td>7872</td>
<td>7780</td>
<td>7698</td>
<td>7615</td>
<td>7531</td>
<td>7457</td>
<td>7404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6-8 MIDDLE

| 3869 | 3772 | 3802 | 3866 | 3946 | 4010 | 4054 | 4080 | 4085 | 4070 | 4035 | 3990 | 3951 | 3907 |

### 9-12 HIGH

| 4636 | 4846 | 5005 | 5133 | 5239 | 5178 | 5236 | 5324 | 5418 | 5485 | 5532 | 5556 | 5543 | 5510 |

### TOTAL HEADCOUNT

| 16377 | 16588 | 16638 | 17065 | 17239 | 17201 | 17246 | 17276 | 17284 | 17251 | 17181 | 17076 | 16951 | 16821 |
CHART 3
PROJECTED PERCENT ETHNICITY AND RACE ENROLLMENT IN NORTH THURSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OCTOBER HEADCOUNT

YEAR


AFRICAN AMERICAN  ASIAN  AMERICAN INDIAN  HISPANIC  MINORITY  UNKNOWN  CAUCASIAN

(Based on data through 2010)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Occupied Residence</th>
<th># Planned</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village at Union Mills Apts</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village at Union Mills</td>
<td>SF-Small Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany Lane Apts</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Oly View</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaglecliff</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Oly View</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows Crossing/Rosewood</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>EF/ Meadows</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakbrook</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countrywood</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlerock (Talcott Ridge)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Park/Highlands</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Lydia Hawk</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (Hidden Springs)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Seven Oaks</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Heights</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Place</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullen Heights</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Springs</td>
<td>SF-Small Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattison Park</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Farm</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mt View</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikes Woods</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mt View</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Pointe &amp; Apartments</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Pointe Cottages</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinewood Trails</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Glen</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>915</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Populations Forecast by Elementary School Service Area**

**North Thurston Public School**


**Note:** Numbers may not add due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School / District</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth</th>
<th>Total Growth Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Forest</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>12,590</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>13,690</td>
<td>14,420</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Hawk</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic View</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>11,210</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Glade</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td>14,780</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>8,590</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>12,390</td>
<td>13,960</td>
<td>15,230</td>
<td>16,030</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Thurston P.S. Total</td>
<td>85,310</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>104,240</td>
<td>115,010</td>
<td>123,910</td>
<td>131,360</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>2006 ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>PROJECTED 2030 ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>NET CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/2 K)</td>
<td>(1/2 K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERGREEN FOREST</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZONS</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACEY</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKES</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>-101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYDIA HAWK</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEADOWS</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTAIN VIEW</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLYMPIC VIEW</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT GLADE</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN OAKS</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH BAY</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6483</strong></td>
<td><strong>9864</strong></td>
<td><strong>3381</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lacey and Urban Growth Area
Residential Developments Since 2004
11,068 Total Units
Updated 2/21/2013

Map 1

Development Status
- Application Submitted
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- Final
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Source: City of Lacey
III. DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS

School facility and student capacity needs are determined by the types and amounts of space required to accommodate the district's adopted educational programs. The educational program standards established by North Thurston Public Schools include grade configuration, optimum facility size, class size, educational program offerings, as well as classroom utilization and scheduling requirements and use of temporary facilities (portables). These standards are established through the instructional plan adopted by the district, the school calendar/schedule, teachers' contracts, and organizational structure. These programs or structures are subject to change by the district to adjust for changes in the program year, special programs, class sizes, use of technology, and other physical aspects of school facilities. The district will periodically review its school capacity inventory and adjust for changes to the educational program standards.

Although North Thurston Public Schools continues to study alternate organizations, calendars and schedules, the North Thurston Public Schools believes the adopted organization is educationally sound and reflects community values. If alternate organizations, calendars or schedules are adopted, the district would revise the capacity calculations.

Grade Configuration

North Thurston Public Schools has adopted an organization that houses kindergarten through sixth grade in elementary schools, seventh and eighth grades in middle schools, and ninth through twelfth grades in high schools.

The district is planning to change the grade configuration to K-5 elementary schools and 6-8 middle schools within the period covered by this plan.

School Schedule/Calendar

North Thurston Public Schools has adopted a traditional calendar beginning in early September and completing in mid June. North Thurston Public Schools has adopted a traditional daily schedule with academic classes beginning between 7:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and completing mid-afternoon.
Class Size

North Thurston Public Schools has class size maximums of 25 for preschool classes, 25 students for grades K-3, 30 students for grades 4-6 and 32 students in grades 7-12. District-wide average class sizes at all grade levels are lower than the maximum class sizes noted.

North Thurston Public Schools has temporarily suspended lower class size goals due to reduced state funding. In addition, this plan anticipates that full day kindergarten will not be funded by the state within the next 6 years.

Temporary Facilities (Portable Classrooms)

Temporary facilities do not allow the full range of educational activities envisioned by NTPS. However, temporary facilities play an important role in any given planning period. Temporary facilities are needed to prevent the over-building of school facilities, to meet the needs of service areas in the district and to cover the gap between the time that families move into new residential developments and the date that construction is completed on new permanent school facilities. Over time, NTPS seeks to provide permanent capacity to meet enrollment demand in spaces that provide for full educational programming.

Core Facilities and Elective Offerings

Core facilities, such as the size of a cafeteria or gym, the number of restrooms, or the size and number of specialty areas such as shops, often limit enrollment to levels below that expected by room occupancy levels. In addition, for secondary schools, occupancy in the classrooms is further limited by scheduling constraints and student course selection. For example, secondary schools offer a number of elective courses and many elective courses will not attract a full classroom of students.

Additional Non-Program Constraints on Space Requirements

Government mandates and community expectations may also affect how classroom space is used. Traditional educational programs offered by school districts are often supplemented by non-traditional, or special programs such as special education, bilingual education, remediation, alcohol and drug education, AIDS education, preschool programs, computer lab, music programs, and the like. These special or non-traditional programs are factors that have been considered in determining the student capacity of school facilities.

Calculation of Student Capacity

For funding purposes, the State (OSPI) calculates school capacity by dividing the gross square footage of a building by a standard square footage per students established in WAC 392-343-035.
North Thurston Public Schools 2013 Capital Facilities Plan

This statewide standard is a simple and uniform approach to determining school capacity for purposes of allocating available State Match Funds to school districts for new construction.

However, this method is not considered to be an accurate reflection of the actual capacity required to accommodate the adopted educational program of North Thurston Public Schools or other area school districts. This method does not take into consideration the additional capacity considerations described in this section.

To calculate student capacity, NTPS uses a practical capacity model that factors in the adopted local educational program, limitations of existing facilities, and non-program constraints. Under this model, the use of each room in each facility is reviewed along with applicable educational programming standards. The capacity for each facility is established by multiplying the permanent classrooms available by the scheduling limitations on average students per class. It is not possible to achieve 100% utilization of regular classrooms as a result of scheduling conflicts for student programs, fluctuations in enrollment by school throughout the year, the need for specialized rooms for certain programs, and the need for teachers to have a work space during planning periods. For every room housing students, a calculation is made assigning a maximum number of students per room. The calculation determines the number of students each school can accommodate. Core facilities and special use facilities limitations are also considered in this assessment of classroom capacity.

For secondary school classrooms, the calculation also accounts for utilization rates. Based on analysis of utilization of its existing secondary schools, NTPS determines a utilization rate for secondary school classrooms.

*Calculation of Space Allocation Applying Educational Program Standards*

The district's program results in a different capacity than the state-rated capacity. The district builds more space per student than the state-rated formula for funding (WAC 392-343-035) provides. According to its educational program standards and non-program constraints, NTPS has set the capacity of its facilities. Dividing gross square foot by grade grouping by capacity of facilities by grade groupings results in the following average space per student of district facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>Space per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>81.5 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (7-8)</td>
<td>114.2 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>107.8 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY

To determine what facilities will be required to accommodate future demand (student enrollment) at acceptable or established local programming standards, NTPS must first establish a baseline of facilities available to serve the needs of the district. This section provides an inventory of capital facilities owned and operated by NTPS, including permanent schools, developed school sites, undeveloped land, and support facilities. School facility capacity was determined based on the permanent space required to accommodate the district's adopted educational program standards (see Section III). A map showing locations of the district developed educational facilities is provided as Map 3.

Existing Schools

NTPS currently operates:

- 13 elementary schools serving grades K-6;
- three (3) standard middle schools serving grades 7-8;
- one (1) magnet middle school serving grades 6-8
- three (3) comprehensive high schools serving grades 9-12
- one (1) special focus high school serving grades 9-12.

Measures of Capacity

As discussed in Section IV, NTPS has adopted a space allocation standard that reflects the space NTPS has determined as necessary to meet the requirements of its locally adopted educational program standards as well as state-established minimums. For this CFP, school capacity was determined by applying the district's educational program standards to individual schools in order to determine the space requirements of the programs housed in them. It is this capacity calculation which is used to establish the district's baseline capacity and determine future capacity needs based on projected student enrollment.

Existing enrollment may be above or below the capacity at which the district rates the permanent facility.

Inventory

Table 10 identifies the permanent district educational facilities, their district-rated capacities and their location. Capacity of educational facilities has been calculated by the Planning Consultant based on the educational program standards and space allocation standards described in Section III. Extensive interviews with principals and counselors were also conducted. Capacity as noted represents a calculation of the ability of existing permanent facilities to deliver the district's educational program.

Table 11 identifies all district owned assets, their year of construction and major renovations.
TABLE : 10  2013 NTPS INVENTORY OF PERMANENT EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>*CAPACITY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire (6th grade, 1/3 of total)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6501 Virginia St SE, Lacey 98513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Prairie</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>3025 Marvin Road SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Forest</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4601 67th Avenue SE, Lacey 98513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1800 Homann Drive, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>6211 Mullen Road SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>7600 5th Street SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Hawk</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>836 Deerbrush Drive SE, Lacey 98513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1900 College Street SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. View</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1330 Horne Avenue NE, Lacey 98516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic View</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1920 Abernethy Road NE, Lacey 98516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Glade</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1800 Seven Oaks Drive SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>3845 Sleater Kinney NE, Lacey 98506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>4630 Carpenter Road SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7264</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire (7th &amp; 8th, 2/3 of total)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5900 54th Avenue SE, Lacey 98513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>4301 Sixth Avenue NE, Lacey 98516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komachin</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>3650 College Street SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisqually</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>8100 Steilacoom Road, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2465</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Thurston</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>600 Sleater Kinney NE, Lacey 98506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sound</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>411 College Street NE, Lacey 98516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Ridge</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>350 River Ridge Dr SE, Lacey 98513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberline</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>6120 Mullen Road SE, Lacey 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Permanent capacity is based upon District capacity standards as described herein.
## Summary of Existing Facilities

### 2012-13

### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Building</th>
<th>Site Acres</th>
<th>Building Area (Square Feet)</th>
<th>OSPI 2012 State-Rated Capacity</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Year Remodeled</th>
<th>Description of Remodel</th>
<th>2011-2012 Number of Portable Classrooms*</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Portable Classrooms**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Prairie Elementary</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>57,373</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>New School - Original</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Forest Elementary</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>44,008</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizons Elementary w/ land lab</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>51,016</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>HVAC Upgrade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey Elementary</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>47,505</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Addition(gym)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Gym Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Addition (plashted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Addition (gym)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes Elementary</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>48,235</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Hawk Elementary</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Elementary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48,202</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. View Elementary</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>51,439</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Plashted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998/1999</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Asbestos Encapsulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Glade Elementary</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>48,482</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks Elementary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36,589</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Elementary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48,575</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>New** (demo old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Modernize 1976 Wing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Modernize 1981 Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>49,494</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>Modernization &amp; Addition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</td>
<td>175.40</td>
<td>637,193</td>
<td>6,864</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Modernization &amp; Addition</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire Middle School</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29,842</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former SSIS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Middle School</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>86,764</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Horizons Intermediate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komachin Middle School</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>89,360</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition/Modernize</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisqually Middle School</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87,924</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition/Modernize</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>105.41</td>
<td>293,890</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization &amp; Addition</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Existing Facilities (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Building</th>
<th>Site/Building Area</th>
<th>OSPI 2012 State-Rated Capacity</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Year Remodeled</th>
<th>Description of Remodel</th>
<th>2011-2012 Number of Portable Classrooms*</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Portable Classrooms**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Thurston High School</td>
<td>38.4 175,459</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Autoshop &amp; Pool Added</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>New School - Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Building Demolished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>HVAC Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Addition (Auditorium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Pool Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Sound High School</td>
<td>4.4 20,035</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>New School - Original</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Ridge High School ***</td>
<td>41.5 176,772</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>HVAC Renovation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool HVAC Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberline High School</td>
<td>55 197,728</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Pool/HVAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Phase 1/Phase 2 Add</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007/09</td>
<td>Phase 2/Phase 3 Mod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal High School 139.30 569,094 4,360

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS 420.11 1,501,077 13,762

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site/ Building Area</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description of Remodel</th>
<th>Number of PORTABLE Classrooms*</th>
<th>Maximum Number of PORTABLE Classrooms**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>4.6 29,860</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower Learning Center****</td>
<td>38 5,662</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Center</td>
<td>11 92,483</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Street Warehouse</td>
<td>1 9,000</td>
<td>2001-04</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Site/ Building Area</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description of Remodel</th>
<th>Number of PORTABLE Classrooms*</th>
<th>Maximum Number of PORTABLE Classrooms**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drough Site (Marvin Road)</td>
<td>72.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Road Site*****</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllister Park</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Campus</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Campus</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR - Mullen Road Site</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicwood Site (Marvin Road)</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 8-plex modular classrooms at South Bay Elementary, Woodland Elementary, Nisqually Middle School and Chinook Middle School
**Maximum number of portables has been estimated by the Construction & Design office based on space availability and school's infrastructure.
***Of the 6 portables at RRHS, 3 are classrooms, and 3 are for storage only (Dry, No HVAC) and not included on chart above.
****Located on NTHS site, former NTHS library
*****This site is not currently suitable for an elementary. It is located in the McAllister Springs Geologically Sensitive Area. Additional land or sewer are needed in order to build.

Please refer to the North Thurston Public School 2004 Study & Survey for building area (square footage) and more detailed school building information.
V. PROJECTED FACILITY NEEDS (Years 2013-2019)

Six-Year Facility Needs (through 2019)

Projected available student capacity was derived by subtracting projected student enrollment for each of the six years in the forecast period from the existing school capacity. Since this procedure is intended to establish facility needs, proposed construction projects are not included as available capacity at this point. Available student capacity by grade span, based on permanent capacity existing in 2012, is shown in Table 12.

The district is planning on reconfiguring grade levels. Table 12 below makes the adjustment in housing needs between 2015 and 2016 years even though timing of the reconfiguration has not yet been determined.

With grade reconfiguration in the fall of 2018, additional classroom capacity will be required at the middle school level. Unhoused students are defined as students expected to be housed in temporary facilities or classrooms where class size exceeds the District's standard for class size. Projected housing needs by grade span for each year in the six-year forecast period are provided in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-134</td>
<td>-369</td>
<td>-520</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>-894</td>
<td>-912</td>
<td>-1173</td>
<td>-1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-253</td>
<td>-471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to house the projected number of unhoused students in permanent facilities by the end of the forecast period (the year 2019), the district would have to construct two new elementary schools or grade reconfigure and construct at least one new middle school. Additionally, by the end of the forecast period, portable classrooms will be older than 20 years and most of them will have outlived their anticipated useful life. The district expects that some of these units will need major renovation or replacement with new temporary facilities or, as possible, with permanent facilities.
In addition to capacity-related facility needs, building and system deficiencies are identified and tracked through the district’s annual facility assessment process. Data from this process is used to develop and update the district’s annual Capital Facilities Plan. Building and system deficiencies are regularly prioritized, and reprioritized, to determine on a district-wide level the highest needs to be addressed in each year’s capital plan of work. Through this process the district’s highest priority deficiencies are addressed regularly, subject to the availability of resources. However, when a facility becomes eligible to receive funding for a major modernization, and a project is initiated, all critical building systems are then replaced or upgraded.
VI. PLANNED FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS

North Thurston Public Schools has identified projects that would be required to meet projected enrollment growth while maintaining its educational program. The district's plan for facility improvements has four elements: (1) construction for enrollment growth, including costs associated with permanently and temporarily housing enrollment shifts caused by new residential development; (2) acquisition of school sites for future enrollment growth consistent with residential densities projected by land use plans; (3) construction to preserve and maintain existing facilities; and, (4) construction for program changes.

The district has developed its construction plan, including phasing of construction and renovation projects, in a manner that allows it to minimize project impacts, keep taxes low, and meet educational programming standards. Major facility modernizations are scheduled when projects can be qualified to obtain state matching funds. Capital projects that preserve and maintain existing facilities are given high priority. Strategies to minimize the need for additional permanent facilities are implemented. These strategies also allow the district to maximize the use of state matching funds to construct permanent facilities. Funding of needed facilities identified in this plan is discussed in Section VII.

1. CONSTRUCTION FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH

The district anticipates enrollment to increase at all grade levels through 2019. The district anticipates significant changes in enrollment pattern with large increases in enrollment at certain schools, with some decreases in enrollment at other schools. The district periodically reviews school boundaries and makes adjustments to account for such changes. However, the district has not identified a feasible plan to adjust boundaries to maintain contiguous service areas while balancing enrollment and capacity. The district believes that busing students from noncontiguous service areas will be an interim solution which will require additions to the district’s bus fleet. Table 12 in the previous chapter calculates projected surplus capacity or deficit capacity of district facilities by grade grouping assuming enrollments are adjusted to optimize facility use.

Planned growth-related construction projects are summarized in Table 13 below.
Table 13
Growth Related Construction Projects
Planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
<th>Student Capacity Added(*)</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Middle School #5</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$48,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on District's Educational Program and Capacity Standards

The district plans to open a new middle school in 2016.

Table 14 shows the projected available permanent student capacity, including the additional capacity added by school construction projects, through the six-year forecast period.

Table 14
Projected Available Permanent Student Capacity
(With Added Capacity from Construction)
North Thurston Public Schools 2012-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-134</td>
<td>-369</td>
<td>-520</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-273</td>
<td>-412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Available student capacity based on projected student enrollment.

Construction of new permanent facilities to house students is a lengthy process and increased enrollment does not always occur in the areas projected by state and local population forecasts. Therefore, to meet the enrollment demands of new development, it is also necessary for the district to make use of temporary classrooms while enrollment options and boundary adjustments are evaluated, new sites acquired, and new permanent facilities constructed. Temporary provision of facilities to house students at elementary, middle and high school grade levels will require relocation of existing portables, renovation of existing portable, acquisition and installation of new portables throughout the district.

North Thurston Public Schools plans to begin design and site development for additional new facilities to house its increasing enrollment. NTPS has budgeted $42.6 million for this work.
North Thurston Public Schools 2013 Capital Facilities Plan

The district has budgeted $1,612,500 for facility planning related to enrollment increases.

**Assuming passage of the next Bond**, the district expects $9,858,000 will be used to purchase and install new temporary facilities and to relocate and modernize existing temporary facilities to allow for their continued use to temporarily meet student enrollment demands. Of the $9,858,000, it is estimated that $8,000,000 will be needed to purchase and install new temporary facilities and $1,858,000 will be needed to relocate and refurbish existing temporary facilities to extend their use.

In addition to these capital facilities costs, enrollment growth will require additional buses. The estimated cost of providing additional bus capacity is $1,370 per additional elementary school student.

2. SITE ACQUISITIONS

In order to accommodate future growth, the district anticipates acquiring sites consistent with estimated maximum enrollment of proposed development. Recent development patterns have shown a greater degree of residential development occurring within the southwest and northeast quadrants of the district. Thurston Regional Planning Council projections indicate future growth in the north and northwest areas of the district.

The district is committed to constructing neighborhood schools for elementary schools. This policy supports City of Lacey land use policies.

The district is committed to maximizing the opportunity for students to walk to school. This policy supports Thurston County development requirements.

In cooperation with the City of Lacey, land use policies have been established that plan additional elementary school sites as part of large residential developments and/or village centers.

Acquisition of new school sites in advance of enrollment needs is critical to preparing the school district to meet the challenge of increasing enrollment. Since it is uncertain how or when land will ultimately be developed or how the district may deliver services in the future, the district anticipates that it may acquire more sites than the minimum supported by enrollment projections. The district currently owns five potential elementary school sites, four potential middle school sites and one potential high school site. However, as growth occurs and both development regulations and educational programming are modified over time, these sites may not ultimately be suitable for development at the time when construction is needed.
Further, in addition to the walkability and neighborhood school policies discussed above, in siting schools the district evaluates construction and operation costs, effectiveness of site to meet educational programming needs, and access to infrastructure. The availability of connections to public infrastructure such as water, electricity, sewer, stormwater treatment, and roads are important factors for the district in planning and siting schools. While the district has a fundamental obligation to serve urban and rural students, the availability of urban services to a site may be beneficial in the district’s ability to serve students effectively and efficiently. The district will continue to work with local jurisdictions to coordinate development and planning for public infrastructure that is utilized by schools. Sites that become unsuitable for development may later be surplused or exchanged for sites more suitable or in different geographic locations.

Given the enrollment projections presented in this Capital Facilities Plan, the district intends to acquire additional sites to serve projected enrollments if and as appropriate. The district intends to negotiate conveyance of school sites from residential developers or payments of funds resulting from collection of residential mitigation fees. The district anticipates expenditures of $2,000,000 to acquire school sites.

3. PRESERVATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING FACILITIES
(INCLUDING SOME CONSTRUCTION FOR PROGRAM CHANGES)

The district has identified the projects listed in Table 15/15A and Table 16/16A for asset preservation and maintenance.

| Table 15 |
| Facility Maintenance Projects |
| North Thurston Public Schools 2012-2019 |
| (2014 Bond Option) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernizations (EF, PG, MEA and NTHS)</td>
<td>$140,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Upgrades: Roofing &amp; Exterior</td>
<td>$4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Upgrades: Interior</td>
<td>$3,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Systems</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements</td>
<td>$1,935,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects Administration</td>
<td>$4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$189,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. CONSTRUCTION FOR PROGRAM CHANGES

The district has included projects for program changes in Table 15.

5. SUMMARY OF PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS (2013-2019)

The district's 2013-2019 Capital Facilities Plan anticipates capital expenditures of $284,770,500 with a 2014 Bond option during this six year period.

Projects are summarized in Table 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School #5</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>$14,400,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary #14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School #6 / High School #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Forest Elementary</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Thurston High School</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$18,750,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$11,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Glade Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Upgrades/APP</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Upgrades: Roofing &amp; Exterior</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Upgrades: Interior</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$3,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Systems</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
<td>$1,090,000</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Health Improvements</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$309,000</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
<td>$327,000</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$1,935,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
<td>$1,090,000</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects Administration</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$4,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Land Acquisition *</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Planning *</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$272,500</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$287,500</td>
<td>$1,612,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portables/Modulars *</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,618,000</td>
<td>$1,624,000</td>
<td>$1,654,000</td>
<td>$2,672,000</td>
<td>$1,690,000</td>
<td>$9,858,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$35,550,000</td>
<td>$60,645,500</td>
<td>$67,229,000</td>
<td>$32,336,500</td>
<td>$38,432,000</td>
<td>$50,577,500</td>
<td>$284,770,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Anticipated Mitigation Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be funded with Mitigation Fees
VII. DISTRICT'S FINANCE PLAN

Six-Year Finance Plan

The district has prepared a multiyear financing plan in which the planned improvements discussed in Section VI are priced and funding identified within projected funding capacities and using identified funding sources. The Capital Projects Six-Year Finance Plan 2013 through 2019 is found on Table 16. This plan is based upon the capital facility needs and investment policies identified in this Capital Facilities Plan. In addition, the cost projections involve assumptions regarding costs of labor and materials, project mitigation, development regulations, funding sources at federal, state, regional and local levels, and infrastructure improvements serving schools.

Funding of school facilities is secured from a number of sources, with the major source being voter approved bonds consistent with school district financing authority provided by the state. Other sources may include state matching funds and residential impact (mitigation) fees. If probable funding sources (e.g., voter approved bonds) fall short of meeting the identified capital facility needs, the assumptions of this plan will be reassessed through the district's annual review process to ensure that facilities are available to meet the district's educational programming standards. The district will provide its updated Capital Facilities Plan to local planning jurisdictions on an annual basis for consideration in their coordinated intergovernmental plans. Each of the identified funding sources is discussed in greater detail below.

Funding Sources

1. 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 pass a bond. Bonds are then retired through collection of property taxes.

The North Thurston Public Schools currently has an assessed valuation of $8,325,531,647. The bond limit for all outstanding bonds is 5% of assessed value, or $416,276,582.35. As of September 1, 2012, the District had $120,775,839 of debt and a bond capacity of $295,500,744.

2. Capital Levies

Levies may be used to fund capital improvements. Levies may have a duration of up to 6 years. A 50% voter approval is required to pass a levy.
3. **State Match Funds**

OSPI provides some funding for capital improvements. Eligibility is determined through a set of administrative rules. State match funds come from the Common School Construction Fund. Revenues accrue 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. State match funds have provided a significant portion of funding for past capital improvements.

4. **New Development Mitigation**

Authority for local jurisdictions to condition new development on the mitigation of the school impacts is provided under various state laws (e.g., the State Subdivision Act, Chapter 58.17 RCW, the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21C RCW, and the Growth Management Act, Chapter 36.70A RCW) and some local land use standards (e.g., conditional use permits). These policies seek to ensure that adequate public facilities are available to serve the demands of new growth and that impacts of new development are proportionately mitigated by authorizing permitting jurisdictions to condition development approval on implementation of mitigation measures that enable local service providers (including school districts) to meet the infrastructure demands of new development.

- **Subdivision Act Mitigation.** RCW 58.17.110 requires that the permitting jurisdiction find that proposed plats make appropriate provisions for schools and school grounds.

- **SEPA Mitigation.** SEPA provides that local jurisdictions may condition approval of a new development to mitigate specific adverse environmental impacts which are identified in SEPA environmental documents. See RCW 43.21C.060. Under SEPA, the "built environment" includes public schools. WAC 197-11-444(2)(d)(iii).

- **GMA Mitigation.** Development impact fees have been adopted by a number of jurisdictions in the region as a means of supplementing traditional funding sources for construction of public facilities needed to accommodate new development. However, to date, no jurisdiction within the district's boundaries has adopted an impact fee ordinance. School impact fees are generally collected by the permitting agency at issuance of the building permit or certificates of occupancy.

The district participates in the permit review processes of jurisdictions within its boundaries to provide information regarding a proposal's impacts to public school facilities. Per Board Policy 9220, the district believes that reasonable residential mitigation fees voluntarily made by developers of new residential housing in accordance with legal requirements are an appropriate source of funds for (1) projects reasonably related to and benefiting the new housing development, (2) projects necessary to provide adequate schools or school grounds to serve such new residential housing, or (3) projects reasonably necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts of such new housing development on the district's educational facilities and programs.
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Such residential mitigation fees address facility construction for enrollment growth, site acquisitions, and related temporary student housing impacts (e.g., portables) but are not used for preserving or maintaining existing facilities. The district will take appropriate steps within its power to allow, encourage and support any county or city which has jurisdiction and authority to require such residential mitigation fees.

The Six Year Capital Finance Plan (below) portrays how North Thurston Public Schools intends to fund improvements to school facilities for the years 2013 through 2019.

Capital Finance Plan
(2014 Bond Option)

Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFP balance: (4/30/13)</td>
<td>$8,290,471.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Fee Collections (2012-18 est.)</td>
<td>$6,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from General Funds</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Matching Funds (est. for new MS)</td>
<td>$14,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Matching Funds (est. for mods)</td>
<td>$20,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of G. O. Bonds (proposed 2014 bond)</td>
<td>$175,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Capital Assets</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,040,471.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>$82,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernizations</td>
<td>$140,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Needs</td>
<td>$28,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Upgrade/Asset Preservation</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Planning</td>
<td>$1,612,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable/Modular facilities</td>
<td>$9,858,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$284,770,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfunded Balance: $59,730,028.17
VIII. PROJECTED FACILITY NEEDS (YEARS 2019-2033)

By the year 2033, the district is expected to have unhoused students at all grade levels. A long-range projection of unhoused students is shown in Table 17 below.

Table 17
Long-Range FTE Projection of Unhoused Students for Year 2033

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment Year 2033</th>
<th>Existing Capacity in Year 2019</th>
<th>Projected Unhoused Students in 2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>7264</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6-8)</td>
<td>3907</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>-542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td>5507</td>
<td>5254</td>
<td>-253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,818</td>
<td>15,883</td>
<td>-935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, the district's long-range forecast of facility needs is based upon the county's twenty-year OFM population projection. The district's six-year facilities plan will be periodically reassessed, and revised as necessary, to maintain consistency with long-range projections of facility needs.
APPENDIX A

Mitigation Fee Calculation

The district calculates a residential mitigation fee that is based upon the cost of providing capacity to serve students generated by growth-related projects. The residential mitigation fee is calculated on a per unit basis determined by residence type (i.e., single-family or multi-family residences). The residential mitigation fee is calculated as set forth in the attached Tables 18 and 19.

The mitigation fee calculation only includes costs for construction of growth-related improvements. As discussed in Section VI, to meet these needs the district plans to acquire additional elementary school sites as they become available and to construct one new middle school. The district also anticipates acquisition of temporary buildings to house new students generated by residential development.

For purposes of calculating the residential mitigation fee, the cost of providing capacity to serve students generated by growth-related projects is a net amount, meaning that it is an amount reduced by the amount of revenues that the district reasonably anticipates it will receive from OSPI and from future tax receipts paid by new residents. For the purposes of this fee calculation, a "credit" is provided for these state match and tax funds which the district expects to receive and apply toward its construction costs.

Additionally, a developer may earn a credit to offset its mitigation fees equal to the value of dedicated land, facilities or monetary compensation the district has agreed to accept from the developer under the mutually acceptable terms of a voluntary mitigation agreement and/or the conditions of a development approval.

For purposes of this calculation, the following have been updated to reflect 2013 data: the student factor, site acquisition cost per acre, building acquisition cost per acre, temporary building acquisition cost, Cost Index (or, area cost allowance for school construction per WAC 392-343-060), match ratio, bond rate and duration, average assessed value, interest rate for bonds, term and tax rate.
| TABLE 18 |
| NORTH THURSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS |
| SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE |
| MAY 23, 2011 |

**PROJECTS:** North Thurston Public Schools is planning to acquire additional elementary sites as they become available.

North Thurston Public Schools is planning to construct one new middle school.

Student factor, land cost, building cost, temporary building cost, Cost Index, match ratio, bond rate and duration, average assessed value, interest rate for bonds, term and tax rate have been updated to 2011 data.

| CALCULATION A: SITE ACQUISITION COST |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1 ELEMENTARY | 12 | 130,000 | 500 | 0.491 | 1,393 |  |
| A2 MIDDLE SCH. | 20 | 130,000 | 750 | 0.140 | 0 |  |
| A3 HIGH SCH. | 40 | 130,000 | 1250 | 0.292 | 0 |  |
| A | 1,393 |  |

| CALCULATION B: BUILDING ACQUISITION COST |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1 ELEMENTARY | 0 | 0 | 0.491 | 0 |  |
| B2 MIDDLE SCH. | 38,250,000 | 750 | 0.140 | 7,140 |  |
| B3 HIGH SCH. | 0 | 0 | 0.292 | 0 |  |
| B | 7,140 |  |

| CALCULATION C: TEMPORARY BUILDING ACQUISITION COST |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1 ELEMENTARY | 188,815 | 44 | 0.491 | 2,065 |  |
| C2 MIDDLE SCH. | 188,815 | 50 | 0.140 | 523 |  |
| C3 HIGH SCH. | 188,815 | 64 | 0.292 | 0 |  |
| C | 2,688 |  |

| CALCULATION D: STATE MATCH CREDIT |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D1 ELEMENTARY | 180.17 | 90 | 0.571 | 0.491 | 0 |  |
| D2 MIDDLE SCH. | 180.17 | 117 | 0.571 | 0.140 | 1,665 |  |
| D3 HIGH SCH. | 180.17 | 130 | 0.571 | 0.292 | 0 |  |
| D | 1,665 |  |

| CALCULATION E: TAX PAYMENT CREDIT |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUE | 204,541 |  |
| INTEREST RATE FOR BONDS | 4.59% |  |
| TERM (MAXIMUM 10) | 10 | 1.99953 | NET PRESENT VALUE OF TAX PAYMENTS | 2,000 |  |
| FACTOR | 0.00123 |  |
| TC | 2,000 |  |
| FACILITY FEE | 7,456 |  |
| FACTOR | 5% |  |
| FEE | 3,728 |  |

**NOTES (1)-(7)**

(1) Site area equals the number of sites required by school type after applying the district's educational programming standards.

(2) Cost per acre means the estimated cost of a site in the district for the grade span of school to be provided after applying district design standards.

(3) Students means the number of students a facility can accommodate by grade span and building type.

(4) Student factor means the number of students of each grade span expected to be generated by development activity by unit type.

(5) Costs per building means the costs of constructing permanent or acquiring temporary buildings based on estimates from comparable projects as adjusted for inflation.

(6) State match credit means the calculation of the district's formula index times square footage per student per grade span times state match percentage times applicable student factor.

(7) Tax payment credit means the calculation of the district's average assessed value by residence type times the tax rate as adjusted by current bond interest rates and levy terms (up to 10 years).
TABLE 19

NORTH THURSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE

MAY 23, 2011

PROJECTS: North Thurston Public Schools is planning to acquire additional elementary sites as they become available.

North Thurston Public Schools is planning to construct one new middle school.

Student factor, land cost, building cost, temporary building cost, Cost Index, match ratio, bond rate and duration, average assessed value, Interest rate for bonds, term and tax rate have been updated to 2011 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATION A: SITE ACQUISITION COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE AREA (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 ELEMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 MIDDLE SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 HIGH SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATION B: BUILDING ACQUISITION COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 ELEMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 MIDDLE SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 HIGH SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATION C: TEMPORARY BUILDING ACQUISITION COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 ELEMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 MIDDLE SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 HIGH SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATION D: STATE MATCH CREDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 ELEMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 MIDDLE SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 HIGH SCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATION E: TAX PAYMENT CREDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST RATE FOR BONDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM (MAXIMUM 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET PRESENT VALUE OF TAX PAYMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX RATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FACILITY CREDIT | 9 |
| FEE | 2,089 |
| FACTOR: 50% FEE | 1,045 |

NOTES (1-7):
(1) Site area equals the number of acres required by school type after applying the district's educational programming standards.
(2) Cost per acre equals the estimated cost of a site in the district for the grade span of school to be provided after applying district design standards.
(3) Student factor means the number of students a facility can accommodate by grade span and building type.
(4) Land cost equals the estimated cost of land for a site in the district for the grade span of school to be provided after applying district design standards.
(5) Temporary building cost means the costs of constructing permanent or acquiring temporary buildings based on estimates from comparable projects as adjusted for inflation.
(6) State match credit means the calculation of the district's raise index times SPI square footage per student per grade span times state match percentage times applicable student factor.
(7) Tax payment credit means the calculation of the district's average assessed value by residence type times the tax rate as adjusted by current bond interest rates and levy terms (up to 10 years).