

Adopted  
May 22, 2012  
RIVERVIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 407  
2012  
CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Lori Oviatt	President
Greg Bawden	Vice-President
Jodi Fletcher	Director
Carol Van Noy	Director
Danny L. Edwards	Director

Conrad Robertson, Superintendent

Prepared by:  
William J. Adamo  
Director of Business and Operations  
(425) 844-4505

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	Introduction	3
2	Student Enrollment Trends and Projections	4
3	Standard of Service	5
4	Capital Facilities Inventory	7
5	Projected Facility Needs	9
6	Capital Facilities Plan with Growth Related Projects Identified	11
7	Capital Facilities Financing Plan	12

## **SECTION 1 -- INTRODUCTION**

### **Purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan**

Presented herein, in conformance with the Growth Management Act and local county and municipal codes is the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) of the Riverview School District.

This Capital Facilities Plan is intended to provide the City of Carnation, the City of Duvall, King County, other jurisdictions, and our own community with a description of facilities needed to accommodate projected student enrollment at acceptable levels of service over the next six years (2012 – 2018).

The Growth Management Act also requires reassessment of the land use element of local comprehensive plans if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs, and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. This Capital Facilities Plan is intended to provide local jurisdictions with information on the school district's ability to accommodate projected population and enrollment demands anticipated through implementation of various comprehensive plan land use alternatives.

### **Overview of the Riverview School District**

The Riverview School District services three jurisdictions: King County, the City of Carnation, and the City of Duvall. The district is 250 square miles and is located in northeast King County serving the Snoqualmie River valley from the King/Snohomish County line south approximately 16 miles, and from the western ridge of the valley to the cascade foothills. The district currently serves an enrollment of approximately 3,217 (headcount enrollment) students, with three elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, two alternative high school programs, and two alternative elementary school programs. The grade configuration is kindergarten through fifth grade for elementary school, sixth through eighth for middle school, and ninth through twelfth for high school. Three of the alternative programs are housed at the Riverview Learning Center in Carnation.

## SECTION 2 -- STUDENT ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

### Projected Student Enrollment 2012-2018

Enrollment projections are most accurate for the initial years of the forecast period. For later years, the review of enrollment patterns, housing trends, and other demographic changes are useful yearly activities in evaluating and adjusting projections. This year's plan anticipates a 2% growth in student enrollment which is based on recent enrollment trends. Some of the trends are as a result of: 1) transfers from private schools, 2) increases in preschool age children from the district's existing population, and 3) significant decreases students attending school outside the district. Although housing starts have decreased from recent years, the district will experience enrollment growth. The new sewer system in Carnation has freed up large tracts of developable land within the incorporated city limits. In the event that enrollment growth slows, plans for new facilities can be delayed. It is much more difficult, however, to initiate new projects or speed projects up in the event enrollment growth exceeds the projections.

The Riverview School District, like most school districts, projects enrollment using a modified "Cohort Survival" method. This method tracks groups of students through the K-12 system, and notes and adjusts the projections to account for year-to-year changes, including local population growth. For example, this year's fifth grade is adjusted based on average past enrollment trends in order to estimate next year's sixth grade enrollment.

Since the yearly figures for each grade are dependent on the previous years' grades, kindergarten projections are treated differently. Riverview projects its kindergarten enrollment based on historical kindergarten enrollment patterns and district enrollment growth patterns.

Table 2.1

**Riverview School District Headcount Enrollment Projection**

Grade	11-12 Actual*	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
<b>K</b>	232	237	242	247	252	257	262
<b>1</b>	261	237	242	247	252	257	262
<b>2</b>	245	266	242	247	252	257	262
<b>3</b>	263	250	271	247	252	257	262
<b>4</b>	248	268	255	276	252	257	262
<b>5</b>	263	253	273	260	282	257	262
<b>K-5</b>	1,512	1,511	1,525	1,524	1,542	1,542	1,572
<b>6</b>	264	259	249	269	256	278	253
<b>7</b>	250	269	264	254	274	261	284
<b>8</b>	257	255	274	269	259	279	266
<b>6-8</b>	771	783	787	792	789	818	803
<b>9</b>	260	262	260	279	274	264	285
<b>10</b>	220	256	258	256	275	270	260
<b>11</b>	225	212	247	249	247	265	261
<b>12</b>	229	206	194	226	228	226	242
<b>9-12</b>	934	936	959	1,010	1,024	1,025	1,048
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,217</b>	<b>3,230</b>	<b>3,271</b>	<b>3,326</b>	<b>3,355</b>	<b>3,385</b>	<b>3,423</b>

\* thru 4-1-12

Growth rate of 2%, with assumptions for variations at grades 6, 10, 11, and 12.

### **SECTION 3 -- DISTRICT STANDARD OF SERVICE**

School facility and student capacity needs are dictated by the types and amounts of space required to accommodate the district's adopted educational program. The educational program standards which typically drive facility space needs include grade configuration, optimal facility size, optimal school enrollment size, class size, educational program offerings, classroom utilization and scheduling requirements, and use of portable classroom facilities.

In addition to factors which affect the amount of space required, government mandates, contractual requirements, and community expectations may affect how classroom space is used. Traditional educational programs offered by school districts are often supplemented by nontraditional or special programs such as special education, expanded bilingual education, remediation, migrant education, alcohol and drug education, preschool and daycare programs, home school, computer labs, music programs, movement programs, etc. These special or nontraditional educational programs can have a significant impact on the available student capacity of school facilities.

Special teaching stations and programs offered by the Riverview School District at specific school sites include:

#### Elementary:

- Computer Labs
- Classroom Computers
- Group Activities Rooms
- Program for Academically Talented (Gifted/PAT)
- Special Education (The District attempts to integrate special education students and regular education students to as great an extent as possible. Most special education students are served both in a regular education classroom and a special education classroom.)
- Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Home School Alternative (PARADE)
- Preschool Education Program (ECEAP)
- Multi-Age (Eagle Rock /ERMA)

#### Secondary:

- Computer Labs
- Alternative (CLIP & CHOICE high school program)
- Special Education
- Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Career and Technical Education (CTE)
- School-to-Work

Variations in student capacity between schools are often a result of what special or nontraditional programs are offered at specific schools. These special programs require classroom space which can reduce the permanent capacity of some of the buildings housing these programs. Some students, for example, leave their regular classrooms for a short period of time to receive instruction in these special programs. Schools often require space modifications to accommodate special programs, and in some

circumstances, these modifications may reduce the overall classroom capacities of the buildings.

The current Standard of Service data for Riverview, in terms of teaching station loading, is identified on Table 3.1. Class sizes are averages based on actual utilization as influenced by state funding and collective bargaining restrictions.

Riverview's Standard of Service also considers the different educational functions when considering student capacity needs. Those functions are as follows:

**Elementary classrooms –**

- regular, grades K-5
- self-contained learning center (special education)
- learning support classrooms (special education pullout, LAP, Title I, etc.)

**Secondary –**

- regular, grades 6-8
- special education, grades 6-8
- learning support, grades 6-8
- regular, grades 9-12
- learning support, grades 9-12 (special education pullout, LAP, Title I, etc.)

Involuntarily transferring students to a school with excess capacity is done rarely as a last resort and with Board of Directors' authorization. Involuntarily transferring of students can result in difficulties in the community, with staffing, and with transportation.

**Table 3.1**

**Riverview School District Standard of Service**

**CLASS SIZE**

**Elementary**

Regular, alternative, gifted	24	students/classroom, average
Self-contained learning classrooms	12	students/classroom, average
Learning support classrooms	0	students/classroom, average

**Middle School**

Regular	24	students/classroom, average
Regular (portables)	24	students/classroom, average
Self-contained learning classrooms	12	students/classroom, average
Learning support classrooms	0	students/classroom, average

**High School**

Regular	24	students/classroom, average
Regular (portables)	24	students/classroom, average
Self-contained learning classrooms	12	students/classroom, average
Learning support classrooms	0	students/classroom, average
Vocational education	24	students/classroom, average

## **SECTION 4 -- CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORY**

Under the Growth Management Act, public entities are required to inventory existing capital facilities. Capital facilities are defined as any structure, improvement, and piece of equipment or other major asset, including land, which has a useful life of at least ten years. The purpose of the facilities inventory is to establish a baseline for determining what facilities will be required to accommodate student enrollment in the future at established levels of service. This section provides an inventory of capital facilities of the Riverview School District including site-built schools, portable classrooms, developed school sites, undeveloped land and support facilities. School facility capacity figures are based on the inventory of current facilities and the district's adopted educational program standards as presented in the previous section.

### **Schools**

The Riverview School District currently operates 3 elementary schools (grades K-5), one middle school (grades 6-8), and one high school (grades 9-12). The district also provides the Eagle Rock Multi-age Program, an elementary alternative program, sited adjacent to the Cedarcrest High School campus. In addition, the district supports the following alternative programs housed in the Riverview Learning Center facility: CLIP alternative high school; CHOICE alternative high school; and PARADE, a parent partnership program. ECEAP, a pre-school program, is housed again in yet another separate facility.

Individual school capacity has been determined using the number of teaching stations within each building and the space requirements of the district's adopted educational program. This capacity calculation is used to establish the district's baseline capacity and determine future capacity needs when considering projected student enrollment.

Classroom capacities have been determined for each school according to their usage. For the purpose of this Plan, classroom uses are: regular education, self-contained special-education, and learning support. The school facility inventory is summarized on Table 4.1. The current inventory of facilities indicates a permanent capacity of 3,300 students, with an additional 635 student capacity available in interim facilities.

The School Board of the Riverview School District is committed to serving students at small schools. Evidence suggests that this practice a significantly beneficial affect on student learning. Further, there are significant benefits to school culture and climate.

Table 4.1

**Riverview School District Facility Inventory and Capacity Calculations 2012**

School	Grade Levels Served	Site Size (acres)	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)	Permanent Teaching Stations	Self-Contained Special Education Classrooms	Stations Used for Learning Support Purposes*	Permanent Student Capacity	Interim Teaching Stations	Self-Contained Special Education Classrooms	Interim Stations Used for Learning Support Purposes*	Interim Student Capacity	Total Student Capacity	Year Built	Last Remodel
<b>Carnation Elementary</b>	K-5	8.81	50,567	21	1	3	444	4	0	0	96	540	1960	2011
<b>Cherry Valley Elementary</b>	K-5	12	56,252	23	0	2	504	2	0	0	48	552	1953	2011
<b>Stillwater Elementary</b>	K-5	19	49,588	22	1	2	492	0	0	2	-48	444	1988	n/a
<b>Multiage Program</b>	K-5	@ CHS Site	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	96	96	n/a	n/a
<i>Subtotal K-5</i>		<i>39.81</i>	<i>156,407</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>1,440</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>1,632</i>		
<b>Tolt Middle School</b>	6-8	40	85,157	32	2	3	720	6	0	0	144	864	1964	2009
<i>Subtotal 6-8</i>		<i>40</i>	<i>85,157</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>720</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>864</i>		
<b>Cedarcrest High School</b>	9-12	78	108,946	43	1	3	972	7	0	0	168	1140	1993	2009
<i>Subtotal 9-12</i>		<i>78</i>	<i>108,946</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>972</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>1,140</i>		
<b>Riverview Learning Center</b>	K-12	2.08	14,545	7	0	0	168	0	0	0	0	168	2011	n/a
<i>Subtotal 9-12</i>		<i>2.08</i>	<i>14,545</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>168</i>		
<b>Total K-12</b>		<b>159.89</b>	<b>365,055</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3,300</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>3,804</b>		

\*Some teaching stations are used for purposes that do not allow them to be used as regular classrooms. E.g. computer labs, music classrooms, storage, special-ed pullout programs.

Support Facilities	Site Size (acres)	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)	Support Facilities	Site Size (acres)	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)
<b>Main/Trans Facility</b>	adj. to Tolt MS	6,800	<b>Stepping Stones (portable)</b>	adj. to Carn. ES	1,500
<b>Educational Service Center</b>	1.25 acres	20,886			

Support Facilities	Site Size (acres)	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)	Support Facilities	Site Size (acres)	Building Area (Sq. Ft.)
<b>District Office portables</b>	adj. to Carn. ES	7,200	<b>Extended day</b>	adj. to CV. ES	1,910
<b>Annex Building</b>	inc with ESC	1,421			



## SECTION 5 -- PROJECTED FACILITY NEEDS

### Near-term Facility Needs

This Capital Facilities Plan has been organized in such a way as to maintain adequate capacity of the district's facilities through the construction and/or expansion of permanent facilities. Table 5.1 is a summary by school level of projected enrollments, current capacities, and projected additional capacities. Based upon current enrollment projections, the district has permanent capacity needs at all grade levels.

### Intermediate-term Facility Needs

The District has identified a potential need for a new K-8 school and anticipates that the construction of this school will be complete just outside the six years of this planning period. The project is contingent on enrolment growth, proceeds from a new bond, and state match funds. In addition, the building grade level configuration needs further study

### Planned near-term non-capacity facility improvements

In February, 2007 the voters of the Riverview School District approved a \$56,600,000 bond issue that was utilized to finance a variety of improvements to the facilities of the district. As a result of a competitive bidding environment over the last five years and prudent oversight of the projects financed by the issue, the district had additional capital improvement/addition funds available. A facility was purchased and various projects are currently underway to implement a prioritized district facility and site needs list. The following projects are on that list:

Description	Location
Recoat track	Cedarcrest High
Replace synthetic field	Cedarcrest High
Remodel concessions building	Cedarcrest High
Outside grass playfield renovation	Cherry Valley Elementary
New intercom system	Eagle Rock Multi-Age Program
Replace existing basketball baskets in gym	Stillwater Elementary
New Mondo flooring in gym	Stillwater Elementary
New intercom system	Stillwater Elementary
Remodel classrooms (to the extent of new casework and new sinks)	Tolt Middle School
New Campus wide Security System	Tolt Middle School
New entry way canopy for freezer	Tolt Middle School
Replace window for attendance secretary in new addition	Tolt Middle School
New concession, restrooms, maintenance storage building	Tolt Middle School campus
New Professional development/district office(s) building remodeling	Duvall

**Table 5.1  
School Enrollment and Capacity Projections 2012-13 through 2017-18**

<b>Elementary (K - 5)</b>	<b>11-12 Actual</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Projected Enrollment	1,512	1,511	1,525	1,524	1,542	1,542	1,572
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities</b>	<b>-24</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-36</b>	<b>-54</b>	<b>-54</b>	<b>-84</b>
Capacity in Relocatables	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Number of Relocatables	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Capacity with Relocatables	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>156</b>

<b>Middle School (6-8)</b>	<b>11-12 Actual</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Projected Enrollment	771	783	787	792	789	818	803
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	763	763	763	763	763	763	763
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-24</b>	<b>-29</b>	<b>-26</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>-40</b>
Capacity in Relocatables	144	144	144	144	144	144	144
Number of Relocatables	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Capacity with Relocatables	907	907	907	907	907	907	907
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>104</b>

<b>High School (9-12)</b>	<b>11-12 Actual</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Projected Enrollment	934	936	959	1,010	1,024	1,025	1,048
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in Perm. Facilities</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>
Capacity in Relocatables	168	168	168	168	168	168	168
Number of Relocatables	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Capacity with Relocatables	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217	1,217
<b>Net Surplus or (Deficit) in all Facilities</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>169</b>

<b>Surplus/Deficiency Capacity (K-12)</b>	<b>11-12 Actual</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Projected Enrollment	3,217	3,230	3,271	3,326	3,355	3,385	3,423
Capacity in Permanent Facilities	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capacity in Perm. Facil. and Relocatables	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>3,852</b>
Surplus Capacity with Relocatables	635	622	581	526	497	467	429
Surplus Capacity <i>without</i> Relocatables	83	70	29	-26	-55	-85	-123

## SECTION 6 - CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN WITH GROWTH RELATED PROJECTS IDENTIFIED

### Planned New Improvements - Construction to Accommodate Growth and Adequate Capacity

There are currently no district plans to build in the six-year Capital Facilities Plan window.

### Planned Improvements - To Existing Facilities that include a Growth Related Project

As summarized in Table 6.2, the district plans technology upgrades which are funded by a capital projects levy approved by the voters in February of 2010

**Table 6.2**  
**Planned Projects to Existing Facilities**

Project	Location	Capacity Added	Source of Funds	Growth related project? Yes or No
<b>2012-2013</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No
<b>2013-2014</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No
<b>2014-2015</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No
<b>2015-2016</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No
<b>2016-2017</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No
<b>2017-2018</b>				
Technology Upgrades	All	-0-	Technology Levy	No

\* Technology upgrades are based on using funds from the Technology Levy approved by voters in February 2010 and a planned levy in 2015.

## **SECTION 7 - CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN**

Funding of school facilities is typically secured from a number of sources including voter-approved bonds, voter approved levies, state matching funds, impact fees, and mitigation payments. Each of these funding sources is discussed below.

### **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 issue. Bonds are sold as necessary to generate revenue. They are retired through collection of property taxes. In February, 2007 the voters of the Riverview School District approved a \$56,600,000 bond issue that will be utilized to finance a variety of improvements to the facilities of the district over a six-year period.

### **Capital Projects Levies**

Capital Projects Levies are typically used to fund small construction projects and other capital improvements or acquisitions. A simple majority of voter approval is required to pass a levy. Money comes to the district through the collection of property taxes. The district passed a four-year capital improvement levy in February of 2010 for the upgrade of technology assets including new computers, upgrades to the network infrastructure, and software.

### **State Financial Assistance**

State financial assistance comes from the State's Common School Construction Fund. Bonds are sold on behalf of the fund then retired from revenues accruing predominantly from the sale of renewable resources (i.e. timber) from state school lands set aside by the Enabling Act of 1889. If these sources are insufficient to meet needs, the Legislature can appropriate funds or the State Board of Education can establish a moratorium on certain projects.

State matching funds can be applied to school construction projects only. Site acquisition and improvements are not eligible to receive matching funds from the state. Because availability of state matching funds has not kept pace with the rapid enrollment growth occurring in many of Washington's school districts, matching funds from the State may not be received by a school district until two to three years after a matched project has been completed. In such cases, the district must "front fund" a project. That is, the district must finance the complete project with local funds.

### **Impact Fees**

Impact fees have been adopted by a number of jurisdictions as a means of supplementing traditional funding sources for construction of public facilities needed to accommodate new development. Impact fees are generally collected on new residential construction by the permitting agency at the time of final plat approval or when building permits are issued.

## Budget and Financing Plan

Table 7.1 is a summary of the budget that supports the elements of this Capital Facilities Plan. Each project budget represents the total project costs which include: acquisition, construction, taxes, planning, architectural and engineering services, permitting, environmental impact mitigation, construction testing and inspection, furnishings and equipment, escalation, and contingencies. In addition, it includes financing that is separated into three components: estimated state financial assistance, estimated impact fees, and projected local revenues (i.e., interest income and local levies).

**Table 7.1**  
**2012 Capital Facilities Plan Budget**

<b>PROJECT</b>	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	<u>Local Funds</u>	<u>State Assistance</u>	<u>Impact Fees</u>
<i>Other Projects</i>										
Technology Acquisitions & Upgrades	\$ 967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$5,805,480	\$5,805,480		
<b>Totals:</b>	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$967,580	\$5,805,480	\$5,805,480	\$0	\$0

## SECTION 8 -- IMPACT FEES

None are projected with this Capital Facilities Plan