

BOARD STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES

April 12, 2022

Call to Order

President Rivera called the Study Session of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 4:00 p.m. on April 12, 2022.

Roll Call

Present: Rebeca Rivera, President; Emily Williams Vice President; Sara Betnel Director; Meghan Jernigan Director; Sarah Cohen, Director

Absent: Yubi Mamiya, Shorewood Student Representative, Sky Stark, Shorecrest Student Representative.

The following topics were discussed:

2022-23 Budget Development, Part III

Ms. Marla Miller, Deputy Superintendent, and Mark Spangenberg, Director Finance and Business Services, presented.

The budget is a work in progress and we are still waiting on a couple important things from the state. We will be working with the most recent information from OSPI available to us, as of last night, and that is reflected in the calculations shared today. They are still working on distributing some of the enrollment stabilization funding that should have a fairly significant impact for us. We are working with an estimate, not a final. We are not sure what the financial picture will be as this is an unusual year, but there is a major challenge ahead in order to balance the budget.

Tonight's conversation will focus on the General Fund with the following agenda:

Current projections for 2022-2023

- Enrollment
- Revenues
- Expenditures
- Fund balance

Potential next steps for balancing the budget

Board discussion of interests, concerns and general development of the budget

Ms. Miller shared a document from OSPI's financial web page. It is a tool that serves as a translator between what the legislature did and how that impacts individual school districts. This sheet starts with a disclaimer making clear that there's no guarantee in the data that's provided. It's OSPI's best estimate of the impacts of all of the various changes that all come together in order to calculate a school district's revenues and potential expenditures. The next tab provides all of the underlying assumptions that are built into the district by district impacts at the state level. On the third tab you can look at the impacts for Shoreline and any other school districts as well. It's important to look at the assumptions built into this tool. There are choices you have in this tool for looking at the impact of different enrollment projections. F195 is the budget document that comes out at the end, after all of the data has been put together and we finalize a budget presented to you for adoption in August. It is the form number OSPI uses to talk about the budget document itself.

The enrichment levy is our local levy, just passed by voters in February. The levy is intended to supplement the state's basic education funding for school districts. We have a good understanding what our enrichment levy now will be for the next several years.

The document provides information to us by looking at four years. After McCleary, the state picked up more responsibility for funding school district positions. They have two different ways factoring the cost of living into the calculations from the state. They use CPI to figure inflation factors built into revenue formulas, as well as an implicit price deflator to determine what they would consider to be the cost-of-living adjustment that is talked about with employees. On the left of the sheet is the funding mechanism and on the right is the distribution of the state's share of some costs related to compensation.

We will not be going through all the detail, but you can see how the state is calculating their expected revenues for districts. You will recognize the prototypical school funding model we've looked at in our previous study sessions. Here is a picture of how final legislative action impacted the prototypical schools funding model.

Going to the summary tab, you see other districts by clicking on arrow at top of page. The form recalculates based on all that data that's in the prior sheet, showing the projections for Shoreline School District. The projection also has the ability to look at multiple school years, based on the information today. If you look at what their assumptions are for today, you can see two more years of information. The next field is where enrollment projections are. The tool does not know what our predicted enrollment will be yet, so it is working with what we know to be a slightly inflated enrollment projection. All of the revenues seen here are based on a projected enrollment of 9,090.8 FTE. We expect to be 151 students lower than that, so once we put in our projections, all the revenue projections will drop a little bit. When we come back to you with a preliminary budget, then a final budget, we will be working with actual projected enrollment.

President Rivera asked if we are expecting 150 students more, would the numbers go up then?

Ms. Miller clarified if we were expecting more students, then the numbers would go up. We are expecting a drop, which is based on our January enrollment with our retention factors rolling forward.

The third column on the sheet is what we focus on. This now represents the impacts of the legislative changes, taking into account all the pages of calculations and formulas. This is the result of those calculations in the OSPI software, feeding into it the legislative decisions. It is very important to know the first number is basically apportionment and they split out some categorical programs that have funding designated for a particular program purpose. Everything else is in the apportionment total bucket. Where there is some growth in the programs, primarily it's the flow through of the funding for the COLA and the funding for the assumption of enrollment.

In looking at the line items, they are referencing notes down below. One of the things affecting Shoreline primarily is for Transportation. OSPI is still working through the details of how the \$13 million transportation safety net will be allocated. They have not distributed it out to school district individual revenue projections. We know there will still be some adjustment changing that number, and it is not shown here yet. It is the same with the stabilization funding. The state is still working on some of the distribution models of how to show school by school, district by district impacts.

For school year 2021-2022, all the items above, add up to \$107 million. The state has recalculated what they think our local levy can be and what we actually will be able to collect. Putting this all together, adding the levy and the state funding from above together, it is \$142 million.

That's the really critical data for how we're able to present you with information tonight and a little bit of why we still don't have the final number. Our current year budget 2122 assumes that we fully collected ESSER funding. We are not expecting to have additional ESSER funding to collect in the 2023 school year. There is a little bit of misrepresentation here, but the note states that. They also

split the information out by per pupil using the enrollment above and include ESSER funding, and shown here is the total funding per pupil in this picture.

President Rivera asked if there is an idea around what kind of stabilization funding they might receive?

Ms. Miller responded we have been told that there was a rough estimate of somewhere around \$3 million for Shoreline for additional enrollment stabilization. This seems a bit high, but we hope that amount will be available.

Mr. Spangenberg mentioned there was talk about only helping districts with half the amount, so we want to be sure we are receiving \$3 million and not \$1.5 million before we commit to that. We should get the enrollment stabilization mid-May, because they have to see the May enrollment.

The District will have enough information by the end of next week so we can plug in our own data. Mr. Spangenberg noted the state has to calculate the enrollment stabilization because they have access to the enrollment data statewide. The roughly \$1.5 to \$3 million apportionment will be received this year.

President Rivera clarified that it will be in May's apportionment and asked if we will know that number before the deadline for RIF.

Mr. Spangenberg said OSPI knows all districts need that information.

Director Jernigan asked the clarifying question; every district has the same May 15 deadline?

Yes.

President Rivera asked if the stabilization funding can be used however we want?

Ms. Miller explained, when the funding is called enrollment stabilization, it's harkening back to federal funding for pandemic relief. Because it is federal funding, OSPI has to clarify what additional documentation might be required. The feds have published the appropriate and eligible uses of ESSER funding. We are not expecting that they're going to change the eligibility requirements for this, and that's what their reference point is. This funding is still trying to help take care of some of the impacts from the pandemic.

Ms. Miller shared a one-page overview of the difference between the current fiscal year and the information we have for planning next year's budget for the general fund. The state revenue estimates are from that tool that we just looked at, based on the April 11 version of OSPI's data. The left side of the sheet is summarizing the revenue changes compared to last year. The right side is comparing expenditure changes from last year. Below that is information about fund balance that is relevant to balancing the budget. On the right corner of the page is a number that changes based on the data that is entered in revenues, expenditures or fund balance. The goal is to have that number be positive, and to be more positive above the minimum amount to give as much minimum fund balance, trying to build into the budget balancing process for this fall. It is a challenge in a year when you're losing revenue and your expenditures are greater than funding available.

We are below the board policy that would be 4.5% to 5% fund balance. The budget we adopted last year was below 2%. We will look at how much we need to do at least to have a 2% minimum fund balance, and then what would it take to go above that. This will be part of the conversation as we build the budget. The other piece of information that we want to just keep in front of us is that we are

projecting a decline in enrollment, and the number unfortunately is likely to be high. Kindergarten enrollment, as of yesterday, is much lower than projected.

President Rivera noted the fund balance reserves at the bottom of the page says state enrollment stabilization. In that is \$3 million, is that what we talked about?

Yes.

That net reserves minus net expenditures showing the negative almost \$4 million, is that including the state enrollment stabilization?

Ms. Miller confirmed it is including the state enrollment stabilization funds. She referenced the left side of the sheet, revenue changes from last year, noting the first line. The state apportionment \$8.1 million, that is the difference between what we saw on the multiyear posting table we just went through, next year compared to this year. Also built in is what we think is going to be an increase in our levy collection compared to the current school year. Because the ESSER revenue in 2021-2022 helped balance our budget, but it was a one-time money and is not coming back in 2022-2023, we need to recognize that reduction in revenues that balanced the budget this year with revenues that will be available to balance the budget next year. All of these calculations recognize we don't have additional District allocated ESSER revenue that we control. We still have some through the state formula we just looked at, but we don't have any additional money we expect to be able to claim. When you add that all together, based on the assumptions right now, revenues dropped by \$2.3 million in total.

Director Betnel asked if we still have pandemic related expenses that we are incurring that we do not have incoming ESSER revenue to help support?

Ms. Miller answered yes, but not to the same extent that we had in prior years. What we have this year is the cost of the North City testing site which was new staff, PPE and additional utility costs with additional HVAC related costs, custodial supplies. We are tracking those so we'll be able to say that in the current fiscal year, these are the additional ESSER eligible costs that we were not able to claim.

President Rivera inquired, if ESSER revenue was covering costs for the district for COVID, could it be that next year in our budget we actually don't have some of those expenditures? Potentially that could alleviate some of these.

Ms. Miller explained, in looking at the initial information for this period, we don't want to overestimate what that would look like. Ms. Miller reminded the group that the North City testing site was supported by the State Department of Health. They awarded us a grant to help pay for the extraordinary costs of staff for that site. We would not be able to double dip, so we have to pull those things out before giving final ESSER class costs.

We know big expenditure increases for the coming year are the compensation increases related to COLA. We were caught off guard by the 5.5% COLA that turned up in the final budget. It is great as there are real costs for employees and that is a benefit. The state only funds about half that cost for us. The net difference in that is significant and was not part of our initial planning. We thought it would be roughly 2.5 – 2.8% COLA, so that is a big difference for us.

The COLA line on the spreadsheet includes some placeholders because we haven't finished all the bargaining and we do have some open contracts this year. We have to finish that process and bargain in good faith, so there is a bit of cost estimating in here that is not yet finalized.

The pandemic unfortunately not only impacted costs for the district, but also influenced our insurance carriers and cost of utilities. We are seeing fuel costs that are greater.

Utilities number on the sheet is still in blue because it likely will be a little bit high for cost of utilities for next year compared to this year. Ms. Miller gave the example of running HVAC systems constantly during the pandemic. They will not be ran as much, so the cost likely will be less. Solar panels will help offset costs, but utility costs are going up. We will do some drilling down and number crunching, and the utilities number will be better tuned by the time you see this next time.

Director Betnel asked what is the difference by running the air changes and not running the air exchanges? A couple thousand-dollar difference?

Ms. Miller answered it will be more than a couple thousand dollars. It will depend on how much do we still need to have fresh air exchanges as we continue to deal with concerns about virus and air quality.

We will also dig into looking at consumption with the positive impact of solar. We will look at this rather than cost because regardless of what the rates are, we can see if we increased or decreased our consumption of a particular type of utility. CDC has approved going back to a normal air exchange program. Some parents and staff are nervous about that, and we want to be sure we are not going too far too fast.

Director Betnel commented there may be a benefit during non-pandemic times.

Ms. Miller commented the ventilation systems for our schools work very well.

There is a place holder for the change to the City of Shoreline surface water management fee credit program. A credit for instruction has allowed Shoreline to fully offset the cost of this fee. The city is completing on overview of the changes they expect. Compared to the former program, it looks like the fees would increase by about 40%. If we had to pay the whole fee, it probably would in a \$1 million range. They are continuing with the idea of a credit for the educational program associated with helping students learn about the environment in ways that impact surface water management. We will likely pay something in 2023, but unsure of what that might be at this time.

President Rivera asked if, in regards to that fee, is there any kind of credit given for certain kinds of landscaping?

Yes, there is a long report and the city came back with things they think would be able to grant credit for. Ms. Miller gave examples and there would need to be conversations on the financial benefit of these choices for the District. The likelihood is that we want to pay attention on the curriculum and make sure it fits in structurally and we're not just teaching something because we can get a credit for it, but it makes sense for students to spend their time learning with the outcome being a reduction in the fee we have to pay.

The following line acknowledges the legislature passed a bill that says that students would receive Orca Cards.

There is a placeholder for restoring minimum fund balance, and we are below where we should be by Board Policy. It is a difficult year to make reductions in order to add to fund balance, but it is also a critical safety net for the District. It is a financial policy that is important, so we want to think about how to try and build that back.

Because we are expecting to have fewer students next year, there are some automatic changes to staffing. When we talk about the staffing ratios for classrooms, the variable of how many students per grade affects how many teaching positions are generated to be allocated out to the classrooms. Looking at the reduction of 151 students, the ballpark figure of those enrollment driven staffing reductions is around a million dollars right now. If we work with those numbers now, there will be a reduction in the staff positions created.

Part of the SEA contract included an early notification incentive for people to let the District know by February 1 if they didn't expect to return in the fall. We heard from somewhere around 44 FTE who

have notified us they are not returning next year. That is not factored into any of this yet, and when looking at balancing the budget, having some vacant positions will be helpful. When looking at reductions needed, and going through a RIF resolution with the Board, it matters what the individual contracts are eligible to teach, and what content areas they may be endorsed in, will determine where they can be assigned. A lot of moving parts.

The next lines are to hold, and as we work through the process, we will add numbers into administrative staffing reductions, certificated staffing reductions, classified staffing reductions, as well as non-staffing reductions. All the numbers add up to a negative \$3.9 million, which means we would need to reduce at least that much, and probably more, in order to bring the end fund balance to a better balance than it is now.

There is a placeholder for transportation stabilization, I believe that is going to be different than the 2122 one time funds. They will be one time funds, but they are not yet allocated for 2223 going forward.

President Rivera noted the legislature passed a requirement for school districts to have certificated arts teachers in all grades. Is that additional expense included here?

Ms. Miller will double check but doesn't think it is. The prototypical school funding formula changes assumed that we fully met all of the requirements, and that is one of the notes on the state pivot table. I think the additional funding that is beyond changes to the SLE is not included here, but we'll double check to be sure.

Director Betnel wondered what additional unfunded mandate impacts, such as the arts instruction as well as language access, will have, and if we have information on that yet?

Ms. Miller said we will have finer information and will share with the group as soon as we can. Based on everything seen and the calculations looked at, we don't expect to have any reduction - or any requirement to add more staffing - in order to earn that new increased state funding for those positions.

President Rivera asked what the impact is on the budget for positions that had not been filled this year, and we haven't been paying for? When these positions are filled, is that an additional expenditure?

Ms. Miller stated it is twofold. As we update the cash flow report for this year, and if we underspend what we budgeted, that will go into fund balance, helping balance next year's budget. If the positions are built into our program model that we have to fill next year, those will be increases adding to the number you have on the sheet.

Budget Development Calendar

Ms. Miller shared a document showing an annual picture of how a budget is built and comes together. Once district enrollment projections have been established, individual programs that may generate different staffing allocations are provided before finalizing the school-to-school projections. Revenues and potential expenditures should be completed by the beginning of June. Because of the May 15 statutory timeline, we will bring you a rough resolution at the May 10 meeting, defining a maximum FTE the district would be authorize to reduce if necessary. The District must get Board approval in order to move ahead with notifications.

BEA staffing allocations are complete by mid-June, as well as department allocations. The budget adoption by the Board will be done by August 31.

President Rivera asked, as we are talking about seniority levels, if she is remembering correctly that there is some protection for our newer BIPOC staff?

Ms. Miller noted it is one of the newer aspects of the SEA agreement, adding in a variable that would be considered in the RIF process. We have been cautious about adding new staff knowing we were looking at a really challenging budget.

Director Jernigan asked if the District could disclose and report the racial makeup of those folks involved in the RIF decision making process.

Yes, demographic data can be provided.

Director Betnel stated we are waiting to hear from the USDA on if they will be extending the waiver for this year. Do you have an idea of what timing we are looking at for this?

Ms. Miller explained we typically have not had the federal meals program information until June or July due to congressional timelines. It won't have a huge impact on budget planning. Mr. Spangenberg noted all the information he has seen indicates it will be returning to paid, free and reduced again next year. He hasn't heard a single source say we can hope for a continuation for all free.

Principals will receive preliminary Department Allocations a week from Friday. This will give them some updated information after we know what the May 10 RIF Resolution is. We hope to give final BEA staffing allocations in mid-June before people leave for summer.

Department Allocations will be identified allocations distributed to program directors in the middle of June.

The Budget adoption by the Board has to happen by August 31. Nobody wants to wait that late, so we like to be able to give a preliminary report in late June. The first reading will be at the July Board meeting, and final adoption in an August meeting.

The public hearing for the budget is scheduled with the second reading final adoption, so we want to be sure people have information. We are trying to be as transparent as we can with the information we have and give people the opportunity to weigh in.

Director Betnel asked if there is somewhere currently where the existing staffing at Shoreline Schools can be found by someone in the community? And with that staffing, somewhere that notes 'required by state' or 'funded by state' – like 80% or full – so the community can get a glimpse to get that picture of understanding?

Ms. Miller noted all the materials we share with the Board are available on the web, but can be buried. We can do a better job to pull that information out to make it easier to comprehend, and easier to find, and will work with staff to help make that happen.

Ms. Miller would like to send the Board a format for sharing thoughts and information about the budget to provide some thoughts and ideas and look to see if there is alignment in what people are thinking. Looking at putting things in three categories: must keep, pause, and wondering if we were to continue, we may want to reevaluate. There is a little bit of opportunity that comes out of this really tough time, but we're in the tough time right now, and it may take a couple years for enrollment to come back.

So much of our funding is enrollment driven, especially now that we've got both levy and state funding heavily dependent on it. It may be a couple years we're in this boat and then I think we'll move ourselves back into where we're adding back without having to make any reductions.

President Rivera thanked Ms. Miller and added it will be good to have transparency, and to have the Board share their thoughts with each other. Hope to have an opportunity at some time, as a Board, to have the discussion to hear other people's thoughts.

Ms. Miller wondered if the group would like to have one more study session before the May 10 board meeting, giving the group a chance to look at things again together, and give direction before the Board resolution is finalized. If that is of interest to the Board, we'd like to support that work.

Director Jernigan asked if a template would be shared for the Board members to offer their comments?

Yes.

President Rivera commented she likes the idea of the template and also would like the group to have a more transparent conversations with the Board around this.

Director Jernigan wondered if once that is circulated, can we aggregate all the information and have it sent out in a Friday briefing, prior to the May 10 meeting?

Ms. Miller shared that we're going to try to provide as much non-staff related reductions as possible so that we are not going straight to people. 86% of our General Fund is people, we can't balance this budget without impacts on employees.

President Rivera thanked Ms. Miller and Mr. Spangenberg for the endless hours of work and recognized the stress and weight of compiling this information together.

Ms. Miller acknowledged these are hard things to think about and appreciates the thoughtfulness brought to this. A lot of good due diligence thinking about what the legislatures done and what are things that we're doing now we could consider. We will get you a template for providing that input. Any questions you have in the meantime, route them to Dr. Reyes and we'll get the information to you best we can.

School Board Redistricting Overview

Presented by FLO Analytics: McKay Larrabee, Emma Swanson, Kathryn Murdoc

McKay Larrabee is a Senior GIS Analyst with FLO Analytics. Kathryn Murdoc works with communications and engagement. Emma Swanson is a GIS technician.

The goal for this meeting was for the Board to get an understanding of the process of baseline conditions of where the district has grown, the redistricting criteria, look at initial scenarios of the existing conditions and come up with a set of draft maps to share with the public to elicit comments. We cannot underline this point enough:

This process will NOT affect where a student attends school. This process affects school board director districts ONLY, not attendance areas. This process is *completely* different.

Why Redistricting?

- RCW 29A.76.010 - Every ten years school districts must review their board of director districts to ensure equitable geographic representation.

- Shoreline has five geographic regions or districts, one for each board seat. Candidates for school board must run for the seat of the director district they live in.
- Each position is elected by all district voters, so each of the five directors represents the entire district in their board actions.
Important to note, the Board member must live in the geographic area they represent, they are voted by all voting members district-wide.

High-Level Process Flow

These are the four stages we need to keep in mind:

1. Data Collection
This is done with the public information that is available (i.e.: census information, current director district, municipalities, tribal lands, etc.)
2. Springboard
All collected data goes into scenarios called springboards. These look at different criteria to create population balance.
3. Draft map
Could one or more of the springboards or the existing conditions become a draft map which will be presented at our draft map hearing?
4. Final Map
Elicit hearing testimony and email comments along the way
Public hearing testimony and email comments

Redistricting Timeline

April 12	Board Study Session – review springboard
April 13	Publish draft maps
April 13 -26	Public comment on draft maps
April 19	Board meeting – review draft maps and opportunity for public comment
May 3	Publish final map
May 3-10	Public comment on final map
May 10	Board meeting – adopt final map

Redistricting Requirements/Criteria

- Districts **must** be population balanced
- Districts **must** be contiguous
- Redistricting **must** be drawn in compliance with all local, state, and federal laws including the Federal Voting Rights Act. Redistricting **must** not be done to favor or disfavor a protected class or political party
Note: FLO doesn't work for any political party. They merely look at demographic and population information that comes in the census blocks. Those are the building blocks and the geographies that are used.
- Districts **should** be as compact as possible
- Districts **should** preserve communities of mutual interest
- Districts **should** preserve the use of existing natural boundaries; artificial boundaries as well, such as roads
- District **should not** split census blocks
The census has put out a series of numbers, the total population, and then the demographics from within those census blocks. If we were to split down the middle of those, we wouldn't be able to guarantee the demographics of that census block and also wouldn't know where growth might happen in the next 10 years. We really want to stay away from splitting census blocks.

Population Balance

When balancing population, we must consider total population. This reflects the principle that an elected body represents all residents, not only those who are eligible to vote.

The key metric is *deviation range* from the “ideal population.” Ideal population is the total population divided by the number of districts. Add together the percentage deviation of the most and least populous districts to determine the deviation range.

Deviation range **must** be below 10%, **should** be below 5%, and always aspire toward 0%.

Redistricting Criteria

Contiguity

- No islands
- Exception: real or jurisdictional islands which then must be functionally connected

Compactness

- Districts should not be unnecessarily thin or serpentine
- Compactness will be measured

Existing or natural boundaries

- Major streets and roads
- Rivers, lakes, mountains
- Lines that are already being used as boundaries

Director Jernigan asked if those include public parks?

Ms. Larrabee answered yes, it does include parks and natural areas.

Preserving Communities

There is no definition for what a community of interest is. We use cities and towns, attendance areas, neighborhoods – things we can find that are publicly available and easily put into our software. What is missing is what a person might think about their community, and that is why it is important to hear from the Board and from members of the public. If FLO has come in and provided initial scenarios that draw a line right down your community of interest, that's when we want to hear about it. If we can change that and still have population balance, we will definitively do so.

If we can't keep a community of interest together with keeping that deviation low enough, that's one situation when we wouldn't be able to keep communities of mutual interest together. In Shoreline that doesn't seem to be much of an issue.

Communities of Mutual Interest

- A community of interest is a population that shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. There are no concrete rules on how to define a community of interest.
- Redistricting **should** preserve communities.

Voting Rights Act and Demographics

When FLO first starts their baseline conditions, we are looking to see if there is a possibility for majority minority district.

A couple of legal requirements are at odds with this:

- The 14th amendment prohibits the use of race or ethnicity to draw district boundaries.
- The Voting Rights Act requires consideration of race or ethnicity data to avoid voter dilution.

FLO is looking to see potential for a minority district to represent over 50% - to be represented in over 50% of the citizen voting age population (CVAP). It's something to keep our eye on as we go

through the process and ensure there is no voting dilution. Shoreline is currently 63% white. We also look at core plat maps that look at distribution of minority populations to see if there are any populations dense enough to constitute a minority district, but in looking at the demographics, that is not a possibility for Shoreline School District.

Existing Districts

Shoreline's overall deviation is only 3.1%. The director districts are drawn really well and have had even population growth in the last ten years and are sitting in a good spot.

The deviation is coming from district three, which is the lowest under that ideal population number of 14,418, giving us a -1.2% deviation. District five is the highest above the ideal population line, over by 263 people, for 1.8%. This amounts to 3.1%, which is well below the 5% threshold. The District could choose to share the existing districts map as one of the draft maps.

Existing Districts – Demographics

To comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (1965), which protects against vote dilution on the basis of race and ethnicity, FLO reviewed the geographic distribution of the citizen voting-age population (CVAP) by race and ethnicity using interpolated data for 2020 from American Community Survey data. No minority group or coalition of minority groups appear to be sufficiently large or geographically compact enough to constitute a majority in a prospective district. Currently there is no voting dilution in Shoreline.

Population Change

A slide was shared that reflected population change over the past ten years and showed growth or detracting in the census blocks. In the last ten years the District has experienced only growth and it is fairly even growth. Looking at the chart of differences (2010 vs 2020) you see the growth in each of the districts. District five has experienced the most growth, and the slowest growth has been in district two.

Director Betnel asked about a census block in district five which includes a middle school, a high school, a park and a residential facility. Can you share with everyone what was shared with me when I asked about that? Ms. Larrabee explained that in that block, there was growth of 207 people. There were zero people in that block in 2010 and 207 people in that block in the 2020 decennial census. In looking at potential causes for that, we found the residential facility has about 200 residents and would make sense that is the cause for the increased population.

Director Jernigan noted that Shoreline used to be a community of small houses and big lots. There is a lot of big growth happening and where two light rail stations are coming, that's where we're concentrating some of the growth.

Director Cohen added, in looking at a larger area in district three on the map, that is Shoreline Community College.

Ms. Larrabee noted these are where populations were living at the time of the 2020 census. There can be some oddities with universities. Not to imply this directly to the community college, but if there is boarding there, we've had intriguing patterns with situations where students were remote and weren't counted at their resident dorm. There are a lot of oddities that have come forth, especially with the pandemic.

Director Betnel observed the blocks of land along I-5, where tracts of land have been purchased, and homes have been taken down in preparation for the light rail. That will be interesting to watch what happens there.

Ms. Murdoc commented that when you are looking at maps preparing for ten years from now, the District is within 3%, which is a great spot. Growth may look different ten years from now. That is a good point to keep in mind as we move forward.

Springboard Workshop

- To assist the Board in determining draft maps, FLO will share springboard scenarios and rationale utilizing different redistricting criteria.
- FLO will then model requested revisions to any of the presented springboard maps and/or create new scenarios for consideration and discussion.
- Please note that the existing director districts are well balanced and can/should be considered as a viable initial scenario.

Springboard 1

Objectives:

- Low population deviation
- Use roads
- More compact

The overall deviation on the springboard is 1.4%

On the map you can see areas that secede to other districts to create different population and deviation for this springboard. The color block here is reflected in the associated population number in the tables on the bottom.

There was a discussion about specific streets and movement of districts on the springboard 1 map. President Rivera asked about the area on the top of the map and Director Jernigan followed up asking if we could zoom in for clarity on the street on the map. She noted the change on this map between district one and four would have implications on current district director seats. Ms. Larrabee said they can zoom in, and clarified neither of the springboards affect any of the current director seats. That was taken into consideration when creating the maps.

If a director were to be redistributed in a scenario, that director serves out the remainder of their term. Where it would become an issue is if that director was redistricted, they'd need to run against a fellow director. It is important to keep that in mind so you can ensure continuity in directors.

Springboard 2

Objectives:

- Low population deviation
- Use roads
- Align to precincts and neighborhoods
- Minimal change

The overall deviation on the springboard is 4.1%. On the map there are no changes to districts two and five. This has the same block in district four as springboard 1, and two changes to district three with impacts on district one.

Director Cohen asked if there's any consideration in this process about keeping school communities together, about mapping onto attendance areas, and just how that plays out.

Ms. Larrabee said we keep an eye on that but it is almost impossible. The population densities are so different. We have tried to look at that but it doesn't match up. If you think about

attendance areas, it tends to be a natural community of interest. It's unfortunately too large of a community interest to keep intact with keeping population deviation low.

Ms. Swanson noted that especially with attendance areas, sometimes they're not based on census blocks to begin with, and we definitely don't want to split so they end up bleeding over into other director districts.

Director Rivera wondered about using springboard 2, what's the benefit of this one over our existing one?

Ms. Larrabee said we are bringing the Board initial scenarios looking for feedback. Right now, we're bringing some different takes on approaches looking only at data. In this case we are only looking at precinct lines. We also looked at neighborhoods, trying to keep certain neighborhoods together. That is why we want to hear from you today for feedback on where we may have missed the mark. It's to give you a first look at a different aspect or different approach to an initial scenario.

Director Betnel mentioned while the board directors for Shoreline School District are elected at large, the boundaries for these districts determine where you need to live in order to run for that district. There are implications on eligibility for seats in the future and what kind of impact we're having on access to running for our seats.

Ms. Larrabee agreed and reiterated we are neutral and so it's helpful to hear from the Board. It also could impact a great successor you have in mind, and we've moved them to a different district. That may be an issue, and one to think about. If we've gone the wrong way on access, then we want to hear from you. You don't need to bring any of these draft maps as they are. You can bring your existing map and springboard 1 as 'draft map A' and 'draft map B'. You could bring all three because this might elicit some other comments from members of the public. We're here to listen to you all, to hear what seems to be working and what seems to not be working.

Outreach & Engagement

Opportunities for public comment

- April 19 board meeting when draft maps are being reviewed
- Via comment form that opens the Friday prior to Board meeting
- Via email to public.info@shorelineschools.org
- May 10 board meeting when final maps are being reviewed

The District will collect feedback and public comments, and FLO will incorporate that information into the analysis, and explain to the community how their input was used to inform the final maps.

Getting the word out

- Shoreline Public School District website
- Friday newsletters

We want to make sure that folks know about the process, they understand what's going on and if they want to engage and share comments with us that we hear it.

Superintendent Reyes commented that Spring Break is April 25-29 and to take that into consideration for the timeline in case we want to make any potential adjustments. She asked about the requirement on public comment on the draft maps. Ms. Larrabee clarified the main requirement

on the RCW is, once you publish the draft maps, you need to hold a board meeting to provide public comment within 10 days of publication of those draft maps.

Ms. Murdoc commented, apart from what Ms. Larrabee stated, we must have seven days of public comment on those final maps, which is May 3 – 10 on the timeline.

Ms. Larrabee stated there is a nuanced piece as well, and that is, even though we have public comment from May 3 – 10, we are not able to make any revisions to that final map. We still want to hear what the public has to say, but in the RCW, if you make any changes to the final map, that seven-day period starts over again. The RCWs are not written clearly so we are being overly conservative with our timeline to ensure we are meeting the letter of the law.

Director Rivera asked what the ultimate role of the Board is. We are hearing these options now, these three maps are going for public comment, and then how is the final map selected on May 3?

Ms. Larrabee said we want to hear from each Board member tonight. I'm looking for guidance from you to decide what you want to share with the public as your draft maps. We can also look at tweaking the maps. It is up to the Board to decide what to bring to the public for the public hearing. Once at the public hearing it is important to hear from the public as well as from each of you in which way you are leaning. That gives some transparency to your thinking on redistricting.

Director Betnel asked if there were other variations of these maps that were looked at in the process before bringing these drafts forward, any that hit the 3.1-0%. Secondly, there is a spot between district two and district five that breaks up a little bit of community of interest. She is interested in the way that line was drawn from the past and how you might have looked at how these two districts are navigating that intersection.

Ms. Larrabee responded utilizing the FLO program to look at what the census blocks look like and the population in each of those blocks may help with some of the questions coming up. She gave Emma a chance to answer questions around developing the springboards because she was instrumental in that process.

Ms. Swanson explained larger changes were made to see if different areas could be moved, and how many big moves could be made that also kept the deviation down. Shoreline is sitting in a really good spot. It was hard to get anything close to what you're looking at right now and up to that 4.1%. We can go higher if you want, but the goal is to go lower. Changing the area and having a good reason to change larger areas was difficult.

In zooming into the spot on the map on the western side between districts two and five, it was clarified that the census block had changed and the bottom of the 'tail' was moved due to the census block. The area above in questions was kept the same with the existing geographies. We can look at this area closer and workshop it. If we change one of these blocks, we'd have to make it up on the other side. In doing that you may need to cross an area that may not make sense.

Ms. Larrabee noted areas that aren't matching up straight away, and that is due to keeping census blocks whole. If a center of the census block was in a district, we counted it in that district. We do not want to break any of those census blocks again because we cannot guarantee the demographics. In the area being discussed, you likely would take not just one, but all three census blocks, which moves 332 people, and you're going to need to move the equal and opposite number of people to rebuild the other districts.

FLO's standpoint when first looking at the boundaries was not to cross major highways if we don't have to, if there is no real reason or consensus around it yet. We can, but we didn't have a reason to do that.

Director Betnel commented that our district tends to split along the freeway as well.

Director Jernigan noted the growth of Shoreline and asked about what will happen in the next ten years. This assessment doesn't provide that level of projection. I know that's not part of the process and this is census data that allows us to understand how we need to redraw right now. We won't revisit this process for another ten years, so I'm curious about how you advise school boards to hold that balance, thinking about how communities are growing and concentrated growth, as they look at these maps?

Ms. Larrabee said that is something districts always have their eye on and the census and redistricting process doesn't take that into consideration as a criterion, so everyone's working from the same playing field. What I usually say to that is if there is a district that you see has more potential for growth, what you can do is have that as the district that is under the most. You want to be careful of the number of people you move. You don't want to have 2.5% points over or under because then you are at the 5% mark. I'm not a lawyer, but I usually recommend folks go as close to zero because then you're looking at a pretty good starting point and pretty good base - especially considering that in the last ten years you've had very equal growth. Not saying that that's going to happen in the next ten years from now. The census doesn't take into consideration future development and you cannot use it for criteria of changing districts.

The group was shown springboard 1 and springboard 2 maps and asked if they wanted to see any manipulations to areas the group might be interested in workshopping to create a potential new scenario.

President Rivera commented she is not big on springboard 2 with the higher deviation rate. When looking at springboard 1, it looks like the biggest changes are to districts one and four. I'm wondering about Director Jernigan's thoughts on how that cuts that neighborhood and community, and what that change would do?

Director Jernigan noted that what is revealed in the process is that our most diverse district seems to be where we need to concentrate a lot of the changes. Without seeing the street numbers, it is hard to understand the impact. Along the I-5 corridor we've got two major developments for our community. We're building light rail, we're building housing, we're concentrating our growth there, and so what we see in our census data and the last 10 years is not a lot of shifting, but we know that's going to change in the next ten years if the region continues at this pace. I appreciate what you said about how what we're meant to do right now is level the playing field with the data we have and not to project out, but it is hard to look at that point where it all comes together and not think about this is where many units are going, and how we divvy that up properly. That's where I'm a little stuck and don't have any particular input on disentangling springboards 1 and 2. I appreciate we have our existing map as an option. We don't have to change it if we don't feel like we should, is that right?

Ms. Larrabee answered that is correct. Shoreline is population balanced, and there is something to be said for appreciating communities of interest as they are now. Considering when you're talking about that type of growth throughout the district in the next 10 years, I just want to reiterate we are talking about total population, so it is a lot. 500 units going up anywhere is going to tip that balance. It requires a district-wide perspective, and a lot of hard work on having the local knowledge to make the right changes that aren't going to affect the communities of interest that you don't want to affect, if at all possible.

Ms. Swanson mentioned I-5 being a huge natural divider, maybe there's an option where I-5 is the divider and districts don't cross it as much up north, we can look at that. The population in district two on the west side of I-5 is around 1400. We can move that into district one, but then district two will look strange and come down to make up for it. Everything will shift, but if that is something you want to see we can do it. Our natural instinct when initially making these is to try and keep them about the same as what your existing lines are unless there is a real reason to change them. I can try to make changes and see if the deviation works.

Director Betnel commented we know growth is coming. "On the map I starred places where I know big developments are coming, but aren't yet. It leans me towards the inclination of offering to keep this as is, or get us closer to zero at this time. In the ten-year timeframe those developments will happen, and I think some of that will settle out over the next ten-year timeframe. The next time this Board needs to do this it will be a much clearer, more realistic picture to get that sense of is this the time where we need to really visit the entire makeup of these districts in that way. That's just the thought that occurs to me, building on what Megan shared and then what you were reflecting back on."

President Rivera appreciated what Director Jernigan was saying about that continuity around I-5 and that growth. My district is four, which is the most diverse district and Ridgecrest is the neighborhood on the east. That is a pretty good line along 15th Ave NE and cutting into that would cut the neighborhood in half and wouldn't be a good move for district four.

Director Jernigan agreed that 15th Avenue is a natural line and wouldn't want to disrupt that.

Ms. Swanson noted we got the data set from online and the neighborhood file we got online was the reason for this shift between districts one and four in that middle area. It's a little easier to move those blocks between districts one and four because they're smaller but they're heavily populated, so you can just move one or the other.

Ms. Larrabee said it sounds like the group is interested in bringing the existing districts as an option for a draft map to get public input. It seems like springboard 2 hits a lot of the things you're interested in, but it isn't hitting the marks you'd like it to hit.

Ms. Larrabee asked each member what they would like to bring to the public as draft maps.

- 1) existing as draft map 1, noting it is the existing districting map, and
- 2) draft map 2 which would be springboard 1

The following feedback was given to having these two draft maps brought to the public:

Director Williams – yes

President Rivera – yes

Director Cohen – yes

Director Betnel – yes

Director Jernigan – yes

Ms. Larrabee said she thinks those are two really good choices and hopes to get some public input on this. FLO will get those two draft maps together and send out to Superintendent Reyes by tomorrow close of business.

Superintendent Reyes asked about next steps so we can keep on the timeline.

Ms. Larrabee explained the next step will be to publish the draft maps in the next couple days so folks can comment on the landing page and be prepared if attending the April 19 meeting to do an in-person comment.

What will be published is a package that includes:

- A map showing some streets
- Statistics behind it including a continuity check, population deviation, demographic information

We'll reconvene on April 19. FLO will present a similar presentation as today. We'll open it up for public comments, and then have the Board give feedback on which way each member is leaning and why. That is how we've done it before, but it is up to the Board to structure it how you'd like.

If there are public comments that come back FLO can make some revisions if necessary, and the Board will choose the final map to be posted on May 3. The timeline can be flexible if needed, but experience shows after the meeting on April 19, we'll know which map will be the final map to post on May 3 after hearing public comments and final decisions from the Board.

President Rivera suggested scheduling a tentative meeting on May 2 if it is needed prior to publishing a final map on May 3 as it is easier to get things on the calendar now.

Ms. Larrabee said that would be fine and you have until November 15. Earlier is better, but there is not any pressure. We can be transparent about the process and discuss the night of the draft map and be sure that we put in next steps of what will happen now, and how that decision making process happens.

Superintendent Reyes asked if the board may decide or get to a place on the 19th where it could be one of the maps so at the 19th meeting the board can decide on one or both as final for May 3, and then decide on May 10 on which of those two, right? Correct, as long as they don't change between May 3 and May 10.

President Rivera thanked the presenters and the meeting adjourned.

Adjournment: 7:46 p.m.

Rebeca Rivera, School Board President

Attest: June 21, 2022

Dr. Susana Reyes, Secretary
Shoreline Board of Directors

All documents referenced in the minutes may be viewed in the Superintendent's Office during normal business hours.