

2. LONG RANGE FACILITIES PLAN (Status: FINAL DRAFT 2/17/2015)

Needs-Driven Improvements. There are three main needs-related drivers that exert influence on a Long Range Facilities Plan:

1. **Growth** (additional student housing capacity needed, both near-term and long-term).
2. **Building Condition** (deterioration or decline of existing facilities sufficient to compel modernization or replacement of facilities).
3. **Obsolescence/ Upgraded Standards** (facilities not able to accommodate changing program needs with spaces too small, changes in student/teacher ratios or lack of special needs rooms, as examples; or the community and educational desire for added features such as elementary gyms).

Growth. Quincy School District (QSD) has experienced significant growth since its 2008 Study & Survey. In October of 2007 QSD had 2,392 students. This compares to 2,851 students, total enrollment (October 2014). This equates to growth of 65.57 students per year.

Interestingly, in 2007/2008 the recent 5-year growth trend had been relatively flat (growing only 17.8 students per year from 2,303 in 2002 to 2,392 in 2007—with declining kindergarten numbers). Because of declining kindergarten numbers, the state projected forward a net decline in enrollment—forecasting 2,327 students by the year 2013 (when QSD actually had 2,746 students).

This forecast decline is a natural outcome of the Cohort Projection methodology. This methodology looks backward 5 years to establish growth rates that it then projects forward to the future 5 years.

Obviously QSD has experienced significant growth not foreseen by the Cohort Projection. But, as a result, the current Cohort Projection is now looking backward at the recent significant growth—and applying that growth trend to the future. This results in the following forecast of additional robust growth:

- Growth pressures in QSD will become acute over the next 5 years with a projected increase of 372 students by the year 2019 (a forecast increase from 2,851 to 3,223 students spanning from October 2014 to October 2019). This is a 13% increase overall. In addition Quincy has been growing over the past seven years with an increase of 459 students since 2007—from 2,392 to 2,852 students spanning from October 2007 to October 2014—or a 19% increase. Altogether, by the year 2019, the actual growth and forecast growth will be 34.7% over the 2007 enrollment (with an additional 372 students, for an overall total of 831 students since 2007). During this time period there has

been no growth in permanent facilities. QSD has addressed growth with portables.

- This is a future forecast growth rate of 13% over the upcoming 5 years, or about 2.5% per year. (Note that this growth rate exceeds the 1.6% growth rate forecast for the general population of Grant County. However, in Grant County the largest segment of the population are young people, ages 0 to 18. In this respect, QSD's enrollment growth is consistent with the overall demographics of Grant County.)
- Forecast average growth of 74.4 students per year (although this will vary from year to year).
- Interestingly most of these growth pressures are forecast at the K-8 grade span. While some of the past growth since 2007 has occurred at the High School (152 students over the past 5 years, or from 720 to 872 in the years 2007 to 2014), the current Cohort Projection forecasts a modest decline in grades 9-12 up to the year 2019 (with a reduction to 809 students) and a rebound in 2020 (with 849 students). This is the result of a pocket of low class enrollments in the grade levels immediately below and feeding into the High School (current grades 4 to 8) where the present average class size is 202.4 (compared to 230 for all other classes). However, larger enrollment numbers in classes behind this low pocket (grades K-3) suggest High School enrollment will rebound in 2020 and beyond.
- In short the Cohort Projection forecasts grade 9-12 enrollment will go down 65 students over the upcoming 5 years (a decline of 8.3%, from 872 in 2014 to 809 in 2019). By contrast the K-8 enrollment will go up 435 students over the next 5 years (an increase of 22%, from 1979 students in 2014 to 2,414 students in 2019).

This, of course, suggests that QSD is likely to have a housing problem—which it does—i.e. more students than can be housed in its main buildings. This housing problem is already evident in the portable classroom buildings required to accommodate students (26 total portable classrooms in the K-8 grade span, and 6 portable classrooms at the High School, grades 9-12):

George:	4 Classrooms total (2 portables) or 40% of all classrooms
Monument:	6 Classrooms total (3 portables) or 20% of all classrooms
Mountain View:	8 Classrooms total (4 portables) or 30% of all classrooms
Pioneer:	4 Classrooms total (2 portables) or 17% of all classrooms
Quincy Jr. High:	4 Classrooms total (2 portables) or 20% of all classrooms
Quincy High School:	6 Classrooms total (3 portables) plus Fitness Center

This tally says that about 23% of the K-8 classrooms are portables, or almost 1 of every 4 students attends school in a portable.

A large number of portables is usually symptomatic of a housing problem—but this housing problem often translates into eligibility for state funding assistance for “unhoused students.” Essentially the state allots area per student (based on the 5-year look-ahead enrollment) allowing 90 SF per student for the K-6 grade span, 117 SF per student for the 7-8 grade span, and 130 SF per student for the 9-12 grade span. The net result of this analysis says that, by state formula, QSD needs 229,815 SF to house its K-8 students, but only has 206,745 SF in its K-8 inventory (portables don’t count because they are non-permanent). In short QSD is eligible for 23,070 SF of state-assisted construction funding in the K-8 grade span (or 238 unhoused students at the aggregate average of 96.75 SF per student in the K-8 span). This same analysis suggests the High School is “over-housed” at its current size and not eligible for funding to accommodate “unhoused” high school students (or capacity for 256 additional students at 130 SF per student). See “SUMMARY: Analysis of State Funding Assistance” spreadsheet elsewhere in this section.

[NOTE: The state space allocations per student are antiquated, and almost never meet the requirements of real-world space needs. The allocations were originally generated in the 1970’s, and have not been rigorously updated over time to reflect expanded programs, Title IX requirements, reduced class sizes, etc. More realistic numbers are: 100-110 SF per student (K-6); 145-160 SF per student (middle school 6-8 or 7-8); and 160-200 SF per student (9-12). By keeping these numbers down, in effect OSPI dilutes matching eligibility and spreads funding around over a broader number of school districts than it otherwise could with more realistic numbers. Thus there is little political incentive to make adjustments.]

Building Condition. The overall physical condition of Quincy Schools is very good (see Section 1). Recent Building Condition Assessment forms score the overall schools with a grade of 87.55 out of 100 possible (see attached spreadsheet summarizing results). The scores range from 83.20 at the Junior High to 88.61 at the High School. This is due to a building program that spanned from 1997/98 to 2005 where new construction and modernization addressed most facilities—and due to good maintenance over the past 10 to 18 years.

Obsolescence/Upgraded Standards. Based on the recent improvements to most schools, there is little pressure to significantly improve facilities based on obsolescence or upgraded standards. An exception may be Quincy Junior High (which scores well in terms of physical condition at 83.20, considered fair condition, but was renovated circa 1986, 29 years ago).

Another consideration in this category might be adding gymnasiums to elementary schools with small gyms that also function as cafeterias. When the gym doubles as a cafeteria, it usually means that there is about 2 hours per day that gym time cannot be scheduled. Most contemporary elementary and middle schools (like Monument or the Jr. High, for example), have gym space separate from cafeteria space, thus allowing all-day scheduling of the gym and accommodation of more students overall for P.E./Fitness instruction. By contrast George, Mountain View and Pioneer have gyms that double as cafeteria, thus putting reducing times available for P.E./Fitness instruction.

Near-Term Facility Needs. In the past Study & Survey cycle (2008) there was no compelling need (nor any state funding eligibility) for major capital projects. However a matrix was developed to focus on smaller-scale capital improvements to address minor deficiencies throughout QSD. These deficiencies have been updated and categorized into (1) Routine Maintenance, (2) Minor Capital Improvements (likely affordable within routine minor capital budgets), (3) Major Capital Improvements (like affordable only with passage of a bond or other outside funding), and (4) Improvements Due to Growth (generally very pressing and accomplished with portable classrooms). Following this narrative is a matrix of these needs on a school-by-school basis showing approximate cost, priority and time line.

Long-Term Conclusions. Growth pressures in QSD will become acute over the next 5 years with the predicted increase of 372 students by the year 2019 (a forecast increase from 2,851 students as of October 2014 to 3,223 students in October 2019). This is a 13% increase overall. In addition Quincy has been growing over the past seven years with an increase of 459 students since 2007—from 2,392 students in October 2007 to 2,851 in October 2014—a 19% increase. Combined, by the year 2019, the actual growth and forecast growth will be 34.7% over the 2007 enrollment (831 students total).

During this time period there has been no growth in permanent facilities. QSD has addressed growth with portables.

As previously cited, while the upcoming growth is forecast at 372 students overall, this translates to 435 students at grades K-8 due to a forecast decline in high school enrollment of 63 students. In an oversimplified way, QSD will need about 20 classrooms to house 435 students at grades K-8. While this is over-simplified, it is at least a moderately accurate “yardstick” to measure potential ways of addressing growth and expanding student housing.

Addressing Growth and Expanding Student Housing. There are four categories or pathways to address this growth and expanding student housing, each of which have their own pros and cons:

1. **Addressing Growth with Portables:** This is the most economical solution (and sometimes an economic necessity) but it also has its drawbacks:
 - a. **Portables Pro: Low Cost.** Portables’ costs are typically 20% to 50% of the cost of permanent classrooms. The costs vary depending on ease of site adaptability, regulations in the locale, and the outfitting (“dry” portables without sinks and toilets versus “wet” portables with sinks and toilets). Quincy’s recent experience has been approximately \$140,000 for a 2-classroom “wet” portable. Much of the cost effectiveness of portables comes from the efficiency of factory construction, but a big cost differential is the fact that corridors and other support spaces are not constructed for portables.

- b. Portables Con: Limits to Number of Portables.** There are sometimes physical and programmatic limits to portables. Occasionally a tight site will cause “shoe-horning” in as many portables as physically possible (and Mountain View is approaching its limit). In addition, excessive portable classrooms sometimes overburden the “core” facilities of the host school. They can create a situation where there is not sufficient time or space to schedule P.E./Fitness, Library time, music or art. Sometimes cafeteria space can become strained or insufficient. This strain is a factor at George, Mountain View and Pioneer elementary schools where the gym doubles as cafeteria, thus reducing time available for P.E./Fitness instruction—and suggests that portables should be added with caution at these sites. In addition, at some point portables begin to “land” in awkward spots—taking away playground spaces, or being positioned undesirably close to on-site traffic.
- c. Portables Con: Security/Safety.** Portables require exterior foot traffic outside the building where students are potentially exposed to security/safety risks. This is a fundamental drawback of portables.
- d. Portables, the QSD Situation (Grades K-8).** There are 26 portable classrooms serving grades K-8 (where the most severe growth pressures exist). Pioneer Elementary has 4 portable classrooms. This is a reasonably comfortable number for Pioneer where the host school has about 21 general classrooms in the main building (and portables represent 16% of the general classroom total). But at George Elementary, as a small school with only 6 general classrooms in its main building, 40% of its classrooms are in 4 portable classrooms—probably straining gym and cafeteria capacity. Similar strain or pressures on the limits for portables are likely at Monument Elementary and Mountain View Elementary. At Monument there are 6 portable classrooms versus 24 in the main building (portables representing 20% of the overall total). Mountain View Elementary has 8 portable classrooms versus 19 in the main building (portables representing 30% of the overall total). Finally, at the Junior High there are 4 portable classrooms versus about 20 classrooms (with portables representing about 17% of the overall total). In the K-8 span there are approximately 90 main-building general classrooms. Thus 26 portables represent 22.4% of total classroom (slightly more than 1 in 5 district-wide in K-8).
- e. Portables, the QSD Situation (Grades 9-12).** There are 6 portable classrooms at the High School (where there has been noticeable growth of 152 students over the past 5 years—from 720 to 872 over years 2009 to 2014). However, the need for these portables may dissipate over the next 5 years. The current Cohort Projection forecasts a modest decline in High School Enrollment over the next 5 years, from the present 872 to 809.
- f. Portables, General Conclusions.** Portables are usually a fact-of-life and necessity for fluctuations in school enrollment. Typical elementary schools will have 2 to 4 classrooms of portables even in modest growth

conditions. However, beyond this level, portables sort of exhaust their utility and put a burden on sites and program function as cited above. In QSD's case providing, say, 18 additional portable classrooms among its elementary schools (where the main buildings' support capacity for portables is already strained) is probably not a good long-term solution to accommodate expected enrollment growth. Providing 2 more portable classrooms at the Junior High is more feasible, but probably pushes main building support capacity to the limit.

2. **Addressing Growth with Permanent Classroom Additions.** This approach would add permanent classrooms and related support spaces such as corridors, toilet rooms, and other miscellaneous spaces. This approach works well in some circumstances, but has its disadvantages too:
 - a. **Permanent CR Additions, Pro: Less Costly than Adding an All-New School.** With permanent classroom additions, some auxiliary space is added for corridor and/or support space (toilets if needed). But generally, unlike an all-new school, core spaces such as Library, Gym, Cafeteria, Administration, boiler room, etc. are not added. In effect the classroom additions "piggyback" on these core facilities. By contrast an all-new school must develop all of these core facilities—and thus the cost of the classroom space is significantly higher than the cost of an all-new school. As a hypothetical example, this study estimates that the cost of 20 added classrooms at four schools throughout QSD would be approximately \$10.0M versus \$19.5M for an all-new school with 20 classrooms (with an all-new site, and fully-outfitted school).
 - b. **Permanent CR Additions, Pro: Better Security/Safety.** With all-inside circulation, permanent additions eliminate the exterior circulation and security exposure that portables have.
 - c. **Permanent CR Additions, Con: Limits to Number of CR's Added.** This is a similar analysis to that of limits on portables. There is sometimes a tight fit on the site. Or the number of classrooms may overburden student use of core facilities (gym, cafeteria, library, music, art, other)—with the number of classroom out of balance with the core support spaces. Or the addition requires major upgrade of electrical service capacity or boilers, or both. Lastly, similar to portables, sometimes additions are difficult to "shoe-horn" in on a tight site; and they often want to "land" where there are currently portables in position—thus requiring the expense of removing or relocating the portables.
 - d. **Permanent CR Additions, the QSD Situation.** It's not a black-and-white line, but all of the elementary schools are at or near a development level that cannot easily tolerate permanent classroom additions—because they would likely stress or overburden use of core facilities (gym, cafeteria, library, etc.). For example, adding 4 or 6 classrooms at Mountain View Elementary is only a marginally good idea because it makes permanent the stress on gym/cafeteria (a dual-purpose room); because the addition

would probably want to “land” where 6 portable classrooms are now located (thus requiring removal or relocation of portables); and because the boiler/electrical infrastructure may not support these additions, requiring significant extra expense. This same set of complications apply in different degrees at George and Pioneer elementary schools. The Junior High may be an exception, because the main building probably has sufficient core space to support additional classrooms. However, at the Junior High the location of the additional classrooms is not clear, and might project onto play field area (which is a planning consideration that requires addition analysis beyond the scope of this Study). In any case permanent classrooms additions would be difficult to address all of QSD’s housing needs.

- e. **Permanent CR Additions, General Conclusion.** As a solution category for addressing growth, adding classrooms is viable, but best applicable at schools that are smaller in size with core spaces available to support the permanent addition. For example, the previous 3-classroom and 4-classroom additions at Monument Elementary made a lot of sense—boosting the original 17-classroom school up to 24 classrooms—a level easily supported by its gym, separate cafeteria, library, stage/music, etc. But adding 4 or 6 permanent classrooms on top of these two additions at Monument Elementary suggests this approach would probably stress the overall balance between classrooms and core support space. In short, adding permanent classrooms is not a universally applicable solution to growth.

- 3. **Addressing Growth with a New Elementary School.** This straightforward approach suggests building a new elementary school. It comes from the acknowledgment that all of the existing elementary schools are probably “maxed out” in terms of core capacity to support additional classrooms. An all-new elementary school would have about 20 additional classrooms and its own new core support facilities.

- a. **The Need for a New Site.** Approximately 8 to 12 acres is needed for the average elementary school. QSD has an undeveloped parcel (#200821000, 58 acres, north of town) that can physically accommodate an elementary school and lies within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line per the Growth Management Act. This means that the City of Quincy can provide sewer or water service to this site.
- b. **New Elementary School Cost:** \$16.7M net local cost after state funding assistance of \$2.8M.

- 4. **Addressing Growth with a New Middle School.** This is a partial solution that would shift all 6th graders to a new middle school, joining grades 7 and 8. This grade-level combination is the most common middle school configuration, and it aligns with the Common Core curriculum. With this shift approximately 10 classrooms of 6th graders would be vacated to make room for growth, thus

- solving about half of the approximate 20-classroom shortage in the growth forecast. This partial solution has a number of pros and cons:
- a. **New Middle School Pro: Replaces QSD’s Oldest School.** This replaces the oldest school facility in QSD. The school was built in three major components in 1938, 1960 and 1986. The 1938 portion was modernized in 1986. Overall the school is in generally fair condition, but nevertheless an aggregate average age of 35 years. Still a good sound building with life left in it, but on the verge needing updating.
 - b. **New Middle School Pro: Eligible for State Match.** This project would be eligible for state funding assistance in the amount of \$10.1M. The state “match” applies to either modernization or replacement of the school.
 - c. **New Middle School Con: It Still Costs a Lot.** This project requires \$33.7M in local funding, net after state funding assistance (plus site acquisition costs, if necessary).
 - d. **New Middle School Collateral Issues: What Happens to the Old School?** This is a question that patrons will ask—and the answer is at this point in time is pure speculation: if a new middle school is built on a new site, the old middle school could become, for example, a community center, perhaps run by the City of Quincy. Alternatively, if a new middle school is built on the present site, the original middle school would be demolished because the site is not big enough for all development needs with two full-sized buildings on it. A typical middle school site ranges from 12 to 20 acres. The present site is 14 acres—the low end of the ideal planning range. However, an all-new middle school could be built in conjunction with a new elementary school on QSD’s 58-acre site north of town (Parcel 200821000).
 - e. **New Middle School: Save for a Future Phase?** This may be a viable response—to conclude that the 6th graders would shift in a future bond cycle (maybe 6 years from now), and a new middle school would be built in response to upcoming growth (i.e. growth beyond the forecast year of 2019). In short this delayed start charts a path for absorbing distant-future growth and sort of “milks” more life out of the existing building in the interim, extending its overall life to 40-plus years. (Note that this presumes a new elementary school would handle the currently forecast growth.)
5. **What about Modernizing and Adding onto the Existing Middle School—Instead of Building a New Middle School?** This is an alternative to an all-new middle school. This approach would have the existing middle school modernized, and add probably 10 classrooms for mainstream 6th grade. As with the all-new middle school this modernization/addition only solves about half of the 20-classroom shortage in the growth forecast. Similarly this partial solution has a number of pros and cons:
- a. **Modernized Middle School Pro: Less Cost.** The modernized middle school would attract state funding (\$10.1M) and cost about \$4.6M less in

local dollars (but a modest tax assessment savings of about 9 cents/\$1000).

- b. Modernized Middle School Con: Less than Ideal Design Outcome.** It is common with 1930s-vintage structures that many of the existing classrooms are long and narrow—and not ideally shaped for contemporary use. This is awkward for instructional uses, and a struggle to “modernize” because this geometry is locked into the structural system of the building. In other similar schools teachers have called such long/narrow classrooms “bowling alleys.” In the Junior High’s case about 20% of the school would have this less-than-ideal geometry “modernized” and locked in for another 40 or 50 years. In addition, the overall school was built in sort of patchwork fashion over three time periods (1938, 1960, and 1986)—without any vision, intent, or “master plan” for growth that would become a large middle school and increase its overall size by about 80%. So adding onto the existing building is awkward in many respects. For example, the added classrooms may want to protrude onto the play fields in a sprawling fashion that distances them from core facilities (as compared to a new and more compact design). An additional gym/PE station will likely be needed and may be less than ideally placed. But the biggest problem is enlarging core spaces that are somewhat hemmed in by existing structure (like the cafeteria, which is completely surrounded). All of these difficulties can be addressed, and some can be fully solved. But there will be planning compromises that QSD will have to live with for 40 or 50 years. This is always a judgment call—and there are no right or wrong answers. But about 2 out of 3 other school districts with similar planning issues and this same dilemma opt for replacement of the facility.

Financial Considerations. School construction financing is usually done with a combination of local funds and state funding assistance or “matching funds.” The matching fund eligibility is generated by enrollment growth and “unhoused” students per OSPI’s calculations (where they compare available space to projected growth). Or, matching fund eligibility is generated by age of facilities. OSPI regulations permit significant modernization after a facility has aged 20 or 30 years since its initial construction or last modernization, depending on the date of completion which is established by School Board project acceptance as complete. The 30-year criterion applies to buildings accepted on or after January 1, 1993.

Because QSD has modernized or built new most facilities in its 1998 building program, it is not eligible for state matching funds on any of these facilities until 30 years after project completion—i.e. dates ranging from 2030 to 2035, depending on when the official completion paperwork was filed. The Junior High is an exception to this, having been remodeled circa 1986. It is therefore eligible for modernization or replacement (via new-in-lieu of modernization) as permitted by OSPI.

As cited previously, QSD is eligible for 23,070 SF of state-assisted funding in the K-8 grade span (or housing for 238 additional students in the year 2019 per the current Cohort Projection). This translates into approximately \$2.7M in state funding assistance for an expansion in the K-8 span.

In addition, the Junior High School is eligible for state funding assistance for modernization or new-in-lieu replacement. This translates into approximately \$10.2M in state funding assistance for this particular project.

Interestingly, the “state match” percentage has declined in Quincy from 72.12% in 2007/2008 to the present 46.51% for 2014/2015. This is likely due to significant increase in assessed property value and the commercial development that has occurred in the past 8 years. The assessed value tax base has more than doubled in the last 6 years from \$1.08 billion to \$2.38 billion.

All totaled the financial options for funding major capital improvements include a potential of \$12.8M in state funding assistance and the balance in local funds. Under Item 4 of this Study and Survey, the current status of Quincy SD’s financial situation for capital improvements is as follows:

Assessed Valuation, Quincy SD:	\$2,376,205,592 (vs. \$1,083,637,187 in 2008)
Current Indebtedness:	\$ 5,440,000 (vs. \$14,614,000 in 2008)
Remaining Bond Capacity:	\$ 113,136,815 (vs. \$39,486,950 in 2008)
Current Tax Per \$1,000 Assessment:	\$ 0.29 (vs. 1.57 in 2008)
Current Debt Pay-off Date:	12/1/2022 (vs. December 1, 2023 in 2008)
Current Market Rate for Bonds:	4% +/- (same in 2008)
Cost to Finance \$6.5M in New Bonds:	\$0.28 per \$1,000 Assessed Value
Cost to Finance \$30M in New Bonds:	\$0.86 per \$1,000 Assessed Value
Cost to Finance \$50.4M in New Bonds:	\$1.37 per \$1,000 Assessed Value

Potential Bond Packages: The following is a menu of potential bond packages that respond to QSD needs as suggested by this Study & Survey. For this summary, we include “Probable” options that seem the most viable and worthy of consideration, as well as combinations of “Probable” options. (Other “Possible” options are listed elsewhere herein. See spreadsheet hereinafter for all options and more details.)

Option 2: New Elementary School: This project would add in the range of 20 classrooms to absorb forecast growth of 435 students.

Cost: \$16.9M in net project cost after \$2.8M in state match.

Tax impact: \$0.48/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Option 10: New Elementary School & Modernize/Add to Jr. High: This project would add approximately 20 classrooms at grades K-5, and 10 more at grades 6-8, converting the Junior High to a middle school.

Cost: \$45.8M in net project cost after \$12.9M in state match.

Tax impact: \$1.31/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Option 11: New Elementary School & New Junior High School. This project would add approximately 20 classrooms at grades K-5, and 10 more at grades 6-8, converting the Junior High to a middle school. The old Junior High would be repurposed to include Administration, Support Services, Early Childhood, Enrollment Center, Community/Parent Partnerships, Board Room, after-school sports.

Cost: \$51.4M in net project cost after \$12.9M in state match.

Tax impact: \$1.47/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Option 12: New Elem. & Modernize/Add to Jr. High; Add Elem. Gyms; Add Minor Capital Projects: This is essentially Option 11 plus new elementary gyms (3) and minor capital improvement projects.

Cost: \$56.4M in net project cost after state match.

Tax Impact: \$1.62/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Option 13: New Elem. & New Jr. High; Add Elem. Gyms; Add Minor Capital Projects: This is essentially Option 12 plus new elementary gyms (3) and minor capital improvement projects.

Cost: \$62.0M in net project cost after state match.

Tax Impact: \$1.78/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Option 14: New Elem.; Jr. High Moves to High School; Build All-New High School Projects: This also includes \$3M in minor capital projects as listed hereinafter.

Cost: \$100.2M

Tax Impact: \$2.87/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Caution: This requires that the likely high school site south of town be incorporated within the Growth Management boundary to obtain sewer and water utilities. Alternatively a new high school could be sited on the 58-acre parcel north of town (in combination with a new elementary school, same site). In addition, the state match for the Jr. High replacement (\$10.2M) would not be available.

“Add-on” Option 15: George Elementary Classroom Additions

Project: Add 6 Permanent Classrooms to George Elementary School (more classrooms can be added at approximately \$0.5M each), but at some point expanded library and other support facilities must be considered.

Cost: \$3.1M

Tax Impact: \$0.09/\$1,000 of assessed value.

“Add-on” Option 16: Gym Additions at George, Mountain View and Pioneer

Project: Add 3 gyms comparable to the separate gym at Monument.

Cost: \$7.6M

Tax Impact: \$0.22/\$1,000 of assessed value.

Additional Bond Components. Typically school districts will add other components to the main project(s) of a bond including such items as:

- Technology Upgrades

- Safety/Security Upgrades
- Small Capital Improvements (a list of potential projects is included hereinafter).
- Land Acquisition (to put in the “land bank” for long-term future projects).

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS:

- **Past Growth:** QSD has had significant growth over the past 7 years (459 students). This growth was not forecast.
- **Projected Growth:** The state now forecasts future growth of 435 students in grades K-8, and a decline of 63 students in grades 9-12.
- **Near the Limit on Portables:** The recent past growth has been addressed with portable classrooms—a total of 32 classrooms (ranging from 4 to 8 portable classrooms per school). In the K-8 grade span, 22.4% of the general classrooms are portables (more than 1 of every 5 classrooms). The main school buildings’ core spaces will not support many more portables.
- **Adding on to Existing Schools Is Problematic:** Most of the existing K-8 schools have core spaces that will strain to accommodate additions.
- **Adding a New Elementary School is a Viable and Compelling Solution to Growth:** A new elementary school would add about 20 general classrooms to accommodate projected growth of 435 students.
- **Worth Considering: Adding a New Elementary and Building a New Middle School for Grades 6-8.** This could be considered as an auxiliary part of the solution to growth. It is a good fundamental planning option worth pursuing in the long term. It adds about 10 extra classrooms as a “cushion” for growth—and over the long term, QSD will need this facility (or something like it). But it has its pros and cons—and perhaps the collective judgment would be to wait on this option to a future time frame. This option could be viewed as a future phase that would presumably be validated in the next Study & Survey planning cycle.

LOOKING FAR DOWN THE ROAD: This kind of long-distance forecasting always comes with a big disclaimer that says current trends will change, and that a fresh look should be undertaken every 6 years. Nevertheless the distant look (2020 and beyond) suggests the following outcomes and potentials (based on present growth trends):

- **Grades K-5:** Continued growth at present rates will generate need for a second new elementary school somewhere around 2028.
- **Grades 6-8, or 7-8:** If not addressed in this present cycle, the Junior High will age and grow to a point where modernization or replacement will have to be seriously considered in the 2020 to 2025 time span.
- **High School:** The High School enrollment will decline over the next 5 or 6 years but rebound to present levels by about year 2222. By the year 2030 there could be 1,000 students at the High School. In the year 2034, the High School will be eligible for state funding assistance to modernize or replace it.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
 SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
 SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
 REPORT 1049 - DETERMINATION OF PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS
 SCHOOL YEAR 2014-2015

Grant/Quincy(13144)

Grade	--- ACTUAL ENROLLMENTS ON OCTOBER 1st ---										AVERAGE %	--- PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS ---				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018		2019	2020			
Kindergarten	211	197	226	230	264	250	270	281	293	304	315	327				
Grade 1	192	209	180	232	223	260	244	264	275	286	297	308				
Grade 2	199	192	205	187	233	222	261	245	265	276	287	298				
Grade 3	200	201	186	205	183	235	220	259	243	263	274	285				
Grade 4	216	211	191	189	205	184	236	221	260	244	264	275				
Grade 5	202	220	205	193	186	221	186	239	224	263	247	267				
Grade 6	205	203	210	210	197	193	223	188	241	226	265	249				
K-6 Sub-Total	1,425	1,433	1,403	1,446	1,491	1,565	1,640	1,697	1,801	1,862	1,949	2,009				
Grade 7	252	210	191	207	213	202	193	223	188	241	226	264				
Grade 8	177	252	206	186	210	212	201	192	221	187	239	224				
7-8 Sub-Total	429	462	397	393	423	414	394	415	409	428	465	488				
Grade 9	266	231	250	213	190	234	232	220	210	242	204	261				
Grade 10	175	192	191	252	219	196	216	214	203	194	223	188				
Grade 11	121	130	179	182	243	203	177	195	193	183	175	202				
Grade 12	158	152	173	198	180	239	230	201	221	219	207	198				
9-12 Sub-Total	720	705	793	845	832	872	855	830	827	838	809	849				
DISTRICT K-12 TOTAL	2,574	2,600	2,593	2,684	2,746	2,851	2,889	2,942	3,037	3,128	3,223	3,346				

Notes: Specific subtotaling on this report will be driven by District Grade spans.
 School Facilities and Organization
 Printed Dec 30, 2014

COHORT PROJECTION: Based on October 2014 Enrollment

PROJECT COST SCENARIOS: MINIMUM TO MAXIMUM

Option 1: Classroom Additions to Elementary Schools
 Project(s) Scope: 17-18 Classrooms (translates to 4-6 classrooms per school).
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$9,323,224.16
 State Match: (\$2,783,161.39)
 Net Local Cost: \$6,540,062.77
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$0.28 per \$1000 of assessed value
Possible option,
main buildings strain to support additions

Option 9: Combine Options 2 & 3
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Build new elementary school; modernize the Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$39,390,398.15
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$26,474,936.87
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Possible option

Option 2: Build a New Elementary School
 Project(s) Scope: New Elementary with approx. 18-20 classrooms
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$19,475,359.15
 State Match: (\$2,783,161.39)
 Net Local Cost: \$16,692,197.76
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$0.48 per \$1000 of assessed value
Probable option

Option 10: Combine Options 2 & 4
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Build new elementary school; modernize and add to Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$58,757,158.40
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$45,841,697.12
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$1.31
Probable option

Option 3: Modernize the Junior High School
 Project(s) Scope: Modernize only...no addition.
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$19,915,039.00
 State Match: (\$10,132,299.89)
 Net Local Cost: \$9,782,739.11
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Possible option,
does not address growth

Option 11: Combine Options 2 & 5
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Build new elementary school and new Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$63,307,645.87
 Repurpose Jr. High \$1,000,000.00 Admin., Support Services, Early Childhood, Enrollment Ctr., Community/Parent Partnerships, Board Rm., Sports
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$51,392,184.59
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$1.47
Probable option

Option 4: Modernize and Add to the Junior High
 Project(s) Scope: Move 6th grade to Jr. High; modernize and add 50,046 SF
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$39,281,799.25
 State Match: (\$10,132,299.89)
 Net Local Cost: \$29,149,499.36
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Possible option,
but combines with others per Option 10

Option 12: Combine Options 2 & 4, Add Elem Gyms, Add Minor Capital Improvements
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Build new elementary school; modernize and add to Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$58,757,158.40 New Elementary and Modernize/Add Jr. High
 Add Gyms: \$7,607,861.78 George, Mtn. View, Pioneer
 Add Minor Capital: \$3,000,000.00
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$56,449,558.90
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$1.62
Probable option

Option 5: Replace the Junior High
 Project(s) Scope: Move 6th grade to Jr. High; build all-new 110,964 SF middle school
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$43,832,286.72
 State Match: (\$10,132,299.89)
 Net Local Cost: \$33,699,986.83
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Possible option,
but combines with others per Option 11

Option 13: Combine Options 2 & 5, Add Elem Gyms, Add Minor Capital Improvements
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Build new elementary school; build new middle school
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$63,307,645.87 New Elementary and New Middle School
 Add Gyms: \$7,607,861.78 George, Mtn. View, Pioneer
 Add Minor Capital: \$3,000,000.00
 Repurpose Jr. High \$1,000,000.00 Admin., Support Services, Early Childhood, Enrollment Ctr., Community/Parent Partnerships, Board Rm., Sports
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$62,000,046.37
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$1.78
Probable option

Option 6: Combine Options 1 & 3
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Add to elem. schools; modernize the Jr. High (no addition)
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$29,238,263.16
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$16,322,801.88
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Unlikely option

Option 14: New Elementary School; Jr. High moves to HS; build all-new High School
 Project(s) Scope: See above.
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$19,475,359.15 New Elementary
 New High School \$80,485,624.87
 Add Minor Capital: \$3,000,000.00
 State Match: (\$2,783,161.39)
 Net Local Cost: \$100,177,822.63
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$2.87
Probable option

Option 7: Combine Options 1 & 4
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Add to elem. schools; modernize and add to Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$48,605,023.41
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$35,689,562.13
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Unlikely option

Option 15: George Elementary Additions
 Project Scope: Add 6 permanent classrooms (gym addition option is included elsewhere)
 Total Project Cost: \$3,083,144.71
 State Match: \$0.00
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$0.09
Add-on option

Option 8: Combine Options 1 & 5
 Project(s) Scope: See above. Add to elem. schools; replace/enlarge the Jr. High
 Total Project(s) Cost: \$53,155,510.88
 State Match: (\$12,915,461.28)
 Net Local Cost: \$40,240,049.60
 Approx. Tax Rate:
Possible option

Option 16: Gym Additions at George, Mountain View, Pioneer
 Project Scope: Add gyms; existing gyms become cafeteria/multi-purpose
 Total Project Cost: \$7,607,861.78
 State Match: \$0.00
 Approx. Tax Rate: \$0.22
Add-on option



Growth Management Boundary