

Map 4.4 - Proposed Middle School Plan. Showing general school enrollment levels as a % of capacity with the proposed solutions in place.

5.0 HIGH SCHOOLS

High schools in the District are facing two significant pressures affecting capacity – enrollment growth of the general population and a long term trending growth in students with IEP's, requiring more focused one-on-one instruction. The HS level is currently facing some pressure, especially at Damonte Ranch, McQueen, Spanish Springs and Wooster. This pressure will continue to grow over the coming years peaking in about 8 – 10 years. While the bulk of this growth is on the periphery, unlike the ES and MS levels, there is more of a balanced need across all the HS's in the District. AACT and additional online programs are not likely to reduce the overall burden on the existing schools as those programs have historically had a very limited draw and would likely reduce the need by less than 3% (500 students). The primary reason for this is that even with a fully accredited online program, there are still required periods of in-person teacher-student interaction.

5.0.1 CURRENT CONDITIONS

Currently, as is depicted in Map 5.1, Damonte Ranch, Wooster and McQueen HS are all facing near capacity enrollment issues. Spanish Springs is in an overcapacity situation with enrollment sitting right at 100%. North Valleys and Hug HS are approaching a critical stage, but currently have some additional capacity to absorb enrollment growth. The remaining schools all have capacity to absorb as much as 18% of additional enrollment before meeting capacity.

The current pressure at Spanish Springs could be alleviated by spot rezoning some of the population into the Sparks or Reed attendance zones, however, the benefit of this effort is questionable due to a strong growth rate in the Spanish Springs area and projected growth in both the Sparks and Reed boundary areas. In addition, there are geographic challenges with rezoning a large portion of the Spanish Springs area into the more urban schools.

Damonte Ranch pressure could be dealt with in the short term through the introduction of portable classroom buildings that would add an additional 8 classrooms and capacity for 200 students. Some level of intervention will be needed very shortly as the enrollment growth at Damonte will exceed capacity in the next school year, most likely.

McQueen HS presents a very different problem. The school is relatively isolated geographically and has little room on the campus for expansion or the accommodation of additional portable classrooms. Very shortly, it will reach capacity.



Map 5.1 - High School Exisiting Capacity (2015-2016). Showing general school enrollment levels as a % of capacity for the 2015-2016 school year.

5.0.2 5-YEAR PROJECTION

Growth pressures continue to build over the next 5 years across all high schools in the district. Damonte Ranch moves into an over-capacity position as the growth in the South Meadows continues, as is shown in Map 5.2. These growth pressures also impact Wooster, moving it into an over-capacity condition. Reno HS and Galena begin to feel pressure, moving closer to the 90% mark overall.

Closer to the heart of the city, Hug and Reed begin to show enrollment strain as they approach their limits. Some of the pressure being felt at Hug stems from the small size of the school. As the second smallest HS in the District, it has very little capacity to accommodate any growth.

Rezoning at this stage will result in marginal relief for the over-capacity schools and marginal value to the District since the ongoing growth will negate the value of the effort in less than 18 months.



Map 5.2 - High School Expected Capacity (2019-2020). Showing general school enrollment levels as a % of capacity by the 2019-2020 (5 year) school year.

5.0.3 10-YEAR PROJECTION

The 10 year projection reflects the entrance into the HS level of the population bubble that has been moving consistently through the system in the prior years. Fully half of the high schools in the district now reach an over-capacity position and 3 of the remaining 5 move very close to their maximum capacity limitations. Only Reno HS remains below a 90% capacity position, but that capacity could be used to relieve the some of the problems at other schools in the west side of the District.

At this point, there would be no value in a wide scale rezoning as the capacity issues far outweigh the ability of the existing schools to absorb additional enrollment. The one exception to this would be a small rezoning between McQueen and Reno. The Reno facility could accommodate the excess enrollment at McQueen if a reasonable boundary change could be determined.

The extent of the capacity need at the HS level in this 10 year time frame will only be corrected through the addition of new schools. The need is broad based, affecting most of the HS's in the district.

The general outcome of the data analysis begins to highlight several key issues at the high school level:

• Growth is evenly distributed even though there are larger pressure points in the periphery. This is likely the result of the fact that there are only 10 HS in the main part of the district (excluding Incline and AACT).

• By the end of the 10 year time frame, 9 of the ten high schools are either over-capacity or very near their capacities.

• A full rezone would provide little or no value as the total enrollment growth is in excess of all of the existing capacity. This, along with natural geographic barriers severely limits the value of any wide scale rezoning.

• Spot rezoning is a viable action and can be used to address some anomalies, most specifically between McQueen and Reno HS.



Map 5.3 -High School Expected Capacity (2024-2025). Showing general school enrollment levels as a % of capacity by the 2024-2025 (10 year) school year.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

While the primary purpose of this analysis is to look at enrollment and capacity of existing facilities, there are some other considerations that must be reviewed in this context. These factors do have a potential impact on the overall capacity of the system as they can reduce the efficiencies or add stressors that may alter attendance characteristics.

These considerations include:

• The trend in the number of students with IEP's. Analysis of this data would indicate that, especially at the HS level, there is an overall trend upward in the number of IEP's, among individual schools. Because an increase in IEP's can require additional one-on-one instructional time, it can have the negative effect of reducing the overall capacity of the school due to classrooms being pulled out of general use in favor of small group, specialized instruction.

• Existing facility age. This is an issue in the older schools, given that there overall capacity is significantly less than the new model HS's. From smaller than average rooms, to smaller sites that limit the number of temporary or portable classrooms, to the relative size of the school and its capacity to house additional grade level sections, older schools have greater general capacity limitations impacting their use.

• Core city schools vs. suburban schools. Historically, the District has chased growth at the outer periphery. As new developments have generated significant numbers of new students, new schools used all of the resources available from the perspective of capital investment. While there has been capital investment to maintain and service the core city schools, there are some challenges and equity issues that should be addressed. A big part of this does revolve around the higher need for more personalized instruction within the core city populations.

• Water rights. With the increasing pressure being put on water resources in the county – from development and from the ongoing and deepening drought – the cost of acquiring additional water rights on developable property is quickly approaching (and will potentially exceed) the cost of acquiring the property. Effective and more efficient use of existing water rights is a more cost effective model for managing the growth in the county.

5.0.4 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Based on the analysis of the existing data, the following strategies represent the recommendations of this report:

Strategy HS.1

Add to the Existing Damonte Ranch HS to increase its capacity to 2400 students as a base. With an additional 4 portable classrooms, the overall enrollment capacity climbs to 2600. This addition should be a high priority to the district as it will be relatively easy to accomplish and minimally disruptive.

Strategy HS.2

Construct a new 2400 student HS to replace Hug and Sparks HS. This should be built in the northern portion of the Sparks enrollment zone, but more to the west so it is central to a combined enrollment zone. As noted in the MS discussion, the existing Sparks HS would be repurposed as a middle school. Existing Hug can also be repurposed to a number of district level functions. Included in this recommendation would be a limited boundary realignment to better balance enrollment and growth between the new school, Reed and Spanish Springs. Also, given the enrollment projections, it is likely that this school would require 6 portable classrooms within the 10 year timeframe of the analysis.

Strategy HS.3

Construct a new 2400 student HS in the southern portion of the Wooster enrollment zone to replace the existing Wooster. This adds an additional 550 seats to the attendance zone which will can be used to relieve Damonte Ranch. As a further relief for Damonte Ranch, this recommendation also includes a realignment of the southwest portion of the Damonte Ranch to move that enrollment to Galena HS.

Strategy HS.4

Rezone McQueen and Reno HS boundary areas to better balance enrollment between the two schools. This may have very limited value if actual enrollment exceeds the projections. One additional alternative in this area would be the creation of a specialized HS in existing commercial space to draw students out of the two existing schools. The limit of this alternative school would likely be no more than 400-600 students.

Strategy HS.5

Construct a new 2400 student HS in the North Valley area to service student enrollment growth in that area. Included in this would a realignment of the Existing North Valleys HS Zone to send students in that direction. It could also include a minor re-zone to move enrollment from Spanish Springs to North Valleys, however, geographic obstacles may make this impractical.

In total, these strategies accommodate all of the projected enrollment growth for the 5 and 10 year period identified in the data provided. As is shown in Map 5.4, the recommendations relieve much of the crowding in the Spanish Springs and South meadows areas, but several schools remain at the 100% capacity mark. A deeper analysis of these growth areas along with a more detailed enrollment distribution discussion, could resolve the population density issues for those schools shown as remaining at full capacity since overall capacity at the expanded HS level is adequate to absorb the projected enrollment without any school at full capacity (if the population were distributed equally across all HS zones). The recommendations presented here for the HS level continue to build on the discussion regarding a re-investment in the core of the District, while still accommodating growth on the periphery. Geographic boundaries will continue to shape the best ways to organize the enrollment areas for each school. However, there will be a need to look broadly at the HS boundaries as a part of the implementation of these strategies due to the disparities in both facility capacity and enrollment growth.

Map 5.4 on the following page graphically represents the implementation of the HS strategies. No significant boundary realignment is reflected in this map, other than what would be required to create the new school boundaries noted above.



Map 5.4 - Proposed High School Plan. Showing general school enrollment levels as a % of capacity with the proposed solutions in place.

6.0 ALTERNATIVE CAPACITY MODELS AND OTHER MITIGATING SYSTEMS

As part of this report, we were asked to provide our opinion and any supporting data regarding alternative models for dealing with enrollment growth or if the growth could be mitigated through other means and systems. The recommendations in this report already include one of the most effective tools to mitigate the impact of rapid growth in a school district – implementation of a full year multi-track schedule for the elementary school level. Other opportunities include:

- Increased use of Charter Schools
- Increased use of Online education
- Conversion of existing vacant commercial space into educational facilities

We will address each of these separately, looking only at their capacity to relieve enrollment pressures.

Charter Schools – Currently, charter school enrollment equates to approximately 4% of the total enrollment in Washoe County Schools. In state of Nevada as a whole in 2012 (the last year data is available), there were 39 charter schools enrolling a total of 18,255 students. This accounted for 4.2% of the total public school enrollment in the state. This seems to indicate that Washoe County is tracking quite close to the state average. This is also in line with the national average, which is also 4.2%. This average has been trending upward, however, most of the growth in enrollment is happening at the elementary school level. At the secondary level, enrollment growth for Charter schools has been trending towards flat and possibly towards contraction. Charter schools generally have a very specific educational focus that is attractive to a limited number of students. In addition, at the secondary level, most charter schools are not large enough to accommodate any sports teams, which has proven to be a limiting factor in the United States.

Looking specifically at what impact charter schools could have as a mitigating tool, we assessed it from the perspective of the secondary level schools, as most of the current charters serve this population. With a current participation rate of 4%, and making the assumption that participation will remain at that level, the net impact on the serving the projected enrollment growth would be an additional 45 students going to charters. If we assume a stronger growth rate of 5% for the ten year period, the impact would reduce the need by 250 students. Overall, if we take into account total district enrollment, charter schools would mitigate between 350 and 1,000 students.

Charter schools in general are comprised of smaller student populations. On average, charter schools in the United States average 300-600 students, with the national average at about 350 students. There are examples of charter schools with enrollment of more than 1,000 students, but they are not typical and are usually K-12 schools. The primary objective of the original charter movement was to reduce the size of the school and create a more personalized instructional model with lower teacher/student ratios.

Online Education - While there has been a broad discussion nationally about online

delivery as a heavy influencer in the future of education, there has not been a major shift in American education to a full embrace of virtual schooling. Across the country, almost all online educational programs include a regular in-person meeting between the student and the instructor. This requires that space be allocated for both traditional instruction and small group meetings. Overall, online education will have a negligible impact in reducing the capacity need created from growth in the district.

Conversion of Existing Vacant Commercial Space – While existing commercial space presents an attractive alternative to building new buildings, there are a number of challenges posed by this option. Most notably is the cost. While new school construction requires anywhere from \$200 - \$300/SF (based on the function of the specific space), converting existing large scale retail/commercial environments will save, on average only about \$25 - \$50/SF (depending on condition and infrastructure present in the existing space). Across the United States, there are very few examples of successful conversions of large scale commercial space into public school environments. The most notable example is the Village Academy High School in Pomona California. This 9-12 high school was converted into a high school from an existing shopping mall in the 1990's. The 2013 enrollment in the school was 469 students. The majority of the examples of schools that use converted commercial space are charter schools, generally with smaller populations. The primary factors limiting the conversion of existing commercial properties are:

• Nevada is in zone 4 of the seismic classification system in the International Building Code. In addition, public school facilities are classified as "essential" structures under the building code and are therefore required to have a higher seismic performance level than typical commercial buildings. This requirement would result in substantial upgrades to the existing structural systems in a typical commercial structure, which significantly reduces the cost benefit of reuse.

• Mechanical systems in commercial buildings, especially retail based buildings, are designed to accommodate a much lighter heating and cooling load than is typically required for a school setting. Fresh air requirements, zoning of air distribution, and temperature modulation are all designed to lower performance requirements than a traditional school environment.

• Availability of space is a limiting factor. With the exception of big-box stores, typical retail or commercial buildings are considerably smaller than the traditional school.

• Access to natural daylight is limited in larger scale commercial buildings. Whether in a bigbox retail store or a large warehouse building, the large interior volumes create significant challenges to getting daylight into the learning spaces. Numerous studies have shown that access to natural daylight is proven to improve academic performance.

• Lease structures in commercial buildings are not typically designed to accommodate the improvements required for academic space. The increased cost of improvements typically exceed the markets standards for improvement allowances, thereby requiring additional capital investment by the district.

As an option to relieve crowding, use of existing vacant commercial space does not provide a significant opportunity to address the long term growth need.

7.0 COST IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations in this report reflect what we believe would be the most cost effective strategies to address the enrollment growth and capacity issues the District will be facing in the next 10 years. While it is practically impossible to predict what the actual costs for implementation will be 10 years in the future, it is possible to provide a present day cost model that recognizes that the implementation will occur over time. The projections presented here are to be used as a reference point establishing a general scale of the work proposed. These figures are not intended to present an absolute or actual cost. All dollars presented here represent the cost in 2015 dollars.

There are three general categories that can be considered when establishing the general scale of the cost model – New Construction; Remodeling and Reinvestment; Soft Costs and Inflation. The cost model assumes a 10 year implementation with the following conditions:

• Reconfiguration and reinvestment occurs first inside the McCarran loop at the high school and middle school levels.

• Addressing enrollment capacity issues at the elementary level occurs in stages over a period of three years.

• Addressing the enrollment needs at the middle school level is a high priority for completion prior to year 5 of the projections.

• Construction of the new facilities in the North Valleys, Spanish Springs, and South Meadows areas completes the implementation process.

Based on this general timeline and prioritization, the following represents a cost model attributable to the recommendations:

New Construction – The recommendations project the need for 5 new schools with a capital investment as follows:

\$400M
\$120M
\$30M
\$25M

Remodeling and Reinvestment – The recommendations project the reconfiguration of Sparks HS, reconfiguration of Sparks and Dilworth middle schools and selective capital investment in 26 elementary schools inside the McCarran loop (includes the creation of a new specialized school in the existing Wooster High School). The capital investment needed would be as follows:

 Remodel Sparks High 	School into a	middle school ·	- \$40M

- Remodel Sparks and Dilworth Middle Schools \$10M
- Core Area school investments \$100M

Soft Costs and Inflation – While it is not possible to predict inflation over a 10 year span, it is possible to allocate for increased costs based on historical precedent. Construction inflation is currently projected to fall between 6-10% for the next several years. While this is a significant impact, the historical cost inflation in construction has averaged 3%. As such, by using the total cost of the investment, taken at its midpoint, and inflated at 3% per year over 10 years, would provide a sufficient model to accommodate long-term inflation.

Inflation escalation – \$100M
 Repurpose Hug, Risley, and Lincoln Park – \$10M

This brings the total level of investment for capital construction projected in this recommendation to approximately \$835M over a 10 year time frame. This cost does not include the current annual capital expenditures of approximately \$20M for maintenance and refurbishment of all the schools in the district. It is assumed this level of expenditure would continue during this time frame.

The final cost implication of the recommendations in this report would be the annual cost associated with operating approximately 30 elementary schools under a full year multi-track schedule. Based on discussions with district staff and their estimates of the additional operational costs for a school on such a schedule, it is estimated that there would be an annual operating cost of \$7-9M to fully implement the multi-track program. This assumes approximately 30 elementary schools would be participating on a multi-track schedule. Therefore, over the 10 year time frame envisioned in this implementation, the total additional operating costs would be \$70M-\$90M.

8.0 APPENDICIES

8.0.1 APPENDIX 1- ENROLLMENT PROJECTION DATA

<u>Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases</u>

Elementary		Grade		School Capacity					Projecte	d Enrollme	ents and Cl	assrooms			
School		Range	Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Allen	Classrooms	DK 6th	25	4	29	33	33	31	31	32	31	31	32	34	34
	Enrollment	FK - UII	621	100	721	619	605	574	574	578	580	590	607	624	641
Anderson	Classrooms	PK - 6th	17	6	23	23	24	23	24	24	22	23	24	25	26
	Enrollment	FK - UII	424	150	574	515	517	529	529	528	516	521	534	548	563
Beasley	Classrooms	PK - 6th	33	4	37	40	40	41	41	41	40	40	42	42	43
	Enrollment		836	100	936	826	841	873	883	871	856	826	835	851	874
Beck	Classrooms	K - 6th	22	2	24	26	24	24	24	24	23	25	27	27	27
	Enrollment	K Oth	547	50	597	563	547	527	529	526	518	529	540	555	572
Bennett	Classrooms	PK - 6th	31	2	33	29	29	28	28	28	27	28	31	34	34
	Enrollment		747	50	797	546	538	548	545	555	541	554	572	587	606
Booth	Classrooms	PK - 6th	23	2	25	24	24	25	24	23	23	24	25	26	26
	Enrollment		557	50	607	419	418	410	401	395	404	409	420	432	444
Brown	Classrooms	PK - 5th	27	10	37	48	49	50	49	48	50	49	50	51	53
	Enrollment		644	250	894	955	973	978	975	991	988	973	997	1,018	1,051
Cannan	Classrooms	K - 6th	25	4	29	40	38	38	39	39	39	39	41	42	42
	Enrollment	K Oth	621	100	721	757	765	767	778	783	779	783	804	826	849
Caughlin Ranch	Classrooms	PK - 6th	25	0	25	27	27	28	26	27	26	26	26	26	28
	Enrollment		643	0	643	566	555	554	531	522	534	537	547	563	581
Corbett	Classrooms	PK - 6th	20	4	24	27	26	25	24	24	24	26	25	29	29
	Enrollment		491	100	591	499	499	500	491	483	477	486	500	515	529
Desert Heights	Classrooms	PK - 6th	33	2	35	28	28	27	27	27	27	27	28	29	30
	Enrollment		811	50	861	506	511	496	491	497	501	510	529	541	555
Diedrichsen	Classrooms	K - 6th	22	0	22	22	23	24	24	24	23	24	25	26	27
	Enrollment		547	0	547	421	436	457	459	454	454	453	461	473	488
Dodson	Classrooms	PK - 6th	24	0	24	27	26	27	26	26	26	26	26	29	29
	Enrollment		589	0	589	441	456	459	460	458	462	459	471	484	499
Donner Springs	Classrooms	PK - 6th	33	2	35	36	38	38	37	38	39	39	40	41	43
	Enrollment		811	50	861	686	713	722	735	740	756	761	775	790	809
Double Diamond	Classrooms	PK - 5th	31	6	37	45	49	53	55	56	55	54	54	54	57
	Enrollment	otin	738	150	888	936	1,015	1,092	1,133	1,130	1,106	1,081	1,074	1,094	1,128
Drake	Classrooms	K - 6th	22	0	22	19	19	19	19	18	19	19	19	20	20
	Enrollment		525	0	525	317	320	313	306	306	308	299	307	314	322
Duncan	Classrooms	PK - 5th	23	4	27	24	23	22	23	23	23	24	24	25	27
	Enrollment		537	100	637	446	434	422	435	439	442	449	466	480	493

<u>Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases</u>

Elementary		Grade		School Capacity					Projecte	d Enrollme	nts and Cl	assrooms			
School		Range	Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Dunn	Classrooms	DK 6th	26	0	26	26	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	30	30
	Enrollment	FK - Uti	633	0	633	532	537	540	557	568	565	566	581	595	612
Elmcrest	Classrooms	PK - 6th	21	2	23	20	19	21	20	19	20	20	21	21	23
	Enrollment	FK - Oth	504	50	554	352	349	349	342	341	346	362	374	384	395
Gomes	Classrooms	K - Ath	22	2	24	26	26	25	27	29	30	31	34	34	35
	Enrollment	K HUI	510	50	560	510	507	498	520	565	598	630	647	664	681
Gomm	Classrooms	K - 6th	22	0	22	21	21	21	20	21	21	20	21	22	23
	Enrollment	K Oth	547	0	547	443	436	426	415	416	433	432	441	453	466
Greenbrae	Classrooms	K - 6th	16	4	20	19	19	18	18	18	19	21	21	21	21
	Enrollment	K Oth	410	100	510	392	400	402	399	401	406	408	418	429	442
Hall	Classrooms	K - 6th	28	2	30	31	31	34	36	36	40	41	46	46	41
	Enrollment	N Oth	702	50	752	653	685	731	754	783	861	928	981	959	930
Hidden Valley	Classrooms	PK - 6th	27	0	27	29	29	29	29	31	32	34	34	36	38
	Enrollment		680	0	680	516	513	502	522	562	584	613	628	660	674
Huffaker	Classrooms	PK - 6th	24	0	24	25	25	26	26	26	26	27	29	31	32
	Enrollment		611	0	611	481	477	485	485	502	509	525	542	559	581
Hunsberger	Classrooms	K - 6th	31	4	35	34	34	34	34	34	35	35	36	37	38
	Enrollment	it oth	772	100	872	760	762	757	753	761	773	770	779	794	814
Hunter Lake	Classrooms	PK - 6th	17	2	19	18	17	18	17	16	18	18	18	18	19
	Enrollment		438	50	488	370	373	375	374	375	371	367	370	380	392
Incline	Classrooms	PK - 5th	30	0	30	22	21	21	21	22	23	23	23	23	23
	Enrollment	otin	716	0	716	438	423	416	413	413	425	430	444	457	471
Juniper	Classrooms	K - 6th	24	2	26	23	22	22	23	23	22	22	22	22	22
	Enrollment		611	50	661	455	461	458	456	460	449	455	466	479	494
Lemelson	Classrooms	PK - 6th	19	2	21	19	19	18	18	18	18	19	20	21	22
	Enrollment		471	50	521	406	395	392	386	387	386	390	402	412	424
Lemmon Valley	Classrooms	PK - 6th	30	4	34	38	36	36	38	39	38	38	38	39	40
	Enrollment		715	100	815	694	689	695	692	719	696	716	723	733	748
Lenz	Classrooms	K - 6th	21	4	25	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	25
	Enrollment		524	100	624	481	482	472	467	473	474	473	481	495	509
Lincoln Park	Classrooms	PK - 6th	21	3	24	24	23	24	23	22	22	23	24	25	25
	Enrollment		504	75	579	430	427	422	430	413	405	410	420	431	446
Loder	Classrooms	PK - 6th	26	1	27	31	29	30	30	30	31	31	32	32	33
	Enrollment		633	25	658	587	592	601	610	602	604	606	624	641	660

<u>Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases</u>

				School											
Elementary		Grade		Capacity				-	Projecte	d Enrollme	nts and Cl	assrooms	-		
School		Range	Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Mathews	Classrooms	DK 5th	31	3	34	32	33	33	32	33	33	33	35	36	37
	Enrollment	FK - Jul	705	75	780	597	591	588	600	605	610	619	641	662	681
Maxwell	Classrooms	DK 6th	21	6	27	33	34	34	34	35	36	36	37	38	39
	Enrollment	FK - UII	503	150	653	646	667	678	669	665	681	682	699	718	738
Melton	Classrooms	DK 5th	31	0	31	32	32	31	31	31	31	32	32	33	33
	Enrollment	FK - Jul	738	0	738	593	595	579	565	565	568	575	593	613	633
Mitchell	Classrooms	K Cth	16	6	22	22	23	23	23	22	22	21	21	23	24
	Enrollment	K - 011	410	150	560	445	461	462	459	455	454	460	470	483	496
Moss	Classrooms		29	0	29	31	32	32	32	35	35	35	36	38	38
	Enrollment	PK - 0(1)	718	0	718	617	623	643	658	674	691	690	721	740	773
Mount Rose	Classrooms		15	6	21	21	22	21	21	23	23	23	23	24	24
	Enrollment	PK - 8th	392	150	542	466	469	468	479	484	491	493	502	513	525
Natchez	Classrooms	DK Cth	12	0	12	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	11
	Enrollment	PK - 0(1)	314	0	314	187	188	188	187	184	184	192	198	204	210
Palmer	Classrooms	K C+b	22	4	26	25	25	26	25	25	26	27	27	27	27
	Enrollment	κ - οιπ	525	100	625	520	532	538	527	523	524	537	548	563	579
Peavine	Classrooms		17	0	17	20	18	18	18	17	17	19	20	20	20
	Enrollment	PK - 501	423	0	423	387	379	379	382	372	372	377	389	401	414
Pleasant Valley	Classrooms		23	0	23	21	21	21	21	21	22	22	22	22	23
	Enrollment	PK - 501	559	0	559	401	411	417	412	411	410	414	426	438	454
Risley	Classrooms	K C+b	23	2	25	23	23	23	24	23	23	24	27	27	27
	Enrollment	κ - οιπ	557	50	607	485	488	494	500	495	497	506	520	535	550
Sepulveda	Classrooms	K Cth	28	2	30	37	38	37	38	37	35	36	36	36	37
	Enrollment	K - 011	702	50	752	805	835	843	824	793	773	770	771	782	799
Silver Lake	Classrooms	K Eth	24	4	28	30	31	30	30	30	30	31	31	33	33
	Enrollment	K - 501	584	100	684	650	657	651	656	655	652	658	677	696	721
Alice Smith	Classrooms		30	6	36	35	37	38	39	39	39	39	40	41	42
	Enrollment	PK - 0(1)	715	150	865	733	759	770	781	782	787	801	818	839	869
Kate Smith	Classrooms		11	4	15	19	19	18	17	16	16	16	17	18	18
	Enrollment	PK - 0(1)	285	100	385	331	335	328	321	313	315	311	319	327	337
Smithridge	Classrooms		29	5	34	40	40	40	39	39	39	40	40	42	46
	Enrollment	FK - 5(1)	675	125	800	748	762	776	749	738	749	760	788	812	837
Spanish Springs	Classrooms		31	4	35	36	36	38	38	38	37	37	37	38	40
	Enrollment	רא - טנח	772	100	872	782	800	819	839	818	804	794	802	815	845

Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases

Elementary		Grade		School Capacity					Projected	d Enrollme	nts and Cl	assrooms			
School		Range	Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Stead	Classrooms	K Gth	31	4	35	36	37	37	37	35	36	36	38	39	39
	Enrollment	K - UII	747	100	847	719	731	712	711	695	711	722	738	757	779
Sun Valley	Classrooms	DK - 6th	28	4	32	35	35	35	34	34	35	36	36	38	39
	Enrollment	FK - UUI	679	100	779	682	691	693	679	669	659	667	681	699	719
Taylor	Classrooms	DK 6th	25	4	29	30	30	30	31	30	29	30	29	29	30
	Enrollment	FK - Oth	643	100	743	625	625	626	621	618	613	613	623	631	646
Towles	Classrooms	K - 6th	20	0	20	20	21	21	20	21	20	20	20	21	21
	Enrollment	K - Ull	509	0	509	377	390	409	411	397	390	382	381	384	397
Van Gorder	Classrooms	K 6th	31	4	35	38	39	40	41	41	41	41	40	42	45
	Enrollment	K - UII	772	100	872	803	807	813	817	811	829	834	852	876	903
Verdi	Classrooms	K - 6th	13	0	13	11	12	14	15	15	15	15	15	16	16
	Enrollment	K - UII	328	0	328	221	247	266	290	300	308	312	317	323	332
Veteran's	Classrooms	DK - 6th	22	2	24	20	19	20	20	20	20	22	22	22	23
	Enrollment	FK - Oth	525	50	575	405	392	399	391	386	375	391	401	412	423
Warner	Classrooms	DK 6th	21	2	23	19	20	19	19	20	20	20	20	21	21
	Enrollment	FK - UUI	504	50	554	401	390	367	365	364	361	367	379	389	400
Westergard	Classrooms	K - 5th	24	4	28	30	31	32	33	32	33	34	34	35	36
	Enrollment	K-Jui	584	100	684	663	677	689	695	678	682	685	702	724	740
Whitehead	Classrooms	K Gth	22	0	22	23	22	21	21	22	21	21	21	21	22
	Enrollment	K - 011	547	0	547	479	467	472	472	470	451	455	462	473	487
Winnemucca	Classrooms	DK 6th	31	0	31	35	35	35	35	35	34	35	35	37	39
	Enrollment	FK - OUI	772	0	772	640	651	647	644	645	647	653	672	689	709

ECE Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases

			Incl	Classrooms, . Gyms & Mu Canacity	sic/										
Middle		Grade		Port-					Projected	l Enrollme	nts and C	lassrooms			
School		Range	Base	ables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Billinghurst	Classrooms	6th -	43	0	43	44	44	46	47	50	50	50	49	49	48
	Enrollment	8th	1,082	0	1,082	952	962	998	1,046	1,090	1,099	1,103	1,075	1,062	1,058
Clayton	Classrooms	6th -	32	2	34	36	35	36	36	35	36	36	35	35	35
	Enrollment	8th	831	50	881	722	708	723	716	727	728	714	698	693	681
Cold Springs	Classrooms	5th -	56	0	56	31	32	33	35	37	39	41	42	44	45
	Enrollment	8th	1,409	0	1,409	686	711	741	795	836	880	919	943	947	1,000
Depoali	Classrooms	6th -	52	0	52	54	61	66	72	76	80	82	80	78	76
	Enrollment	8th	1,320	0	1,320	1,213	1,355	1,468	1,632	1,723	1,841	1,863	1,845	1,790	1,749
Dilworth	Classrooms	7th -	30	0	30	30	29	29	30	31	32	32	31	31	30
	Enrollment	8th	740	0	740	594	571	569	591	615	638	640	627	603	595
Incline	Classrooms	6th -	18	0	18	10	11	11	12	12	11	11	10	9	9
	Enrollment	8th	489	0	489	206	235	233	246	235	220	220	217	225	225
Mendive	Classrooms	6th* -	43	0	43	48	50	49	49	51	56	56	54	52	51
	Enrollment	8th	1,072	0	1,072	1,094	1,147	1,121	1,122	1,195	1,265	1,281	1,243	1,201	1,180
O'Brien	Classrooms	7th -	43	0	43	38	36	38	40	40	40	38	38	38	38
	Enrollment	8th	1,025	0	1,025	592	667	593	738	749	736	712	714	718	709
Pine	Classrooms	6th -	44	0	44	49	48	48	52	53	53	53	52	52	50
	Enrollment	8th	1,096	0	1,096	1,054	1,046	1,018	1,100	1,124	1,118	1,113	1,105	1,095	1,087
Shaw	Classrooms	7th -	43	4	47	45	45	46	48	52	53	53	53	53	53
	Enrollment	8th	1,096	100	1,196	1,046	1,049	1,082	1,144	1,222	1,244	1,216	1,234	1,238	1,215
Sparks	Classrooms	7th -	34	0	34	37	36	36	38	41	41	40	38	39	38
	Enrollment	8th	836	0	836	749	731	737	794	848	845	815	797	796	783
Swope	Classrooms	6th* -	33	0	33	32	32	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	31
	Enrollment	8th	853	0	853	714	721	748	757	761	746	737	740	732	718
Traner	Classrooms	6th -	30	2	32	35	35	36	36	35	35	35	36	35	35
	Enrollment	8th	749	50	799	743	747	782	745	730	741	764	749	744	738
Vaughn	Classrooms	7th -	34	0	34	30	30	30	30	32	32	32	32	32	32
	Enrollment	8th	836	0	836	642	632	613	631	687	704	686	676	677	673

(Version 07/30/2015)

Notes:

* - 6th grade GT/Magnet students only

ECE Classrooms + New SE/Strategies Programs + SE Program Increases to match Enrollment Increases

			Incl	Classrooms, . Gyms & Mu Capacity	sic/										
High		Grade		Port-					Projected	Enrollme	nts and C	lassrooms			
School		Range	Base	ables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
Damonte	Classrooms	9th -	61	8	69	73	74	78	81	86	89	92	97	100	103
Ranch	Enrollment	12th	1,597	200	1,797	1,753	1,773	1,871	1,988	2,090	2,183	2,285	2,378	2,462	2,540
Galena	Classrooms	9th -	66	0	66	58	59	61	61	62	61	65	65	66	67
	Enrollment	12th	1,692	0	1,692	1,375	1,389	1,453	1,445	1,459	1,477	1,500	1,534	1,553	1,568
Hug	Classrooms	9th -	67	0	67	59	60	62	61	64	63	63	66	65	64
	Enrollment	12th	1,645	0	1,645	1,418	1,451	1,494	1,505	1,521	1,528	1,544	1,563	1,555	1,550
Incline	Classrooms	9th -	28	0	28	13	13	14	14	14	14	15	16	13	13
	Enrollment	12th	784	0	784	301	286	300	301	306	321	318	327	311	308
McQueen	Classrooms	9th -	61	14	75	74	76	76	76	77	79	79	83	83	84
	Enrollment	12th	1,601	350	1,951	1,849	1,852	1,905	1,893	1,915	1,944	1,981	2,043	2,061	2,064
North	Classrooms	9th -	81	8	89	82	82	82	82	86	87	91	94	95	94
Valleys	Enrollment	12th	2,061	200	2,261	2,033	2,026	2,054	2,064	2,129	2,190	2,282	2,339	2,355	2,372
Reed	Classrooms	9th -	84	12	96	82	82	83	86	86	88	91	94	97	96
	Enrollment	12th	2,127	300	2,427	2,032	2,002	2,047	2,118	2,118	2,172	2,224	2,308	2,381	2,405
Reno	Classrooms	9th -	77	3	80	68	71	70	71	72	72	73	73	73	72
	Enrollment	12th	1,965	75	2,040	1,699	1,752	1,763	1,763	1,801	1,795	1,817	1,824	1,823	1,819
Spanish	Classrooms	9th -	85	10	95	94	98	99	100	101	105	109	112	114	113
Springs	Enrollment	12th	2,160	250	2,410	2,395	2,472	2,527	2,553	2,597	2,676	2,781	2,886	2,883	2,874
Sparks	Classrooms	9th -	57	4	61	51	52	53	52	53	52	54	55	56	56
	Enrollment	12th	1,425	100	1,525	1,246	1,267	1,298	1,281	1,294	1,302	1,328	1,367	1,386	1,385
Wooster	Classrooms	9th -	69	2	71	78	78	80	81	82	85	87	90	92	92
	Enrollment	12th	1,794	50	1,844	1,805	1,822	1,882	1,908	1,926	1,960	2,027	2,078	2,120	2,133
AACT	Classrooms	9th -	31	0	31	19	19	20	19	19	20	20	20	21	21
	Enrollment	12th	792	0	792	519	515	527	527	536	549	566	582	593	597

Elementary			School Capacity					Projected	Enrollme	nts and C	lassrooms			
School		Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
TOTALS	Classrooms	1,502	160	1,662	1,712	1,716	1,727	1,730	1,736	1,741	1,770	1,812	1,869	1,915
	Enrollment	36,857	4,000	40,857	33,926	34,271	34,456	34,534	34,562	34,695	35,021	35,850	36,718	37,739

		Incl	Classrooms, . Gyms & Mu	sic/							_			
Middle			Capacity					Projected	Enrollme	nts and C	lassrooms			
School		Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
TOTALS	Classrooms	535	8	543	519	524	537	558	578	591	592	583	580	571
	Enrollment	12,598	200	12,798	10,365	10,650	10,813	11,426	11,855	12,101	12,097	11,987	11,844	11,738

High		Incl.	Classrooms, . Gyms & Mu Capacity	sic/				Projected	Enrollme	nts and Cl	assrooms			
School		Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
TOTALS	Classrooms	767	61	828	751	764	778	784	802	815	839	865	875	875
	Enrollment	19,643	1,525	21,168	18,425	18,607	19,121	19,346	19,692	20,097	20,653	21,229	21,483	21,615

All		Incl	Classrooms, . Gyms & Mu Capacity	sic/				Projected	Enrollme	nts and C	lassrooms			
Schools		Base	Portables	Total	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25
TOTALS	Classrooms	2,804	229	3,033	2,982	3,004	3,042	3,072	3,116	3,147	3,201	3,260	3,324	3,361
	Enrollment	69,098	5,725	74,823	62,716	63,528	64,390	65,306	66,109	66,893	67,771	69,066	70,045	71,092

CUNINGHAM G R O U P

®

Cuningham Group Architecture, Inc.

St. Anthony Main 201 Main Street SE Suite 325, Minneapolis, MN 55414 612 379 3400



Washoe County School District

Every Child, By Name And Face, To Graduation[™]

Enrollment and Capacity Analysis Presentation Findings and Recommendations 5 October 2015



Assumptions and Precepts

- Used existing data and mapping
- Assumed no school should exceed 100% capacity
- Focus primarily on accommodating enrollment
- Growth will need to be accommodated for in stages
- Overall recommendations are a starting point
- Purpose of this presentation is for discussion
- Cost analysis is for representative scale purposes



High Schools



Current Context – High Schools

• 2015 – 2016





Current Context – High Schools

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)





Current Context – High Schools

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)
- 2024 2025 (10 Year Projection)
- Growth is dispersed, but still generally at periphery
- Rezoning does not solve problem as current capacity will not handle growth
- Online will not result in any material change or benefit
- Bulk of problem is 10 years out.
- Program accommodation will reduce overall capacity





Recommendation – High Schools

2024 – 2025 Shown (10 Year Projection)

- New 2400 student HS's in north valley and Wooster area.
- Combine Hug and Sparks zones, build new combined 2400 student HS on central site (new Sparks)
- Increase Damonte Ranch to 2400 student capacity with additions
- Wooster boundary adjusts to relieve Damonte Ranch
- Some rezoning around new Sparks HS to disperse enrollment load



Middle Schools



Current Context – Middle Schools

• 2015 – 2016





Current Context – Middle Schools

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)





Current Context – Middle Schools

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)
- 2024 2025 (10 Year Projection)

- Growth continues at the periphery
- Population bubble moves through middle levels in 5 years.
- Largest growth in the South Meadows
- Existing schools in core of cities are small and lack site capacity for growth
- Rezone of whole district not viable due population imbalance





Recommendation – Middle Schools

• 2019 – 2020 Shown (5 Year Projection)

- Three new middle schools 2 new 1200 student schools and repurpose of Sparks High into 1400 - 1500 student school
- Mendive and Billinghurst remain at capacity
- Depoali and Shaw relieved by new schools and rezoning
- Billinghurst, Traner, and Clayton adjust boundaries



Elementary Schools



Current Context -Elementary

• 2015 - 2016





Current Context -Elementary

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)





Current Context -Elementary

- 2015 2016
- 2019 2020 (5 Year Projection)
- 2024 2025 (10 Year Projection)

- Growth continues to be focused on the periphery
- Core city schools generally remain within or close to capacity limits
- Rezone of whole district not viable due population imbalance
- Spot rezoning can address anomalies





Recommendation – Elementary

- 2024 2025 Shown (10 Year Projection)
- Multi-track Year round outside of core
- 1 new ES school, location TBD
- Risley and Lincoln Park move to old Sparks and old Dilworth
- Focus academic and capital resources in the core
- Rezoning in the core area to balance capacities and enrollment across core schools.
- Add some students from edge of core boundary



Other Pressures

- Trend line for growth of IEP's indicates a potential long term need for more dedicated spaces.
- 2.4% growth model moves most of the problems up 5 years.
- Diversity balance may impact some decisions
- Capacity issues impact ES and MS first, with the exception of outlying HS's
- Year round multi-track for 29 ES will cost \$7.25M annually



Implementation Milestones

1 year
2 years
2 years
3 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
5 years
6 years
6 years
10 years



Investment Cost Projection

 Three new HS (\$135M Ea. in 2015 \$) 	\$400M
 Additions to Damonte Ranch 	\$30M
 Two new MS (\$60M Ea. In 2015 \$) 	\$120M
• New ES	\$25M
 Convert Sparks HS to MS 	\$40M
 Convert Sparks and Dilworth to ES 	\$10M
 Repurpose Hug HS and Risley ES 	\$10M
 Core school investments 	\$100M
 Inflation escalation 	\$100M
• Total	\$835M



Washoe County School District

Every Child, By Name And Face, To Graduation[™]

Enrollment and Capacity Analysis Presentation Findings and Recommendations 5 October 2015



Future Agenda Items

As Requested by the Public Schools Overcrowding & Repair Needs Committee As of October 19, 2015

Suggested agenda item	<u>Status</u>
Tax Analysis - overview of sources, rates, revenue, debt service, and	Presented 9/25
regional comparisons	Continuation on 10/9
National landscape of alternative school models including efficiencies, multitrack, and out of the box thinking	Scheduled on 10/23
Update on current and projected enrollment and expected policy &	Presented 10/9
operational implications	
Cost of School construction from a policy perspective (building codes,	
systems to lower maintenance, and cost of local government standards	
How to build them cheaper, are we building the right model schools in	
the face of changing city zoning and density	
Household impact and sensitivity analysis of socio-economic categories of	
eligible revenue sources	
Other counties models to fund school construction and how our tax	Presented 9/25
efforts compare	
Academic impact of overcrowding – national and local perspective	
Impacts to schools if no additional funding is provided	
EDAWN economic update	Presented 10/9
Potential and need for corporate partnerships	
Fiscal impact of the 2015 legislation session – new revenue for academic	Presented 9/25
programs (full day k, class size, zoom schools, mental health professionals	
Overview of NRS 281A.520 and SB 380 from the 2015 Legislative Session	
Comparing District Involvement in ballot questions	
Analysis of the likelihood of success	
If failure, then what?	
Sonsitivity of the public to tayor	
Sensitivity of the public to taxes	
And now to increase the likelihood of success	
Who's the opposition	
Ability and desire for polling	
 Analysis of a yes vote vs. no vote 	
Sample ballot questions	