

Lake Washington School District Executive Limitation Monitoring Report

EL-13 Facilities
March 14, 2016

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

<p>1. Develop a fiscally prudent; long-term facilities plan to establish priorities for construction, renovation, and maintenance projects. In setting those priorities, the CEO shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assign highest priority to the correction of unsafe conditions; b. Include maintenance costs as necessary to enable facilities to reach their intended life-cycles; c. Disclose assumptions on which the plan is developed, including growth patterns, and the financial and human capital impact individual projects will have on other parts of the organization, and d. Ensure that facilities and equipment are not subject to improper wear and tear or insufficient maintenance. 	<p>In Compliance</p>	
--	--------------------------	---

Evidence

Long-term planning is accomplished by way of “capital planning” and “preventive/predictive maintenance planning.” These planning measures work in tandem to provide integrated strategies for district construction, maintenance, and operations in order to establish priorities that result in present and continually “safe and functional buildings” (Administrative policy DA, Fiscal Management Goals) in alignment with the District’s strategic goals: *Goal 2 - Provide Safe & Innovative Learning Environments*; and, *Goal 4 – Use Resources Effectively & Be Fiscally Responsible*. Planning balances the facilities needs with prudent use of resources to minimize the potential impact of taking funding away from classroom instruction.

Capital Planning

Tools used for capital planning include: 1) the Six-year Capital Facilities Plan; 2) growth and modernization/ replacement project planning; 3) development tracking, school capacity studies, occupancy utilization, and enrollment projections; 4) total cost of ownership studies and resource impact analysis; 5) real estate planning; 6) the State Study and Survey; 7) the State Asset Preservation Program building condition analysis; and, 8) district educational specifications for schools. The District updates baseline educational specifications prior to a bond measure and uses total cost of ownership studies to help determine building and site solutions that are durable and in alignment with available resources.

- As a result of the failure of Bond measures in February and April 2014, the District convened a 63-member Long Term Facilities Planning Task Force to look at the issues of capacity and aging schools. Their work began in November 2014 and continued through 2014-2015 school year. Their work was not completed and needed to continue into the 2015-2016 school year.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

- | | | |
|--|------------------|---|
| 1. Develop a fiscally prudent; long-term facilities plan to establish priorities for construction, renovation, and maintenance projects. In setting those priorities, the CEO shall:
<i>{see page 1 for complete listing}</i> | In
Compliance |  |
|--|------------------|---|

In
Compliance



Evidence {continued}

- The 2015-2020 Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan was updated in April 2015 and adopted by the School Board in June 2015. It was then presented to the King County School Technical Review Committee (STRC) in June 2015, with adoption at a later date. By the end of the 2015 calendar year, all jurisdictions (King County, City of Kirkland, City of Redmond, and the City of Sammamish) adopted the fees as proposed by the District. The school impact fees on new residential development will be \$9,715.00 per single-family unit and \$816.00 for each multi-family unit. The single-family fee is an increase of \$92.00 and the multi-family fee is an increase of \$71.00 from last year’s fees.

Preventive Maintenance Planning

Preventative maintenance planning tools include, but are not limited to: the Asset Preservation Program (*Appendix A*); life-cycle system replacement planning; planned, predictive, and preventive maintenance through an automated work order system; system surveys and assessments; failure analysis; metrics; monitoring; and, trending. Both capital levy and general fund monies are expended to address facilities (i.e. building and site) system upgrades and needs.

The priority of Facility Services is to avoid and/or correct unsafe conditions in order to provide educational (i.e. business) continuance and avoidance of injury. Unsafe conditions are known by way of various assessments and inspections or reports to Facility Services. Assessments and inspections as well as corrective, predictive, and preventive maintenance programs proactively inform capital (i.e. construction) planning.

The State Asset Preservation Program (APP) evaluates building/site systems to determine their general condition. This condition analysis (evaluation) is conducted annually, and it informs both the capital levy and preventive maintenance programs. A requirement of the APP is to annually report the findings of the evaluation to the Board of Directors, provide a record of that report to the Board, and then submit that evidence to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) prior to April 1 each year.

Facility Services employs preventive/predictive maintenance, life-cycle planning, as well as building condition and evaluation assessments to help ensure that facilities and equipment are not subject to improper wear and tear or insufficient maintenance. These methodologies are reviewed and updated on a regular basis.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

1. Develop a fiscally prudent; long-term facilities plan to establish priorities for construction, renovation, and maintenance projects. In setting those priorities, the CEO shall: <i>{see page 1 for complete listing}</i>	In Compliance	◀ ▶
--	------------------	-----

Evidence {continued}

- In 2014-2015, Facility Services issued and accomplished 6,399 preventive maintenance (PM) work requests. These types of requests are proactive. They extend the useful life of varying building and site equipment reducing unexpected or premature equipment failure.
- The report of the annual APP evaluation has been completed and results reported in Appendix A - see Building Condition Scores from August 2014. The assessment only focuses on the physical condition of general building systems.
- In 2014-2015, Facility Services implemented a new work order management system called InfoCentre. The new work order system is designed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the district’s facility maintenance service delivery. In 2014-15, 956 work requests from the previous work order system were transferred to InfoCentre. In addition, InfoCentre received 16,419 new service requests and resolved 15,801 work orders.
 - InfoCentre launch – September 2, 2014
 - Phase 2 implementation included the launch of the Remote Operations Center (ROC). The ROC monitors critical mechanical equipment throughout the district via the building automation systems. The ROC also serves as the first responder to thermal comfort issues and mechanical equipment alarms.
 - Pilot launch (Muir) – March 20, 2015
 - District wide launch – August 1, 2015

Together, capital and preventive maintenance planning help ensure that: unsafe conditions are the highest priority to correct; facilities reach their intended life-cycles; changes in demographics and a sensitivity of project impacts on the organization are accommodated; facilities and equipment are not subject to premature failure; and, buildings remain open to support student education.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

2. Secure board authorization before building or undertaking major renovation of buildings.	In Compliance	◀ ▶
---	------------------	-----

Evidence

The State School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP) is adhered to for major school construction projects. The method requires Board of Director authorization at various points of a project (e.g. new-in-lieu or replacement vs. modernization decisions, project educational specifications, verification that a project will not result in or aggravate a racial imbalance, commitment to build the project, value engineering analysis, constructability review, commissioning report, and final acceptance). The Board must authorize the district to enter into a contract with a general contractor for major building construction or renovation.

- In 2014-15, the Board authorized the following actions:

Board Authorization	Major Construction Project	Action
November 17, 2014	Rose Hill Middle School	Building Commissioning Report

3. Recommend land acquisition by first determining growth patterns, comparative costs, construction and transportation factors, and environmental factors.	In Compliance	◀ ▶
--	------------------	-----

Evidence

The District monitors both short-term and long-term trends in demographics and updates projections annually. The monitoring includes tracking King County births, enrollment, and residential developments. These factors inform the District’s six-year Capital Facilities Plan and help identify potential property acquisition needs. Property acquisition needs can also occur when changes are made by regulatory agencies regarding zoning or land use. If needed, a feasibility study is conducted to determine the viability of the acquisition. Then, based on the Board of Directors’ agreement, due diligence is done on the property before the acquisition is presented to the Board for authorization to purchase.

In 2012, King County restricted school development in rural areas. The District owns several properties that are not able to be developed or will be restricted in use because of this ruling. The County’s decision caused the District to begin to look at options for owned property in the urban area.

- The District conducted an extensive property search for a middle school on the east side of the District in 2013-2014. Land options were very limited. However, a suitable property was identified and preliminary due diligence was conducted that led to the purchase of the property in the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

4. Acquire, encumber, or dispose of real property only with Board authorization.

In
Compliance



Evidence

The acquisition, encumbrance, or disposal of property requires Board authorization.

Acquisition

Site acquisition needs are based on master planning existing sites in alignment with program and project planning and “the attendance area maps for future school neighborhoods” (Administrative Policy FB, Facilities Planning).

- There was one (1) acquisition of land in the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

Site 72 - 21.57 acres of real property situated in the Redmond Ridge Corporate Center in King County, Washington

Encumbrance

Board Resolution No. 02 from April 1, 1982 gives the Superintendent or his/her designee the authority to grant utility easements on district-owned property. Because of this, utility easements do not require Board approval. However, non-utility easements are submitted to the Board of Directors for approval. Prior to being submitted to the Board, legal counsel and staff review each easement.

- There were three (3) utility or non-utility easements granted in the 2014-2015 school year.

Site	Recording Number	Date	Type	Name	Assoc Name	Legal Description
87/STEM	N/A	9/8/2014	AGREEMENT	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOL	UNION HILL WATER ASSOC.	N/A
07	20140917000569	9/17/2014	EASEMENT GreenBelt/Wetland	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO 414	KIRKLAND CITY OF	SEC 32 TOWN 26 RANGE 05 322605-9008
07	20150616002342	6/16/2015	EASEMENT Sanitary Sewer	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	KIRKLAND CITY OF	SEC 32 TOWN 66 RANGE 05 326605-9008
07	20150616002343	6/16/2015	EASEMENT Water Line	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	KIRKLAND CITY OF	SEC 32 TOWN 66 RANGE 05 326605-9008

Disposal

Disposal of real estate property must have Board action and is done in accordance with Administrative Policy DN, School Properties Disposal Procedure. This includes any “intergovernmental disposition of property” (i.e. dedication or conveyance of property). Property records are maintained in the Support Services office.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

- During the 2014-2015 school year, there was one (1) dedication and one (1) conveyance of property:

Site	Recording Number	Date	Type	Name	Assoc Name	Legal Description
79	20141017000672	10/17/14	DEED Deed of Dedication	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	KIRKLAND CITY OF	SEC 08 TOWN 25 RANGE 05 082505-9248
46/74	20150709000823	7/9/2015	COVENANT Inspection & Maint of Stormwater Facilities and BMPS	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	KING-COUNTY GOVT	SEC 08 TOWN 25 RANGE 06 082506-9008

5. Prohibit construction schedules and change orders to deviate significantly from previously approved plans and budget parameters.

In
Compliance



Evidence

Facility Services staff work to prohibit the substantial change in the schedule, budget, and change orders of construction projects. This is accomplished by weekly review of the contractor’s schedules and the scope of the work. In addition, there is regular review of the budget by both the project manager and district administrative staff.

- Major school construction projects did not substantially change (in schedule, budget, or change orders) from approved plans in 2013-2014. There were no major school construction projects in the 2014-2015 school year.
- A two-year Interim Capacity Plan that led to the placement of green 23 classroom portables in 2014-15, the creation of teacher planning spaces at two schools, and the planning for a classroom addition at Redmond Elementary School.

Schedules

Schedules influence planning and budget (due to inflation and market conditions), while program, project phasing, unforeseen conditions, and other situations can cause schedule changes. The schedules are initially formed prior to a bond or levy measure that funds a project, which is then refined before the beginning of a project.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

5. Prohibit construction schedules and change orders to deviate significantly from previously approved plans and budget parameters.	In Compliance	◀ ▶
---	------------------	-----

Evidence {continued}

Budgets

Budget parameters are initially determined prior to the capital bond or levy that funds identified projects. Each measure establishes a program budget, in which there are multiple projects. Project budgets are closely monitored with reports submitted to senior management to help ensure adherence to the set project budget. If additional budget - beyond that which was initially established - is needed, senior management approval is needed to adjust the budget and/or allocate from project contingencies. Deviation from initial budget parameters can occur. Some reasons for such deviation include: unforeseen circumstances; changes in codes and regulations; and, changes in scope, programming, and/or project timing.

In general, construction budgets include two types of costs: 1) “hard” (the construction contract cost for both site and off site work) costs; and, 2) “soft” (e.g., taxes; fees [permit, legal, inspection and professional services]; easements; insurance; furniture, etc.) costs. The square foot cost of a building is based on the construction (i.e. “hard”) costs, including change orders divided by the building’s total square footage.

- Major construction project budgets are shown on the following chart; all projects were within their program budget as of September 2015:

Major Construction Projects	Amount Budgeted	Budgeted “Hard” Costs	Budgeted “Soft” Costs	Amount Spent as of August 31, 2015	Reason for Overage
Carson Elementary	\$26,409,625	\$17,865,070	\$ 8,544,554	\$26,409,625	Sewer connection, land improvements & railing corrections
Frost Elementary	\$24,415,285	\$20,642,920	\$ 3,772,365	\$24,409,421	NA
Lake Washington High	\$87,178,000	\$66,677,045	\$20,500,955	\$87,156,225	NA
Finn Hill Middle School	\$45,342,602	\$32,107,602	\$13,235,000	\$44,754,563	Issues related to completion of work
Muir Elementary	\$29,639,422	\$21,056,680	\$ 8,582,742	\$30,232,124	Mechanical system, litigation
Keller Elementary	\$26,343,000	\$18,901,414	\$ 7,441,586	\$24,933,708	NA
Sandburg Elementary	\$30,575,000	\$21,489,382	\$ 9,085,618	\$29,569,913	NA
Rose Middle School	\$59,779,000	\$44,027,647	\$15,751,353	\$58,575,785	NA
Bell Elementary	\$32,531,000	\$23,488,337	\$ 9,042,663	\$31,673,173	NA
Rush Elementary	\$34,062,269	\$23,511,892	\$10,550,377	\$33,666,706	NA
ICS/Community	\$26,648,990	\$18,203,482	\$ 8,445,508	\$25,480,231	NA
Eastlake High School Addition	\$18,169,620	\$12,706,916	\$ 5,462,704	\$14,469,789	NA
Redmond High School Addition	\$15,830,380	\$10,987,531	\$ 4,842,849	\$14,787,818	NA
STEM Secondary Choice School	\$34,031,922	\$24,701,670	\$ 9,330,252	\$34,007,019	NA

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

5. Prohibit construction schedules and change orders to deviate significantly from previously approved plans and budget parameters.

In
Compliance



Evidence {continued}

Change Orders

Major construction projects are complex. All construction projects have change orders. Construction change orders are a “change management” process whereby agreed upon modifications to the original contract’s scope of work of a project are implemented. Such modifications are agreed upon by the owner, architect, and contractor. Reasons for change orders include: regulatory agency requirements; unforeseen conditions; owner-requested changes; and, design coordination issues. The district’s goal is to have a construction change order rate below ten (10) percent of the construction “hard” cost of the project. A change order rate greater than fifteen (15) percent would be considered a significant deviation from the intended project.

- No major construction occurred during the 2014-2015 school year. No change orders were submitted for approval by the Board.

6. Provide students and staff with an uncompromised and healthy environment.

In
Compliance



Evidence

The district utilizes various strategies to promote healthy learning and working environments for students and staff that are in alignment with available resources.

Standards and Levels of Service

Various facilities and operational standards and levels of service have been established that support consistent healthy learning and working environments. These include and are not limited to: school design elements (e.g. day lighting, acoustics, building envelope integrity, and other sustainable building/site aspects); building materials that do not contain asbestos, lead, PCBs or other regulated materials and that have no or very low volatile organic compounds (VOCs); durable, easily maintained and cleanable surfaces; and, established custodial service levels and expectations. In addition, there are reviews, updates, and additions to standards and to levels of service.

- In 2014-2015, Facility Services and Custodial Services continued the work to update processes, standards, guidelines, levels of services, and protocols. The Custodial Services Level of Service (LOS) documents were updated based on current staffing levels and compatibility with school level needs. In addition to outlining service during the school year, Custodial Services also developed separate LOS documents for school year breaks and summer break service.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board's End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

6. Provide students and staff with an uncompromised and healthy environment.

In
Compliance



Evidence

Inspections and Assessments

Planned and regular inspections as well as responsive assessments are conducted to maintain healthy conditions. Some examples are: the regular planned examination of vital building and site systems (*Appendix B*); various building condition evaluations that inform both planning and project implementation and fulfill State requirements; and, the prompt response to Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ) concerns.

Beginning in the 2012-2013, the Board adopted a resolution committing the District to the State's requirement of the Asset Preservation Program (APP). A team of inspectors (professionals in the design and construction industry) went to each school to evaluate the sites and the buildings by way of the Building Condition Assessment (system). Every building's major site and building systems, as well their sub-systems received a condition rating. Those ratings were entered into the State's Information and Condition of Schools (ICOS) automated system. The 2012-2013 evaluation included all permanent school buildings and did not include portables. The assessment is completed annually and includes portable classroom inventory and condition.

- The latest building assessment was completed in the summer of 2015.

Environmental and Health Concerns

- There were no Indoor Environmental Quality concerns that led to a loss of a school's educational time in 2014-2015. A health concern in a building led to building testing and inspections, which results in corrections to the building's systems.
- Facility Services manages a variety of programs and makes notifications as is appropriate. For example, protocols have been developed to manage specific programs such as Integrated Pest Management (IPM/*Appendix C*) in order to appropriately and pro-actively address various situations.
 - In the event chemicals are used while school is in session, notifications from the school involved are sent home with students. In 2014-2015, there were no notifications.
 - In 2014-2015 the district completed the IPM Star Certification audit and was awarded Star Certification in July of 2015.

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

6. Provide students and staff with an uncompromised and healthy environment.

In
Compliance



Evidence

Response to Emergencies

Issues that are deemed an immediate danger to the health, welfare, or safety of persons using buildings or sites are considered emergencies and responded to the same day with the goal to resolve within two (2) days. Other situations that warrant the same type of response include violations to the fire code, repair of fire/security detection systems, roof leaks, or situations that might lead to the major disruption of the educational program. In addition, incidents of vandalism are treated as emergencies and responded to accordingly.

- In 2014-2015, there were a total of 60 incidents of vandalism in the district reported to Support Services requesting response. The following chart provides detail of reports by level:

	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011
Elementary	31	31	35	66	98
Middle Schools	19	16	21	19	30
High Schools	10	20	31	28	31
Other Sites	0	0	1	3	1
Total	60	67	88	116	160

- The most frequent types of vandalism were graffiti (47 events).

Vandalism, reported to Support Services for repair, cost the district \$11,564 during the 2014-2015 school year. If the perpetrators are caught, the district seeks restitution. No dollars were recovered in 2014-2015.

	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011
Annual Cost of Reported Vandalism	\$11,564	\$12,561 With a recovery of \$326	\$14,140 With a recovery of \$710	\$27,823	\$37,737 With a recovery of \$1,100

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

7. Permit the public’s use of facilities as long as student functions and the academic program are not compromised. Accordingly, the CEO shall develop a plan for public use of buildings that includes:
- a. definition of permitted uses;
 - b. a fair and reasonable fee structure;
 - c. clear delineation of user expectations; and
 - d. consequences and enforcement procedures for public users who fail to follow the established rules.

In
Compliance



Evidence

The district makes building and fields available for public use on a scheduled basis to ensure that school functions and the academic programs are not compromised. Each site is responsible for scheduling their buildings.

Permitted Use

To assist schools and the public in understanding the guidelines for community use, the district provides *Guidelines and Procedures for Use of School District Facilities* on the district website. Schools are also provided specific guidelines for staff in charge of building use. These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated as needed.

Fees

User groups pay fees depending on their classification. Building use fees are increased on an annual basis per the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The district tracks the amount of dollars received from building use (the chart below only reflects the past five years). Schools receive 30% of fees collected, excluding the cost of custodial, supplies, and energy.

- In 2014-2015, a total of \$576,002 was collected. This figure includes energy use, theater, and stadium fees, but not leases nor monies paid for custodial help. The chart below provides a details of fees collected:

	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011
<i>Amount to Schools</i>	\$37,648	\$44,660	\$39,368	\$30,077	\$35,889
<i>Energy Use</i>	\$131,321	\$140,783	\$120,101	\$118,355	\$109,304
<i>Supply Fees</i>	\$54,294	\$58,909	\$50,904	\$43,036	\$51,138
<i>Amount to General Fund</i>	\$87,846	\$104,201	\$91,862	\$70,0171	\$83,744
<i>Pool Rental</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Stadium Rental</i>	\$159,690	\$188,787	\$182,145	\$210,624	\$205,723
<i>Theater Rental</i>	\$105,203	\$108,011	\$91,728	\$53,932	\$44,211
<i>Total</i>	\$576,002	\$645,351	\$576,108	\$526,195	\$530,009
<i>Reimbursement for Custodial Help</i>	\$79,332	\$75,880	\$54,320	\$70,089	\$77,272

EL-13 Facilities

Executive Limitation: The CEO shall assure the availability of an appropriate education environment within physical facilities that are safe, efficient, and properly maintained and that support the accomplishment of the Board’s End Results policies.

Accordingly, the CEO shall:

- 7. Permit the public’s use of facilities as long as student functions and the academic program are not compromised. Accordingly, the CEO shall develop a plan for public use of buildings that includes:
 - a. definition of permitted uses;
 - b. a fair and reasonable fee structure;
 - c. clear delineation of user expectations; and
 - d. consequences and enforcement procedures for public users who fail to follow the established rules.

In
Compliance



Evidence

Expectations and Consequences

The “Application for Use of School District Facilities” form, filled out by each requesting user group, delineates user expectations and consequences if procedures are not followed or if damage occurs to the building/site. User groups who cause any building or site damage, break equipment, vandalize school property, or make alterations to buildings or groups will be billed for repairs and corrections and may lose their right to be granted future building use.

I certify the above to be correct as of March 14, 2016.

Traci Pierce, Superintendent