



August 7, 2017

Steve Walker
City of Seattle, Office of Housing
P.O. Box 94725
Seattle, WA 98124-4725

Dear Steve:

Thank you for: allowing Seattle Public Schools to provide input in regard to the potential for school usage at Fort Lawton. Thank you for clarifying that the City intends to move forward with affordable housing as a high priority for the City and for the Federal Government.

As requested, Dr. Flip Herndon and his staff have been working hard over the past 30 days to answer the basic threshold questions that you sent to us. Here are our responses:

1. ***Has SPS confirmed with our contact at the Department of Education that it can meet federal requirements for educational conveyances? These include, but are not limited to:***
Response: No, our repeated phone calls and emails to the US Department of Education have not been responded to.
 - a) ***Having the necessary funds, or ability to obtain those funds immediately upon transfer or lease, to carry out the proposed program;***
Response: No, we do not have those funds immediately available. We do have a capital levy planned for February of 2019 and if approved could have funds available.
 - b) ***Having an immediate need and ability to use all of the property SPS would apply for; and***
Response: With current projects scheduled, we could not demonstrate an immediate need. We just added middle school capacity and have elementary and high school projects underway. However, at the rate of growth of SPS enrollment we could see a need in the very near future.
 - c) ***Having the ability to complete construction of a school within the required timeline.***
Response: Yes, we have a good track record on completing construction within the three-year timeline.
2. Does SPS have the immediate funding and staff capacity needed to become a partner in the redevelopment planning process? This would include:
 - a) ***Assuming a proportionate share of carrying costs for the property (currently the costs of leasing the property are shared between the Office of Housing and Seattle Parks and Recreation),***
Response: Yes, we could identify funding to be a partner.
 - b) ***Providing additional funds to expand the scope of environmental review, and***
Response: Yes, we would have funds to expand the scope.
 - c) ***Providing staff or consultant time to co-develop a revised proposal and provide relevant environmental information for the EIS (including site planning, building massing, geotechnical study, zoning analysis, etc.).***
Response: Yes, we could provide funding and/or staff or consultant time to assist.
3. In addition to these threshold questions, the City would also need to know the following information to further assess how the school opportunity fits into the overall vision for the property:

- a) ***What are SPS's requirements for the property to successfully build an elementary?*** At a minimum, we would need to know:
- ***Size and location of the required conveyance***
Response: Ideally, the size of an elementary would be 4+ acres for a 90,000 sq. ft. building that would be able to educate 660 students.
 - ***Whether the school would be new construction or a reuse of existing structures,***
Response: Our staff have determined that the existing building would not meet seismic code and would necessitate demolition so new construction would be in order.
 - ***General description of requirements relating to vehicular access and parking,***
Response: We would review existing codes with the city on parking and bus pick up and drop off. Generally, our parking requirements have been mainly for staff parking and some additional visitor parking.
 - ***Potential adverse environmental impacts that could be created by the development.***
Response: Based on our previous school siting work, impervious surfaces seem to be the most likely impact. It would depend on the footprint of the building and parking.
- b) ***How does the need for new elementary capacity in Magnolia compare to other needs within the district?*** This relates to the above Department of Ed requirements regarding "immediate need", and includes providing the following types of information:
- ***Projected enrollment for elementary schools within the McClure service area, compared to other elementary schools.***
Response: We have 2 projects funded and the possibility of additional expansion at 1 or 2 other elementary schools on Queen Anne.
 - ***Projected capacity for elementary students within those schools, including capacity that will be added through capital improvements that already have funding through levies or other revenue. (For example, this would include the re-opening of Magnolia Elementary, and addition at Queen Anne Elementary).***
Response: Magnolia Elementary is projected to be a 500 seat elementary school; those would be new seats. The addition at Queen Anne is for 8 classrooms, which would equate to roughly 200 seats. However, some of those seats are replacing current portables so the net add of seats at Queen Anne would be approximately 100-150.

In summation, SPS is desperately seeking additional land for future school sites. We recognize the once in a lifetime opportunity obtaining some of the Ft. Lawton property provides.

However, it appears that we must prove immediate need have funds in hand. Since we already have projects underway we cannot prove immediate need. And, we do not have immediate funds in hand for added projects.

Thus and unfortunately, we cannot meet the criteria you have asked us to respond to. If you know of any other way that we might partner with the city in future usage of this property, please do give consideration to the continuing need for school sites in Seattle.

Thank you!

Sincerely,



Dr. Larry Nyland
Superintendent