

AD-A259 992



DTIC
ELECTE
JAN 12 1993
S C D

Everett/Snohomish County Impact Coordinating Council

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPACT PROJECTIONS: OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE COSTS

EVERETT NAVY HOMEPORT PROJECT

FINAL REPORT: 1992 UPDATE

August 1992

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

98 1 07 067

93-00507



Accession For	
NTIS GRAM	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By Per <i>lt</i>	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Dist	Special
A-1	

Everett/Snohomish County Impact Coordinating Council

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPACT PROJECTIONS: OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE COSTS

EVERETT NAVY HOMEPORT PROJECT

FINAL REPORT: 1992 UPDATE

August 1992

NBBJ

This report was prepared under contract from the City of Everett on behalf of the Everett/Snohomish County Impact Coordinating Council with financial support partially provided by the Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense. The content reflects the views of ESCICC and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Economic Adjustment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Study Update Summary	1
B.	Introduction	6
C.	Evolution of State Funding for Homeport Project-Related Education Impacts	9
D.	State Funding for Kitsap County School Districts	14
E.	Operations and Maintenance Cost Impact Projections - Snohomish County School Districts	19
F.	Potential Strategies for Snohomish County School Districts	14
 Appendices		
1	Homeport School District Operation and Maintenance Cost Impact Model: General Operating Instructions	22
2	Homeport School District Operation and Maintenance Cost Impact Model: Form for Updating Input Factors	25
3	Operations and Maintenance Cost Impact Projections by School District	27

A. STUDY UPDATE SUMMARY

This report is an update of the School District Impact Projections: Operations and Maintenance Costs associated with the Everett Navy Homeport project. The original study effort was completed in November 1990.

This update uses the computer model developed in the original effort to project Homeport project-related impacts on school district operations and maintenance costs using the most current information on the projected numbers and timeframe for arrival of expected Homeport-related school children. Although the model can generate projections for any year between 1992 and 2000, the report summarizes the results for two years -- 1995 and 1996 -- since almost 70% of the Homeport project-related population is expected to arrive in Snohomish County during this period.

The computer model for projecting Homeport project-related impacts on school district operations and maintenance costs can generate projection results under three scenarios. Version 1 (Full Incremental Demand) calculates impacts for all Homeport project-related school children immigrants, regardless of whether a school district has a projected unhoused student need in the year(s) in which the Homeport-related population is expected to arrive. Version 2 (Unhoused Incremental Demand-SPI) calculates impacts for Homeport project-related school children only to the extent that the district is projected to have an unhoused student need based on enrollment forecast and classroom capacity data maintained by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI). Version 3 (Unhoused Incremental Demand-LSD) likewise calculates impacts only to the extent that an unhoused student need is projected, using forecast enrollment and classroom capacity data maintained by each local school district.

Projections of Homeport project-related school children immigrants under all three versions are taken directly from the separate Homeport School Impact Forecasting Model completed as part of the study entitled *School Enrollment and Fiscal Impact Projections Update* (August, 1992). Reference is made to this latter report document for a description of methods and assumptions used to project Homeport project-related immigrants and unhoused student need.

The following points highlight the major similarities and differences between the current update and the original effort completed in 1990. The first five points relate to projected Homeport project-related school children immigrants which are part of the separate School Enrollment and Fiscal Impact Projections Update modelling effort. They are summarized in this study because of their relevance to projections of Homeport project-related impacts on school district operations and maintenance costs.

1. *Projected Homeport Project-Related School Children*

- ▶ A total of 2,517 Homeport project-related school children are expected to attend Snohomish County public schools once the full contingent of Homeport ships arrive and construction is completed (1998). Of this total, approximately 58% (1,462) represent dependents of military personnel, while 9.5% (238) are dependents of civilians working directly on the Homeport project. The remaining 32.5% (817) represent children of those working in the area as an indirect consequence of the Homeport project.
- ▶ A comparison of the Homeport project-related school children projected in the School Enrollment and Fiscal Impact Projections 1992 Update with the previous 1990 analysis, shown on a "steady-state" basis (full ship arrival) is as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Previous (1990) Projections</u>	<u>Updated Projections</u>	<u>Percentage Increase/ (Decrease)</u>
Military	1,819	1,462	-20%
Civilian Direct	109	238	+118%
Civilian Indirect	<u>583</u>	<u>817</u>	+40%
Total	2,511	2,517	0%

As this summary reveals, total projected Homeport project-related school children remains virtually unchanged from the previous update, although the composition of the total has changed dramatically.

The decrease in projected school children that are dependents of military personnel reflects a reduction in the expected number of Homeport ships that will be based in Everett. When the 1990 update was completed, it was assumed that thirteen ships would ultimately be based in Everett. The latest information anticipates that only seven ships will be permanently housed at the base.

The increase in civilian direct and indirect school children from the previous update is primarily due to modifications in two model assumptions. First, the current update assumes that 25% of Homeport project-generated civilian jobs are expected to be taken by those already living in the Everett area, while the 1990 update assumed a factor of 35%. Therefore, Homeport project-related civilian jobs are expected to be filled by a higher percentage of new residents as compared to the previous update. The lower local jobs factor reflects the tightened employment market in recent years throughout Snohomish County. Second, the current update assumes a household size for civilian families of 3.22, as compared to a household size of 2.35 used in the previous update. The higher number reflects more current data from the 1990 census.

- ▶ The timeframe for ship arrival has been decelerated from the 1990 update. The latest information indicates that the full contingent of Homeport ships will arrive by 1995, while the previous 1990 update anticipated complete ship arrival by 1993.

- A comparison of the forecast distribution of projected Homeport project-related school children by school district (at steady state) between the current update and the previous 1990 analysis is as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>1990 Update</u>		<u>1992 Update</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Arlington	68	2.7 %	86	3.4 %
Darrington	3	0.1	11	0.4
Edmonds	241	9.6	640	25.4
Everett	713	28.4	466	18.5
Granite Falls	10	0.4	40	1.6
Index	0	0.0	4	0.2
Lakewood	50	2.0	39	1.5
Lake Stevens	201	8.0	107	4.2
Marysville	316	12.6	228	9.1
Monroe	58	2.3	103	4.1
Mukilteo	414	16.5	317	12.6
Northshore	95	3.8	173	6.9
Snohomish	289	11.5	208	8.3
Stanwood	45	1.8	52	2.1
Sultan	<u>8</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>1.7</u>
Total	2,511	100.0 %	2,517	100.0 %

The updated projected distribution of Homeport project-related school children by school district is based on current population forecasts for cities and towns in Snohomish County as prepared by the Snohomish County Planning Department. The forecasts embody population estimates stemming from the 1990 census. The distribution in the previous 1990 update was based on a 1987 analysis by the Puget Sound Council of Governments (forerunner of Puget Sound Regional Council).

- Similar to the previous update, the majority (74%) of Homeport project-related school children are expected to reside in five school districts: Edmonds, Everett, Mukilteo, Marysville, and Snohomish.

2. Operations & Maintenance Cost Impacts

A comparison of Homeport project-related impacts on school district operations and maintenance costs projected in the current update with the amounts from the original 1990 analysis is as follows.

	<u>Total O & M Impacts</u>	<u>Cost per Child</u>	<u>Percentage Impact</u>	
			<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>
Version 1: Full Incremental Demand				
Current Update: Impacts for 1995 & 1996 (1992 \$s)	\$4,200,000	\$2,536	67%	33%
Previous Update: Impacts for 1992 & 1993 (1990 \$s)	\$5,979,000	\$2,632	80%	20%
Version 2: Unhoused Incremental Demand Using SPI Data				
Current Update: Impacts for 1995 & 1996 (1992 \$s)	\$1,110,000	\$2,265	71%	29%
Previous Update: Impacts for 1992 & 1993 (1990 \$s)	\$2,736,600	\$2,545	82%	18%
Version 3: Unhoused Incremental Demand Using Local School District Data				
Current Update: Impacts for 1995 & 1996 (1992 \$s)	\$1,907,000	\$2,384	72%	28%
Previous Update: Impacts for 1992 & 1993 (1990 \$s)	\$4,462,000	\$2,544	81%	19%

This comparison reveals that under all three versions the Homeport project-related impacts have declined from the previous analysis for the two peak years of immigration. That change reflects a lower number of projected Homeport-related immigrants during the two peak years (reflected in all three versions) as well as a smaller number of projected unhoused students (reflected in Versions 2 and 3).

The projected operations and maintenance cost per child declined slightly from the 1990 analysis. This is due to a decrease in the ratio of portable units (instructional space) required to total projected immigrants. Note that portable units are determined in the model on a threshold basis (at least 13 new students are needed to support the need for a portable unit) rather than on a direct proportional basis.

The military proportion of total Homeport project-related impacts is lower than in the previous analysis, which is a reflection of the smaller number of Navy ships that are now projected to reside at the Everett installation.

Similar to the original analysis, approximately 85% of projected Homeport project-related operations and maintenance cost impacts are for instructional space and pupil transportation needs.

3. Potential Sources of Mitigation

Since the completion of the original study effort, two events have occurred that may affect potential sources of mitigation for Homeport project-related impacts on local school districts in Snohomish County:

- ▶ A study projecting the fiscal impacts of the Homeport project on the State of Washington was completed in June 1991. The results of that study show that the state will accrue a significant benefit from the Homeport construction phase and a modest but positive fiscal benefit for the steady state year (1998) and beyond.
- ▶ Snohomish County and several cities within the county have recently adopted school impact mitigation ordinances that requires development proposals that generate a need for school services to contribute to the costs of providing the services at standards established by the school districts. These ordinances generally cover the costs for new facilities as well as the cost of new buses.

B. INTRODUCTION

House Bill 611, passed by the 1987 legislature, appropriated approximately \$8 million to mitigate the impacts on local school districts in Snohomish County from the Everett Navy Homeport. The only funding allocations made to date under House Bill 611 has been approximately \$1.3 million distributed to Kitsap County school districts for impacts associated with the Nimitz arrival in Bremerton.

The purpose of this analysis is to:

1. Provide an overview of the chronology and intent of state funding for mitigating the education-related impacts associated with the Everett Homeport Project.
2. Provide a detailed description of the successful efforts of the Kitsap school districts in obtaining state funding for the Nimitz impacts.
3. Project operations and maintenance cost impacts on Snohomish County school districts from the Everett Navy Homeport Project, using the methodology employed in the Kitsap funding case. A computer model has been developed for the purpose of projecting operating and maintenance costs. The model takes projections of Homeport project-related immigrant school children and applies various input factors to project cost impacts in four categories of expenditures: Instructional Space (portables); Instructional Materials (textbooks); Furniture and Equipment; and Pupil Transportation Costs (buses).

The model can project Homeport project-related operations and maintenance cost impacts on each Snohomish County school district for any year between the 1992 and 2000. This report presents projection information for 1995 and 1996, as current information indicates that 70% of the Homeport project-related population will arrive during those two years.

4. Identify potential strategies for Snohomish County school districts for pursuing future state funding from Homeport project-related impacts.

C. EVOLUTION OF STATE FUNDING FOR HOMEPORT-RELATED EDUCATION IMPACTS

I. Initial Appropriation

The original State funding vehicle for Homeport-related impacts was House Bill 611 passed by the 1987 Legislature. House Bill 611 appropriated a total of \$10.4 million from the state general fund for the increased demands for public services as a result of the development or construction of the Everett Homeport. Of this total, \$8 million was designated for education impacts. The legislation stated that allocations to specific agencies were to be made based on increased agency operating expenditures and workload directly associated with the Homeport. Furthermore, House Bill 611 indicated that "the governor may release to the specific agencies only the amount necessary to offset the directly incurred increased costs which have been documented by the agency."

As part of this analysis, representatives of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), Office of Financial Management (OFM), and Department of Community Development (DCD) were contacted to gain an understanding of the rationale and mechanics behind the \$8 million appropriated under House Bill 611 for Homeport education impacts. Although each of these sources were unable to provide any documented analyses supporting the original education appropriation, the rationale behind the original appropriation is discussed in a January 28, 1988 DCD memorandum dealing with Homeport-related education impacts for Kitsap school districts. On page two and three of that memorandum it is stated that:

"The estimate (\$8 million appropriation) was produced by DCD and SPI on the basis of information provided by DCD and the United States Congress with regard to the proposed funding and construction schedule for the project and the associated increase in population directly resulting from the project. On the basis of these assumptions, DCD requested SPI to prepare cost estimates for education needs based on a worst case estimate (i.e. largest population increase). These estimations were based on the regular formula allocation for a specific target student population for such items as: Non-employee related costs (NERC), textbooks, space, furniture, etc.

At the time the estimations were made, we did not know where the enrollment increases might occur or what circumstances an impacted school district might experience at the time such an impact was realized. Therefore, we simply made an estimation to cover the costs of the expected student increases as though they were going to be normally absorbed into the state's school system. We knew that these estimations would have to be revised upon receipt of more detailed information from DCD and Congress regarding funding for the project.

Therefore, the estimations that resulted in the \$8 million appropriation were no more than that -- estimations. They were intended to provide an upper level cost for education funding, thereby avoiding any need for additional funding later in the biennium. They were not intended to be a definitive estimate of what any particular school district(s) might require when faced with a major increase in enrollment."

It is clear from this discussion that the \$8 million education appropriation was not intended as a "hard" number; and that actual funding for Homeport-related education impacts would require more detailed estimates once the Homeport completion date became nearer and better information was available on where immigrants would live, and what school districts they would attend. What is important to note is not the amount appropriated, but the fact that with this legislation a commitment was made to help mitigate the education impacts from the Homeport.

2. Subsequent Appropriations

In 1987, the Aircraft Carrier Nimitz was assigned to Bremerton for a "selected restricted availability" (limited overhaul). Although House Bill 611 was originally intended as a vehicle for funding impacts associated with the development of the Homeport in Everett, a successful case was made by the school districts in Kitsap County to obtain mitigation funds for the education impacts associated with the Nimitz's stay in Bremerton.

During the 1988 legislative session, a revised appropriation was made for Homeport funding under House Bill 611 in the amount of \$2,266,000. Of this total, \$1.3 million was allocated to fund the education-related impacts associated with the arrival of the Nimitz at Bremerton. The legislation itself was amended to allow funding for the Nimitz arrival as an exception to the limitation in the original House Bill 611 that restricted funding to costs associated with the Homeport development at Everett. A full discussion of State funding related to the Nimitz arrival in Bremerton is included in a subsequent section of this document.

3. Current Situation

According to current SPI records, the entire \$1.3 million appropriated by the 1988 legislature has been distributed to the school districts in Kitsap County. Any new requests for State funding of Homeport-related education impacts will require new appropriations during future legislative sessions.

The state's position on funding of Homeport-related impacts is probably best explained in the January 28, 1988 DCD memorandum noted above. The overriding principle guiding DCD, the Governor's Office and OFM is that the state recognizes its obligation for aiding local communities, but will not be placed in the position of being the balancing entry in the equation for payment of impacts. Other guiding principles include:

- ▶ Funding for Homeport-related impacts should proceed at a pace equal to that of the project. This means that funding for education impacts will likely require the actual arrival of Homeport-related immigrants into specific school districts.
- ▶ In determining the state obligation, more than just the increase in demand for services will be considered. Such increases must be reviewed against the essential mission of the program that is impacted. House Bill 611 was not intended as a means to "double fund" existing state programs, nor was the measure intended to be a guise to identify persons associated with the Homeport project from other citizens of the state.
- ▶ Local participation is an essential part of the Homeport program. The state does not wish to be the balancing entry in the equation, but will share with the local communities the responsibility for funding Homeport-related impacts.

D. STATE FUNDING FOR KITSAP COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Central Kitsap, North Kitsap and Bremerton school districts have received a total of \$1.3 million in state funds for mitigating impacts associated with the U.S.S. Nimitz stay at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton. An overview of the process, rationale and methodologies used in the Kitsap County funding case provides useful lessons for Snohomish County school districts as they plan for the Homeport arrival in Everett.

1. *Rationale for State Funding in Kitsap County*

The U.S.S Nimitz was assigned to Bremerton in July, 1987 for a limited overhaul. The Nimitz arrival in Bremerton was viewed by the Kitsap County school districts and the state as a temporary assignment that would end upon the aircraft carrier's move to Everett once the permanent Homeport was completed.

The initial request for impact funding was made by Dr. Hertzke, Superintendent of the Central Kitsap School District, in a June 25, 1987 letter to Governor Gardner and through other contacts with representatives of DCD and SPI. Dr. Hertzke argued that the almost 800 students of the Nimitz crew expected to enroll in Kitsap County public schools caused a number of financial impacts which are not addressed by existing state or federal funding mechanisms.

Those impacts related primarily to "start-up" costs rather than regular operating costs that for the most part are addressed by the per pupil funding received through the state funding allocation formula. Specifically, Dr. Hertzke requested funding to service the Nimitz students in the categories of portable classrooms, equipment, textbooks, and buses (pupil transportation). In making this claim, it was noted that all of the Kitsap school districts had a *shortage of classrooms* for existing students, and that each district met the state's rigid and conservative FTE matching criteria for new facility construction without the Nimitz impact being factored in.

Dr. Hertzke also requested funding for levy replacement costs. The rationale behind levy replacement was that the local school district operating levies are undertaken biannually, and once determined, are locked in for two years. While the influx of students related to the Nimitz would result in increased local costs, local taxes to pay for those costs could not be raised until the next levy determination.

As a result of these requests made by the Kitsap school districts, SPI was instructed to analyze and recommend appropriate impact funding amounts for the districts. As a result of this analysis and review by DCD, impact funds were recommended in the following categories: student instructional space (portables); furniture and equipment; textbooks; and pupil transportation costs. In reviewing the documentation related to the Kitsap School District case, several salient points underlie the rationale for impact funding:

- ▶ The interpretation was made that House Bill 611, which was the state legislative funding vehicle for mitigating Homeport impacts, applied to the early arrival of the Nimitz in Bremerton. A January 28, 1988 DCD memorandum states: "We further believe that the sponsors of HB 611 had every intention of meeting the additional costs associated with the Homeport project, whether the costs were actually incurred in Bremerton or Everett."

- ▶ Much of SPI's justification for state funding of impacts related to the Nimitz arrival in Bremerton centered on the anticipated **temporary** stay of the carrier until the Everett Homeport was completed. For example, impact funding for non-employee operating costs (NERC) such as textbooks, furniture and equipment was based on the premise that the state funding formula for NERC is intended to cover these costs over their useful lives (more than one year). The allocation formulas assume enrollment will be relatively stable, and thus the substantial transitory enrollment increase related to the Nimitz was a unique situation that the allocation formulas are not designed to accommodate.

Likewise, the justification for funding portables was based on the fact that all four districts have enrollments that exceed the capacity of their school facilities (without considering the Nimitz students), and that given the transitory nature of the Nimitz-related enrollment, the purchase of portables was preferred over the construction of permanent school facilities.

- ▶ The funding determination was greatly influenced by the fact that the Nimitz students had already arrived, and therefore the impacts were actually being realized by the school districts.

2. Methodology for Determining Impact Funding Levels

While the amount ultimately appropriated by the State to the Kitsap County Schools for Nimitz-related impact mitigation was the result of a substantial amount of lobbying and negotiation between the school districts, DCD and OFM (as described below), the basic methodology developed by SPI as part of their special analysis was accepted throughout the process. The starting point for determining impacts was an accurate count of students in each school district with a parent on the Nimitz. This was accomplished through a detailed counting process that included use of information provided on "in case of emergency cards," questionnaires sent home with each student in the districts, and direct contact of parents. As a result, it was determined that for the 1987-88 school year, Nimitz FTE enrollment was as follows:

<u>School District</u>	<u>FTE's</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	
South Kitsap	74	13	3	90
Central Kitsap	246	50	60	356
North Kitsap	2	2	4	8
Bremerton	<u>64</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>82</u>
Total	386	73	77	536

Based on these FTE determinations, impacts were calculated as follows:

Instructional Space (Portables): Total Nimitz student FTE's in each district were divided by an average class size of 25 to determine the number of required portables. An additional allocation was made for handicapped students. Manufacturers of portable classrooms were contacted to obtain current pricing information, and after comparing the cost of leasing and buying, SPI determined that purchasing the portables at a price of \$40,000 per unit was the least costly and preferable option. The total number of required portables was multiplied by \$40,000 to calculate the allocation for instructional space.

Furniture and Equipment: The calculation for furniture and equipment was based upon the established state standards for funding these items as part of the regular matching formula for capital construction (WAC 180-27-095). The rule states the amount of state assistance for which a district qualifies shall be the eligible square foot area of the project multiplied by the state determined area cost allowance at time of bid and that product multiplied by: 2% for elementary schools; 3% for middle schools; 4% for high schools; and 5% for handicapped facilities.

The standard state methodology was used to determine furniture and equipment impacts. For example, for the 386 Nimitz FTE students enrolled in all Kitsap district elementary schools, an allocation was calculated as: 80 square feet (state square foot allowance per elementary student FTE) x 386 FTE's x \$75.50 (area cost allowance) x 2% (furniture and equipment allowance for elementary schools) = \$46,629. The same calculation was made for Nimitz student FTE's enrolled at the middle and high school levels, as well as for handicapped students.

Textbooks: A profile of reported Nimitz enrollments yielded a weighted student grade level (excluding kindergarten) of 4.4. Thus the average student textbook allocation was based upon the direct cost to provide textbooks for a fourth grade student. At the time the analysis was completed, the approximate amount Kitsap school districts were spending on textbooks for each fourth-grader was \$169. Therefore, an allocation for textbooks was calculated by multiplying enrollment numbers by \$169, with an additional factor (42%) included for handicapped students.

Pupil Transportation: Allocations for pupil transportation (bus acquisition) costs were made based upon actual ridership counts reported by the districts. Separate calculations were made for large busses used for regular transportation (basic education program) and buses for special transportation. Both calculations involved a similar methodology that included the following steps:

1. Multiplying the Nimitz-related student headcount by the district's bus transport percentage (students bused divided by total enrollment) to determine a bus impact headcount.
2. Dividing the bus impact headcount by the average number of students transported by bus to determine the number of new buses required.
3. Multiplying the number (or fraction thereof) of new buses required by the current state supported purchase price for school buses to determine the financial impact. Since regular transportation buses have a useful life of 20 years, and the length of the Nimitz's stay at Bremerton was estimated at five years, the impact was limited to 25% of the state supported bus purchase price.

3. Determination of Final Impact Funding

The period of time between the initial SPI analysis (late 1987) and the final approved OFM recommendation of state funding for Kitsap County (in May, 1988) was characterized by heavy lobbying and negotiation on the part of the school districts (with support from local legislators), DCD and OFM. A summary of Kitsap County funding recommendations for the 1987-88 school year from each of the involved parties is as follows:

	<u>Original SPI Recommendation</u>	<u>DCD Recommendation 1/28/88</u>	<u>Kitsap School District Recommendation</u>	<u>Final OFM Recommendation</u>
Instructional Space	\$ 929,024	\$ 175,200	\$ 929,024	\$ 740,000
Furniture & Equipment	109,105	99,285	99,285	99,285
Textbooks	102,418	50,000	103,617	102,418
Pupil Transportation	79,205	N/A	78,283	79,205
Levy Replacement/Costs	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>204,000</u>	<u>—</u>
	\$1,219,752	\$ 324,485	\$1,414,209	\$1,020,908

The SPI recommended funding of \$1,219,752 was based upon the methodologies described above for each of the expenditure categories. The DCD recommendation made several downward adjustments to the SPI-determined amounts. First, DCD felt that the Districts should be allocated only an annual lease cost for portables rather than the cost of outright purchase. Second, funding for furniture/equipment and textbooks was recommended at approximately 90% and 50%, respectively, of the amounts calculated by SPI. This reduction was based on the belief that the regular state funding formulas would pick up some of these costs over the life of the Nimitz stay at Bremerton. DCD did not make a recommendation regarding pupil transportation costs since that analysis had not been completed at the time of their review.

The Kitsap school districts agreed with the SPI recommendations for all expenditure categories, except that they accepted the DCD recommendation of funding furniture and equipment at 90%. In addition, the Districts continued to pursue funds for levy replacement.

The final OFM recommendation that was approved by the State legislature included a total of \$1,020,908 for the 1987-88 school year. That amount was comprised of the following components:

- ▶ Instructional Space (portables) were funded at \$740,000, which was based on a per unit purchase price of \$37,000. The reduction from the \$40,000 unit cost identified by SPI reflects a disallowance of a percentage for "contingencies." In addition, whereas the SPI calculations were based upon a need of approximately 23 portables, the more current Nimitz enrollment information available at the time of the OFM recommendation indicated a need for 20 of the units.
- ▶ Furniture and Equipment was funded at an amount of \$99,285, which is the level recommended by DCD. That amount represents approximately 90% of the amount calculated by SPI.
- ▶ Textbooks and pupil transportation costs were funded at levels of \$102,418 and \$79,205, respectively. Each of these amounts agree with the original calculations made by SPI.
- ▶ No amounts were funded for levy replacement costs.

The \$1,020,953 was allocated to the Kitsap County school districts for the 1987-88 school year. The same methodology was applied to new Nimitz enrollment for the 1988-89 school year to yield an additional allocation of \$279,092. These two amounts together represent the \$1.3 appropriation made during the 1988 legislature.

Two methods were used by OFM for distributing the state funds. The allocations for textbooks, furniture and equipment, and pupil transportation were distributed at one time based upon the calculations described above. The allocations for portables were made on a "as purchased" basis. Each district is reimbursed for portables purchased to house Nimitz students upon receipt of appropriate documentation by the state.

According to Dr. Hertzke, superintendent of the Central Kitsap School District, the districts believe that, with the exception of the failure to provide funds for levy replacement costs, state funding of the Nimitz-related education impacts was reasonable and sufficient.

E. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COST IMPACT PROJECTIONS - SNOHOMISH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The same methodology employed by SPI in determining an appropriate allocation for the Nimitz impacts on Kitsap County school districts was used to project the operation and maintenance cost impacts from the anticipated arrival of the Homeport ships in Everett. The Homeport School district Operations and Maintenance Cost Impact Model (Model) was developed to project Homeport project-related school children in each district and to apply various input factors to calculate impacts for four categories of expenditures: Instructional space (portables); Instructional materials (textbooks); furniture and equipment; and pupil transportation costs (buses).

The Homeport School District Operations and Maintenance Impact model can project impacts on each Snohomish County school district for each year during the period 1992 to 2000. This report presents projection information for 1995 and 1996, as current estimates indicate that the majority (66%) of the Homeport project-related population will arrive during those two years.

1. Data Inputs/Assumptions/Methodology

The major data inputs, assumptions, and methodology used to project Homeport-related operations and maintenance cost impacts are described in the following paragraphs. Instructions for operating the model are included as Appendix 1. Forms for updating model input factors are included as Appendix 2.

1. **Enrollment:** Projected Homeport project-related school children are taken directly from the Homeport School Impact Forecasting Model. That model was developed as part of the Homeport School Enrollment and Fiscal Impact Projections planning effort that estimated Homeport project-related impacts on the capital facility costs of each school district. Separate projections have been made for the military, direct civilian, and indirect components of total Homeport-related immigrants.
2. **Years:** Homeport project-related operations and maintenance cost impacts can be projected in the model for any year between 1992 and 2000.
3. **Costs:** All costs are stated in 1992 dollars.
4. **Handicap/Non-Handicap Percentages:** Ninety-two percent of immigrant school children are assumed to be non-handicapped, while 8% are assumed as handicapped. These are the same percentages used in the Homeport School Enrollment and Fiscal Impact Projections planning effort.
5. **Instructional Space (Portables):** The projected Homeport-related military school children immigrants in each district were divided by an average class size of 25 to determine required portables. Similar to the SPI analysis, a factor of 1.44 was applied to handicapped immigrants to account for their greater space allocations allowed by State funding formulas. The total number of required portables were multiplied by an estimated 1992 unit cost factor of \$42,000 to determine the total financial impact. The unit cost reflects the approximate current cost to purchase and install a portable classroom facility in Snohomish County, based on discussions with several school district purchasing personnel.

6. **Instructional Materials** (Textbooks): The total projected military school children immigrants in each district were multiplied by the following rates to estimate the financial impact related to purchasing new textbooks:

Non-Handicapped	\$175
Handicapped	\$248

These cost factors are based on textbook unit costs used in the SPI analysis, and inflated to 1992, using an annual rate of 3%.

7. **Furniture and Equipment**: Separate calculations were made for elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, and handicapped facilities, using the following current state standards:

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Handicapped</u>
Per Student Space Allocation (SF)	80	110	120	140
Furniture and Equipment Allowance (% of construction costs)	2%	3%	4%	5%

A construction cost index of \$82 per square foot of space was used in calculating the furniture and equipment financial impact. This represents the current Boeckh Index used by SPI for state matching purposes.

The method for calculating furniture and equipment impacts is illustrated in the following example, using Arlington military impacts for 1995 (Version 1):

Elementary School: Total Military Immigrants (24) x Non-Handicapped Percentage (92%) x Space Allocation (80) x Construction Cost Index (\$82) x Furniture and Equipment Allowance (2%) = \$2,898

Middle School: $3 \times 92\% \times 110 \times \$82 \times 3\% = \$746$

High School: $3 \times 92\% \times 120 \times \$82 \times 4\% = \$1,086$

Handicapped: $30 \times 8\% \times 140 \times \$82 \times 5\% = \$1,378$

Total Impact: $\$2,898 + \$746 + \$1,086 + \$1,378 = \$6,108$

8. **Pupil Transportation** (Bus Acquisition): Separate calculations were made for basic and special bus acquisition costs as follows:

Basic Education: The current percentage of students transported in each district was applied to projected Homeport-related school children to estimate the number of immigrants that will require bus transportation. That number was divided by each school district's average bus load factor to estimate the impact stated as the number of buses required. Finally, the current state-determined purchase price for bus acquisition (for a 78 passenger diesel, automatic vehicle) was applied to the number of required buses to estimate the Homeport-related impact. Since the Homeport will be permanently based in Everett, the full purchase cost for buses is the appropriate factor for estimating impacts.

Special Education: The same methodology used for basic education was applied to projected special education immigrants, except that all special education students are assumed to require bus transport. The current state-determined bus purchase price for smaller, 22-passenger vehicles with wheelchair lifts and tie-down systems was used in projecting special education bus acquisition cost impacts. The projections for special education pupil transportation costs assume that 8% of the project-related school children (handicap percentage) will require special transportation.

To project pupil transportation cost impacts, current factors for numbers of students transported, average bus loads, and bus acquisition costs were obtained from SPI. These factors are as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>Bus Transportation Percentage</u>	<u>Average Bus Load</u>	
		<u>Basic Education</u>	<u>Special Education</u>
Arlington #16	74 %	109.35	6.75
Darrington #330	60 %	77.50	8.00
Edmonds #15	53 %	130.59	12.59
Everett #2	39 %	96.20	13.20
Granite Falls #332	84 %	100.00	22.00
Index #63	100 %	16.50	8.00
Lakewood #306	94 %	125.75	12.05
Lake Stevens #4	78 %	131.24	14.67
Marysville #25	58 %	84.84	23.82
Monroe #103	74 %	106.52	4.00
Mukilteo #6	53 %	119.13	16.62
Northshore #417	69 %	137.11	13.14
Snohomish #201	69 %	92.49	9.00
Stanwood #401	82 %	121.95	6.50
Sultan #311	68 %	101.44	8.00
Bus Acquisition Cost:			
Current 1992 Cost		\$82,114	\$34,027

9. **Projection Versions:** Projections were run using three different scenarios for the number of new immigrant school children. Version 1 (Full Incremental Demand) calculated impacts for all Homeport project-related school children immigrants, regardless of whether the school district was projected to have an overall unhoused student need. Version 2 (Unhoused Incremental Demand-SPI) calculated impacts for Homeport project-related school children only to the extent that the district was projected to experience an unhoused student need condition, based on SPI enrollment and classroom capacity data. Version 3 (Unhoused Incremental Demand-LSD) likewise calculated impacts only if an unhoused student need condition was present, using local school district data on forecast enrollment and classroom capacities.

2. Projection Results

The projected operations and maintenance impacts under each of the three scenarios is summarized as follows (amounts are in constant 1992 \$):

	Homeport Project-Related School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture and Equipment	Pupil Transportation	Total
Version 1: Full Incremental Demand						
1995						
Military	920	\$1,554,000	\$175,941	\$195,676	\$583,945	\$2,509,502
Civilian Direct	33	0	6,311	8,313	20,946	35,569
Civilian Indirect	404	630,000	77,261	100,125	254,440	1,061,826
	1,357	\$2,184,000	\$259,513	\$304,114	\$859,331	\$3,606,958
1996						
Military	151	\$ 126,000	\$28,877	\$32,825	\$99,096	\$286,798
Civilian Direct	42	0	8,032	10,567	26,179	44,777
Civilian Indirect	106	126,000	20,271	26,987	71,071	244,329
	299	\$252,000	\$57,181	\$70,378	\$196,345	\$575,904
Total						
Military	1,071	\$1,680,000	\$204,818	\$228,501	\$683,041	\$2,796,360
Civilian Direct	75	0	14,343	18,880	47,125	80,346
Civilian Indirect	510	756,000	97,532	127,112	325,511	1,306,155
	1,656	\$2,436,000	\$316,693	\$374,492	\$1,055,677	\$4,182,862
Version 2: Unhoused Incremental Demand (SPI Data)						
1995						
Military	250	\$378,000	\$ 47,810	\$58,864	\$179,300	\$663,974
Civilian Direct	10	0	1,912	2,888	7,046	11,846
Civilian Indirect	109	84,000	20,845	30,942	72,677	208,464
	369	\$462,000	\$70,568	\$92,694	\$259,022	\$884,284
1996						
Military	68	\$42,000	\$13,004	\$14,786	\$49,147	\$118,937
Civilian Direct	15	0	2,869	4,091	11,408	18,368
Civilian Indirect	38	42,000	7,267	10,496	28,459	88,222
	121	\$84,000	\$23,140	\$29,373	\$89,015	\$225,527
Total						
Military	318	\$420,000	\$60,814	\$73,650	\$228,447	\$ 782,911
Civilian Direct	25	0	4,781	6,979	18,454	30,214
Civilian Indirect	147	126,000	28,112	41,438	101,136	296,686
	490	\$546,000	\$93,708	\$122,067	\$348,037	\$1,109,811
Version 3: Unhoused Incremental Demand (Local School District Data)						
1995						
Military	432	\$714,000	\$ 82,616	\$ 91,158	\$286,436	\$1,174,211
Civilian Direct	11	0	2,104	2,459	7,466	12,029
Civilian Indirect	163	210,000	31,172	37,420	108,846	387,438
	606	\$924,000	\$115,891	\$131,037	\$402,749	\$1,573,677
1996						
Military	114	\$ 84,000	\$21,801	\$23,092	\$ 73,135	\$202,027
Civilian Direct	27	0	5,163	6,845	18,021	30,029
Civilian Indirect	53	42,000	10,136	12,188	37,101	101,425
	194	\$126,000	\$37,101	\$42,125	\$128,256	\$333,481
Total						
Military	546	\$798,000	\$104,417	\$114,250	\$359,571	\$1,376,238
Civilian Direct	38	0	7,267	9,304	25,487	42,058
Civilian Indirect	216	252,000	41,308	49,608	145,947	488,863
	800	\$1,050,000	\$152,992	\$173,162	\$531,005	\$1,907,159

The projected impacts for each district are presented in Appendix 3. The projection results reveal the following:

- ▶ Total projected impacts are \$4.2 million for 1995 and 1996, if impacts are calculated for all Homeport project-related immigrants. Total projected impacts are significantly lower (\$1.1 million if SPI data is used; \$1.9 million if local school district data is used), if such impacts are considered only to the extent that there is an unhoused student need in each district.
- ▶ Under all three scenarios, the impacts related to providing instructional space (portables) and pupil transportation (acquiring buses) are by far the most significant cost items. Of the total cost impacts projected in each scenario, approximately 85% is comprised of the costs to provide temporary instructional space and to acquire new buses.
- ▶ Under all three scenarios, the military-related impacts represent approximately 70% of total Homeport impacts.
- ▶ Under Scenario 1 (Full Incremental Demand), the school districts projected to have the largest impact are: Edmonds (\$1.1 million for 1995 and 1996); Everett (\$793 thousand); Mukilteo (\$571 thousand), and Snohomish (\$336 thousand), and Marysville (\$326 thousand). Together these five districts comprise 75% of total impacts.
- ▶ Under Scenario 2 (Unhoused Incremental Demand: SPI Version), the school districts with the greatest projected impacts are: Mukilteo (\$571 thousand), Monroe (\$140 thousand), Arlington (\$109 thousand), and Marysville (\$98 thousand). Together these four districts comprise 83% of total impacts.
- ▶ Under Scenario 3 (Unhoused Incremental Demand: Local School District Version), the largest projected impacts are: Everett (\$693 thousand), Marysville (\$379 thousand), Northshore (\$223 thousand), and Monroe (\$197 thousand). Together these four districts comprise 78% of total impacts.

It is important to recognize that these projection results are preliminary estimates that will need to be updated as more current information becomes available on such key variables as ship arrival dates and immigrant location patterns.

F. POTENTIAL STRATEGIES FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Based on the foregoing analysis, a number of potential strategies can begin to be identified to aid Snohomish County school districts future efforts for obtaining state funds to mitigate anticipated Homeport project-related education impacts. These strategies are discussed below through a series of key questions that will have a major influence on impact funding.

1. *Is the methodology used in the Kitsap School District case appropriate to the situation in Everett?*

Throughout the year-long process for determining funding allocations for mitigating the education impacts in Kitsap County from the Nimitz arrival in Bremerton, the state was clear in distinguishing the Kitsap situation from the proposed Homeport in Everett. The SPI analysis that formed the basis for Kitsap school district funding states "The recommendations are unique to Kitsap County's situation and should not form the basis for allocations to districts in the Snohomish County area."

The prime distinguishing factor between the Kitsap and Everett situations is the transitory nature of the Nimitz presence in Bremerton. Much of SPI's justification for additional state funding for Kitsap County school districts was based on the belief that, because the Nimitz would only be in Bremerton on a temporary basis (until the Everett Homeport is completed), the regular state formulas would not adequately fund the increased Nimitz-related enrollment. This argument was used as a major part of the rationale for allocating funds for both non-employee related costs (textbooks and furniture/equipment) and instructional space (portables).

Textbooks and furniture/equipment are funded by the state through both the annual basic education formula (NERC component) and the state matching formula for capital facility construction (furniture and equipment allowance). SPI reasoned that since the formula for NERC assumes a relatively stable enrollment level, the temporary influx of Nimitz enrollment would not be adequately funded by the state's basic education allocation. Likewise, since the Nimitz stay in Bremerton was not permanent, it would not be feasible to build new schools, and therefore the matching furniture and equipment allowance included as part of state construction funds was unavailable to help offset the increased cost associated with Nimitz students.

The state generally provides no funding for portables, but does fund permanent school construction costs through the matching formula. Since new school construction was not a viable way of accommodating the temporary enrollment influx caused by the Nimitz, it was determined that additional funding of temporary space (portables) was justified.

Strategies for Snohomish County

It is obvious that the rationale for impact mitigation related to the Everett Homeport cannot use the transitory argument that was employed in the Kitsap situation. While the methodology employed in the Kitsap County case is relevant to Snohomish County, the school districts must use other arguments to justify state funds. These include:

- ▶ House Bill 611 represented a state commitment for helping to mitigate the local impacts associated with the Everett Homeport. The fact that the legislative intent of House Bill 611 was directed at Snohomish County, coupled with the fact that funds were provided to Kitsap schools for the Nimitz stay at Bremerton should together strengthen the argument for a state financial commitment to mitigate the impacts on school districts in Snohomish County.

- ▶ The influx of Homeport project-related school children will create an immediate need for additional portables in most school districts in Snohomish County until permanent facilities are constructed. The cost impacts associated with the purchase of portables as well as for start-up costs like new textbooks and equipment, are no different than what was experienced in Kitsap County. In Snohomish County, however, subsequent state funding for permanent school facilities could factor in amounts already allocated for temporary needs.
- ▶ The argument must be made that the Everett Homeport will have unique impacts on school district expenditures, and that it is not analogous to the arrival of a new private firm to the County, for two reasons:
 - ▶ Unlike a new private company, the Homeport will not add to the tax base and thus will not contribute to the increase in public monies required to educate the new Homeport-related students.
 - ▶ The school children of military parents are likely to be different from the civilian population in the of level of educational services required. According to Dr. Hertzke, superintendent of the Central Kitsap School District which has dealt with large military-based enrollment for over 20 years, the children of military personnel tend to be more mobile and have greater special education needs than the civilian population.

2. *What lessons can be learned from the Kitsap case?*

A number of valuable lessons can be learned from the experiences of Kitsap County school districts in their successful funding efforts, including:

- ▶ It will be very difficult to receive state funding allocations prior to the Navy's arrival in Everett. In the Kitsap situation, the state required detailed confirmation on the number and location of Nimitz students. It is unlikely that the state will provide funding based solely upon estimates of where projected immigrants will live and what schools they will attend.
- ▶ It is likely that operations and maintenance impact funding will be limited to the dependents of military personnel. In the Kitsap school district case, Nimitz-related civilian enrollment impacts were never considered.
- ▶ Success in obtaining funds is not likely to be an easy task. The Kitsap school districts had to undertake an intensive year-long effort that included significant support from local legislators to convince the state agencies of the need for adequate impact funds. Similar legislator support will be needed if Snohomish County school districts are to successfully obtain state funding.
- ▶ The Kitsap school districts are a valuable source of information regarding the educational impacts of students in military families. The extensive experience that those districts have in serving the educational needs of the military population was clearly a benefit in their successful funding requests. Since the Snohomish County school districts have significantly less experience with educating military school children, it will be important to maintain contact with Kitsap school district superintendents. For example, they may be able to provide documented evidence of higher than normal mobility or other variables that can help make a case for the added costs of educating children from military families.

3. *Should the determination of impacts be based on the entire number of military immigrant school children, or should it be limited to the unhoused student component only?*

It is clear that to the extent that an individual school district's existing classroom capacities are sufficient to meet student demand (including the influx of Homeport-related immigrants), the case for state impact funding will be more difficult. However, the calculation of unhoused student need reflects an overall school district condition. If a concentration of Navy immigrants locates in a specific area within a district, individual school facilities may be overburdened even though student demand and classroom capacity in the district as a whole is in balance. This situation is very much evident in Kitsap County, where a large portion of the Navy students are concentrated around a few school facilities rather than spread through the districts.

***Appendix 1: Homeport School District Operation and Maintenance Cost Impact Model
General Operating Instructions***

Appendix 1: Homeport School District Operation and Maintenance Cost Impact Model General Operating Instructions

The Homeport School District Operation and Maintenance Cost Impact Model (Model) projects Homeport project-related impacts on each Snohomish County school district for the following costs:

- ▶ Instructional Space (portables)
- ▶ Instructional Materials (textbooks)
- ▶ Furniture and Equipment
- ▶ Pupil Transportation Costs (bus acquisition)

The Model can project Homeport project-related operations and maintenance cost impacts for any year within the timeframe 1992-2000. The amount of information contained in the Model is limited to the amount of data that can be stored on one 360 kilobyte computer diskette. Because of this limitation, projections for only two years can be calculated each time the model is run, and projections for additional years require that the Model be rerun.

All costs in the Model are stated in 1992 dollars.

Model Versions

Three versions of the Model are available for use. They each incorporate the same formulas for projecting Homeport project-related operations and maintenance cost impacts, but differ in the number of project-related school children in each school district that is the basis for all calculations. The three versions of the model are:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Version 1 | File Name: OPMAIN1.WK1
This version uses total projected Homeport project-related school children as the basis for calculating impacts, regardless of whether there is a projected unhoused student need in a district |
| Version 2 | File Name: OPMAINS.WK1
This version uses total projected Homeport project-related school children, but only to the extent that there is a projected unhoused student need in a school district using Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) criteria for forecast enrollment and classroom capacities. |
| Version 3 | File Name: OPMAINL.WK1
This version uses total Homeport project-related school children, but only to the extent that there is a projected unhoused student need in a school district using criteria for forecast enrollment and classroom capacities from each local school district. |

Before Running the Model

In addition to the three files described above, certain files from the Homeport School Impact Forecasting Model (developed to project Homeport project-related capital facility cost impacts) must be accessed to run the Model. These files contain the projections of Homeport project-related school children immigrants which are the basic building blocks from which operations and maintenance cost impacts are calculated. In order to run the model, the following files (in addition to the "OPMAIN" files) need to be loaded as follows:

Subdirectory\File

Version 1:	HPSPILJ\DISTRIB.WK1
Version 2:	HPSPILJ\HOUSESPI.WK1
Version 3:	HPLSDLJ\HOUSELSD.WK1

Refer to LOTUS 1-2-3 and DOS operating manuals for instructions on creating file directories and subdirectories.

Operating the Model

The following operating instructions apply regardless of which version of the Model is run.

1. The file containing the appropriate Model version (either OPMAIN1.WK1, OPMAINS.WK1 or OPMAINL.WK1) must be retrieved using the LOTUS 123 file command (\FR).
2. Upon retrieving the Model file, an instruction screen will be accessed which provides an overview of the Model and basic operating instructions.
3. To begin operating the model, press the letter "m" or select "menu" from the menu bar. All Model operations are menu-driven. The following describes each command in the Model's main menu screen:

Inputs: The Input command allows the user to view and/or change the various input factors that drive the Model's calculations. Forms for updating the input factors are included as Appendix 2.

Outputs: The Output command allows the user to view the operations and maintenance impact projection results for the two years selected in the Update command (see below). The user has the option of scrolling through the projection results, at which time the menu system is turned off. To re-enter the menu system, simply depress the "Alt" and "m" keys simultaneously.

Print: The Print command allows the user to print the projection results for each of the two years selected for calculations. The print commands have been set up to print on 8.5" by 11" paper.

Update: The Update command must be run each time the model is used. This command serves three important functions. One, it updates the file for the latest projections of Homeport project-related school children for the entire projection period (1990-1997). Second, it allows the user to specify the two years for which operation and cost impact projections are desired. Third, the Update command recalculates and saves the file using the updated information.

Help: The Help command provides access to the screen that contains the basic instructions for operating the Model.

Quit: The Quit command allows the user to leave the menu system.

Additional information on the Model, including a description of the logic and formulas used to calculate operations and maintenance cost projections can be found in Section D.

***Appendix 2: Homeport School District Operating and Maintenance Cost Impact Model
Form for Updating Input Factors***

**Appendix 2: Homeport School District Operating and Maintenance Cost Impact Model
Form for Updating Input Factors**

1. Years Selected for Impact Projection (must be between 1992 and 2000)

Year 1 _____

Year 2 _____

2. Instructional Space (Portables)

Current Purchase Cost Per Unit _____

3. Furniture and Equipment (Current SPI standards)

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Handicapped</u>
Space Allocation per Student (sq.ft.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Furniture & Equipment Allowance (% of construction cost)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Current Construction Cost Index	_____			

4. Textbooks

	<u>Non-Handicap</u>	<u>Handicap</u>
Current Textbook Cost per Student	_____	_____

5. Handicapped Percentage

Non-Handicapped Student Percentage _____

Handicapped Student Percentage _____

Appendix 2: Homeport School District Operating and Maintenance Cost Impact Model
(continued) Form for Updating Input Factors

6. Pupil Transportation Costs (current SPI Factors & Costs)

	<u>Bus Transportation Percentage</u>	<u>Average Bus Load</u>	
		<u>Basic Education</u>	<u>Special Education</u>
Arlington #16	_____	_____	_____
Darrington #330	_____	_____	_____
Edmonds #15	_____	_____	_____
Everett #2	_____	_____	_____
Granite Falls #332	_____	_____	_____
Index #63	_____	_____	_____
Lakewood #306	_____	_____	_____
Lake Stevens #4	_____	_____	_____
Marysville #25	_____	_____	_____
Monroe #103	_____	_____	_____
Mukilteo #6	_____	_____	_____
Northshore #417	_____	_____	_____
Snohomish #201	_____	_____	_____
Stanwood #401	_____	_____	_____
Sultan #311	_____	_____	_____
Current Bus Acquisition Cost		_____	_____

Appendix 3: Operations and Maintenance Cost Impact Projections by School District

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)

Version 3

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	114	\$84,000	\$21,801	\$23,092	\$73,135	\$202,027
Civilian Direct	27	\$0	\$5,163	\$6,845	\$18,021	\$30,029
Civilian Indirect	53	\$42,000	\$10,136	\$12,188	\$37,101	\$101,425
	194	\$126,000	\$37,101	\$42,125	\$128,256	\$333,481

Table 2
 Snohomish County School Districts
 Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts
 Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)
 Version 3

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	10	\$0	\$1,912	\$1,908	\$6,307	\$10,127
Civilian Direct	4	\$0	\$765	\$908	\$2,523	\$4,196
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,408	\$4,415	\$7,162
	21	\$0	\$4,016	\$4,223	\$13,245	\$21,485
Monroe #103						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$7,241	\$9,757
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$461	\$2,414	\$3,258
Civilian Indirect	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,444	\$6,034	\$8,434
	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$3,275	\$15,688	\$21,449
Mukilteo #6						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Northshore #417						
Military	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,331	\$6,461	\$10,895
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$628	\$1,762	\$2,964
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,256	\$3,524	\$5,928
	20	\$0	\$3,825	\$4,215	\$11,747	\$19,787
Snohomish #201						
Military	9	\$0	\$1,721	\$1,500	\$7,794	\$11,015
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,732	\$2,448
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$666	\$3,464	\$4,896
	15	\$0	\$2,869	\$2,499	\$12,991	\$18,359
Stanwood #401						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$703	\$1,854	\$2,939
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$927	\$1,526
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$927	\$1,526
	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,519	\$3,707	\$5,991
Sultan #311						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$847	\$1,205
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,693	\$2,651
	3	\$0	\$574	\$741	\$2,540	\$3,855

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)

Version 3

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$5,487	\$8,004
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$915	\$1,272
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,036	\$3,658	\$5,459
	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,572	\$10,060	\$14,735
Darrington #330						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Edmonds #15						
Military	36	\$42,000	\$6,885	\$7,477	\$18,821	\$75,183
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,814	\$2,614	\$5,384
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,179	\$2,091	\$4,036
	45	\$42,000	\$8,606	\$10,470	\$23,527	\$84,603
Everett #2						
Military	24	\$42,000	\$4,590	\$4,640	\$12,300	\$63,530
Civilian Direct	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,256	\$3,075	\$5,479
Civilian Indirect	14	\$42,000	\$2,677	\$2,846	\$7,175	\$54,698
	44	\$84,000	\$8,415	\$8,742	\$22,549	\$123,706
Granite Falls #332						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Index #63						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lakewood #306						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,581	\$2,297
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$791	\$1,390
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,581	\$2,538
	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,316	\$3,953	\$6,225
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,295	\$4,442	\$7,075
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$461	\$1,269	\$2,113
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$795	\$2,538	\$4,098
	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$2,551	\$8,249	\$13,286

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)

Version 3

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	432	\$714,000	\$82,616	\$91,158	\$286,436	\$1,174,211
Civilian Direct	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,459	\$7,466	\$12,029
Civilian Indirect	163	\$210,000	\$31,172	\$37,420	\$108,846	\$387,438
	606	\$924,000	\$115,891	\$131,037	\$402,749	\$1,573,677

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)

Version 3

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	84	\$126,000	\$16,064	\$17,882	\$52,982	\$212,928
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$628	\$1,892	\$3,094
Civilian Indirect	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$8,210	\$23,968	\$81,445
	125	\$168,000	\$23,905	\$26,720	\$78,842	\$297,467
Monroe #103						
Military	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$8,195	\$45,857	\$103,320
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$2,414	\$3,371
Civilian Indirect	16	\$42,000	\$3,060	\$4,016	\$19,308	\$68,385
	56	\$84,000	\$10,709	\$12,786	\$67,579	\$175,075
Mukilteo #6						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Northshore #417						
Military	58	\$84,000	\$11,092	\$10,947	\$34,066	\$140,104
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$587	\$945
Civilian Indirect	21	\$42,000	\$4,016	\$4,140	\$12,334	\$62,491
	80	\$126,000	\$15,299	\$15,254	\$46,987	\$203,540
Snohomish #201						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Stanwood #401						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,996	\$5,561	\$8,704
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,406	\$3,707	\$5,878
	10	\$0	\$1,912	\$3,401	\$9,268	\$14,581
Sultan #311						
Military	16	\$42,000	\$3,060	\$3,534	\$13,547	\$62,140
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$5,080	\$7,597
	22	\$42,000	\$4,207	\$4,903	\$18,627	\$69,737

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using Local SD Criteria)

Version 3

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	27	\$42,000	\$5,163	\$5,223	\$24,692	\$77,078
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,632	\$3,658	\$6,055
	31	\$42,000	\$5,928	\$6,855	\$28,350	\$83,134
Darrington #330						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Edmonds #15						
Military	29	\$42,000	\$5,546	\$8,551	\$15,162	\$71,259
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$295	\$523	\$1,009
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,769	\$3,137	\$6,054
	36	\$42,000	\$6,885	\$10,615	\$18,821	\$78,321
Everett #2						
Military	152	\$294,000	\$29,068	\$29,303	\$77,898	\$430,269
Civilian Direct	4	\$0	\$765	\$795	\$2,050	\$3,610
Civilian Indirect	56	\$84,000	\$10,709	\$11,511	\$28,699	\$134,920
	212	\$378,000	\$40,543	\$41,608	\$108,647	\$568,799
Granite Falls #332						
Military	3	\$0	\$574	\$885	\$2,275	\$3,733
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$590	\$1,517	\$2,489
	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,474	\$3,792	\$6,222
Index #63						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lakewood #306						
Military	15	\$42,000	\$2,869	\$3,465	\$11,859	\$60,193
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,891	\$5,534	\$8,764
	22	\$42,000	\$4,207	\$5,356	\$17,394	\$68,956
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,179	\$2,538	\$4,483
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	3	\$0	\$574	\$885	\$1,904	\$3,362
	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$2,064	\$4,442	\$7,845

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)

Version 2

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	68	\$42,000	\$13,004	\$14,786	\$49,147	\$118,937
Civilian Direct	15	\$0	\$2,869	\$4,091	\$11,408	\$18,368
Civilian Indirect	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$10,496	\$28,459	\$88,222
	121	\$84,000	\$23,140	\$29,373	\$89,015	\$225,527

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)

Version 2

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	10	\$0	\$1,912	\$1,908	\$6,307	\$10,127
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$631	\$1,230
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$631	\$1,230
	12	\$0	\$2,295	\$2,724	\$7,569	\$12,587
Monroe #103						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$7,241	\$9,757
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$461	\$2,414	\$3,258
Civilian Indirect	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,444	\$6,034	\$8,434
	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$3,275	\$15,688	\$21,449
Mukilteo #6						
Military	21	\$42,000	\$4,016	\$4,736	\$10,498	\$61,250
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,203	\$2,499	\$4,658
Civilian Indirect	14	\$42,000	\$2,677	\$3,683	\$6,998	\$55,359
	40	\$84,000	\$7,650	\$9,622	\$19,995	\$121,267
Northshore #417						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$587	\$1,187
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$816	\$1,175	\$2,373
	3	\$0	\$574	\$1,224	\$1,762	\$3,560
Snohomish #201						
Military	12	\$0	\$2,295	\$2,497	\$10,393	\$15,185
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$741	\$2,598	\$3,913
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,664	\$6,062	\$9,065
	22	\$0	\$4,207	\$4,903	\$19,053	\$28,163
Starwood #401						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$703	\$1,854	\$2,939
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$927	\$1,526
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$927	\$1,526
	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,519	\$3,707	\$5,991
Sultan #311						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 2
 Snohomish County School Districts
 Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts
 Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)
 Version 2

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$5,487	\$8,004
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$915	\$1,272
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,036	\$3,658	\$5,459
	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,572	\$10,060	\$14,735
Darrington #330						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Edmonds #15						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Everett #2						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Granite Falls #332						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$758	\$1,116
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$758	\$1,116
	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,517	\$2,232
Index #63						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lakewood #306						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,581	\$2,297
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$791	\$1,390
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,581	\$2,538
	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,316	\$3,953	\$6,225
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,295	\$4,442	\$7,075
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$295	\$635	\$1,121
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$295	\$635	\$1,121
	9	\$0	\$1,721	\$1,884	\$5,711	\$9,316

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)

Version 2

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	250	\$378,000	\$47,810	\$58,864	\$179,300	\$663,974
Civilian Direct	10	\$0	\$1,912	\$2,888	\$7,046	\$11,846
Civilian Indirect	109	\$84,000	\$20,845	\$30,942	\$72,677	\$208,464
	369	\$462,000	\$70,568	\$92,694	\$259,022	\$884,284

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)

Version 2

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	25	\$42,000	\$4,781	\$8,051	\$15,768	\$70,600
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$295	\$631	\$1,117
Civilian Indirect	12	\$0	\$2,295	\$3,878	\$7,569	\$13,742
	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$12,224	\$23,968	\$85,459
Monroe #103						
Military	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$8,195	\$45,857	\$103,320
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$2,414	\$3,371
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$2,517	\$8,447	\$12,303
	47	\$42,000	\$8,988	\$11,286	\$56,718	\$118,993
Mukilteo #6						
Military	113	\$210,000	\$21,610	\$24,532	\$56,487	\$312,628
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,444	\$2,499	\$4,900
Civilian Indirect	51	\$84,000	\$9,753	\$13,047	\$25,494	\$132,294
	169	\$294,000	\$32,320	\$39,023	\$84,480	\$449,822
Northshore #417						
Military	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,632	\$2,349	\$4,746
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$587	\$1,187
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$2,448	\$3,524	\$7,120
	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$4,488	\$6,461	\$13,053
Snohomish #201						
Military	5	\$0	\$956	\$2,040	\$4,330	\$7,327
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$816	\$1,732	\$2,931
	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$2,856	\$6,062	\$10,257
Stanwood #401						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,996	\$5,561	\$8,704
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,406	\$3,707	\$5,878
	10	\$0	\$1,912	\$3,401	\$9,268	\$14,581
Sultan #311						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Unhoused Student Need (Using SPI Criteria)

Version 2

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	27	\$42,000	\$5,163	\$5,223	\$24,692	\$77,078
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$915	\$1,272
Civilian Indirect	12	\$0	\$2,295	\$2,965	\$10,974	\$16,234
	40	\$42,000	\$7,650	\$8,355	\$36,581	\$94,585
Darrington #330						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Edmonds #15						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Everett #2						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Granite Falls #332						
Military	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$2,551	\$9,858	\$14,895
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,090	\$3,792	\$5,837
	18	\$0	\$3,442	\$3,640	\$13,650	\$20,732
Index #63						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lakewood #306						
Military	15	\$42,000	\$2,869	\$3,465	\$11,859	\$60,193
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,891	\$5,534	\$8,764
	22	\$42,000	\$4,207	\$5,356	\$17,394	\$68,956
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,179	\$2,538	\$4,483
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	3	\$0	\$574	\$885	\$1,904	\$3,362
	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$2,064	\$4,442	\$7,845

Table 2
 Snohomish County School Districts
 Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts
 Based on Full Incremental Demand
 Version 1

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	151	\$126,000	\$28,877	\$32,825	\$99,096	\$286,798
Civilian Direct	42	\$0	\$8,032	\$10,567	\$26,179	\$44,777
Civilian Indirect	106	\$126,000	\$20,271	\$26,987	\$71,071	\$244,329
	299	\$252,000	\$57,181	\$70,378	\$196,345	\$575,904

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Full Incremental Demand

Version 1

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$2,792	\$8,200	\$13,478
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,203	\$3,154	\$5,313
Civilian Indirect	9	\$0	\$1,721	\$1,998	\$5,677	\$9,395
	27	\$0	\$5,163	\$5,993	\$17,030	\$28,186
Monroe #103						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$7,241	\$9,757
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$461	\$2,414	\$3,258
Civilian Indirect	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,444	\$6,034	\$8,434
	13	\$0	\$2,486	\$3,275	\$15,688	\$21,449
Mukilteo #6						
Military	21	\$42,000	\$4,016	\$4,736	\$10,498	\$61,250
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,203	\$2,499	\$4,658
Civilian Indirect	14	\$42,000	\$2,677	\$3,683	\$6,998	\$55,359
	40	\$84,000	\$7,650	\$9,622	\$19,995	\$121,267
Northshore #417						
Military	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,331	\$6,461	\$10,895
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$628	\$1,762	\$2,964
Civilian Indirect	8	\$0	\$1,530	\$2,072	\$4,699	\$8,301
	22	\$0	\$4,207	\$5,031	\$12,922	\$22,160
Snohomish #201						
Military	12	\$0	\$2,295	\$2,497	\$10,393	\$15,185
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$741	\$2,598	\$3,913
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,664	\$6,062	\$9,065
	22	\$0	\$4,207	\$4,903	\$19,053	\$28,163
Stanwood #401						
Military	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,036	\$3,707	\$5,508
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$927	\$1,526
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,854	\$2,811
	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$2,019	\$6,487	\$9,845
Sultan #311						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$847	\$1,205
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,693	\$2,651
	3	\$0	\$574	\$741	\$2,540	\$3,855

Table 2

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Full Incremental Demand

Version 1

1996

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$5,487	\$8,004
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$915	\$1,272
Civilian Indirect	4	\$0	\$765	\$1,036	\$3,658	\$5,459
	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,572	\$10,060	\$14,735
Darrington #330						
Military	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Edmonds #15						
Military	36	\$42,000	\$6,885	\$7,477	\$18,821	\$75,183
Civilian Direct	11	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,814	\$5,751	\$10,668
Civilian Indirect	26	\$42,000	\$4,972	\$6,535	\$13,593	\$67,101
	73	\$84,000	\$13,961	\$16,826	\$38,166	\$152,952
Everett #2						
Military	28	\$42,000	\$5,355	\$6,272	\$14,350	\$67,977
Civilian Direct	8	\$0	\$1,530	\$2,072	\$4,100	\$7,702
Civilian Indirect	19	\$42,000	\$3,634	\$4,886	\$9,737	\$60,257
	55	\$84,000	\$10,518	\$13,231	\$28,187	\$135,936
Granite Falls #332						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,517	\$2,474
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$758	\$1,116
	3	\$0	\$574	\$741	\$2,275	\$3,590
Index #63						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$4,919	\$5,277
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$4,919	\$5,277
	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$9,837	\$10,553
Lakewood #306						
Military	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,581	\$2,297
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$408	\$791	\$1,390
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,581	\$2,538
	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,316	\$3,953	\$6,225
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	8	\$0	\$1,530	\$1,703	\$5,076	\$8,309
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$461	\$1,269	\$2,113
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,611	\$3,807	\$6,566
	16	\$0	\$3,060	\$3,775	\$10,153	\$16,988

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Full Incremental Demand

Version 1

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School	Instructional	Instructional	Furniture &	Pupil	
	Children	Space	Materials	Equipment	Transport.	
Total Snohomish County						
Military	920	\$1,554,000	\$175,941	\$195,676	\$583,945	\$2,509,562
Civilian Direct	33	\$0	\$6,311	\$8,313	\$20,946	\$35,569
Civilian Indirect	404	\$630,000	\$77,261	\$100,125	\$254,440	\$1,061,826
	1357	\$2,184,000	\$259,513	\$304,114	\$859,331	\$3,606,958

Table 1
 Snohomish County School Districts
 Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts
 Based on Full Incremental Demand
 Version 1

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Marysville #25						
Military	84	\$126,000	\$16,064	\$17,882	\$52,982	\$212,928
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$628	\$1,892	\$3,094
Civilian Indirect	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$8,210	\$23,968	\$81,445
	125	\$168,000	\$23,905	\$26,720	\$78,842	\$297,467
Monroe #103						
Military	38	\$42,000	\$7,267	\$8,195	\$45,857	\$103,320
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$2,414	\$3,371
Civilian Indirect	16	\$42,000	\$3,060	\$4,016	\$19,308	\$68,385
	56	\$84,000	\$10,709	\$12,786	\$67,579	\$175,075
Mukilteo #6						
Military	113	\$210,000	\$21,610	\$24,532	\$56,487	\$312,628
Civilian Direct	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,444	\$2,499	\$4,900
Civilian Indirect	51	\$84,000	\$9,753	\$13,047	\$25,494	\$132,294
	169	\$294,000	\$32,320	\$39,023	\$84,480	\$449,822
Northshore #417						
Military	62	\$84,000	\$11,857	\$12,579	\$36,415	\$144,851
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,175	\$2,132
Civilian Indirect	27	\$42,000	\$5,163	\$6,589	\$15,858	\$69,610
	91	\$126,000	\$17,403	\$19,742	\$53,448	\$216,593
Snohomish #201						
Military	74	\$126,000	\$14,152	\$15,204	\$64,087	\$219,444
Civilian Direct	3	\$0	\$574	\$628	\$2,598	\$3,800
Civilian Indirect	33	\$42,000	\$6,311	\$8,199	\$28,580	\$85,090
	110	\$168,000	\$21,036	\$24,032	\$95,265	\$308,333
Stanwood #401						
Military	20	\$42,000	\$3,825	\$4,328	\$18,535	\$68,688
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$927	\$1,285
Civilian Indirect	9	\$0	\$1,721	\$2,239	\$8,341	\$12,301
	30	\$42,000	\$5,737	\$6,734	\$27,803	\$82,274
Sultan #311						
Military	16	\$42,000	\$3,060	\$3,534	\$13,547	\$62,140
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,369	\$5,080	\$7,597
	22	\$42,000	\$4,207	\$4,903	\$18,627	\$69,737

Table 1

Snohomish County School Districts

Projected Homeport-Related Operations and Maintenance Cost Impacts

Based on Full Incremental Demand

Version 1

1995

School District	Homeport Proj-Related					Total
	School Children	Instructional Space	Instructional Materials	Furniture & Equipment	Pupil Transport.	
Arlington #16						
Military	30	\$42,000	\$5,737	\$6,108	\$27,435	\$81,280
Civilian Direct	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$915	\$1,272
Civilian Indirect	14	\$42,000	\$2,677	\$3,555	\$12,803	\$61,035
	45	\$84,000	\$8,606	\$9,829	\$41,153	\$143,588
Darrington #330						
Military	5	\$0	\$956	\$1,075	\$4,626	\$6,656
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	2	\$0	\$382	\$333	\$1,850	\$2,566
	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,408	\$6,476	\$9,222
Edmonds #15						
Military	239	\$420,000	\$45,706	\$50,543	\$124,953	\$641,202
Civilian Direct	8	\$0	\$1,530	\$1,944	\$4,183	\$7,656
Civilian Indirect	103	\$168,000	\$19,698	\$25,732	\$53,850	\$267,280
	350	\$588,000	\$66,934	\$78,219	\$182,985	\$916,139
Everett #2						
Military	172	\$294,000	\$32,893	\$37,463	\$88,148	\$452,504
Civilian Direct	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,611	\$3,075	\$5,833
Civilian Indirect	75	\$126,000	\$14,343	\$19,264	\$38,437	\$198,043
	253	\$420,000	\$48,384	\$58,338	\$129,659	\$656,381
Granite Falls #332						
Military	14	\$42,000	\$2,677	\$2,959	\$10,616	\$58,253
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	6	\$0	\$1,147	\$1,498	\$4,550	\$7,195
	20	\$42,000	\$3,825	\$4,457	\$15,166	\$65,448
Index #63						
Military	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$4,919	\$5,277
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	1	\$0	\$191	\$167	\$4,919	\$5,277
Lakewood #306						
Military	15	\$42,000	\$2,869	\$3,465	\$11,859	\$60,193
Civilian Direct	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Indirect	7	\$0	\$1,339	\$1,891	\$5,534	\$8,764
	22	\$42,000	\$4,207	\$5,356	\$17,394	\$68,956
Lake Stevens #4						
Military	37	\$42,000	\$7,076	\$7,644	\$23,478	\$80,198
Civilian Direct	2	\$0	\$382	\$575	\$1,269	\$2,226
Civilian Indirect	17	\$42,000	\$3,251	\$4,183	\$10,787	\$60,221
	56	\$84,000	\$10,709	\$12,401	\$35,535	\$142,645