# Moorlands district and community comparison

What the new records clarify and what families still need answered

**Save Moorlands Elementary community briefing**
November 4, 2026 | Source review through this date

Northshore has released a closure savings workbook, transportation estimates, enrollment data and a full facilities assessment. These records answer some earlier requests. They also leave the central site comparison unresolved: how would the **same school program** fit and cost at Moorlands and Arrowhead after recreation, access and other constraints are treated consistently? [D1]

| Topic | What the release establishes | What still needs an answer |
|---|---|---|
| Land and recreation | The November 2 deck counts 6.93 acres at Moorlands and 12.39 at Arrowhead. | Show equivalent layouts and explain treatment of the city park and each school's play space. |
| Annual savings | A school-specific model includes added receiving-school staffing. | Price all incremental costs and reconcile continued swing-site operations. |
| Transportation | 199 current Moorlands walkers would become bus riders; typical existing rides get shorter. | Validate traffic, arrival capacity, future enrollment and actual incremental cost. |
| Facilities and safety | Moorlands has the better condition score; Arrowhead has the better scoped seismic result. | Compare the work required for each proposed use and reconcile cost scopes. |

## The community request

Publish a costed comparison of the district proposal, an alternative that retains Moorlands, and keeping the south unchanged. Use the same years, student programs, site requirements and service standards for each option. Address Shelton View's temporary accommodation in every option.

**How to read this report:** District figures are identified as reported estimates. Community calculations are labeled and reproducible from the cited inputs. Questions identify evidence still needed; missing material in this review is not proof that it does not exist. Source keys and methods appear on pages 8-9.

# Compare usable land on the same assumptions

The playground and field issue remains a design question

The community's November 2 argument reserves Arrowhead's recreation functions and excludes the city park from Moorlands' district acreage. This tests whether a larger parcel means a proportionately larger usable site. It does not establish a permitted rebuild at either campus.

| Measure | Arrowhead | Moorlands |
|---|---|---|
| District-owned land in November 2 deck | 12.39 acres | 6.93 acres |
| District deck terrain characterization | About 9.3 acres described as buildable | Generally level |
| Community screen below 15% slope | 7.31 acres | 6.52 acres |
| Community screen below 5% slope | 4.15 acres | 4.17 acres |

**Different measures:** The community rows use a modeled 2.17-acre recreation reservation at Arrowhead and exclude the city park at Moorlands. They include existing buildings and circulation. They are terrain screens, not certified vacant or net buildable acreage. The slope thresholds are cumulative; do not add the rows. [C1; D9, PDF pp. 18 and 38]

## What the district has and has not counted

The November 2 deck **includes Moorlands' purchased parcels**: 5.90 acres described as ready for school use and 1.03 requiring City approval. It says a Moorlands replacement must fit its own field and play area, while Arrowhead's field, playground and trees remain. The scenario webpage still starts with roughly 5 versus 12 acres and says the additional Moorlands land does not support rebuilding. [D9, pp. 18, 38] [D6]

The park agreement supports school-hours use and scheduled ballfield priority, preserves public use and provides a termination process. Exclusive school use of the entire park and a fully signed current agreement with all amendments remain unverified. A rebuild needs evidence about future access. [D8]

## The question that resolves this difference

**Why must Moorlands replace its current park-supported recreation on district land, and what common recreation standard is used at Arrowhead?** Publish side-by-side layouts, recreation areas, access routes, drainage, tree retention and grading, with a City-supported explanation of park and parcel approvals.

# Annual savings need a complete cost bridge

The new workbook improves the evidence but does not price the whole plan

Earlier community work distinguished a representative school's base cost from avoidable closure savings. The new workbook provides a more specific model and adds receiving-school staffing. The Moorlands portion can now be calculated as follows. [D2]

| Annual general fund change 2026-27 dollars | Case A | Case B |
|---|---|---|
| Moorlands savings after the model's 5% reduction | $1,379,172 | $1,379,172 |
| Less added staffing at Arrowhead and Woodmoor | $297,897 | $379,948 |
| Community calculation of modeled net | **$1,081,275** | **$999,223** |

Case A uses projected 2028 resident enrollment. Case B uses October 2026 enrolled FTE plus incoming resident pockets. They are model cases, not a statistical confidence range or two independently verified forecasts. This table isolates the south/Moorlands component; it is not the districtwide scenario total. [D2, Summary!A5; Closing!D21; S1 Receiving!AB6:AB7, AB16:AB17]

## Costs the workbook does not separately price

Summary!A16 lists transportation changes, one-time closure and transition, added receiving-school custodial or utility costs, assistant-principal changes, repurposing costs or revenue, and escalation beyond 2026-27. It says the 5% reduction generally covers some of these. Ask which costs, in what amounts, and whether the allowance is sufficient; do not treat every omission as zero. [D2]

Classroom teachers and planning are excluded on both sides because they follow students. Special education, English-language services, Title I and LAP are not modeled. Grade-level staffing and actual positions removed or retained still matter. [D2, Summary!A17; Notes!A8:A11]

## Swing-site use changes the accounting question

The workbook counts about **$295,783 a year** in Moorlands utilities, facility-manager and custodian savings after the 5% reduction. The November 2 deck proposes continuing to occupy Moorlands for Shelton View in 2028-2030 and for later rebuilds. Reconcile which operating costs continue, move with Shelton View, or are genuinely avoided. [D2, Closing!D27; D9, p. 19]

**Request:** A yearly ledger through at least the first post-2030 reuse period, separating recurring operating savings, one-time transition and capital costs, continued occupancy costs and documented avoided accommodation costs. Apply the same ledger to the retain-Moorlands alternative.

# Transportation has benefits and new burdens

The new estimates quantify a change the community had raised

| South rebalancing measure | Today | Proposed model |
|---|---|---|
| Moorlands walkers in ML0 who become riders | 199 walk | 199 ride to Arrowhead |
| Ride for those new riders | Walking trips | AM 14-17 min<br>PM 14-22 min |
| Typical existing ride and average existing ride | 27 min | 25 min |
| Longest ride across the south group | 39 min | 38 min |
| Arrowhead longest ride | AM 26 / PM 32 min | AM 30 / PM 38 min |
| Combined morning and afternoon routes | 17 | 18 |
| Routes over 45 minutes | 0 | 0 |

District estimates, not observed future trips. Source: [D3, PDF p. 1]. The report uses current 2026-27 students and excludes traffic. AM + PM route counts are not a count of unique buses or driver positions. The 199 walkers are a current cohort; they are not the 233 projected 2028 residents assigned to Arrowhead.

## What changes in the comparison

The model shows shorter typical existing rides and a slightly shorter longest ride across the south group. Those benefits do not measure the lost walking option for 199 Moorlands students. Arrowhead's longest modeled rides rise by four minutes AM and six PM.

## Questions to take back to the district

**Will routes work during school traffic?** Provide trip times with traffic, arrival and dismissal assumptions, queue capacity, pedestrian crossings and bus/parent separation plans.

**What is the incremental annual cost?** Price driver hours, route miles, fleet and reimbursement changes. Link the amount to the savings model and its 5% allowance. The 17-to-18 route total does not establish the cost of one additional bus.

**What changes with the 2028 cohort?** Re-run routes for implementation-year enrollment and document walking eligibility and safe access. Publish aggregate results without identifying students or addresses.

# Facilities and seismic evidence

A better condition score does not settle required capital work

| District assessment measure | Moorlands | Arrowhead |
|---|---|---|
| Building condition score<br>Higher is better | 63.02 / 100 | 55.96 / 100 |
| Facility Condition Index<br>Lower is better; both rated Poor | 0.46 | 0.49 |
| Corrective-action planning total<br>2025-2029 chart | $13.98 million | $4.89 million |
| Scoped seismic result | Higher-Level Structural Risk | Lower-Level Structural Risk; passed checks |
| Recommended seismic upgrade planning estimate | $5.49 million, buildings A-D | No upgrades recommended in this study |

Source: [D4], PDF pp. 55 / printed 48 and 206 / printed 199 for condition and corrective actions; PDF pp. 486-487 for seismic results; PDF p. 503 for Moorlands' detailed seismic estimate. The condition summary charts are embedded images and were checked visually.

## What supports the community finding

Moorlands has the higher general condition score and the lower FCI. Both campuses need work. A Poor rating by itself does not identify which neighborhood school should close or what either campus needs for a specific proposed use.

## What the new evidence adds

Moorlands' corrective-action total is higher. The separate seismic study recommends structural upgrades there; Arrowhead passed the scoped checks. Covered play areas, covered walkways and nonacademic buildings were excluded. Both neighborhood-school and swing-site use of Moorlands need to address these findings. [D4, pp. 486-487]

The main FCA excludes the separate seismic costs. Its rough-order planning estimates are described as plus or minus 100%. Moorlands' seismic cost sheet is marked **DRAFT** and includes escalation, contingencies, soft costs and tax. These are not bids or interchangeable rebuild prices. [D4, pp. 9, 19, 503]

**Request:** Engineer-reviewed scopes and costs for each occupancy, with completed work removed, overlaps reconciled, common price years, useful lives and phasing. Adding the FCA and seismic totals does not establish definitive closure savings or a rebuild cost.

# Capacity and swing space need an operating plan

Compare the same pupils and programs in every option

The enrollment workbook labels design capacity as classrooms multiplied by 22.5. It lists 765 at Moorlands, 518 at Arrowhead and 833 at Woodmoor. Those are a stated design measure; they do not independently establish usable capacity for the actual mix of classrooms, special programs, services, childcare, lunch, buses or portables. [D5]

| 2028 resident comparison | Published figures | What to verify |
|---|---|---|
| Moorlands without the proposed change | 438 residents | Moorlands is above 400 in this resident forecast. |
| Arrowhead after south rebalancing | 463 residents | 230 baseline + 233 incoming = 463. |
| Woodmoor after south rebalancing | 686 residents | Workbook baseline 486 + 203 incoming = 689; reconcile the 3-student version difference. |

Sources: D5, Sheet1!B4, B5, B17, B24, I5, I17, I24; D6, South section; D2, S1 Receiving!D6:E7. Residents, enrolled headcount and full-time-equivalent enrollment are different measures. Small version differences call for a model bridge, not a conclusion that a plan cannot work.

## The temporary-use proposal needs reconciliation

The November 2 deck recommends Moorlands as Shelton View's swing site in 2028-2030 and for future rebuilds. The FAQ says the destination is undecided. A recommendation can precede a decision; identify which option and cost assumptions the savings model uses. [D9, p. 19] [D7]

The FAQ says there are no plans to sell school buildings and estimates a modular swing site at more than $20 million. That alternative capital estimate is not annual operating savings attributable to Moorlands. Request its dated scope and compare realistic accommodation options. [D7]

## Price three complete choices

**District proposal:** Move Moorlands pupils to Arrowhead/Woodmoor and operate Moorlands for swing use.
**Retain Moorlands:** Test a paired consolidation or boundary alternative, with a real solution for Shelton View.
**No south change:** Cost the district's Canyon Creek/Woodmoor temporary split option. Use equal standards for educational disruption, transport, access and required building work. [D9, p. 19]

# Six questions that can be answered with records

Ask for the supporting documents before the recommendation is finalized

### 1 What fits at each campus under the same standards?

**Records needed:** Dimensioned comparative layouts for the same student program, showing existing and replacement buildings, recreation, buses, parents, parking, drainage, trees and grading; area schedules distinguishing gross land from the permitted building envelope. [D9, pp. 18, 38; C1]

### 2 Why does the park change the Moorlands requirement?

**Records needed:** The fully signed park agreement, all current amendments, use maps and a City-supported explanation of access, school-hours priority, termination and rebuild conditions; current church license and parcel approval pathway. [D8] [D9, p. 18]

### 3 What is the full annual and multiyear net saving?

**Records needed:** Editable model, source cost sheets and staffing allocations; itemized exclusions; positions actually removed; annual costs for occupied or idle Moorlands swing use; documented avoided accommodation costs and a reconciliation of the 5% allowance. [D2]

### 4 Will the transport and receiving campuses work in practice?

**Records needed:** Implementation-year route model with traffic, aggregate stop/ride assumptions, arrival and dismissal queue analysis, safe walking access and itemized incremental transportation cost. [D3]

### 5 What capital work is required for each proposed use?

**Records needed:** Current condition and seismic work status, engineer-reviewed occupancy scopes, schedules and comparable estimates, with overlaps and price years reconciled. Include swing occupancy and a retain-Moorlands option. [D4]

### 6 Which classrooms and services support the capacity claim?

**Records needed:** Room-level capacity and program map, permanent/portable inventory, projected attending enrollment, resident-to-attending bridge, grade-level staffing and special-service/childcare plan for every option. [D5]

**Timing:** The district plans its written closure analysis for November 23, 2026, a first reading February 22, 2027 and a vote March 8, 2027. Dates are subject to change. Ask the written analysis to answer these questions with the underlying records and make them available early enough for public review. [D10]

# Sources and exact references

## Official documents and how to check the comparisons

PDF page numbers below are physical file pages, counting the cover as page 1. Printed page numbers are added when different. Source files and web pages were reviewed November 4, 2026. Links use district resource-manager entries from its data index where available.

**D1 Northshore enrollment and boundaries data index**
Index connecting the district's new public spreadsheets and reports. The linked files, rather than the index alone, support the numerical claims.
https://www.nsd.org/our-district/who-we-are/enrollment-boundaries/data

**D2 Closure Net Savings All Scenarios posted 11.2**
Closing!D4:D21 and D25:D27; S1 Receiving!AB6:AB7 and AB16:AB17; Summary!A2, A5, A16:A17; Notes!A3:A11. Moorlands receiving rows repeat in the other scenarios. Full native precision was used before rounding to whole dollars.
https://www.nsd.org/fs/resource-manager/view/8b6764e1-211a-489b-be8f-d4407e312792

**D3 EDAC Scenario Transportation Summaries v3**
PDF p. 1, South Rebalancing Transportation Summary, October 2026. At a Glance, Today vs. This Scenario, Longest Ride at Each School and the traffic/cohort footnote.
https://www.nsd.org/fs/resource-manager/view/4abfbb5f-59fa-41e9-b05f-b3dc163e0b8a

**D4 Northshore School District FCA Report Final R1**
Main report dated April 25, 2025. PDF pp. 55 and 206 (printed 48 and 199): school summaries; pp. 56 and 207: narrative conditions; p. 9 (printed 2): seismic costs not integrated; p. 19 (printed 12): ROM uncertainty. Appendix C pp. 486-487: January 17, 2025 seismic memo; p. 503: draft Moorlands estimate.
https://www.nsd.org/fs/resource-manager/view/154ed936-2528-4a6b-ac10-de45662e6281

**D5 Resident Projections to 2030 All Grades**
Sheet1!B3:C5, B17:C17, B24:C24: design capacity and acreage; I5, I17, I24: 2028 residents; A51:A54: source notes. Capacity basis is B4; campus acreage is attributed to county tax records in A52.
https://www.nsd.org/fs/resource-manager/view/f659ea1a-b581-42f9-bc7b-a0ccb151e77a

# Source notes and methods

Keep the measures distinct when sharing these findings

**D6 Scenario 2 Close Moorlands and Sunrise**
South: Moorlands closes (every scenario) section. Contains the original-campus acreage narrative, 2028 receiving-school residents and design capacities.
https://www.nsd.org/our-district/who-we-are/enrollment-boundaries/scenario-2

**D7 Northshore enrollment and boundaries FAQ**
Questions on sale of property and Shelton View's temporary location. Reconcile its undecided destination with the November 2 recommendation; do not treat either as a final Board decision.
https://www.nsd.org/our-district/who-we-are/enrollment-boundaries/faq

**D8 2018 City of Kenmore and Moorlands Park Agreement**
PDF pp. 2-4, sections 5 and 7: term, school-hours use, public use and City rights; pp. 24-25, Exhibit F, sections 1.2-1.5: ballfield priority and scheduling. Reviewed posted copy does not establish a fully signed current agreement and every amendment.

**D9 Moorlands Community Presentation Slides November 2 2026**
Community-supplied district deck, 46 pages. PDF pp. 18 and 38: site comparison; p. 19: proposed swing use and no-south-change option. No public district download URL was located in this review; no private sign-in link is cited. File SHA-256 begins 7991b1ecf8edb5a3.

**D10 District process and timeline**
Written-analysis, recommendation and Board-vote milestones. Dates remain subject to district updates.

## C1 Community terrain and recreation method

The November 2 analysis uses the 2021 USGS King County bare-earth elevation source (WA_KingCounty_2021_B21), county parcel geometry and the Kenmore_Aerial_2026 imagery service. A 4-foot grid in EPSG:2926 measures cumulative slope below 5%, 10% and 15%. The broader Arrowhead reservation unions visible recreation with modeled lawn, courts and covered play, totaling 2.1682 acres. Only its overlap with each slope class is deducted. Moorlands includes district parcels and excludes the city park.

Working table *comparison_results.csv*, scenario *broader recreation reservation*, grid_ft = 4, thresholds 5 and 15, is the basis for page 2. The 8-foot sensitivity case gives 4.22 / 4.30 acres below 5% and 7.40 / 6.62 below 15% (Arrowhead / Moorlands). These differences reinforce that hundredths of an acre are not survey precision.

Existing roofs and circulation remain in the headline screen. Traced recreation is a modeling choice, not a verified legal minimum. Trees, setbacks, wetlands, soils, access, drainage, construction phasing and building design require further review. The screen neither proves Arrowhead infeasible nor certifies a Moorlands rebuild.

Public input services: USGS 3DEP elevation | Kenmore aerial imagery | King County parcel geometry. Retained inputs, polygons and calculations support revision and independent review.