mahlum

LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT | MERCER ISLAND, WASHINGTON 16 SEPTEMBER 2020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARTICIPANTSii

01. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1

Introduction & Process

Vision & Educational Program

Existing Conditions

Capacity & Enrollment

Plan Development

02. VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM......9

District Vision

Long-Range Planning Goals

Educational Programs

Designing for Student-Centered Excellence

03. EXISTING CONDITIONS23

Existing Facilities

Facility Age

Facility Condition Assessment

Safety & Security

Educational Adequacy

Recent Capital Expenditures

04. CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT......35

District Capacity

Enrollment Forecasting

Accommodating Enrollment

05. PLAN DEVELOPMENT 42

Process Overview

Project Identification & Approach

Plan Development

Plan Prioritization

Preferred Plan Scenario

APPENDICES

A. VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

FPC 1 Meeting Minutes & Presentation

Issue Paper 1: Vision & Educational Programs

Updated FPC Planning Goals & Reconfirmation Analysis

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS, CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

FPC 2 Meeting Minutes & Presentation

Issue Paper 2: Capacity & Enrollment

Issue Paper 3: Existing Facility Condition

Enrollment Forecast (*MISD Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December* 2019)

Building Condition Assessment - Partial (MISD Study and Survey Update Executive Summary, BLRB, September 2018)

C. PLAN DEVELOPMENT

FPC 3 Meeting Minutes, Exercise Results & Presentation

FPC 4 Meeting Minutes, Exercise Results & Presentation

FPC 5 Meeting Minutes & Presentation

D. OUTREACH

Student Outreach Meeting Minutes Community Outreach Meeting Minutes

,

District Staff Outreach Meeting Minutes

Outreach Presentation

PARTICIPANTS

MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

District Leadership Team

Erin Battersby, Executive Director, Legal Affairs, Compliance & Human Resources

Ty Bergstrom, Executive Director of Finance / Chief Financial Officer

Donna Colosky, Superintendent

Craig Degginger, Communications & Alumni Relations Coordinator

Brandy Fox, Owner's Representative, Construction Planning & Management

Tony Kuhn, Director of Maintenance & Operations

Andreeves Ronser, Director of Information Technology

Fred Rundle, Assistant Superintendent of Learning Services

Facility Planning Committee

Will Atkinson, MIHS Student

Colin Brandt, Current Parent (Island Park ES / IMS)

Julie Ogata Ciobanu, Site Council / PTA (MIHS)

Vickie Cleator, Current Parent (MIHS)

Susan Conrad-Wang, Mercer Island Preschool Association

Dave Cutright, Current Parent (West Mercer ES)

David D'Souza, School Board

Steve Duncan, Site Council / PTA (Lakeridge ES)

Tiffin Goodman, Mercer Island Planning Commission

Carol Gregory, PTA (Islander MS)



The planning team would like to thank everyone who gave their time, energy, and ideas to develop this Long-Range Facility Plan.

The contributions of many diverse individuals from across the community, including District leadership, teachers, staff, students, parents, business owners, and other community members, helped create a plan that reflects the needs and aspirations of the Mercer Island School District and its community.

Debbie Hanson, Past Parent

Lin Hao, Schools Foundation (previous)

Lena Hardisty, MIHS Student

Janelle Honeycutt, Site Council / PTA (IMS)

Zach Houvener, Mercer Island Parks & Recreation

Anne Hritzay, Past Parent

Kate Wise Knecht, Current Parent (Lakeridge ES)

Sandra Levin, Mercer Island Chamber of Commerce

Robin Li, Current Parent (West Mercer ES)

Deborah Lurie, School Board

Kristina Mehas, Site Council / PTA (Island Park ES)

Kathy Morrison, Resident / Retired Educator

Bob Olson, Past Parent

Sgt. Ryan Parr, MIPD

Gus Poole, Sports Community

Carrie Beckner Savage, Current Parent (Island Park ES / Lakeridge ES)

Becky Shaddle, Boys' and Girls' Club PEAK

Jim Stanton, Past Parent

Amanda Stoffer, Site Council / PTA (Northwood ES)

Kim Thomas, Site Council / PTA (West Mercer ES)

Pat Turner, Rotary Club / Resident / Retired Educator

David de Yarza, Current Parent (MIHS)

Board of Directors

Deborah Lurie, President

Maggie Tai Tucker, Vice President

Brian Giannini Upton, Legislative Representative

Tam Dinh

David D'Souza

OUTREACH PARTICIPANTS

Teachers & Staff

Dave Bentley, Music Teacher (IMS/MIHS)

Parker Bixby, Music Teacher (MIHS)

Kristina Getty, First Grade Teacher (Lakeridge)

Brian Lawrence, Music Teacher (IMS/MIHS)

Katie McConn, English Teacher (MIHS)

Alida Mendes, CCR Teacher (MIHS)

Jessica Olson, Second Grade Teacher (Lakeridge)

John Parker, Theater Tech Specialist (MIHS)

Annalise Rockow, Music Teacher (IMS/MIHS)

Trina Sherman, Second Grade Teacher (Northwood)

Kyle Thompson, Music Teacher (IMS/ MIHS)

Chantel Torrey, Art Teacher (MIHS)

Students

Alex Rosenbaum, MIHS Student Finn Ernsdorff, MIHS Student Norah Evans, MIHS Student Meghana Kakubal, MIHS Student Tristan Moore, MIHS Student Paul Noone, MIHS Student Thomas Short, MIHS Student Miles Silverman, MIHS Student Alexandra Van Blerkom, MIHS Student Evan Wallin, MIHS Student Joyce Zhang, MIHS Student Winston Zhang, MIHS Student

Community Members

Marie Bender, Mercer Island Resident Bill Hochberg, Mercer Island Resident Patrick Jordan, MISD Parent Leslie McKelvie. MISD Parent David Myerson, Mercer Island Resident Lucia Pirzio-Biroli, Planning Commission Suzanne Skone, Chamber of Commerce Ren Yuthok, Mercer Island Resident Tsering Yuthok Short, MISD Parent

MAHLUM ARCHITECTS

David Mount, Partner-in-Charge JoAnn Wilcox Hindmarsh, Principal-in-Charge LeRoy Landers, Planning Principal Jennifer Lubin, Senior Planner Marijana Misic, Technical Support



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION & PROCESS

PURPOSE

In the summer of 2019, Mercer Island School District (the District) undertook an effort to develop a Long-Range Facility Plan. Mahlum was selected to facilitate this process and assist with preparation of the plan.

The primary purpose of the Long-Range Facility Plan is to evaluate the adequacy of existing educational facilities within the context of current educational objectives, set the stage to plan for future capital improvements for those facilities as needed, and address how student population will be accommodated over the next 10 years and beyond.

The Plan provides a strategic framework for management of the District's facilities over time, such that they continually support the ongoing success of District students, staff, and community.

The Long-Range Facility Plan results from a synthesis of three primary

considerations: educational program (evaluating the adequacy of existing educational facilities within the context of current educational objectives), enrollment and capacity (understanding how student populations will be accommodated over the next 10 to 20 years), and facility condition (considering deferred maintenance, modernization, and replacement of existing buildings and sites). Plan proposals that address these primary considerations are guided by a strategic vision established by the District and informed by input from the broader District community.

PROCESS

A District Leadership Team (DLT) was assembled to provide input during the planning process and participate with a Facility Planning Committee (FPC) to develop recommendations for plan options. The DLT was comprised of key District leadership, including representation in the areas of administration, finance, curriculum, communications, facilities management, and technology. The FPC was assembled to assist with plan development. The Committee included participation by parents from various schools and neighborhoods, School Board members, community and business leaders, representatives from local regulatory agencies, and student representatives.

The Committee met with the planning team five times over the course of the planning process. These three-hour meetings covered the following topics:

- > Vision & Educational Program (Meeting 1)
- Capacity & Enrollment / Existing Conditions (Meeting 2)
- > Plan Development (Meetings 3-5)

In addition, input related to District goals and needs was gathered from teachers and staff, students, and the broader community, which informed the development of the plan. Periodic updates were presented to the Board of Directors during Board meetings throughout the planning process.

SECTION 01 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Due to the unforeseen constraints of the pandemic that developed towards the end of this process, in the Spring of 2020, the second round of staff, student, and wider community engagement was postponed, as was the final FPC meeting to review the community's feedback and finalize the plan.

It was determined by the District that the best course of action was to complete the planning process and document the Long-Range Facility Plan that was developed by the FPC with strong consensus. The District plans to gather community input at a later date when inperson meetings are again possible.

This document represents the collaborative effort of the District Leadership Team, Facility Planning Committee, Board of Directors, and the broader Island community.

VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

DISTRICT VISION, VALUES & MISSION

The Board of Directors has approved new Policy 0001 that sets the District's direction by defining its core values, vision, and mission. The new values, vision, and mission statements center the District's work on students as the priority and educating the whole child.

The Student-Focused Fundamentals, also developed by the Board, sustain accountability of these goals through an annual monitoring and measuring process.

Values

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- > Supporting the whole child.
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings.
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive.
- Providing rigorous and challenging learning.

Vision

Inspiring our students to be lifelong learners as they create their futures.

Mission

The District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively.

For more information regarding the District's values, vision, and mission, refer to Section 02: Vision & Educational Program.

PLANNING GOALS

In addition to the District's vision for educational programs, the planning team worked with the FPC to identify a set of goals specifically associated with the Long-Range Facility Plan. These goals were organized into topical categories by the planning team and prioritized by the FPC, via a voting process, to better understand which objectives were deemed most critical.

After gaining a deeper understanding of District need and reviewing the additional goals developed by teachers, students, and the community during outreach sessions, the Committee confirmed and reprioritized the planning goals.

The most highly prioritized goals across all categories include:

 Provide built-in, flexible and adaptable spaces



- Provide more opportunities for occupational learning
- Provide visible sustainability (and explain why)
- > Improve traffic impact around schools
- Provide next generation project-based learning labs for science
- Create spaces that students are excited to be in
- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools
- > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school
- > Provide support spaces for teachers
- > Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields
- Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season)
- Create adaptable environments that accommodate future technology needs

Traffic and safety around the schools was a concern for the Committee. The District is committed to partnering with the City of Mercer Island to ensure any future school designs facilitate safe bicycle and pedestrian access to and through school sites and connections with City improvements off-site.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

To further inform the planning process, District representatives identified need related to specific educational programs, with a focus on those needs having physical space implications that may impact the Long-Range Facility Plan.

It was recognized that all needs may not be addressed in the first phase of the Long-Range Facility Plan, therefore, those items remaining should be "kept on the radar" for future phases of work.

Educational program goals were defined for each grade level grouping:

Elementary School

- > Improve/expand special education spaces
- Improve multipurpose space by adding a gymnasium or cafeteria
- > Add shared learning areas outside of classrooms

Middle School

- > Improve/connect special education spaces
- Complete replacement project to create equitable learning spaces

High School

- Improve/increase capacity of alternative education space (Crest Learning Center)
- Provide a variety of specialized spaces to expand the College & Career Readiness (CCR) program
- > Improve older high school science labs
- Improve/expand PE and athletics spaces to provide equity and teaching space
- > Improve/expand performing arts areas
- > Improve general education spaces
- > Improve shared support areas

Support / Other Programs

- Relocate the Adult Transition Program out of Crest Learning Center
- > Modernize library/multimedia centers
- > Provide space for technology
- > Provide space for professional learning

A complete list of the planning goals that were developed, as well as further information about the District's educational goals, can be found in Section 02: Vision & Educational Program.

SECTION 01 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHART:

Facility Assessment Comparison



EXISTING CONDITIONS

Mercer Island School District's educational and support facilities vary in age, condition, and level of educational adequacy. Information about the physical condition of existing District facilities provides a metric for evaluating one component of District need.

There are currently seven school facilities in the District, including four elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and an alternative high school. District support facilities include Mary Wayte Pool, the Administration Building, and two maintenance/transportation buildings.

The Boys and Girls Club PEAK facility is a joint-use facility that is owned by the Boys and Girls Club and situated on District-owned property. Private and charter schools on the Island are not included in this Long-Range Facility Plan. Due to the scarcity of available property on the Island, the District does not own any undeveloped sites that are in reserve for future use.

FACILITY CONDITION ASSESSMENT

A facility assessment of all District educational facilities was completed in 2018 by a separate consultant. A chart summarizing assessment scores is shown above. Recently constructed facilities, including Northwood Elementary School and the new Islander Middle School building, scored over 95 percent, indicating that they are in excellent condition.

All other District facilities, which are older, still had relatively high assessment scores, all between 71 and 85 percent. West Mercer Elementary School and Mercer Island High School fall into the "good" condition category and all other facilities are in the "fair" condition category. This is likely due to substantial renovation of these facilities completed during the mid-nineties, and because they have been well maintained by the District. None of the facility assessment scores indicate a need to replace a school facility solely based on its condition.

SAFETY & SECURITY

Specific elements that impact safety in the District were also evaluated, including seismic condition, security, water and air quality, and transportation.

The seismic evaluation indicates that collapse is not anticipated at any District facility, however significant damage, that may not be repairable, should be expected at the older facilities. Security measures, such as secure entrances and cameras, have been implemented across the District. Water and air quality testing has been done and is ongoing, and there are no issues related to this at any District school facilities.

Safe transportation routes for pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, and buses is a necessity for the District, including access to, from, and between school facilities, as well as pick-up, drop-off, service access, sidewalks, bicycle storage, and parking areas. Transportation conditions vary at each school. Elements that are within District property boundaries, such as parking and drop-off areas, are incorporated into the Long-Range Facility Plan and can be addressed by the District. Larger systemic issues, such as connections between schools and neighborhoods, require coordination with other jurisdictional entities on the Island and are not under District control.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Educational adequacy addresses the following question:

How well does the facility create a successful environment for learning, inspiring, and building community?

Although educational adequacy can be difficult to quantify, a 2010 Study and Survey of District facilities evaluated

SECTION 01 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHART:

Existing District Capacity & Projected 2029 Enrollment (Middle Range)



this facility-related consideration in a number of different areas, including building configuration and environmental components, such as natural light and ease of wayfinding.

The Long-Range Facility Plan process updated and expanded this information through building tours, Principal interviews, and outreach meetings with teachers, staff, and students who use the buildings every day. In addition, the area per student was evaluated for all existing school facilities in the District, as another metric for educational adequacy.

Detailed information relating to facility condition assessment, safety and security, and educational adequacy is included in Section 03: Existing Conditions.

CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

Mercer Island School District currently serves over 4,300 students in kindergarten through 12th grade. The success of the District's educational programs is fostered in part by the ability of each school to house the students, teachers, and spaces needed for effective teaching and learning.

EXISTING CAPACITY

Each school facility has an established capacity, based on the number of

teaching stations in the building, a target number of students per classroom, and a scheduling utilization factor.

Using an agreed upon methodology for establishing capacity at each grade level, the planning team determined that Mercer Island School District has a total permanent capacity of 4,743 seats, including 1,798 at the elementary level, 1,314 at the middle school level, and 1,631at the high school level, including the Crest Learning Center.

ENROLLMENT FORECASTING

Enrollment forecasts are used, in part, to determine whether a school district will need to add or modify facility space to meet educational program or configuration needs. The District received updated student enrollment projections, prepared by Educational Data Solutions LLC, in December 2019. The 10-year enrollment forecast integrates District enrollment trends with local area population, enrollment, and housing trends.

District enrollment projections for the next 10 years indicate an overall increase in student enrollment at the elementary level, and relatively flat enrollment at the middle and high school levels. As shown in the chart above, it is anticipated that District enrollment will flatten out and even decline somewhat between 2020 and 2025, with enrollment growing again in the latter part of the forecast period (2025 to 2030), when more development activity and population growth is expected.

The current District enrollment is 4,387 students. Over the next ten years, total District enrollment is projected to increase by approximately 133 students, resulting in a total of 4,520 total students by 2029-30. This is an overall increase of approximately three percent districtwide.

ACCOMMODATING ENROLLMENT

The chart above compares existing capacity and projected enrollment for each school in the District. This comparison assumes current school boundaries, programs, and conditions.

Based on this analysis, all of the District's school facilities have enough existing capacity to accommodate projected enrollments through 2029-30, including both existing permanent and existing portable capacity. At the high school level, projected enrollment can be accommodated at both the MIHS and Crest Learning Center facilities, which together accommodate 1,631 students.

Additional capacity and enrollment information is included in Section 04: Capacity & Enrollment.



FPC Planning Exercise

LRFP GUIDING PRINCIPLES

APPROACH

- Elementary Schools: replace or fully modernize, depending on cost implications
- > Middle School: replace remaining buildings rather than fully modernize
- > High School: implement renovation/ limited modernization with an emphasis on educational adequacy/ program need
- > Crest: relocate and expand in a new location that is closer to the high school (and consider co-location with administration or other programs)
- Implement needed repairs as necessary at all facilities, to maintain operations

PRIORITIZATION

- > Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
- > Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects; prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer and then Lakeridge
- > Islander Middle School should be one of the first three projects
- The first projects at the high school level include CCR, Shared Support, and Crest/ Administration
- Prioritize improvement projects that have the primary purpose of supporting education

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

The FPC engaged in three planningfocused meetings, to develop and refine the Long-Range Facility Plan. In addition, outreach sessions were held during the planning process and garnered specific input related to District need. Feedback from District teachers and staff, students, and the broader Island community informed the work of the Committee and the development of the Plan.

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION & APPROACH

After establishing planning goals, and gaining an understanding of the District's vision, educational program, existing facility conditions, and projected enrollment growth, the Committee identified potential projects to address District need. Through a series of exercises, members developed a preferred approach to address the need at each identified facility, balancing District need and anticipated community support. Approaches that were considered for each facility included: no work, renovation, major modernization (upgrade to 50-year building), educational adequacy improvements, additions, and full replacement with a new facility.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee input regarding planning goals and approaches was used to develop a list of major projects that address District need. The projects include replacement of the three older elementary schools (Island Park, West Mercer, and Lakeridge), the older middle school buildings (100/200 and 300 Buildings), and Crest Learning Center, as well as a number of program-related improvement projects at the high school. Support facilities that were determined to need replacement at some point in the future were the administration building and Mary Wayte Pool.

Using this set of projects as a base, Committee groups developed two rounds of plan scenarios. The projects were organized along a priority timeline by each group, The second round scenarios, were used as the basis for moving forward in the planning process.

PLAN PRIORITIZATION

Consolidation of plan approaches was used as means to streamline the prioritization process and identify a preferred plan approach. Three strategies were explored In order to facilitate consolidation of the five Committee plan proposals:

- > Focus on major projects
- > Combine high school level projects
- > Adjust location of "outliers"

Guiding Principles

The Long-Range Facility Plan guiding principles are a set of basic tenets which evolved out of the Facility Planning Committee's plan proposals. They can be used to inform and guide subsequent planning discussions. The guiding principles, shown above, are separated into two categories, those that relate to the Committee's overall "approach" to projects and those that relate to the "prioritization" of projects.

As plan development progressed, the Committee focused on five plan alternatives. An additional approach (IP-2) was added to the five scenarios, to align with the first guiding principle: "Do something at every grade level as soon as you can" and include all possible priority orders for the first three projects.

With the addition of this option, the six scenarios fall into three basic groups (shown opposite): those that prioritized replacement of Island Park Elementary School first (IP-1 and IP-2), those that prioritized completion of Islander Middle

DIAGRAM:

Long-Range Facility Plan Scenarios



School first (MS-1 and MS-2), and those that prioritized MIHS projects and Crest first (HS-1 and HS-2).

Committee members were asked which sequence of projects they most supported, considering the following criteria:

- > Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?)
- > Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?)
- > Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
- > Committee goals (Which project best aligns with the top planning goals?)
- > Community support (Which projects will make sense and resonate with the broader community?)

The MS-2 planning scenario had the most Committee support, with 73% of the votes. (85% supported doing the middle school first, including votes for both MS-1 and MS-2.)

PREFERRED PLAN SCENARIO

The Long-Range Facility Plan scenario, illustrated in the above diagram and described on the following page, represents the preferred approach with regard to the prioritization of District need over the next ten years and beyond. It is the culmination of an in-depth planning process conducted by the Mercer Island School District, Board of Directors, FPC, and the broader Island community.

The MS-2 plan scenario selected by the FPC prioritizes Islander Middle School first, replacement of Island Park Elementary School second, and Mercer Island High School / Crest Learning Center projects third. These projects are followed by West Mercer, Lakeridge, the remaining high school projects, and finally Mary Wayte Pool. A detailed description of the preferred plan scenario is included on the following page, and additional information about the planning process and results is included in Section 05: Plan Development.

It is important to note that while the preferred plan scenario identified the order of projects, and broadly outlines their potential scope, the specific timing of each project and how they may be grouped together in phases has not been determined as part of this Long-Range Facility Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the second round of community outreach meetings were not held or incorporated into the Long-Range Facility Plan process. When the District and the community are ready to move forward with large-scale construction, outreach will be made to update the plan as needed, as well as to gather feedback about the LRFP recommendations. This effort will provide additional input on proposed Long-Range Facility Plan scenarios, particularly with regard to confirmation of the first three projects.

It is anticipated that the District, School Board, and community will reconfirm the Long-Range Facility Plan prior to moving forward with any future capital measure. At that time, further development of project scope and cost will be completed. One or more projects may be planned in the same phase, depending on level of community support and funding parameters.

LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN: PREFERRED PLAN SCENARIO

PROJECT 1: ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL PHASE II

Replacement of the remaining older middle school buildings (100/200 and 300) to complete the middle school facility.

- > 1,300 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 2: ISLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of the existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 3: MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL (VARIOUS PROJECTS) & CREST LEARNING CENTER

Addition and/or improvement projects that may include:

College & Career Readiness (CCR)

- > New hands-on (STEM/ maker space / life skills) lab(s) and support
- > Robotics lab expansion
- > Broadcast studio expansion
- > Art room expansion
- > New journalism classroom
- > Other specialized learning areas

Science

> Improvements to older existing science labs with the goal of equivalency to newer science labs

Performing Arts

- > Theater upgrade and/or expansion
- New dedicated teaching space for drama, dance, and performance (black box theater)

PE / Athletics

- Expansion to create equitable practice space, locker rooms, and team rooms
- > Dedicated PE classroom
- > Gymnasium improvements
- > Field improvements

General Education

- > Improvements to existing general classrooms
- > Technology and aesthetic upgrades
- > Shared learning / study areas
- Increase flexibility and opportunities for collaboration

Shared / Support Areas > Library modernization

- > Counseling improvements
- > Teacher offices / support
- > New gender-inclusive restrooms
- > Parking improvements

Crest Learning Center

- > Replacement of existing Crest facility
- > 200 student capacity (150% of existing size)
- > Add a second large greenhouse

PROJECT 4: WEST MERCER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 5: LAKERIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 6: MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL: VARIOUS PROJECTS

Remainder of Mercer Island High School projects that were not previously completed in Project 3.

PROJECT 7: MARY WAYTE POOL

Replacement of the existing Mary Wayte Pool facility.



SECTION 02 VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

DISTRICT VISION

The Board of Directors has approved new Policy 0001 that sets the District's direction by defining its core values, vision, and mission. The new values, vision, and mission statements center the District's work on students as the priority and educating the whole child. The Student-Focused Fundamentals, also developed by the Board, sustain accountability of these goals through an annual monitoring and measuring process.

VALUES

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- > Supporting the whole child.
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings.
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive.
- Providing rigorous and challenging learning.

VISION

Inspiring our students to be lifelong learners as they create their futures.

MISSION

The District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively.

OPERATIONAL EXPECTATION 1800 OE-1: STUDENT-FOCUSED FUNDAMENTALS

In accordance with the values, vision, and mission stated in Board Policy 0001, the District will strive to achieve the following fundamentals, goals, and objectives:

- > Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, student-centered education, and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.
- Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical education; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science and educational technology.

- > Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decision-making and citizenship.
- > Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risktakers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.
- > Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, crossdiscipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- > Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.



LONG-RANGE PLANNING GOALS

COMMITTEE GOALS

The Facility Planning Committee developed a prioritized list of goals during a visioning session at the start of the planning process. These goals were later reprioritized with a second round of voting, allowing committee members to incorporate knowledge that had been gained regarding District need, as well as teacher, student, and community input.

All FPC goals are listed below and on the following page, in the reprioritized order determined by the Committee, along with the number of votes received. Goals have been organized into themes by the planning team. The top planning goals from the reprioritization are summarized on the opposite page for easy reference, however all of the goals have be used to inform the long-range planning process.

Flexibility & Adaptability of Spaces [12 votes]

- > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces [10 votes]
- > Rethink libraries [2 votes]
- > Reduce physical boundaries
- > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim

- > Consider if lockers are needed at the high school
- > Repurpose old computer labs

Safety [10 votes]

- > Improve traffic impact around schools [4 votes]
- > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school [3 votes]
- > Reconfigure sites for more functional use and safer traffic [2 votes]
- > Locate all students under one roof [1 vote]
- Create an environment where students, teachers, and staff feel safe but not under threat
- > Improve pedestrian safety / crosswalks
- Provide contextualized safety and security
- Provide more welcoming exterior and interior lighting (for health / wellness and safety)
- > Disguise safety features
- > Consider safety with regard to both exterior and interior threats
- > Provide structurally sound schools

Occupational Learning [8 votes]

- > More opportunities for occupational learning [8 votes]
- > Integrate occupational learning / pathways

- Provide equity and a common experience for students across all schools
- > Develop more CCR (CTE) programs on campus
- > Provide visual access to engineering, science, and CCR programs

Sustainability [8 votes]

- > Provide visible sustainability (explain why) [7 votes]
- > Address heating, cooling, and sound control in existing buildings [1 vote]
- > Provide visible solar strategies
- > Reduce the carbon footprint of facilities
- Consider future transportation access options (including new light rail)

Program [7 votes]

- > Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science [4 votes]
- > Dedicate space for art [2 votes]
- > Provide more, and well-distributed, unisex bathrooms [1 vote]
- > Provide spaces that stimulate creativity
- Provide surfaces to display art and express community identity
- > Provide speech therapist, psychologist, and other similar support spaces
- Consider a second silent library to provide quiet study space



> Provide more accessible mental health space at the high school

Character & Feel [6 votes]

- > Create spaces that students are excited to be in [4 votes]
- > Prioritize aesthetics and beauty in the design of facilities [1 vote]
- > Provide ergonomic seating [1 vote]
- > Prevent noise cross-contamination
- > Accommodate standing in classrooms
- > Foster appreciation of place
- Provide age-appropriate environments in school facilities
- > Provide natural lighting
- > Consider appropriate use of color and use non-institutional colors

Diversity of Space to Support Learning [5 votes]

- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools [4 votes]
- > Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school [1 vote]
- > Support the whole student
- Accommodate different learners (not only special needs)
- > Purpose-build spaces and limit multipurpose space
- > Provide more small, private work spaces

Teacher Support [4 votes]

- > Provide support spaces for teachers [3 votes]
- > Improve space design to help teacher retention [1 vote]
- > Prioritize the needs of teachers and support staff
- > Provide small collaborative spaces for teachers
- > Provide for teacher adaptability in learning spaces
- Provide flexibility for teachers to adjust lighting

PE / Athletics [3 votes]

- > Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields [3 votes]
- > Provide for safe and controllable community use
- > Add more gymnasium space

Outdoor Space [3 votes]

- > Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) [3 votes]
- Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active / passive; play / learning)
- > Develop more covered outdoor areas
- > Provide connections to usable outdoor space
- > Maintain separation of grades at recess

TOP PLANNING GOALS

Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces

Provide more opportunities for occupational learning

Provide visible sustainability (and explain why)

Improve traffic impact around schools

Provide next generation project-based learning labs for science

Create spaces that students are excited to be in

Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools

Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school

Provide support spaces for teachers

Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields

Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season)

Create adaptable environments that accommodate future technology needs

Technology [3 votes]

- > Create adaptable environments that can accommodate future technology needs [3 votes]
- > Distribute student technology (quiet spaces)
- > Plan for future technology changes
- Dedicate space for mobile technology (storage and charging)
- > Be mindful of technology impacts on quiet spaces

Learning for All [3 votes]

- > Provide a highly-capable program at every school [2 votes]
- > Cross-pollinate spaces and programs to reduce stigma [1 vote]
- > Reduce segregation of the highly capable program
- Create opportunities to see learning happening (transparency)
- > Help foster well-rounded kids
- Provide diverse program options in all schools
- > Provide a high-needs program at every school
- > Locate the Adult Transition Program in the community, rather than in a school

Food, Dining, & Social Areas [3 votes]

- > Recognize that the cafeteria is a place for social / emotional learning; and consider noise impact [2 votes]
- > Replace lockers with social nodes for students [1 vote]
- > Improve common assembly space
- > Provide snack stations around school
- > Explore options around food delivery

TEACHER & STAFF GOALS

The following goals were developed from MISD staff member comments during an outreach session held on January 22nd, 2020, and additional emailed comments from teachers and staff. These goals were used to inform the planning process.

MIHS: General Classrooms

> Bring all high school classrooms up to the standard of recent additions

- > Improve classrooms to be more flexible and better accommodate collaboration
- > Provide a technological and aesthetic remodel for older classrooms (lighting, furniture, windows and coverings, etc.)
- > Provide consistent technology between classrooms to facilitate shared use
- > Provide rooms and furniture designed specifically for blocks and co-teaching that can hold large groups of students
- > Provide spaces for student interaction that are close to classrooms

MIHS: College & Career Readiness

- > Provide specialized spaces that meet the needs of specialized programs, including adequate power and storage, and enough space to create a safe environment
- > Increase the size of the art rooms
- > Increase the size of the robotics / CCR classroom and lab
- Provide a dedicated journalism classroom with editing/layout area and equipment storage

MIHS: Theater & Music

- > Re-imagine the Performing Arts Center: increase capacity (800-850 seats), increase stage (110 seated performers), optimize sight lines, improve functionality and flow, provide modern stagecraft technology, and improve acoustics
- Provide a dedicated teaching space for drama classes that is separate from theater (black box)
- Provide teaching space for the dance program (shared use of drama classroom or black box)
- > Consider versatility of spaces for performances (large and small venues)

MIHS: Teacher Support

- > Provide space for teacher collaboration
- > Provide adequately-sized teacher offices
- > Reconfigure teacher offices to have a stronger connection to the classrooms

MIHS: Other

- > Add a dedicated classroom space in the PE / gymnasium area
- Provide larger locker rooms and support (team rooms, teacher offices)
- Replace small greenhouse at Crest with a professional automated greenhouse
- > Address temperature regulation
- > Improve cell reception (safety issue)

Islander Middle School

- > Provide a dedicated drama space for teaching and performances at the middle school
- > Add three voice booths for voice recording

Elementary Schools: Classrooms

- Provide larger elementary classrooms, to allow supervision of collaboration and pull-out activities
- Provide collaboration space within the classrooms
- Reconfigure older elementary schools to create classroom clusters (similar to Northwood)
- > Provide dedicated visual arts classrooms at the elementary schools

Elementary Schools: Other Areas

- Provide more space and intentionality (function and distribution) for special education services
- Provide dedicated spaces for statemandated individualized testing and professional coaches
- > Provide distributed deescalation spaces that can be supervised
- > Provide calming spaces for students
- Improve privacy for administration and counselor areas
- Provide dedicated restrooms for kindergarten and first grade classrooms
- > Provide sightline supervision of bathrooms
- > Address cleanability of surfaces and materials at the elementary schools

Districtwide

- Provide facility upgrades at older schools (technology and aesthetics)
- > Implement "22nd century" updates throughout the District
- > Improve indoor air quality and provide healthy environments
- Provide classrooms sized to accommodate project-based learning
- > Provide acoustical treatment for all music spaces throughout the District
- Relocate the Adult Transition Program out of the Crest facility

STUDENT GOALS

The following goals were developed from MIHS student comments during an outreach session on January 15th, 2020. These goals will be used to inform the planning process. (Goals refer to MIHS unless otherwise noted.)

Program

- Provide hands-on shop space at the high school (for robotics and other skill-building programs)
- Locate the radio program classroom adjacent to the radio station studio
- > Allow for more cross-pollination of programs at the high school (especially special education)
- > Provide dedicated space for the highly capable program
- > Expand hands-on opportunities at the middle and elementary school levels
- > Provide more spaces for students to work on online classes other than in the Crest commons

Collaborative / Shared Spaces

- > Provide shared spaces throughout the school to accommodate student collaboration
- Provide spaces for socializing and studying
- > Provide bench seating in the hallways throughout the school
- > Extend school library hours to be open after school

Building Environment

- > Provide more windows and skylights to bring in natural light
- > Improve heating system to provide consistent heating across the facility
- > Improve acoustics in the band room and the auditorium
- Renovate the Crest facility (classrooms are not to the same standard as other classrooms)

Building Services

- Develop a more streamlined system for the lunch line (faster, more space)
- > Provide more food options on or close to campus (not the lunch line)
- > Provide more gender-neutral bathrooms distributed throughout the school
- > Renovate the 100/200 hall bathrooms to be more like the 300 hall bathrooms
- Fix bathroom stall doors to minimize gaps

Parking & Site

- > Rethink parking lots and sidewalks to make them safer for students
- Provide more parking for students at the high school
- Improve the configuration of existing student parking lot (add a second exit)
- > Provide a paved walkway to the front door of Crest

Other Facilities

- > At Crest, provide more spaces for students to work on online classes other than in the commons
- > Provide more garden space at the elementary schools
- > Decrease reliance on portable classrooms at the elementary schools
- > Replace Mary Wayte Pool

COMMUNITY GOALS

The following goals were developed from community member comments during an outreach session held on January 15th, 2020, and additional emailed comments from community members. These goals were used to inform the planning process.

Program

- > Provide robotics facilities that meet short-term and long-term program goals
- > Expand curriculum for engineering and S.T.E.M. at all levels in the District
- > Provide more unprogrammed "messy" space, including maker space and tools
- Promote student-led curriculum programs
- Provide space to acquire life skills at school (cooking, financial planning, etc.)
- > Create facilities that help kids learn more, make things, and compete
- Evaluate if recently-built classrooms are appropriately sized

Flexibility & Adaptability

- > Look to the future and prepare to respond to changes that are still unknown
- > Plan for changes in technology

Facilities

- > Put sustainability at the forefront of development plans (for example, roofs should be constructed with solar panels or be solar panel ready and no fossil fuel infrastructure)
- > Consider acoustical performance
- Encourage biking rather than driving to school (and provide infrastructure)
- > Replace Mary Wayte Pool

Community Use

- > Balance community use space across the Island
- > Schools should be seen in the context of the neighborhood (fit and beauty)

Connections & Process

- Consider District and City synergies: integration opportunities and community priorities
- Consider the District and City as one (City manages facilities / District manages education)
- > Connect to Island planning initiatives
- Recognize that financial affordability is paramount for the long-range plan



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The following information summarizes District educational programs that could require and/or benefit from modification of existing facilities within the 10-year time frame of the long-range facility plan. Not all of the District's educational programs are included. Of those shown, it is yet to be determined what, if any, changes may be made. Some programs were determined to not require action as part of the Long-Range Facility Plan, and are included for informational purposes only.

ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

The District currently serves students with identified disabilities using a continuum of special education services. This spectrum of supports is distributed across the schools. Elementary facilities serving students with higher needs exist at Northwood and Island Park Elementary, with Island Park serving as the centrally located site for students needing more intensive behavioral and emotional interventions. All existing elementary schools also have a dedicated resource classroom, however the functionality of these spaces could be significantly improved in the three older elementary schools.

10-Year Program Approach

Facilities serving students with high needs for support will remain at Northwood and Island Park. The current and long-term vision is to embrace an inclusion model in all schools and encourage access to the general education setting rather than creating dedicated "special education" learning spaces or classrooms.

This approach, commonly referred to as the "push in" model, provides services in general education environments rather than pulling students out of their regular education program. Northwood's model, with a dedicated resource room and many services moving into shared learning areas or classrooms, illustrates a configuration that serves students in this way.

While other support functions, such as sensory rooms, are currently provided in existing schools, the District may consider a redistribution of these functions throughout school buildings (rather than consolidated), thereby facilitating rapid and natural access for students and staff. The District's overall goal is to continue working toward an inclusive and equitable learning environment for all students.

Program Requirements

For schools being considered for modernization, existing special education resource rooms, classrooms, and support facilities should be assessed against target program areas established by the latest elementary education specification. Northwood Elementary represents the latest program of educational space developed for MISD Special Services. This area, including one classroom, one resource room, one occupational / physical therapy room, and associated support areas, requires approximately 1,600 net square feet.

MULTIPURPOSE SPACE

Existing Conditions

Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer elementary schools currently have a "multipurpose" space that serves as the auditorium, cafeteria, and physical education (PE) program space. This functional configuration must accommodate two lunch periods, with associated set-up and clean-up time.

Daily use of the multipurpose space for both PE and lunch is less than optimal from the standpoint of scheduling conflict. This conflict extends to kitchen / food service operations, with food serving carts at one elementary being stored outside while PE classes are being



taught. The configuration of the Island Park multipurpose space also requires that students exit the main building in order to access the space, which is less than desirable from a safety / supervision standpoint.

The District provides community access to all school gymnasiums and multipurpose rooms outside of school use hours, and plans to continue to do so. The high school, middle school, and Northwood Elementary School gymnasiums are generally used by the community until 10:00 pm each weeknight and on weekends. A number of requests are not able to be accommodated due to demand. Additional gymnasiums would also be an asset that could be utilized by the community during non-school hours.

10-Year Program Approach

The District's latest elementary education specification provides for separate food service and gymnasium (PE) functions. Ideally, all elementary schools would align with programmatic spaces identified in this District document. This could be accommodated by adding a physical education space or a cafeteria / dining space to existing schools, or could be added during the future replacement of an existing school. However, the age of the District's three older elementary schools (between 56 and 66 years old) should also be considered when determining if adding new permanent square footage is the best option.

Program Requirements

Ideally, all elementary schools would have a dedicated elementary-sized gymnasium and a separate cafeteria / dining area that could seat 250 students.

The area required for an elementarysized gymnasium can range from approximately 3,400 to 5,500 net square feet, and may also need to include associated support areas such as office, storage, and restrooms. The District's elementary education specification allocates 3,400 net square feet for this function, and 4,600 net square feet for a cafeteria/commons seating area for 250.

SHARED LEARNING

Existing Conditions

Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer elementary schools were all constructed over fifty years ago and renovated in the early 1990s. Consequently, they do not reflect current thinking around teaching and learning. One critical element is flexible shared learning space, such as learning areas outside of the classroom and varying types of spaces for different learning styles and group sizes. Volunteers and support staff must use crowded hallways, with their associated distractions, to work with individuals and small groups of students.

10-Year Program Approach

Ideally, educational adequacy would be improved at all elementary schools by adding shared learning spaces. This would provide parity among schools and align with the District's latest elementary education specification.

Program Requirements

The three older elementary schools contain approximately 18 to 20 general education classrooms. In order to improve educational adequacy, four shared instructional areas of approximately 400 net square feet each would be added per school, creating clusters of four to five classrooms.

Implementation would require both modernization of existing space and adding new building area, as some existing classrooms would be displaced, and therefore need to be replaced. Specific space requirements need to be determined on a school-by-school basis, however given a school's age and condition, this may not be the recommended approach.

SECTION 02 | VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM



PREKINDERGARTEN

Existing Conditions

Currently, the District provides two prekindergarten classrooms, located at Northwood Elementary, with no prekindergarten options offered at other District sites. Historically, private prekindergarten programs have served the majority of Island residents, however, there has been some discussion regarding a limited expansion of the public-school prekindergarten option.

10-Year Program Approach

For purposes of this Plan, the District has recommended that expansion of current prekindergarten offerings will not be incorporated.

BEFORE AND AFTER CARE

Existing Conditions

Before and after school care is both desired, and needed, for many families within the Mercer Island community. Students are currently served by a thirdparty provider that is licensed to offer before and after care in gymnasium spaces and in the art classroom at Northwood. Historically, this third-party vendor has used unassigned classrooms, portable classrooms and the library. There are no dedicated spaces available for the sole function of childcare. Before and after care is provided at all four District elementary schools, with all locations currently at capacity. In addition to this on-site before and after care, approximately 200 students are bused to off-site programs at the Boys and Girls Club and the Jewish Community Center.

10-Year Program Approach

There are currently no plans to change the before and after care delivery model or provide dedicated space for this program within the District. If, however, the District opted to provide this service within its range of programs, other existing spaces, beyond the gymnasium, may provide additional capacity.

PORTABLE CLASSROOMS

Existing Conditions

The District currently has two doubleclassroom modular buildings located at Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer elementary schools, providing four "portable" classrooms at each site. The District owns these buildings, which are relatively new and in good condition.

Following the construction of Northwood Elementary, many of the old modular buildings were removed, with those remaining few intended for non-classroom uses. When used as classrooms, these portables create challenges, both for students and staff, including truncation of playground areas and interruption of sightlines (visual supervision) at some sites, limitations on class size, access to technology, safety / security concerns, and isolation from other students and support services.

In addition, direct student traffic via the exterior doors of other classrooms (to access restroom facilities and other school functions) impacts the learning environment of those classrooms. Other operational issues include conflict with stipulations made in staff contract language and difficulty managing "lock down" or other types of emergency drills.

10-Year Program Approach

Ideally, portables classrooms would be eliminated from all District sites, thereby eliminating all current operational challenges associated with them. However, as the six existing modular buildings are in good condition, provide additional space for the schools, and are not needed as classrooms based on current and projected enrollment, the District plans to continue to utilize them at the three older elementary schools.



MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

Special education programs at Islander Middle School are currently distributed into two separate buildings.

10-Year Program Approach

Ideally, all special education programs would be accessible throughout the learning spaces to allow for an inclusive educational experience for all students. The spaces should be flexible in their use to allow for all related special education services to be delivered.

Program Requirements

Further evaluation is needed to determine the specific program requirements for combining middle school special education spaces, however it is likely that this can be accommodated through modernization of existing space as well as new construction.

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION (CREST)

Existing Conditions

The District has an alternative high school program, located in the Crest Learning Center. This program primarily accommodates MISD students on a flexible, part-time basis, with a small number of full-time students. The program serves students that need additional support or an alternative learning setting to the comprehensive high school environment. Crest is also home to the District's online learning program.

Currently, enrollment in this program is limited by the amount of existing physical space. It is estimated that the current enrollment demand is as much as double what current facilities can accommodate.

10-Year Program Approach

In order to accommodate the growing demand for this type of education enrichment and an alternative learning environment, an increase in the amount of facility space for the alternative high school is needed. In addition to providing more adequate space for current functions, additional space is needed to accommodate increased capacity, online learning, and shared learning areas. There is no plan to expand alternative education programming to the middle or elementary levels.

Program Requirements

Provide an alternative high school facility that is double the size of the current space that is being used by the program, approximately 15,000 gross square feet, to serve 200 students. The existing Crest Learning Center is approximately 10,000 gross square feet, with 2,500 gross square feet currently being used by the Adult Transition Program (ATP). ATP is intented to be relocated out of the Crest facility.

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, as well as the best location in the District for the Crest Learning Center program (near, with, or away from the comprehensive high school).

COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS (CCR) Existing Conditions

College and Career Readiness, sometimes referred to as Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses, offer the opportunity to explore and prepare for post-secondary education through real-world learning experiences that develop leadership, professionalism, and project management skills. Although the District offers a number of CCR courses at the high school and middle school levels, there is a significant unmet need in this area, in terms of the breadth of courses offered and appropriate facilities to accommodate these programs.



The lack of appropriate space has limited the type of CCR classes that can be offered in the District. Many of the programs that currently exist are held in makeshift spaces that do not provide adequate learning space, accommodate equipment, and/or limit participation. Currently, MISD sends a number of students out of the District to access certain CCR courses, creating issues related to both travel time and cost.

Students are required to earn two CCR credits to graduate high school. More importantly, completing a CCR pathway is one way students can meet the English Language Arts and Mathematics proficiency requirements. Students who struggle on standardized tests may be disadvantaged by a limited offering of CCR options.

10-Year Program Approach

Add a new large, flexible space that includes robust hands-on learning environments such as a wood shop, metal shop, composites lab, innovation lab, and / or clean tech lab.

Create a stronger connection between all communications programs, to create a "multimedia" pathway (radio, journalism, marketing, newspaper, yearbook, and video production). Create a stronger connection to the alternative high school and look at the potential for shared use between CCR, alternative education, and a professional learning space.

Program Requirements

Develop a new Skills Center with a number of hands-on shop spaces and associated support. Further evaluation of CCR pathways is needed to determine which specific programs and spaces would be the best fit for the District.

Add new and/or improve existing CCR spaces at the high school. Further evaluation is required to determine specific areas of improvement, but spaces may include:

- > Robotics lab expansion
- > Broadcast studio expansion
- > Art room expansion
- > New journalism classroom
- > Other specialized learning areas

SCIENCE LABS

Existing Conditions

The high school currently has a total of 12 science labs, including eight science labs in their original 1997 configuration. These rooms need to be modernized, equipped, and sized to accommodate current programs.

10-Year Program Approach

Modernize the older science labs at the high school to be equivalent to the new science labs that were recently added in 2014.

Program Requirements

Modernize approximately 15,000 square feet of existing space at the high school, include eight science labs and associated support spaces.

PE / ATHLETICS

Existing Conditions

Mercer Island High School has a robust athletic program with nine fall sports, six winter sports, and 11 spring sports. The existing high school facility does not have enough space to accommodate all of the athletic teams, including gymnasium space for practice and locker / team room space. Currently, some teams are using the PEAK facility or the Northwood gymnasium for practices.

10-Year Program Approach

Additions and/or improvements at high school PE and athletic areas as needed to accommodate PE instruction and provide equitable practice and locker / team room space for all high school teams.



Program Requirements

Specific requirements associated with PE and athletics improvements have yet to be developed, but may include:

- > Expansion to create equitable practice space, locker rooms, and team rooms
- > Dedicated PE classroom
- > Gym improvements
- > Field improvements

PERFORMING ARTS

Existing Conditions

The existing MIHS Performing Arts Center seats up to 650 people and the existing stage accommodates an 80-piece band. In addition to a robust high school drama program, the existing PAC is used as a venue for all grades (choir concerts, showcases, middle school drama performances), as well as for districtwide professional development. The current space does not support these needs adequately.

The existing theater also has outdated stagecraft technology, poor acoustics, and limited flow.

10-Year Program Approach

Reimagine the Performing Arts Center (PAC) as a districtwide space with expanded capacity and facility improvements. A new facility would ideally have 800-850 seats (about half of the student body), a stage sized to accommodate 110 seated performers, modern stagecraft technology, and improved acoustics.

In addition, a black box theater is desired, to accommodate smaller performances and provide teaching space for drama and dance classes.

Program Requirements

Specific requirements associated with performing arts improvements have yet to be developed, but may include:

- Theater improvements and/or expansion (seating, stage, and back of house)
- New dedicated teaching space for drama, dance, and performances (black box theater)

GENERAL EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

Many classrooms at the high school haven't been updated in a long time. They do not accommodate new technology well, in terms of space or infrastructure, and many are not configured to support modern teaching and learning. There are also very limited areas for flexible or shared learning outside of the classroom.

10-Year Program Approach

Improve general classrooms to be more flexible and better accommodate collaboration (furniture, storage, and size). Existing classrooms should be brought up to the same level as the classrooms in the most recent modernization.

Program Requirements

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, however improvements to existing general classrooms may include:

- > Technology and aesthetic upgrades
- > Shared learning / study areas
- > Increase flexibility and opportunities for collaboration
- > Other improvements

SHARED SUPPORT

Existing Conditions

The existing MIHS facility has a number of support areas in which improvements would benefit the learning environment. The existing counseling area is undersized and poorly configured, and does not provide optimal space to support students. There is also a need for improved teacher offices and support space, as well as a lack of gender-inclusive restrooms throughout the facility. These areas, and others, while not directly used as teaching spaces, help support District values such as creating inclusive and equitable learning settings, and ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive.

10-Year Program Approach

Improve support areas throughout the existing facility, to provide safe, inclusive, and supportive environments.

Program Requirements

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, however shared support improvements may include:

- > Counseling improvements
- > Teacher offices / support
- > New gender-inclusive restrooms
- > Parking improvements

SUPPORT / OTHER PROGRAMS

ADULT TRANSITION PROGRAM (ATP)

Existing Conditions

The Adult Transition Program (ATP) serves any student with a disability (typically medically fragile students) who would like to stay in school until they are 21. The program focuses on independent living and employment, with most students traveling to jobs off site daily. Currently there are approximately 14 students in the program.

ATP is currently located at the Crest Learning Center and does not have adequate space to meet program needs.

10-Year Program Approach

Growth is not expected in the program as it is currently implemented, but ideally the program would expand to also provide job coaching services for high school students who are not ready for college, particularly at the alternative high school.

Program Requirements

Provide ATP program space at approximately 150% of the current area (3,800 gross square feet). Program requirements include three teaching areas, including an apartment-like space for life skills, a flexible worksite-like space for job training, and a learning space for education. Additional needs include office, restroom, and other support areas.

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, as well as the best location in the District for the ATP program.

LIBRARY / MULTIMEDIA CENTERS

Existing Conditions

Particularly at Mercer Island High School, but also at the older elementary schools, library / multimedia centers are outdated for the current and projected delivery model. These spaces offer the opportunity to redefine existing space to integrate book collections, technology resources, and collaborative small-group work areas.

10-Year Program Approach

Modernize existing library / multimedia centers to provide space for functions beyond traditional library programs.

Program Requirements

Specific program requirements will need to be determined on a school-by-school basis.

TECHNOLOGY

Existing Conditions

Currently the District has limited space to store and securely store mobile technology.

10-Year Program Approach

Provide a dedicated space in every school facility to repair mobile technology and store securely in the summertime.

Program Requirements

Dedicated space should accommodate 12 carts of laptops and a repair / work area. Specific technology space needs will be determined on a site-by-site basis, however it is estimated that approximately 200 net square feet will accommodate this function. Consider the potential to repurpose underutilized existing space in each school to address this space need.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Existing Conditions

With the increased emphasis on professional learning, there is currently not enough space available to accommodate the need for large meeting spaces for teachers and staff during the school day. Each school has professional learning at least three times per month, with the largest meetings between 60-70 people.

Currently, smaller meetings are held at the Administration Building, with larger ones having to utilize rented space at a nearby church or the Mercer Island Community Center. The PEAK facility is used only occasionally due to schedule conflicts with PEAK programs, as well as suitability of the facility.

10-Year Program Approach

Provide a "learning hub" for teachers and staff that is a robust virtual classroom environment for adult learning, as well as a permanent resource and "think tank" area. This space can also function as community-use space in the evenings, and may also be able to be used for some additional educational functions during the day.

Program Requirements

Provide a new multipurpose space that seats 70 people, with associated support space (break out spaces and storage). The multipurpose space should be dividable into three smaller areas, for greater flexibility of use, and have appropriate technology for remote learning and large group presentations.

The professional learning space could be part of the administration complex rather than at a specific school, or it could be part of a reconfigured Crest Learning Center facility.

SECTION 02 | VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM





DESIGNING FOR STUDENT-CENTERED EXCELLENCE

The purpose of a long-range facility plan is to develop a "road map" outlining strategic management of district facilities that offer high-quality, effective, and adaptable learning environments for students. Over the last few decades, education has changed dramatically to incorporate a new understanding of how individuals learn.

Essential to fulfilling the MISD Long-Range Facility Plan's purpose is ensuring that the District builds modern, student-centered learning environments to accommodate the variety of ways that students learn. The Long-Range Facility Plan addresses changing needs for educational program delivery and how facilities can support these requirements.

Many of the District's existing facilities are dated and do not support these aspirations or reflect the cultural norms of the community. Education facilities have historically been designed in a "one-size-fits-all" manner. Older building configurations were designed to support one teacher with a group of 30 students. There is limited flexibility for team-teaching or convening a variety of student group sizes, and typically no space outside the classroom to facilitate more interpersonal instruction.

BACKGROUND

There have been enormous strides in our understanding of how the brain functions and how children and adults learn. We know that individuals learn in a variety of ways, requiring information to be provided in a variety of formats.

This new knowledge has given rise to new approaches towards more effective teaching and learning, such as projectbased learning, student-managed learning, small group work, independent research and presentation. While the realities of our modern world continue to change and evolve, many older school buildings are still configured as they were 80 years ago (designed as factories for learning—with repetitive classrooms, sized for 30 students in a double-loaded corridor configuration).

Today's learners are citizens of the world. They are connected through media and technology to a greater network of information than ever before. They need to be able to sift through vast quantities of information and evaluate it, not memorize it. They must be more creative, innovative, and work in a more collaborative way. As global community members, students need to understand and relate to different cultures and be multilingual. They live in a rapidly changing world, which requires flexibility to meet the needs of the future.

FACILITIES PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

What defines a model school? If such a paradigm exists, design would number among the key factors. Striving for realistic solutions to existing problems such as dated facilities, overcrowding, rising costs and stringent budgets, many public and private institutions are embracing proactive, holistic reforms that integrate innovative teaching methods such as hands-on learning and collaborative project-based work with more effective learning environments that are flexible, adaptable and technology-rich.

Increasingly, insightful teams of administrators, educators, and parents are collaborating with architects to reimagine the schoolhouse. The goal: to create buildings that will engage students, welcome the community, and adapt to shifts in population and pedagogy.

SECTION 02 | VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM





In order to meet the nation's needs for the twenty-first century, the U.S. Department of Education offers the following guidelines regarding the design of learning environments:

- > Enhance teaching and learning and accommodate the needs of all learners
- > Serve as centers of the community
- > Result from a planning and design process involving all stakeholders
- > Provide for health, safety, and security
- > Effectively use adaptable resources
- Allow for flexibility and adaptability to changing needs

EDUCATIONAL & DESIGN TRENDS

Modern learning environments are student-centered and integrate innovative teaching methods, such as hands-on learning and collaborative projectbased work with effective learning environments that are flexible, adaptable and technology-rich. Modern learning environments accommodate and encourage different students, of varying ages, abilities, and interests, to learn different things from different people in different places, in different ways, and at different times.

Modern learning environments engage students, welcome the community and

adapt to shifts in student population. They are flexible, connected, collaborative, culturally relevant, multisensory, and multipurpose; with provisions for small study spaces and shared group space.

Design Patterns

School facility design contributes to creating successful learning environments. Types of teaching and learning, such as independent study, peer tutoring, project-based learning, student-managed learning, mentoring, and distance learning, create the need for different types of space.

Partnerships

Partnerships can facilitate a rich and meaningful learning experience for students beyond the classroom. In a time of diminishing resources, partnerships can augment school programs and provide educational continuity before and after school. Partnerships can take many forms, including aligning services and programs, creating new learning opportunities, sharing facilities, and leveraging resources.

Environmental Responsibility

Teachers and students perform best in facilities that meet their needs. Facilities must be well-ventilated, comfortable environments that are free of hazards

and irritants, while also minimizing energy and resource use. Access to daylight and good acoustics are also key elements of a healthy environment.

School buildings can be designed to go beyond sustainability, in terms of energy use, and employ the building as a teacher of environmental stewardship and a laboratory for learning about natural processes and building technologies. There is increasing national concern about the buildings and spaces in which students learn, and how these might affect both health and achievement.

Learning Everywhere

Learning can take place anywhere. Spaces that support multiple uses are places that provide space for a wide range of learning styles. Additionally, they are spaces that can take a variety of forms depending on the school's social and cultural context, students' ages and abilities, educational philosophies, curriculum and pedagogies. Multipurpose learning spaces must be flexible. They should be able to serve a variety of learning communities within the school, as well as the community surrounding the school.



SECTION 03 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Mercer Island School District's educational and support facilities vary in age, condition, and level of educational adequacy. Information about the physical condition of existing District facilities provides a metric for evaluating one component of District need.

EXISTING FACILITIES

There are currently seven school facilities in the District, including four elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and an alternative high school. District support facilities include Mary Wayte Pool, the administration building, and two maintenance / transportation buildings.

The Boys and Girls Club PEAK facility is a joint-use facility that is owned by the Boys and Girls Club and situated on District-owned property. Private and charter schools on the Island are not included in this Long-Range Facility Plan.

Due to the scarcity of available property on the Island, the District does not own any undeveloped sites that are in reserve for future use.





North Mercer Campus

A number of District facilities are colocated on the District's largest property, known as the North Mercer Campus (or "Complex"), shown above. These facilities include:

- > Northwood Elementary School
- > Mary Wayte Pool
- > Boys and Girls Club PEAK Facility
- > Maintenance Shop
- > Bus Lot
- Maintenance Operations & Transportation Building (MOT)
- > Administration Building
- > Mercer Island High School
- > High School Stadium

FACILITY DATA

The District operates approximately 675,000 square feet of facility space covering over 98 acres. District facilities range in age from four years old to over 70 years old.

The table at right summarizes the age, size and condition of each District facility, with more detailed information on the following pages.

| | FACILITY CONDITION | | FACILITY SIZE | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Facility | Original Construction Date | ICOS Score (2018) | Building Area (Permanent GSF) | Area/Student (Permanent GSF) | Recent Capital Expenditures |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | | | | | |
| Island Park Elementary | 1956 | 76.32 * | 49,399 | 118 | \$125,000 |
| Lakeridge Elementary | 1953 | 80.92 | 51,946 | 114 | \$75,000 |
| Northwood Elementary | 2016 | 98.91 | 77,277 | 166 | \$33,000,000 |
| West Mercer Elementary | 1964 | 85.86 | 54,221 | 119 | \$50,000 |
| | | | 232,843 | 129 | \$33,250,000 |
| MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | | | |
| Islander Middle School | 1958 | 74.07 * | 169,085 | 129 | \$33,850,000 |
| | | | 169,085 | 129 | \$33,850,000 |
| HIGH SCHOOL / OTHER | | | | | |
| Mercer Island High School | 1955 | 85.40 | 223,719 | 149 | \$13,450,000 |
| Crest Learning Center | 1960 | 84.63 | 10,058 | 80 | \$0 |
| Mary Wayte Pool | 1973 | - | 16,263 | - | \$2,415,000 |
| | | | 250,040 | 114 | \$15,865,000 |
| SUPPORT FACILITIES | | | | | |
| Administration Building | 1966 | - | 16,100 | - | \$150,000 |
| MOT Building | 2009 | - | 2,532 | - | \$500,000 |
| Maintenance Shop/Bus Lot | 1997 | - | 4,778 | - | \$200,000 |
| | | | 23,410 | | \$850,000 |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | | 675,378 | | \$83,815,000 |
| SHARED FACILITIES | | | | | |
| Boys & Girls Club PEAK | 2011(est.) | n/a | 44,968 | n/a | n/a |

* Represents an average of multiple building scores. See individual facility summaries for more detailed information.

44,968

CHART: Facility Age Comparison



FACILITY AGE

District educational facilities vary significantly in age, with original construction dates as early as 1953 and as recent as 2016. Although facility age does not solely determine building condition, it is a significant factor that should be considered. The chart above illustrates the age of all District facilities.

Many District facilities have received renovations and additions since their initial construction. The following facilities have undergone major renovations that included the addition of a new roof structure and replacement of exterior walls: Island Park Elementary School, Lakeridge Elementary School, West Mercer Elementary School, Islander Middle School (Main Building), and Mercer Island High School.

This work is indicated in blue in the chart above, and illustrates that the renovations are now more than 20 years old. With this in mind, it is important to understand that major building systems and components, such as foundations, structure, and exterior materials, continue to degrade over time, eventually requiring replacement. In addition to age-related degradation, older school facilities were generally not designed to accommodate current models of teaching and learning. Building configurations were typically designed to support one teacher with a group of 20-30 students, providing limited flexibility for team-teaching or convening a variety of student group sizes.

Older schools commonly have no space outside of the traditional classroom for private conversations, individualized instruction, or group project work. Shared facilities, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums, restrooms, and administration areas are also often undersized for current functions and needs.

NEWER SCHOOLS

The District's newest facility is Northwood Elementary School, constructed in 2015 and opened in 2016. A new building was also added to Islander Middle School in 2015, and additions to Mercer Island High School increased its size by approximately 17,000 square feet between 2012 and 2015.

OLDER SCHOOLS

Island Park Elementary, Lakeridge Elementary, West Mercer Elementary, Islander Middle School (100/200 and 300 buildings), and Mercer Island High School were all built between 1953 and the mid-1960s, making them more than 50 years old. All of these facilities underwent major renovations in the midnineties.

Due to the similar dates of original construction, these facilities can be expected to reach the end of their useful life around the same period of time. While immediate replacement may not be warranted, incremental replacement implemented over the course of several decades should be considered. This proactive approach may be used to ensure that the District is not faced with the burden of replacing multiple facilities within a short period of time.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS

None of the District's existing facilities are currently identified for historic preservation. They are not listed with the National Historic Register, State Historical Preservation Office, or any local historic building lists.

CHART: Facility Assessment Comparison



FACILITY CONDITION ASSESSMENT

A separate consultant team (BLRB Architects) conducted an evaluation of the District's existing facilities in 2018 using the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) Information and Conditions of Schools (ICOS) evaluation method, which establishes a numerical score for each facility.

ICOS is a web-based system that documents and stores information and condition details about facilities and sites operated by Washington school districts. ICOS assists OSPI with the increasing demand for accurate school facility information and building condition data that supports statewide programs such as the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), district facility management, and school facility information requests or policy decisions.

This information is also used to support the OSPI requirement for their performance-based Asset Preservation Program, which gauges how well facilities, buildings, and sites are maintained. ICOS benefits school districts by providing functionality for inventory tracking, condition rating, record keeping, and comparative and report analysis. Scores reflect building and site facilities in terms of their construction components and related deficiencies.

The following components were evaluated:

- > Structural condition and code compliance
- > Exterior building condition
- > Roof condition
- > Interior building condition
- > Electrical building condition
- > Mechanical building condition

Site condition and accessibility evaluation were evaluated separately by BLRB Architects and are not incorporated into the assessment scores.

Assessment scores, shown in the chart above, are from the MISD Study and Survey Update, September 2018 (summary included in Appendix B). Functional deficiencies were not incorporated in the overall score, but were assessed separately for each facility. District support facilities were not assigned ICOS scores, but their condition was considered and is also described in this document.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT SCORING

The following scale is used for the assessment scores:

EXCELLENT: Score of 95 – 100 percent; "new" or "like new" condition

GOOD: Score of 85 – 94.9 percent; "good" condition and requires routine maintenance

FAIR: Score of 62 – 84.9 percent; "fair" condition and requires minor maintenance.

POOR: Score of 30 – 61.9 percent; "poor" condition and requires major maintenance.

UNSATISFACTORY: Score of 0 - 29.9 percent; "unsatisfactory" condition and building replacement should be considered

ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Recently constructed facilities, including Northwood Elementary School and the new Islander Middle School building, scored over 95 percent, indicating that they are in excellent condition.

All other District facilities, which are older, still had relatively high assessment scores, all between 71 and 85 percent. West Mercer Elementary School and

ISLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Assessment by System



Significant Maintenance Needs

- > Roof replacement
- > Fencing repair/replacement
- > Parking lot grind/asphalt
- > ADA exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > Flooring replacement
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

LAKERIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Assessment by System



Significant Maintenance Needs

> Roof replacement

Excellent

- > Fencing repair/replacement
- > Parking lot grind/asphalt
- > ADA interior and exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > Flooring replacement
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Hot water tank replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

WEST MERCER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Assessment by System



Significant Maintenance Needs

> Roof replacement

Excellent

- > Fencing repair/replacement
- > Parking lot grind/asphalt
- > ADA interior and exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > Flooring replacement
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Fire alarm replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

Mercer Island High School fall into the "good" condition category and all other facilities are in the "fair" condition category. This is likely due to the substantial renovation of these facilities that was done in the mid-nineties, and because they have been well maintained by the District. None of the facility assessment scores indicate a need to replace a school facility solely based on its condition.

Summaries of each facility are included in Issue Paper 2: Existing Facility Condition, located in Appendix B.

ASSESSMENT BY SYSTEM

The facility assessment completed in 2018 included an evaluation of the major building systems at each educational facility, including:

- > Structural and foundation systems
- Exterior systems, including walls, windows, doors, and trim
- > Roof system
- Interior systems, including floors, walls, and ceilings
- > Electrical systems, including power, lighting, and low voltage (telecom, CATV, security, sound)
- Mechanical systems, including plumbing and HVAC

High-level evaluation ranked the condition of each system as unsatisfactory, poor, fair, good, or excellent. More detailed assessment information can be found in the MISD Study and Survey Update, September 2018.

Summary charts by system for each school are shown above and on the following page. (Assessments for the District's two most recently constructed facilities, Northwood Elementary School and Islander Middle School Phase One, are not included, as there are no significant issues at these relatively new facilities.)

ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL (100/200) Assessment by System



Significant Maintenance Needs

- Roof replacement (critical at 100/200) (Completed in summer 2020; not reflected in above chart)
- > Fencing to create secure campus
- > Bus loop asphalt replacement (grind/ overlay)
- > Bus loop lighting replacement
- > Track and field replacement (Turf replaced, track sprayed/ lined in summer 2020; not reflected in above chart)
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco repair
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > HVAC equipment replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- Toilet partition replacement/ reconfiguration

MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL Assessment by System



Significant Maintenance Needs

- Locker replacement in gym locker rooms
- Toilet partition replacement/ reconfiguration
- Theater lighting and seating replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Stucco repair

Excellent

- > Brick cleaning and sealing
- > Exterior paint
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- > Exhaust fan replacement
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement
- > Gym bleacher replacement

CREST LEARNING CENTER Assessment by System



Excellent

Significant Maintenance Needs

- > Roof replacement
- > Site ADA improvements
- > CMU and brick repair
- > Brick cleaning/sealing
- > Flooring replacement
- > Furnace replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- > Exhaust fan replacement
- > Fire alarm upgrade/replacement
- > Greenhouse upgrade/replacement

Significant Maintenance Needs

A list of the significant maintenance items that are currently needed for each building are shown above and on the previous page. Buildings are constantly aging and maintenance is a routine part of facility management for every school district. The items included in this list reflect major maintenance work that has been identified by the District's facilities staff.

Comparison by System

Looking at District facilities by system, roof systems are the biggest issue districtwide. The roofs at the Islander Middle School 100/200 building and Crest Learning Center are in the worst condition, followed by all three of the older elementary schools.

Mechanical systems are also an issue at many District facilities, including Islander Middle School (poor condition), Island Park Elementary School (poor/fair condition), and West Mercer Elementary School (poor/fair condition).

Interior systems are in fair condition at Islander Middle School and Crest Learning Center, but are in fair or better condition at other facilities. Structural systems, exterior systems, and electrical systems are in fair or better condition at all facilities.

As reflected in the overall assessment scores shown on page 26, the older buildings at Islander Middle School are in the worst physical condition, followed by Island Park Elementary School and Lakeridge Elementary School.

Note: Subsequent to the Committee meetings, it was determined that roof system scoring for Crest Learning Center was inadvertently shown incorrectly, reflecting a worse condition, and has been corrected in this report.

IMAGE:

Secure building entry at West Mercer Elementary School

IMAGE: Secure building entry at Mercer Island High School



SAFETY & SECURITY

SEISMIC

Seismic condition should be considered in the context of "rolling compliance." New codes are typically issued every few years and adjustments related to seismic requirements occur each time. The first seismic code was developed in 1976 and it has evolved over time with each new code, changing zones from low to moderate to high.

In 2011, the District hired PCS Structural Solutions to complete a structural/ seismic review for all school buildings in the District. In 2016, a structural/ seismic review was performed on the Administration Building.

As stated in the reports (Structural Evaluation Reports, PCS Structural Solutions, 2011), the International Building Code (IBC) performance goal for new construction, with a 1.25 importance factor, is for the building to survive a Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE, a two percent probability of exceedence in 50 years) with some structural damage that would be repairable after the earthquake.

A Seattle fault earthquake that is shallow could generate this kind of earthquake and would be in the range of four times the shaking of the more recent 2001 Nisqually earthquake. For a design earthquake (10 percent exceedence in 50 years), one would expect minor structural damage and the building remaining occupied.

The seismic evaluation conclusions for District facilities indicate that collapse is not anticipated, however significant damage, that may not be repairable, should be expected. If doing other work at the high school, it is recommended to do additional upgrades there, in a portion of the gymnasium. Seismic assessment summaries of all school facilities are included below. Complete seismic reports can be found on the District website.

Island Park Elementary School

- > Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Lakeridge Elementary School

- > Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Northwood Elementary School *

- > Building completed in 2016
- Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

West Mercer Elementary School

- > Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (pre-2016)

- > Structural Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (new building) *

- > Building completed in 2016
- Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

Mercer Island High School

- > Structural Upgrades: 1997 and 2013
- Condition: The building does not meet current code. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, damage may exceed that which is repairable,

IMAGE:

Parking lot access at Island Park Elementary School

IMAGE: Parking lot and drop-off area at Islander Middle School





and while portions of the building were seismically upgraded in the 1990s, it is recommended that roof/ wall connections at the gymnasium be improved when future construction work is performed in these areas.

* Note: Recently completed buildings (Northwood Elementary and Islander Middle School) were not assessed by PCS.

SECURITY

Security is a top priority for the District. Cameras are installed at key locations in all school buildings to facilitate investigations as needed. No cameras are installed in classrooms, offices, or restrooms. Their primary focus is exterior doors, hallways, and gathering spaces such as gymnasiums, commons, cafeterias, and libraries.

Secure entries were installed at Mercer Island High School in 2019 and at the three older elementary school sites in 2017. Newer facilities, including Northwood Elementary School and Island Middle School, were designed and constructed with secure entries. The secure entry at Islander Middle School is not currently used, due to the configuration of multiple buildings on the site.

WATER & AIR QUALITY

Water testing has been done annually at each school building over the past five years. Sampling of drinking water at random fixtures has shown no copper or asbestos, and lead levels have been within standards. Reports are posted on the District website. Given the results over the past five years, at the recommendation of the testing company, sampling is currently scheduled for every two years.

Annual air quality testing is done on an as-needed basis. Typically, testing occurs at several facilities during the year. No findings of contaminates have been found at any District facilities.

TRANSPORTATION

Safe transportation routes for pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, and buses is a necessity for the District. This includes access to, from, around, and between all school facilities, as well as pick-up, dropoff, service access, sidewalks, bicycle storage, and parking areas.

Elements that are within District property boundaries, such as parking and drop-off areas, are incorporated into the Long-Range Facility Plan and can be addressed by the District. Larger systemic issues, such as connections between schools and neighborhoods, require coordination with other jurisdictional entities on the Island, as the District does not have the ability to control the physical or operational conditions outside of District property. The identification of these issues in the Long-Range Facility Plan is intended to create a foundation for the City and District to collaborate in reaching the shared goals of improving safety, enhancing alternative ways to access the schools, and mitigating traffic congestion.

Transportation conditions vary at each school site and should be addressed for every facility. Some particular areas of concern are noted below.

Island Park Elementary School

- Traffic congestion and back-up on Island Crest Way during peak times
- Obstructed sightlines from parking lot out onto Island Crest Way

West Mercer ES

> Entry into the north parking lot is problematic with traffic backing up onto 40th Avenue during drop-off

Islander MS

> North parking lot is not large enough to accommodate all buses, causing many of them to double park during pick-up and drop-off

IMAGE:

Hallway used for shared learning at Lakeridge Elementary School



EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Educational adequacy addresses the following question:

How well does the facility create a successful environment for learning, inspiring, and building community?

Although educational adequacy can be difficult to quantify, a 2010 Study and Survey of District facilities evaluated this facility-related consideration in a number of different areas, including area per student, building configuration, and environmental components such as natural light and ease of wayfinding.

The Long-Range Facility Plan process updated and expanded this information through building tours, principal interviews, and outreach meetings with teachers, staff, and students who use the buildings every day.

SHARED LEARNING

Modern learning environments tend to offer several options that support large group, small group, and individual learning needs. Currently, two options exist in many of Mercer Island School District's older schools. These options are the general classroom environment and the hallway. Facility considerations related to shared learning include:

- Limited or no shared learning areas in older schools
- Limited or no space for one-on-one, group projects, etc.
- > Limited ability for outside of classroom supervision
- Disruption caused by use of learning space as a thoroughfare

CLASSROOMS

Characteristics associated with classroom suitability include:

- Classrooms do not allow for flexible learning
- Limited or no connection to other learning areas
- > Functionally limiting

NATURAL LIGHT

Access to daylight is a key element of a healthy learning environment. Research over the last two decades has shown that lighting impacts physical health, psychological well-being, and academic performance.

Characteristics related to the level and quality of natural light and educational suitability include:

- > Little or no opportunity for visual relief
- Numerous spaces that are dark and uninviting

WAYFINDING / CHARACTER / COMMUNITY

Supervision and wayfinding are important considerations in modern learning environments. Characteristics that can impact the educational suitability of a facility include:

- > Spatially constrictive
- > Restricts observation of students
- > Not particularly welcoming

EVALUATION BY SCHOOL

Older Elementary Schools (Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer)

- > Lack of separate gymnasium and cafeteria / dining spaces
- Limited or no "flex spaces" or shared group learning areas
- > Lack of distributed sensory rooms or "safe spaces"
- > Undersized general classrooms that do not have sufficient storage
- Poor acoustic separation between classrooms
- Limited and/or poorly configured special education spaces

IMAGE: Hallway used for shared learning at Islander Middle School

IMAGE:

Classroom with limited storage at Island Park Elementary School

IMAGE: Hallway with limited wayfinding and natural light at MIHS



- Poorly configured and/or undersized administration area
- Lack of a dedicated art/science classroom (Island Park / Lakeridge)
- Hard surface play too close to classrooms (Island Park / Lakeridge)
- No student restrooms that are adjacent to kindergarten classrooms (Island Park/ Lakeridge)
- Multiple disconnected buildings (Island Park)
- Students in modular cut through other classrooms to access restrooms and other support services (Lakeridge)
- Music room is too far from the stage (Lakeridge)
- Library lacks natural light and needs additional storage (West Mercer)
- Fields have poor drainage that limits use (West Mercer)

Islander Middle School

- Multiple detached buildings create lack of connection between both students and programs
- Common areas in the 100/200 Building ("Classic Building") are difficult to supervise
- Corridors do not accommodate small break-out spaces

- Classrooms in older buildings should be reorganized into effective, smaller, personalized learning communities
- > Building 300 science classrooms do not support STEM adequately and do not have enough storage
- Acoustics separation is poor, and sound transfer between classrooms can be disruptive
- > Provide a new school broadcast studio and editing room
- Modernize library space and increase flexibility

Mercer Island High School

- Older science classrooms are not large enough to accommodate instruction
- Improvements and connectivity could be made to CCR programs (i.e. broadcast programs)
- Reconfigure and consolidate counseling and nurse's room to provide access and confidentiality
- > Provide separate black box theater to enhance drama program and all theater to be used by more programs
- Improve / replace theater technology, including sound, lighting, projection, and curtains, as well as improve acoustics

- Reconfigure library into flexible learning spaces that will encourage better utilization by students and small groups
- Music programs continues to grow; additional space would be useful particularly for larger classes (band)

Crest Learning Center

- > The facility is too small for the programs that are currently housed there (number, size, and type of classrooms and support spaces)
- > Need an additional large greenhouse
- Centralized special education area with new special education classroom and an occupational therapy / physical therapy (OT/PT) room

AREA PER STUDENT

Gross square footage per student (GSF/ student) is one metric that can be used to compare educational adequacy in school facilities. GSF/student is determined by taking the total gross square footage of a facility and dividing it by the permanent student capacity of the building. It is important to note that this metric is not necessarily a reflection of classroom size, as it takes into account all spaces within the building and provides the average amount of total space per student.
SECTION 03 | EXISTING CONDITIONS

CHART:

Area Per Student Comparison (Permanent Capacity)



According to the 2013 Annual School Construction Report, published by School Planning and Management, the national median for GSF/student in new schools completed in 2012 was 137 for elementary schools, 153 for middle schools and 172 for high schools.

OPSI has student space allocations that are much lower: 90 for grades K-6, 117 for grades 7-8 and 130 for grades 9-12. However, these metrics are used solely as funding drivers for the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), and do not represent space planning or design recommendations for districts. OSPI is currently working on development of a capital funding model that is intended to align gross instructional square feet per student with typical staffing requirements on the operations side, which will be more reflective of actual space needs in schools.

A small amount of difference in area per student can have a big impact on the amount of space in a facility and how it is used. For example, the difference between Lakeridge Elementary and West Mercer Elementary is only five square feet per student. However, when this is multiplied by the number of students per classroom (24), it equates to an additional 120 square feet per classroom, or an additional 480 square feet for a cluster of four classrooms.

This additional space is enough to provide break-out areas and/or other types of teaching and support space for the classrooms that a school with a lower area per student would not be able to have, as shown in the diagram below.

Distribution and configuration of space is also important to consider. Adding onto an existing school can increase the area per student, but does not always provide the desired types and relationships of spaces, such as break-out spaces adjacent to classrooms.

A comparison of area per student in the District's school facilities is shown in the chart above.

Impact of Five Square Feet Per Student:

Elementary School Level

The three older elementary schools in the District have similar areas per student, all of which are less than 120 GSF/student. These are below the national median of 137 GSF/student, and the District target of 139 GSF/student, developed in the MISD Elementary School Education Specification, January 2014. It was noted by the District that although these facilities provide fairly large classrooms, they do not provide enough flex space.

The recently constructed Northwood Elementary School has a much higher area per student of 166 GSF/student. This is due in part to additional program areas that increase it from the District target size. Such areas include specialized space for a developmental



Recent Capital Expenditures: Facility Improvements



CHART: Recent Capital Expenditures: New Facilities & Additions



preschool, a high-needs special education program, and an enlarged gymnasium to accommodate community use. These programs were determined to be added into the Northwood facility, but are not part of the District's elementary school education specification program.

As a comparison, Bainbridge School District elementary schools have an average of 151 GSF/student, with individual facilities ranging from 133 to 165 GSF/student. Bainbridge's most recent elementary school (Wilkes Elementary) was constructed in 2013 and provides 157 GSF/student.

Middle School Level

The 129 GSF/student at Islander Middle School is significantly less than the national median of 152 GSF/student. This is likely due, at least in part, to the fact that part of the school is housed in an older facility that is not configured for modern learning. The District does not have a middle school target for area per student.

In comparison, Bainbridge School District's two middle schools range from 114 to 151 GSF/student, with an average of 132 GSF/student. Both schools were built in the 1990s.

High School Level

At 137 GSF/student, Mercer Island High School is significantly below the national benchmark of 172 GSF/student. Similar to Islander Middle School, the majority of the school is in an older facility that is not configured for modern learning, which contributes to this discrepancy. The District does not have a high school target for area per student.

In comparison, Bainbridge High School provides 168 GSF/student. The high school was constructed in 1970.

Crest Learning Center is also significantly below the national benchmark in terms of area per student, with approximately 100 GSF/student. However, it is not unusual for an alternative program to have a lower area per student, due to limited offerings that eliminate the need for some specialized spaces, such as gymnasiums.

RECENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Understanding the relative amount of recent investment in District facilities can help in determining and prioritizing planning approaches for a long-range facility plan. Mercer Island School District has completed a number of improvements to existing facilities over the last 10 years, in addition to constructing a partial replacement school facility at Islander Middle School and a new elementary school, Northwood Elementary. Both facility improvements and new additions were completed at Mercer Island High School.

A list of the total capital expenditures per District facility is included below, and illustrated in the charts above.

- > Island Park ES: \$125,000
- > Lakeridge ES: \$75,000
- > West Mercer ES: \$50,000
- > Northwood ES: \$33.0 M (new facility)
- > Islander MS: \$33.6 M (new facility) \$250,000 (improvements)
- Mercer Island HS: \$9.0 M (additions)
 \$2.6 M (improvemts)
 \$1,900,000 (stadium)
- > Mary Wayte Pool: \$2.4 M
- > Administration: \$150,000
- > MOT Building: \$500,000
- > Maintenance Shop: \$200,000

The breakdown of the work done and associated cost of each project is outlined in the individual facility summaries located in Issue Paper 2, in Appendix B.



SECTION 04 CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

Mercer Island School District currently serves approximately 4,300 students in kindergarten through 12th grade. The success of the District's educational programs is fostered in part by the ability of each school to house the students, teachers, and spaces needed for effective teaching and learning.

Planning for fluctuations in student enrollment is critical, as the state funding formula for education is allocated, and teachers are assigned, based on the number of students anticipated each year.

DISTRICT CAPACITY

DETERMINING CAPACITY

Existing facility capacity is a planning metric that reflects the number of students that can be accommodated in a particular building. It does not take into account specific variations in classroom sizes and configurations, and also does not signify the maximum number of students that can be accommodated in a school. The number of students actually enrolled at a school may be higher or lower than its capacity. Facility capacity can be determined in a variety of ways. MISD determines capacity as follows:

NUMBER OF GENERAL CLASSROOMS (elementary schools) or NUMBER OF TEACHING STATIONS (middle and high schools) X

TARGET NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER CLASSROOM

> X UTILIZATION FACTOR

Number of Classrooms / Teaching Stations

General classrooms at the elementary level include grade-level classrooms, but do not include specialized teaching spaces such as music rooms, gymnasiums, and special education classrooms. At the middle and high school levels, all scheduled teaching stations are included when determining capacity, with the exception of dedicated special education classrooms.

Target Students per Classroom

The target number of students per classroom is a planning parameter that reflects an "ideal" class size target for a given grade level. Actual class sizes vary, and may be larger or smaller than the targets, depending on many operational factors.

For MISD, capacities are based on the following class size targets:

- > Elementary school: 24 students per classroom
- > Middle school: 26 students per classroom
- > High school: 28 students per classroom
- Special education: 10 students per classroom

These capacities reflect the targets included in the District's Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024, adopted in June 2019. This is a "living" document

CHART: Existing Facility Capacity (2019)



that is updated annually. Target classroom capacities will continue to be evaluated, and may be revised in the future, based on the findings of this long-range planning process or other developments in the District. They do not represent District policy, actual student count, or an absolute cap.

Utilization Factor

A utilization factor is applied, to reflect for the amount of time the classroom can be used for teaching each day. Target utilization factors vary between districts and grade levels, depending a number of factors, including the number of periods in the school day and whether teachers use their classrooms for planning. It is usually not possible to achieve 100% utilization because of scheduling conflicts for student programs, the need for specialized rooms for some programs, and the need for teachers to have space to work during planning periods.

Lower utilization factors indicate that classrooms are unused for one or more periods of the day, due to teacher planning time and/or scheduling requirements, which is typical for most middle and high schools. For example, 80 percent utilization reflects classroom usage for four out of five periods a day. For MISD, the utilization factors used in determining capacity are as follows:

- > Elementary school: 95 percent utilization
- > Middle school: 86 percent utilization
- > High school: 90 percent utilization

These utilization factors are also based on the information in the District's Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024, and will continue to be evaluated. They are intended to reflect an average "snapshot" of utilization at each level.

The District's utilization factors are within the typical ranges for each grade level. The high school has a higher utilization factor than the middle school because teachers have dedicated planning areas at the high school and therefore do not need to plan in their classrooms. This allows classrooms to be scheduled for more periods per day.

EXISTING FACILITY CAPACITY

The District's existing facility capacity includes both permanent and portable capacity. Permanent capacity includes classroom space that is in a permanent building. Portable capacity includes classroom space that is in portable, or modular, buildings.

Permanent Capacity

The District's existing facilities have a total permanent capacity of 4,743 students in grades K-12.

The existing permanent capacity at the elementary level, which encompasses kindergarten through fifth grade, is 1,798 students. Individual capacities at each of the District's four elementary school are within a similar range, with between 420 and 456 each.

The existing permanent capacity at the middle school level, which includes sixth through eighth grades, is 1,314 students. All District middle school students are housed at Islander Middle School.

The existing permanent capacity at the high school level, which includes grades nine through twelve, is 1,631 students. This includes capacity at both Mercer Island High School and the alternative high school, Crest Learning Center.

Portable Capacity

The District has a total portable capacity of 276 students, all of which is being used at the elementary level. Three elementary schools in the District currently have portable classrooms on site, including Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer. Each school has four portable

Mercer Island Resident Population Forecasts, 2019-2030

(Mercer Island School District Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December 2019)



classrooms, providing an additional 92-student capacity per school.

At this time, portable classrooms in the District are generally used for functions other than general classrooms, as they are not needed to meet enrollment needs. However, they are still counted as portable capacity, and can be used as such if the need arises in the future.

Because of the temporary nature of modular facilities, portable capacity is typically tracked separately and ideally not considered when determining future capacity need in a long-range facility plan.

TARGET FACILITY CAPACITY

Target capacities at various grade levels are based on current thinking regarding the number of students needed to meet a district's program goals and provide an optimal learning environment. These capacities may vary through the years, as educational program models and funding levels change.

Mercer Island School District has established a target capacity for elementary facilities of between 450 to 500 students per school. It is generally assumed that existing schools that are near the target capacity are best suited to provide the opportunity for full academic programming. The District's four elementary schools are either within or very close to the District's target capacity range.

The District has not established target capacities at the middle school and high school levels. Since there is only one District facility for each of these levels, facilities must be sized to accommodate all District students at those levels.

ENROLLMENT FORECASTING

Enrollment forecasts are used, in part, to determine whether the District will need to add or modify facility space to meet school program or configuration needs.

Student enrollment forecasts, combined with a methodology for determining student capacity in each school, provide a framework for facility needs to better serve student achievement. As such, student enrollment forecasts comprise an important component of the Long-Range Facility Plan.

ENROLLMENT REPORT

The District received updated student enrollment projections in December 2019, prepared by Educational Data Solutions LLC. Enrollment forecasts are typically updated annually to incorporate new enrollment data, as well as newly released birth and housing data.

The 10-year enrollment forecast integrates District enrollment trends with local area population, enrollment, and housing trends. Summary information from the report is included on the following pages, and the full report can be found in Appendix B of this report.

POPULATION TRENDS

- > The population of King County grew at a faster pace than expected between 2012 and 2019. Growth slowed between 2017 and 2018, but the estimated net population gain in 2019 was similar to the large gains between 2014 and 2017.
- > Much of this growth has been driven by a strong economy anchored by extensive hiring at Amazon. The company is expected to reach its hiring goal in the Seattle area over the next one to two years. After that, they are expected to maintain current employment levels (based on newspaper reports).
- > The State is predicting that population growth in King County will be more moderate over the next decade, compared to trends over the past decade.

District Enrollment Projections

(Mercer Island School District Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December 2019)



- > Mercer Island is expected to grow at a lower rate than the overall County over the next decade.
- > The Puget Sound Regional Council's land use forecast assumes a growth trend that is similar to the City's comprehensive plan. It assumes greater density is possible, and thus greater population growth.

ENROLLMENT TRENDS

- Enrollment in the Mercer Island School District is tracking below the previous projection, completed in 2017.
- > Enrollment growth in King County has slowed over the past two years. Based on the most current year of enrollment data, K-12 enrollment in the Puget Sound is continuing to increase with more growth migrating to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish County.
- Mercer Island's share of the King County K-12 population has declined over the past five years, indicating the District is growing at a slower rate than the rest of the County.
- > Based on the latest birth and population forecasts for King County, we expect K-12 enrollment growth in the County to continue growing over the next decades.

- > Given the latest birth data, less K-12 enrollment growth in King County and Mercer Island is predicted over the next decade than was predicted in 2017.
- > There is no evidence that private schools are having a significant impact on District enrollment, however, data for the 2018-19 school year is not available from the State at this time.

HOUSING TRENDS

- > Home sales in Mercer Island have dropped in 2018 and 2019, compared to the trends between 2013 and 2017.
- > Over 1,100 units were added to the District's housing stock between the 2000 and 2010 census period, while about half as many units have been added between 2010 and 2019.
- It is predicted that just over 500 additional units will be added to the District's housing stock by 2030. This is much lower than the period between 2000 and 2010, and may result in less enrollment growth and even declines in enrollment in the near-term (2020 to 2025). The bulk of additional housing development is expected to occur between roughly 2023 and 2030.

- > A net gain of housing might occur in cases where an existing single family unit is torn down and replaced with two or more units. Greater density, as well as the development of new land, can result in housing increases.
- > Based on the City comprehensive plan and the PSRC documents, some increase in multi-family housing units is expected, relative to single family over time. But it is likely that single family units will still make up between 65%-70% of the City's housing stock.
- > Based on 2010 Census data, there are approximately 42 students for every 100 housing units in the District. This number is higher than Lake Washington, Bellevue, or Seattle. The 2019 estimate for the District has not changed.

PROJECTED DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

The 2019 enrollment forecast presents three forecasts ("Low," "Middle," and "High") for a 10-year horizon from 2019-20 to 2029-30, as shown in the chart above. The middle-range forecast is considered the most likely to occur. The low-range forecast considers the effect of less robust local area population and housing growth than anticipated during the forecast period, and the high-

Historical Accuracy of MISD Enrollment Projections 2008 - 2019



range forecast assumes stronger than anticipated growth. For the purposes of the long-range facility plan, the middlerange forecast is used.

District enrollment projections for the next 10 years indicate an overall increase in student enrollment at the elementary level, and relatively flat enrollment at the middle and high school levels. It is anticipated that MISD enrollment will flatten out and even decline some between 2020 and 2025, with enrollment growing again in the latter part of the forecast period (2025 to 2030), when more development activity and population growth is expected.

The current District enrollment (October 2019) is 4,387 students. Over the next 10 years, total District enrollment is projected to increase by approximately 133 students, resulting in a total of 4,520 total students by 2029-30. This is an overall increase of approximately three percent districtwide.

Elementary Level

At the elementary level, growth is projected to increase by approximately six percent over the next 10 years, resulting in a projected K-5 enrollment of 1,842 students. This reflects an anticipated total increase of 104 elementary students. As a districtwide average, this equates to an additional one to two students per classroom.

Enrollment projections have not been provided by individual school at the elementary level, however it is assumed that the proportion of students between the District's four elementary schools will remain relatively constant. This is monitored annually by the District. Enrollment balancing between schools can be achieved through special program assignment or boundary adjustment, in the event that it is needed in the future.

For the purposes of long-range planning, projected elementary enrollment has been allocated to individual schools based on the percentage of current student enrollment distribution.

Middle School Level

Middle school enrollment is projected to decrease by 0.8 percent over the next 10 years, resulting in a total of 1,130 middle school students districtwide. This reflects an anticipated decrease of nine students.

High School Level

High school enrollment is projected to increase by 2.5 percent over the next 10 years, resulting in a total of 1,548

high school students districtwide. This reflects an anticipated increase of 38 students.

FORECAST ACCURACY

The chart above illustrates how accurate previous MISD enrollment forecasts have been over the past 11 years. District enrollment projection data from 2008, 2012 and 2017 enrollment reports is shown, and compared with actual enrollment each year.

Although there is some variation, the projections over the past decade has been relatively accurate. The largest discrepancy between projected and actual enrollment occurred in 2013, and was a difference of 185 students, or about four percent of total enrollment.

SECTION 04 | CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

CHART:

Existing District Capacity & Projected 2029 Enrollment (Middle Range)



ACCOMMODATING ENROLLMENT

The chart above and the table on the following page compare existing capacity and the projected medium-range enrollment for each school in the District, illustrating their ability to accommodate anticipated enrollment through 2029.

This comparison assumes current school boundaries, programs, and conditions. For planning purposes, projected enrollment for individual elementary schools has been distributed proportionally to align with current enrollment distribution, but may be adjusted in the future by the District as needed.

ACCOMMODATION THROUGH 2029

Based on this analysis, all of the District's school facilities have enough existing capacity to accommodate projected enrollments through 2029-30, including existing permanent and portable capacity.

Elementary School Level

At the elementary school level, the District's permanent capacity of 1,798 is slightly less than the projected K-5 enrollment of 1,842 students. This means that, based on the assumed enrollment distribution, all schools are expected to be at or slightly over permanent capacity by 2029. The three elementary schools that have projected enrollment that is greater than permanent capacity (Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer) may also need to utilize one or more of their portable classrooms to house students.

Middle School Level

Islander Middle School's current permanent capacity of 1,314 is well above the projected 2029 enrollment of 1,130 students.

High School Level

At the high school level, the projected 2029 enrollment of 1,548 students is slightly greater than Mercer Island High School's existing capacity of 1,505. This amount of overage (43 students) is typically insignificant at the high school level. This is because of the large size and variations in class size and schedules. The additional 43 students would equate to less than one additional student per classroom.

In addition, because Crest Learning Center serves the same students, its existing capacity of 126 can also be included. The combined capacity of both facilities is 1,631, enough to fully accommodate the projected enrollment.

Preschool

Preschool enrollment was not included as part of the enrollment forecast.

Although there are many thriving and growing private preschools on the Island, their enrollment is not restricted to Mercer Island residents and cannot be easily translated to determine future kindergarten population within the District.

The District has its own developmental preschool program, which has a primary focus of providing support to children with a documented disability who reside in the MISD attendance area. In terms of enrollment for this preschool program, it is currently near capacity due to the amount of available space. If preschool enrollment needs increase, the District may consider expanding the preschool program in the future.

Other Program Considerations

Like many school districts, MISD offers programs and special services beyond K-12 general education instruction, to support students whose needs are not met in traditional school settings. The District currently provides alternative education options and special services such as special education and online learning. The District also provides fullday kindergarten throughout the District and an early learning program at one elementary school.

These programs typically have space and facility requirements that were

CHART: Existing Capacity & Projected Enrollment (Low/Medium/High Ranges)



TABLE: District Enrollment & Capacity

| | CAPACIT | ACITY ENROLLMENT | | | ENROLLMENT | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Facility | Perm. Capacity (2019) | Portable Capacity (2019) | Total Capacity (2019) | Current Enrollment (2019-20) | Projected Enrollment (2029-30) | Change | Over/ Under Perm. Capacity | Over/ Under Total Capacity | |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | | | | | | | | | |
| Island Park Elementary | 420 | 46 | 466 | 410 | 434 | 25 | 14 | -77 | |
| Lakeridge Elementary | 456 | 68 | 524 | 450 | 477 | 27 | 21 | -70 | |
| Northwood Elementary | 466 | 0 | 466 | 408 | 432 | 24 | -34 | -34 | |
| West Mercer Elementary | 456 | 91 | 547 | 471 | 499 | 28 | 43 | -48 | |
| | 1,798 | 205 | 2,003 | 1,738 | 1,842 | 104 | 44 | -230 | |
| MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | | | | | | | |
| Islander Middle School | 1,314 | 0 | 1,314 | 1,139 | 1,130 | -9 | -184 | -184 | |
| | 1,314 | 0 | 1,314 | 1,139 | 1,130 | -9 | -184 | -184 | |
| HIGH SCHOOL / OTHER | | | | | | | | | |
| Mercer Island High School | 1,505 | 0 | 1,505 | 1,510 | 1,548 | 38 | -83 | -83 | |
| Crest Learning Center | 126 | 0 | 126 | Cr | est enrollmei | nt is includ | ded in MIHS | | |
| Mary Wayte Pool | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1,631 | 0 | 1,631 | 1,510 | 1,548 | 38 | -83 | -83 | |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | 4,743 | 205 | 4,948 | | | | | | |

not anticipated during the design and construction era of the older District facilities. It is clear the increased success and demand for these programs fosters space needs that must be designed and integrated districtwide into the overall program delivery for each school.

EXPLORING ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

In order to prepare for a range of potential outcomes in terms of enrollment growth, an analysis of capacity and enrollment was completed looking at all projection ranges included in the December 2019 forecast: low, medium, and high.

The results, shown in the chart above, indicate that at the elementary and middle school levels, even the highgrowth scenario enrollment can be accommodated by the existing facilities, including the existing portable classrooms at the elementary level.

At the high school level, the high range enrollment projection is close to 100 students over the existing combined capacity of MIHS and Crest Learning Center. This is a small percentage of the total enrollment, and would equate to an additional one or two students per classroom.



SECTION 05 PLAN DEVELOPMENT

PROCESS OVERVIEW

Mercer Island School District's Long-Range Facility Plan process began in October 2019 and was completed with Board adoption of the Plan in October 2020. In order to arrive at a Long-Range Facility Plan that accommodates the needs of the District over the next ten years, sets the stage for future planning phases, and reflects the desires of the community, the process included several iterations of plan development,

A District Leadership Team (DLT), made up of key District staff, directed the planning process. A Facility Planning Committee (FPC) was created to provide broad representation from the community, including parents from various schools and neighborhoods, Board members, community and business leaders, representatives from local regulatory agencies, and student representatives. This group met five times throughout the planning process, to provide diverse perspectives and input, and help develop plan proposals. After establishing planning goals, and gaining an understanding of the District's vision, educational program, existing facility conditions, and projected enrollment growth, the Committee identified potential projects that addressed District needs. Through a series of exercises, members developed a preferred approach to address need at each facility. This preferred approach prioritized projects with the context of District need and community support.

Two rounds of planning exercises and discussion resulted in the development of six plan scenarios that addressed District need in different priorities. The final planning meeting provided an opportunity for Committee members to confirm a series of guiding principles for the Long-Range Facility plan and prioritize the six plan scenarios.

Although all plan scenarios represent viable approaches to address the needs of the District and community, one proposal was most strongly supported by the Committee. The preferred proposal will be reconfirmed prior to the District's, and Board's, future decision to move forward with a capital measure request.

COMMUNITY INPUT

Community involvement is an important component in long-range facility planning, and should inform plan development. In addition to the diverse community representation on the FPC, outreach sessions were held during the need evaluation phase of the process with District teachers and staff, students, and the broader Island community.

A second round of outreach sessions, scheduled to garner input on plan options developed by the FPC, did not occur due to impacts of the Coronavirus pandemic. It is the District's intent to engage the broader community at a later date to gather input and confirm the prioritization of the Long-Range Facility Plan developed by the FPC.

IMAGES & DIAGRAM : Spectrum Voting & Results



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION & APPROACH

IDENTIFYING NEED

In the first planning meeting, Committee members were asked to evaluate how well existing District facilities meet the long-range planning goals, based on the facility needs presented in the first two meetings. Individual responses were gathered on a spectrum for each facility, shown above.

The facilities that most or all Committee members identified as not meeting long-range planning goals, and therefore having the greatest need, were:

> Island Park Elementary School



- > West Mercer Elementary School
- > Islander Middle School (100/200 and 300 buildings)
- > Crest Learning Center

Most felt that the District's two newest facilities, Northwood Elementary School and Islander Middle School Phase One, were sufficiently meeting the planning goals. Lakeridge Elementary School, Mercer Island High School, and the Administration building fell in between.

DEVELOPING THE APPROACH

The Committee was then divided into five table groups to discuss and establish the preferred approach to address District need at each grade level. Approaches included renovation (significant maintenance), major modernization (full upgrade to a 70-year building, with or without educational adequacy improvements), or facility replacement (new construction). Groups discussed a high-level targeted question for each category and then voted. One example is shown on the following page, and others are included in Appendix C: Plan Development.

Elementary School Approach

Elementary school replacement was preferred. (Full modernization was chosen by one group due to lack of clarity around relative cost.)

> Existing elementary schools need significant work and should be brought up to the District standard.

IMAGES & DIAGRAM : Approach Exercise & Results



 Facility replacement provides the potential for increased opportunities to improve sustainability, educational adequacy, and building components.

Middle School Approach

Replacement of older middle school buildings was preferred.

- > The older middle school buildings have significant deficiencies.
- > The existing middle school environment feels disjointed, due to extreme differences between the new and old facilities, and the physical separation between buildings.
- > The completed Phase One building was successful and there is a desire to complete this process. Phase Two should connect the buildings.

 Replacement of middle school facilities will impact every student in the District.

High School Approach

Modernization of the high school, with an emphasis on educational adequacy is preferred.

- > There is a desire to improve how the high school can be used, but not implement full-scale modernization.
- Full modernization projects should only occur on an as-needed basis.
- > A range of educational improvements were supported, including CCR spaces, counseling, and library improvements, because they would be visible and benefit all students.

Crest Learning Center Approach

Expansion and relocation of Crest was preferred. Separation of ATP and Crest was also supported.

- > The existing Crest facility does not meet program needs and is not in good condition. It should be relocated, either closer to or connected to the high school.
- Crest should maintain a separate identity as a smaller-scale learning environment, with flexible spaces and individualized learning.
- > Consider co-location with other programs, such as CCR, to reduce stigma and create a stronger proximity to programs that would benefit Crest students.

DIAGRAM:

Long-Range Facility Plan Projects

| | T | 5 |
|--|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |

Island Park Elementary School

Replacement of existing elementary school



HS

Islander Middle School Phase II

Replacement of remaining older middle school buildings (100/200 and 300) to complete middle school facility

Mercer Island High School:

Various Projects

> Science

> College & Career

> Performing Arts
> PE / Athletics
> General Education
> Shared / Support Areas

Readiness (CCR)

Administration Building

Admin. Relacement of the existing Administration Building

WM

LR

Int.

West Mercer Elementary School

Replacement of existing elementary school

Replacement of existing elementary school

Additions/improvements to

existing elementary schools, such as: gymnasium, cafeteria,

Lakeridge Elementary

School

Crest

Crest Learning Center

Replacement of existing Crest facility with a 200-student capacity increase

| | Mary Wayte Pool |
|------|--|
| Pool | Relacement of the existing Mary Wayte Pool facility |

| | Adult Transition Program (ATP) |
|---|--------------------------------|
|) | Relocation of the ATP |

Relocation of the ATP program out of the Crest facility

or classroom addition

Interim Projects

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

PROJECTS

Previous Committee input regarding planning goals and approach was used to develop a list of major projects that address District need, shown above.

The projects include replacement of the three older elementary schools, the older middle school buildings, and Crest Learning Center, as well as a number of program-related improvement projects at the high school. Support facilities that were determined to need replacement were the administration building and Mary Wayte Pool.

Interim projects were included as a way to improve some conditions at schools

that were prioritized later in the process, in the interim before they were replaced.

PLAN SCENARIOS

Using this set of projects as a base, five Committee groups each developed two rounds of plan scenarios. The projects were organized along a priority timeline by each group, The groups shared their scenarios and rationale, and then completed a second round of scenario development, incorporating interim projects and ideas they heard from other groups.

The second round scenarios, shown on the following page, were used as the basis for moving forward in the planning process.

THEMES

AT

Although each group's plan scenario was different, there were a number of consistent themes among the five plans. Each theme is listed below, along with rationale and observations from the Committee.

Interim projects are consistently located within the first three priority projects.

- Completing interim projects early creates better equity across District
- Interim projects proposed for either one, two, or three elementary schools
- It was noted that it was difficult to determine the right amount of time between an interim project and the full replacement of a school

IMAGES & DIAGRAM:

Plan Development Exercise & Resulting Plan Scenarios (Round 2)



Island Park is always the first priority of the three elementary schools.

- > Central, visible, and has many needs
- Replaces an old building that has safety issues and does not use the site well
- > Improves traffic impacts for the school and the surrounding community

West Mercer is always the second priority of the three elementary schools.

- Addresses potential additional population growth from downtown
- > Reduces reliance on portables

Lakeridge is always the last priority of the three elementary schools.

> It is in reasonably good condition



All groups put IMS Phase 2 (Buildings 100/200 and 300) within the first three priorities.

- Impacts the greatest number of students (serves all students)
- Has the greatest facility condition need, including immediate need for new roof
- Expected by the community and finishes what was already started (Phase 1)
- > Potential to create a community showcase: all elementary students to have a place where they are excited to go
- Consolidates buildings (this is the first place students unite from across the District, so it is important to have a cohesive facility)

> Addresses planning goals including safety and adaptability of spaces

High school projects are clustered within the first two and last three priorities.

Earlier Projects:

- Has a wide impact and reaches the most students early on
- > Good community buy-in
- Addresses top planning goals such as providing more opportunities for occupational learning, including CCR

Later Projects:

- Some projects are not as core to student learning
- Possible candidates for booster or other outside funding

DIAGRAM:

Summary of Committee's Original Plan Scenarios (Round 2)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------|----------------------|----------------------|----|----------------------|------|------|-----------|
| GROUP 1 ORIGINAL PLAN SCENARIO | IP | Int. HS | IMS | Crest & Admin. | wм | LR | HS | Pool | | |
| GROUP 2 ORIGINAL PLAN SCENARIO | Int. HS | IP | IMS | wм | Crest & Admin. | LR | HS | Pool | | |
| GROUP 3 ORIGINAL PLAN SCENARIO | Int. HS | IMS | IP | wм | LR | HS | Crest & Admin. | Pool | | |
| GROUP 4 ORIGINAL PLAN SCENARIO | IMS | Int. | Pool | Crest & Admin. | IP | WM | HS | LR | HS | |
| GROUP 5 ORIGINAL PLAN SCENARIO | IMS | IP | Int. | Crest & Admin. | wм | LR | HS | HS | Pool | |

Crest prioritization varies widely, but always includes pairing with administration and possibly other related high school programs. Four out of five groups prioritized the Crest/ Administration replacement in either the first or second round of high school level projects.

- Maximizes use of the megablock site and accommodates enrollment projections
- > Moves Crest closer to the high school, adds professional development space, and frees up space for parking and learning spaces on the megablock site
- May provide stronger association with other high school programs, such as CCR

HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

An analysis of each group's placement of individual high school projects in the plan scenarios, by averaging their numerical positions, resulted in the following prioritization order (with a lower number reflecting a higher priority) :

- 1. CCR (priority of 4.2)
- 2. Shared Support (priority of 4.6)
- 3. Crest / Administration (priority of 4.8)
- 4. Science (priority of 6.0)
- 5. General Education (priority of 6.4)
- 6. Performing Arts (priority of 6.6)
- 7. PE / Athletics (priority of 7.8)

PLAN PRIORITIZATION

The diagram above represents the results of the Committee's five plan scenarios in a simplified format for planning purposes.

- > Positions that had individual high school projects or interim projects are shown as a single element, but still represent a group of various projects
- Crest and Administration are combined into one project (with a new color), as was unanimously represented in the scenarios
- > The ATP project is not included in the scenarios, as it was determined by the District that this project would need to happen sooner than the implementation of the long-range plan

DIAGRAM:

Consolidation Process for Plan Scenarios







FOCUS ON MAJOR PROJECTS

SCENARIO CONSOLIDATION

Consolidation of plan approaches was used as a method to streamline the prioritization process. Three strategies were explored In order to facilitate consolidation of the five plan proposals:

- > Focus on major projects
- > Combine high school level projects
- > Adjust location of "outliers"

Focus on Major Projects

The amount of time between implementation of interim projects and full replacement of schools is not certain, which will impact whether implementation of interim projects makes sense. In addition, there is no guarantee that the design and location of interim projects can be incorporated into the best long-term design solution for future replacement schools, meaning interim projects may also need to be replaced. Therefore, it was determined that the interim projects should be taken out of the scenarios for the long-range plan.

For approaches that filled an entire priority position with interim projects, focusing on major projects simplifies COMBINE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL PROJECTS

prioritization and shifts projects forward. For approaches that combined high school projects with various interim projects in a single priority position, focusing on major projects will allow additional high school projects within the first high school priority position.

Combine High School Level Projects

The size of the Crest/Administration replacement project is significantly smaller than other major building replacement projects. Therefore, combining it with other high school projects reflects this distinction and simplifies prioritization. Final prioritization of individual high school projects will be determined in the future, however, replacement of Crest/ Administration should be considered as a candidate for the first round of high school projects.

The Crest/Administration replacement project combines with other high priority high school level projects, reflecting the size of the Crest / Administration project, relative to other replacement projects, and simplifies prioritization. Priorities shift forward one position. ADJUST LOCATION OF "OUTLIERS"

Adjust the Location of "Outliers"

The Planning Committee has discussed the desire for a partnership between the District and the City for modernization or replacement of the pool. Pending the outcome of this potential partnership, shifting the pool project to align with all other plan proposals facilitates consolidation into fewer plan proposals. In addition, the District has recently invested approximately \$3 million into the pool facility, including a new roof and replacing mechanical systems.

Aligning the pool project with all other proposals shifts all other major projects forward, putting Island Park Elementary within the first three priority positions. The shift of Island Park creates alignment with other plans, with regard to the idea of doing something at every grade level as soon as possible. Positions 4-7 become sequentially identical.

The resulting five plan scenarios fall into three categories, shown in the diagram opposite: Island Park first, high school projects first, and middle school first.

DIAGRAM: Final Long-Range Plan Scenarios

2 5 7 1 3 4 6 HS/ IMS IP-1 IP WM LR HS Pool Crest ISLAND PARK FIRST HS/ IP-2 IP IMS WM LR HS Pool Crest HS/ MS-1 IMS IP WM LR HS Pool Crest HS/ MS-2 IMS IP WM LR HS Pool Crest HS/ IP IMS WM LR HS Pool HS-1 Crest HS/ IMS HS-2 IP WM LR HS Pool Crest

ADDITIONAL SCENARIO

An additional approach (IP-2) was added to the five scenarios, to align with a key guiding principle identified during the planning process: "Do something at every grade level as soon as you can". Adding this approach also allowed the Committee to explore all possible priority sequences for the first three projects.

With the addition of this option, the six scenarios fall into three basic groups: those that prioritized replacement of Island Park Elementary School first (IP-1 and IP-2), those that prioritized completion of Islander Middle School first (MS-1 and MS-2), and those that prioritized MIHS projects and Crest first (HS-1 and HS-2).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Long-Range Facility Plan guiding principles are a set of basic tenets which evolved out of the Committee's plan scenarios. They were used as a tool in the plan prioritization process, and can be used to inform and guide subsequent long-range planning discussions.

The guiding principles are separated into two categories, those that relate to the Committee's overall "approach" to projects and those that relate to the "prioritization" of projects.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES: APPROACH

> Elementary Schools: replace or fully modernize, depending on cost implications

MIDDLE SCHOOL FIRST

HIGH SCHOOL PROJECTS / CREST FIRST

- > Middle School: replace remaining buildings rather than fully modernize
- > High School: implement renovation/ limited modernization with an emphasis on educational adequacy/ program need
- > Crest: relocate and expand in a new location that is closer to the high school (and consider co-location with administration or other programs)
- > Implement needed repairs as necessary at all facilities, to maintain operations

GUIDING PRINCIPLES: PRIORITIZATION

> Do something at every grade level as soon as you can

DIAGRAM:

Preferred Long-Range Plan Scenario with Committee Observations



- > Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects; prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer and then Lakeridge
- > Islander Middle School should be one of the first three projects
- > The first projects at the high school level include CCR, Shared Support, and Crest/Administration
- Prioritize improvement projects that have the primary purpose of supporting education

PRIORITIZATION

Committee members were asked which sequence of projects they most supported, considering the following criteria:

- > Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?)
- > Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?)
- > Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
- > Committee goals (Which project best aligns with the top planning goals?)
- > Community support (Which projects will make sense and resonate with the broader community?)

The MS-2 planning scenario had the most Committee support, with 73% of the votes. (85% supported doing the middle school first, including votes for both MS-1 and MS-2.) Committee members' reasons for choosing the MS-2 plan sequence fell into a number of common themes, which are included in the above diagram.

PREFERRED PLAN SCENARIO

The Long-Range Facility Plan scenario, illustrated in the above diagram and described on the following page, represents the preferred approach with regards to the prioritization of District need over the next ten years and beyond. It is the culmination of an in-depth planning process with the Mercer Island School District, Board of Directors, FPC, and the broader Island community.

The MS-2 plan scenario selected by the FPC prioritizes Islander Middle

LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN: PREFERRED PLAN SCENARIO

PROJECT 1: ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL PHASE II

Replacement of the remaining older middle school buildings (100/200 and 300) to complete the middle school facility.

- > 1,300 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 2: ISLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of the existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 3: MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL (VARIOUS PROJECTS) & CREST LEARNING CENTER

Addition and/or improvement projects that may include:

College & Career Readiness (CCR)

- New hands-on (STEM/ maker space / life skills) lab(s) and support
- > Robotics lab expansion
- > Broadcast studio expansion
- > Art room expansion
- > New journalism classroom
- > Other specialized learning areas

Science

 Improvements to older existing science labs with the goal of equivalency to newer science labs

Performing Arts

- > Theater upgrade and/or expansion
- New dedicated teaching space for drama, dance, and performance (black box theater)

PE / Athletics

- Expansion to create equitable practice space, locker rooms, and team rooms
- > Dedicated PE classroom
- > Gymnasium improvements
- > Field improvements

General Education

- > Improvements to existing general classrooms
- > Technology and aesthetic upgrades
- > Shared learning / study areas
- Increase flexibility and opportunities for collaboration

Shared / Support Areas > Library modernization

- > Counseling improvements
- > Teacher offices / support
- > New gender-inclusive restrooms
- > Parking improvements

Crest Learning Center

- > Replacement of existing Crest facility
- > 200 student capacity (150% of existing size)
- > Add a second large greenhouse

PROJECT 4: WEST MERCER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 5: LAKERIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Replacement of existing elementary school facility.

- > 450-500 student capacity
- > Plan flexibility for future expansion

PROJECT 6: MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL: VARIOUS PROJECTS

Remainder of Mercer Island High School projects that were not previously completed in Project 3.

PROJECT 7: MARY WAYTE POOL

Replacement of the existing Mary Wayte Pool facility.

School first, replacement of Island Park Elementary School second, and Mercer Island High School / Crest Learning Center projects third, followed by West Mercer, Lakeridge, the remaining high school projects, and finally Mary Wayte Pool. A detailed description of the preferred plan scenario is included on the following page.

It is important to note that while the preferred plan scenario identified the order of projects, and broadly outlines their potential scope, the specific timing of each project and how they may be grouped together in phases has not been determined as part of this Long-Range Facility Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the second round of community outreach meetings were not incorporated into the Long-Range Facility Plan process.

The District plans to gather additional input from the community, including District parents, students, and staff, as soon as it is feasible to do so. This effort will provide additional input on proposed Long-Range Facility Plan scenarios, particularly with regard to confirmation of the first three projects.

The District, School Board, and community will reconfirm the Long-Range Facility Plan prior to moving forward with any future capital measure. At that time, further development of project scope and cost will be completed. One or more projects may be planned in the same phase, depending on level of community support and funding parameters. Appendices

A. VISION & EDUCTIONAL PROGRAM

MEETING MINUTES

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island Schools District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 |
|---------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| DATE: | 21 November 2019 | FILE NAME: | M001_FPC1_20191119 |
| SUBJECT: | Facility Planning Committee Meeting 1: Vision 8 | & Educational Prog | ram |
| MEETING DATE: | 18 November 2019 | TIME: | 5:30 - 8:30 pm |
| LOCATION: | Quiet Dining Room, Northwood Elementary Sch | loc | |

ATTENDEES:

| Facility Planning Committee | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| X David D'Souza | Jim Stanton |
| X Deborah Lurie | Bob Olson |
| X Julie Ogata Ciobanu | Toby Suhm |
| X Janelle Honeycutt | X Anne Hritzay |
| X Kristina Mehas | X Kathy Morrison |
| X Steve Duncan | X Pat Turner |
| X Amanda Stoffer | X Lena Hardisty |
| X Kim Thomas | X Will Atkinson |
| X Susan Conrad-Wang | X Lin Hao |
| X Kate Wise Knecht | X Robin Li |
| X Dave Cutright | X Gus Poole |
| X Carrie Beckner Savage | X Sandra Levin |
| X Colin Brandt | X Becky Shaddle |
| X Vickie Cleator | X Zach Houvener |
| X David de Yarza | X Tiffin Goodman |
| X Debbie Hanson | X Sgt. Ryan Parr |
| MISD Support Team | Mahlum Team |
| X Donna Colosky | X LeRoy Landers |
| X Fred Rundle | X Jennifer Lubin |
| Erin Battersby | X JoAnn Wilcox |
| X Andreeves Rosner | X Marijana Misic |
| X Craig Degginger | |
| X Tony Kuhn | |
| X Brandy Fox | |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On November 18th, the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) held its first meeting. This kick-off session included an overview presentation describing the long-range planning process, the role of the committee, and educational program needs. This was followed with a presentation about the District's vision and mission, and a visioning session to identify goals and needs for District facilities that are important to committee members. A copy of the presentation can be found on the District website, for additional information.

COMMITTEE ROLE & SCHEDULE

- :: The Facility Planning Committee can have a profound impact on school facilities in your community. The role of the committee is to attend and participate in every meeting, work with the "big picture," ask questions, express your opinion, be open to others, and have fun! The District cares very much about your input. This committee and the work it is doing is a continuation of the legacy for public education and caretaking for the Mercer Island community.
- The committee is scheduled to meet five more times between now and the end of the process. It is critical that committee members commit to attending all of the meetings, so everyone is working from a shared knowledge base. Meetings are from 5:30 8:30 pm and future meeting dates are as follows: December 16, January 27, February 24, March 30, and June 1.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING PROCESS

LeRoy Landers presented an overview of the long-range planning process.

- :: A long-range plan is a high-level look at what makes the most sense for the next 10 years and beyond, in terms of facilities, and the ability of facilities to support learning.
- :: The three basic elements of the plan are the educational program, enrollment and capacity, and facility condition. Decision-making around the facts and needs in these three big "buckets" are guided by the District's vision.
- :: Ideally, plan development will happen in a strategic, phased manner, through a process of discussion and prioritization. It is a balance of the amount of community support and prioritizing the needs of the District.

DISTRICT VISION & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Donna Colosky and Fred Rundle talked about how the District delivers on their core values, vision and mission. Their presentation further included:

- :: Seven Student-Focused Fundamentals within the policy of the Operational Expectations 1800 OE-1.
- :: Superintendent Focus Priorities: Teaching and Learning funnels everything needed to be achieved by the district; no departmentalizing programs but creating connected systems.
 - Educational Program for Students: programs serving toddlers in prekindergarten through students up to age 21 preparing for college and jobs.
 - Multi-Tier Systems of Support: academic development and social / emotional support are connected; available to every child across the district. This program has been in existence for two years and is continuing to be developed.

- Inclusive and equitable child-centered education for each student: focus on functionality of the whole system working and supporting all the students; ensuring students' voices are heard.
- Professional Learning: focus on all staff in the school district (not just teachers), to promote continuing learning and growth.

PROGRAM SUMMARY & INTERVIEW THEMES

LeRoy Landers presented an overview of potential areas of improvement for each educational facility within Mercer Island School District. The input presented was based on interviewing principals of each school. Some common themes across the District included:

- :: Provide more inclusivity around special education programs, allowing for inclusive educational experience for all students.
- :: Address the current challenges of multi-use spaces, specifically gymnasium and cafeteria.
- :: Provide for more adaptability of spaces, such as shared instructional areas and reconfigured libraries to create learning clusters and small group areas.
- :: Consolidate programs under one roof.
- :: Modernize existing spaces to better accommodate current technologies.
- :: Expand alternative education programs.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

JoAnn Wilcox showed examples of successful learning environments. The examples shown reflected MISD's core values and ways the educational spaces can be responsive to students' strengths and learning styles.

- :: In addition to reflecting MISD's core values, the examples were showing how to address multiple types of intelligences:
 - Verbal / Linguistic
 - Mathematic / Logical
 - Spatial
 - Bodily / Kinesthetic
 - Musical / Auditory
 - Interpersonal
 - Intrapersonal
 - Naturalist
- :: Key components in schools that thrive include:
 - Facilitate learning everywhere
 - Support multiple modes of delivery
 - Offer opportunities for social learning
 - Integrate technology throughout
 - Maximize connections to community
 - Seek educational partnerships and joint use
 - Embrace sustainable design
 - Inspire!

Page 3 of 6

VISIONING EXERCISE

:: Committee members brainstormed about goals for long-range planning in the District. Goals were recorded on cards and then voted on by committee members. Goals are listed below, grouped into like categories and prioritized based on the number of votes. It is important to note that all goals will be carried forward to inform the planning process.

Rethink spaces (36 votes total)

- Built-in flexible adaptable spaces (10 votes)
- Re-think libraries (8 votes)
- Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim (7 votes)
- Support for teachers (spaces) (6 votes)
- Prioritize needs of teachers and support staff (2 votes)
- Provide small collaborative spaces for teachers (1 vote)
- Purpose build spaces and limit multipurpose space (1 vote)
- Replace lockers with social nodes for students (1 vote)
- Consider if lockers are needed in high school?
- Repurpose old computer labs
- Consider a second silent library to provide quiet study space
- Provide teacher adaptability for spaces
- Improve space design to help teacher retention
- Reduce physical boundaries

Safety (29 votes total)

- Improve traffic impact around schools (10 votes)
- Locate all students under one roof (9 votes)
- Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school (2 votes)
- Improve pedestrian safety / crosswalks (2 votes)
- Reconfigure sites for more functional use and safer traffic (2 votes)
- Create an environment where students, teachers, and staff feel safe but not under threat (2 votes)
- Provide contextualized safety and security (1 vote)
- Provide more welcoming exterior and interior lighting (for health / wellness and safety) (1 vote)
- Disguise safety features
- Consider safety with regard to both exterior and interior threats
- Provide structurally sound schools

Flexibility and adaptability of spaces (20 votes total)

- Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools (11 votes)
- Support the whole student (5 votes)
- Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school (3 votes)
- Accommodate different learners (1 vote)
- Provide more accessible mental health space at the high school
- Provide more small, private work spaces

Character and feel (16 votes total)

- Create flexible and adaptable spaces (10 votes)
- Prioritize aesthetics and beauty in the design of facilities (2 votes)
- Create spaces that students are excited to be in (2 votes)
- Prevent noise cross-contamination (1 vote)
- Provide ergonomic seating (1 vote)
- Accommodate standing in classrooms

Page 4 of 6

- Foster appreciation of place
- Provide age-appropriate environments in school facilities
- Provide natural lighting
- Provide flexibility for teachers to adjust lighting

Program (15 votes total)

- Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science (5 votes)
- Dedicate space for art (5 votes)
- Provide more well-distributed unisex bathrooms (2 votes)
- Provide spaces that stimulate creativity (2 votes)
- Provide surfaces to display art and express community identity (1 vote)

Outdoor space (14 votes total)

- Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during rainy season) (8 votes)
- Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active / passive; play / learning) (3 votes)
- Develop more covered outdoor areas (2 votes)
- Provide connections to usable outdoor space (1 vote)
- Maintain some separation of grades at recess

Occupational learning (9 votes total)

- More opportunities for occupational learning (6 votes)
- Integrate occupational learning / pathways (2 votes)
- Provide equity and a common experience for students across all schools (1 vote)
- Develop more CCR (CTE) programs on campus
- Provide visual access to engineering, science, and CCR programs

Special Education / Learning for all (7 votes total)

- Cross-pollinate spaces and programs to reduce stigma (3 votes)
- Provide a highly capable program at every school (2 votes)
- Reduce segregation of the highly capable program (1 vote)
- Create opportunities to see learning happening (transparency) (1 vote)
- Help foster well-rounded kids
- Provide diverse program options in all schools
- Provide a high needs program at every school
- Locate the Adult Transition Program (ATP) out in the community rather than in a school facility

Sustainability (5 votes total)

- Provide visible sustainability (as to why) (5 votes)
- Provide visible solar strategies
- Reduce the carbon footprint of facilities

Food / Dining / Social areas (4 votes total)

- Recognize that the cafeteria is a place for social / emotional learning; and consider noise impact (4 votes)
- Improve common assembly space
- Provide snack stations around school
- Explore options around food delivery

Technology (1 vote total)

- Distribute student technology (quiet spaces) (1 vote)
- Dedicate space for mobile technology (storage and charging)
- Be mindful of technology impacts on quiet spaces
- Plan for future technology changes
- Create adaptable environments that can accommodate future technology needs

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

- :: Sustainable and structurally-sound buildings were assumed to be a priority by members of the committee, and may not be reflected in the prioritization of above goals.
- :: The Committee asked if the District will pursue LEED certification. The District is not planning on pursuing LEED certification, but will obtain WSSP as appropriate.
- :: Previous LRFP work should be considered as part of this process.
- :: Adaptability of existing buildings should be considered: can they accommodate future needs; do their condition allow modernization?
- : Heating and cooling, as well as sound control, are big issues that should be addressed in existing buildings.
- :: It is important to interview teachers to get their perspective.
- :: Don't forget to provide speech therapist, psychologist, and other similar support spaces.
- :: Consider future transportation access options (new light rail may be used by future teachers).

NEXT STEPS

- :: A copy of the presentation materials and meeting minutes will be posted on the District's website. Committee members are encouraged to share and discuss with other community members and convey their input back to the group in the upcoming meetings.
- :: The next meeting will be held in the same location (Northwood Elementary School) on Monday, December 16 at 5:30 pm.

Page 6 of 6



Welcome!

| Introductions, agenda and objectives | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------|--|
| Process/Schedule/Role of Committee | | | | |
| Vision and Programs Vision for education at MISD Outline of programs and their relationship to facilities Program summary and interview themes | | | | |
| Designing for Student Centered Excellence | | | 20 min | |
| Break | | | 5 min | |
| Vision/Go | bal Exercise Goal cards and prioritization Grouping into themes Questions/discussion | (50 min.) (10 min.) (20 min.) | 1 hr 20mir | |
| Next Step | DS | | 5 min | |
| | | | | |





What is a LRFP?

Comprehensive summary of facility need

Studies district facilities' ability to accommodate educational programs Tracks district's capacity with respect to projected enrollment Documents the condition of district's facilities and sites

Tool for strategic management of a district's facilities over time

Explores modernizations, additions, replacement, and new construction Identifies desirable school sites and site acquisition schedules if needed Targets opportunities for more efficient use of sites and facilities Creates a prioritized plan that aligns with community support

What does a LRFP do?

Provides insight into community values and priorities

- Consolidates information needed to make well-informed decisions
- Allows coordination with jurisdictions regarding development in a district
- Helps districts strategically plan for future facility needs
- Keeps communities informed and builds support
- Establishes an ongoing cycle for keeping capital investments up to date
- Helps districts avoid doing something now that will need to be undone later

Objectives for Tonight

- 1. Understand Process/Schedule/Role of Committee
- 2. Overview of Vision and Programs
- 3. Overview Designing for Student Centered Excellence
- 4. Share Your Prioritized Vision/Goals











What are we asking you to do?

Consistently attend meetings and actively participate Work with the "big picture" Express your point of view and be open to other viewpoints Provide input regarding district's facilities' ability to support education in your community Offer recommendations regarding what makes sense to you Provide insight into what the broader community might support Serve as ambassadors for the process and the proposed planand hopefully have fun! We are not asking you to.... Lead the planning process

Lead the planning process Make final decisions regarding what is done with district facilities Establish policy

| Introduct | 20 min | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Process/ | Schedule/Role of Committee | | 20 min |
| Vision an | d Programs Vision for education at MISD Outline of programs and their rela Program summary and interview t | tionship to facilities hemes | 30 min |
| Designing for Student Centered Excellence | | | 20 min |
| Break | | | 5 min |
| Vision/Go | oal Exercise Goal cards and prioritization Grouping into themes Questions/discussion | (50 min.) (10 min.) (20 min.) | 1 hr 20min |
| Next Step | DS | | 5 min |

Mercer Island School District

Good to Great..."How effectively do we deliver on our mission and make a distinctive impact, relative to our resources?" - Jim Collins



Board Policy 0001

Board Policy 0001

Students are the priority

Values, Vision & Mission

Values - What are the core beliefs of our organization?

Vision - What is our "WHY"? What do we want for our MISD students?

Mission - How are we going to reach our aspirations?

Core Values, Vision & Mission

| CORE VALUES Students are the priority. We believe in: • Supporting the whole child • Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings • Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive • Providing rigorous | VISION Inspiring our students to be lifelong learners as they create their futures. | MISSION Mercer Island School District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively. |
|---|---|--|
| Providing rigorous and challenging learning | | |

Operational Expectation 1800 OE -1 Fundamentals

- 1. Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, student-centered education and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.
- Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical fitness; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science; and educational technology.
- 3. Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decision-making and citizenship.

OE -1 Fundamentals

- 4. Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.
- 5. Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- 6. Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.



Superintendent Focus Priorities

Teaching and Learning

What learning do we want for our students?

How are we preparing our students for their world?

Educational Programs for Students

Learning Standards (ELA, Math, Science, Environment and Sustainability, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Health and Physical Education, Financial Education, Computer Science, Educational Technology)

Special Education Services (Pre-K - Adult Transition)

College Career Readiness (CTE)

Alternative Education (including online learning)

Before and After School Care

Athletics/Extra-Curriculars

Multi-Tier Systems of Support

Implement a child-centered system of tiered supports that is inclusive and educates all students at all levels including:

- Interventions for core subject areas (RTI)
- Social-emotional needs (PBIS)

Inclusive and equitable child-centered education for each student

Assure equity and inclusion for each student that recognizes students' voice through continued review and adjustments to the District's:

- Programs/Services
- Practices
- Policies

Professional Learning

Develop and sustain professional learning that has a clear focus and is:

- Student centered
- Focused on the whole child, including social emotional and deep learning
- Utilizes best practices in support of quality teaching and learning for each student
- Collaborative
- Educator driven



"Multipurpose" room is used as a cafeteria and gymnasium. This causes a loss of 1 hour and 20 minutes per day for PE uses.

Having a centralized SPED area would allow better opportunity to connect with other students.

Multiple sensory rooms or "safe spaces" would be very useful. These would ideally be distributed throughout the school and easily accessible.

The campus is not secure. This problem is primarily related to multiple disconnected buildings (multipurpose and modular classrooms).

More "flex spaces" / project spaces distributed throughout the school would be useful.



Shared use of multipurpose room results in limited lunch set up time, impact on PE programming and food service carts having to be stored outside during PE.

and classrooms to enter the building (i.e. to use the restroom, go to the office, etc.).

Students in modular classrooms cut through other

Lack of multipurpose / common space.

No pods / project areas (classrooms and library are used for these functions).



Gym restrooms present a challenge, both from the standpoint of disruption of PE classes and supervised access from the playground.

Gym, dining / commons and entry, stairwells and corridor at Main Office are loud due to the number of hard surfaces. Restroom without direct access from the Health Room is not optimal.

West Mercer Elementary

Shared function of multipurpose room results in a number of PE classes being doubled-up. No flex space outside of classrooms.

Playground / play area is remote from cafeteria. Pod configuration for each grade is desired. Shared art and computer room.

Congestion in main corridor during pick-up and drop-off.

Students using four modular classrooms must leave the portable to use restroom or other school facilities

Islander Middle School

Multiple detached buildings create a lack of connection between both students and programs.

Common areas in the "classic building" are difficult to supervise.

Sound transfer between classrooms in "classic building" can be disruptive.

Building 300 science classrooms do not support current STEM programs very well.

.

III, DER

During hot days, the classroom areas get so hot (from about May through the end of school) that it could be interfering with teaching and learning.



Crest Learning Center is too small for programs currently housed within the facility.

Older science classrooms / labs should be larger to accommodate instruction.

Music program continues to grow. Additional space desired.

Counseling area and health room should be reconfigured to provide better access and confidentiality.



Acoustics in the Theater could be improved.

Separate Black Box Theater would enhance the drama program and allow theater to be used by more programs.

Improved Theater technology / equipment (i.e. lighting, sound, projection, curtain, etc.).

Reconfigure the Library into flexible learning spaces that will encourage better use by students and small groups.

Stadium seating and restrooms need to be renovated.

Improvements and connectivity could be made in College and Career Readiness programs (i.e. Broadcast programs).

Educational Program Needs

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Special Education - improve existing spaces

Portables – eliminate for use as classrooms and potentially remove from site Multipurpose Space – add new gymnasiums or cafeteria to provide separate areas for PE and food service functions

Educational Suitability – add shared instructional areas to create learning clusters and small group areas

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Special Education – allow for inclusive educational experience for all students **Consolidate** – consolidate all programs under one roof

Educational Program Needs

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Alternative Education – expand Crest Learning Center and potentially relocate College & Career Readiness – group existing programs to create a communications pathway and develop a new skills center with a variety of hands-on learning labs Science – modernize existing older science labs (eight) Athletics – provide practice and locker room space for all teams Library – reconfigure into flexible learning areas

SUPPORT / OTHER PROGRAMS

Adult Transition Program – expand program (150%) and potentially relocate Libraries – modernize existing libraries at high school and classic elementary schools Technology Space – create dedicated space for repair and storage Professional Learning – create a new multipurpose space with seating for 70 people

| Introductions, agenda and objectives | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Process/Schedule/Role of Committee | | 20 min |
| Vision and Programs Vision for education at MISD Outline of programs and their rela Program summary and interview | ationship to facilities themes | 30 min |
| Designing for Student Centered Excellence | | |
| Break | | 5 min |
| Vision/Goal Exercise Goal cards and prioritization Grouping into themes Questions/discussion | (50 min.) (10 min.) (20 min.) | 1 hr 20min |
| Next Steps | | 5 min |

How might the design of your schools respond to Board Policy 0001 and Operational Expectation 1800 OE-1 Student Focused Fundamentals?

Board Policy 0001 Values Supporting the whole child Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive Providing rigorous and challenging learning







Operational Expectation 1800 OE-1 Fundamentals, goals and objectives

Create a more personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction and student-centered education are **responsive to students' strengths and learning styles**, interests and passions

Multiple Intelligences

Verbal | Linguistic Mathematic | Logical Spatial Bodily | Kinesthetic Musical | Auditory Interpersonal Intrapersonal Naturalist

Multiple Intelligences

Verbal | Linguistic Mathematic | Logical Spatial Bodily | Kinesthetic Musical | Auditory Interpersonal Intrapersonal Naturalist

Verbal | Linguistic Intelligence

Facility with words and languages Reading, writing, telling stories, memorizing words



Mathematic | Logical Intelligence "Number/Reasoning Smart

Think conceptually and abstractly Explore patterns and relationships Learn form and concept before details







Bodily | Kinesthetic Intelligence "Body Smart

Movement is key to learning Hands-on learning Acting **Physical activity**



Musical Intelligence "Music Smart"

Sensitivity to rhythm and sound both as a learning tool and in the surrounding environment





Learn through interaction Group activities Seminars Dialogue in the classroom



Intrapersonal Intelligence "Self Smart"

Introverted Independent learning and study Introspection





Ecologically receptive Experiences in the natural world Relating information to the natural surroundings



Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.









Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, **cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration,** communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.






Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.





inequity



equity







| Introductions, agenda and objectives | 20 min | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Process/Schedule/Role of Committee | 20 min | |
| Vision and Programs Vision for education at MISD Outline of programs and their rel Program summary and interview | 30 min | |
| Designing for Student Centered Excellence | | 20 min |
| Break | | 5 min |
| Vision/Goal Exercise Goal cards and prioritization Grouping into themes Questions/discussion | (50 min.) (10 min.) (20 min.) | 1 hr 20min |
| Next Steps | 5 min | |

| Introductions, agenda and objectives | 20 min | |
|---|------------|------------|
| Process/Schedule/Role of Committee | 20 min | |
| Vision and Programs Vision for education at MISD Outline of programs and their relationship to facilities Program summary and interview themes | 30 min | |
| Designing for Student Centered Excellence | 20 min | |
| Break | 5 min | Questions? |
| Vision/Goal Exercise Goal cards and prioritization (50 min.) Grouping into themes (10 min.) Questions/discussion (20 min.) | 1 hr 20min | |
| Next Steps | 5 min | |

MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN

Issue Paper 1: Vision & Educational Programs

18 NOVEMBER 2019





MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mercer Island School District (MISD), which serves the city of Mercer Island, enjoys a widespread reputation for quality and excellence, combining academics, cultural expression, and athletic achievement. This tradition of excellence is a major reason many families make Mercer Island their home. Mercer Island School District has a K-12 population of approximately 4,300 students, and employs about 550 teachers and support staff. The average student to teacher ratio is 20:1. Achievement test scores at the elementary, middle, and high school levels are consistently the highest in the state, and the district maintains a graduation rate of over 95 percent.

Mercer Island encompasses an area of approximately 6.38 miles. The district operates over 675,000 square feet of facilities on almost 100 acres throughout the Island. MISD's educational facilities include four elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one alternative high school:

- > Island Park Elementary School
- > Lakeridge Elementary School
- > Northwood Elementary School
- > West Mercer Elementary School
- > Islander Middle School
- > Mercer Island High School
- > Crest Learning Center

In addition, the district has several support facilities, including:

- > Administration Building
- MOT (Maintenance, Operations, and Transportation) Building
- > Maintenance Building
- > Mary Wayte Pool

The map diagram above illustrates the district boundary and approximate locations of MISD facilities.



DISTRICT VISION

The Board of Directors has approved new Policy 0001 that sets the District's direction by defining its Core Values, Vision, and Mission.

The new values, vision, and mission statements center the District's work on students as the priority and educating the whole child.

The Student-Focused Fundamentals sustain accountability of these goals through an annual monitoring and measuring process.

VALUES

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- > Supporting the whole child.
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings.
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive.
- Providing rigorous and challenging learning.

VISION

Inspiring our students to be lifelong learners as they create their futures.

MISSION

The District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively.

OPERATIONAL EXPECTATION 1800 OE-1: STUDENT-FOCUSED FUNDAMENTALS

In accordance with the values, vision and mission stated in Board Policy 0001, the District will strive to achieve the following fundamentals, goals, and objectives:

> Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, studentcentered education, and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.

- Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical education; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science and educational technology.
- > Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decision-making and citizenship.
- > Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.
- > Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- > Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The following list includes information on district educational programs that could require and/or benefit from modification of existing facilities within the 10-year time frame of the Long-Range facility plan.

Not all of the district's educational programs are included. Of those shown, it is yet to be determined what, if any, changes may be made. Some programs were determined to not require action in the long-range plan, and are included for informational purposes only.

ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

PREKINDERGARTEN

Existing Conditions

Currently, the district provides two prekindergarten classrooms located at Northwood Elementary, with no prekindergarten options offered at other district sites. Historically, private prekindergarten programs have served the majority of island residents, however, there has been some discussion regarding a limited expansion of the public-school prekindergarten option.

10-Year Program Approach

For purposes of this long-range facility plan, the district has recommended that expansion of current prekindergarten offerings will not be incorporated into the plan. Therefore, no facility modifications will be required as part of this long-range facility plan.

Program Requirements

The education specification for Northwood Elementary represents the latest program of space for MISD developmental preschool programs. This area, including two classroom spaces and associated support areas, requires approximately 2,700 net square feet.

BEFORE AND AFTER CARE

Existing Conditions

Before and after school care is both desired, and needed, for many families within the Mercer Island community. Students are currently served by a thirdparty provider that is licensed to offer before and after care in gymnasium spaces and at Northwood, in the Art classroom. Historically, this third-party vendor has used unassigned classrooms, portable classrooms and the library as well. There are no dedicated spaces available for the sole function of childcare.

Before and after care is provided at all four district elementary schools, with all locations currently at capacity. In addition to this on-site before and after care, approximately 200 students are bused to off-site programs at the Boys and Girls Club



and the Jewish Community Center. If an approach were developed to expand this program within existing school facilities, the district would be able to serve more families within the Mercer Island community.

10-Year Program Approach

There are currently no plans to change the before and after care delivery model. If, however, the district opted to provide this service within its range of programs, other existing spaces, beyond the gymnasium, might provide additional capacity. There are no current plans to offer dedicated space for before and after school care within the district.

Program Requirements

There is not a quantifiable space need for this program at each site. Varying approaches to before and after care delivery will determine which existing space may be utilized.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

The district currently serves students with identified disabilities using a continuum

of special education services. This spectrum of supports is distributed across the schools. Elementary facilities serving students with higher-needs for support exist at Northwood and Island Park Elementary, with Island Park serving as the centrally located site for students also needing more intensive behavioral and emotional interventions. Existing elementary schools each have a resource classroom, however the function of these spaces could be significantly improved.

10-Year Program Approach

Facilities serving students with high needs for support will remain at Northwood and Island Park. The current and longterm vision is to embrace an inclusion model in all schools and encourage access to the general education setting rather than creating dedicated "special education" learning spaces or classrooms. Northwood's model for a dedicated resource room, but with many services moving into the "fishbowls" or classrooms, illustrates a configuration that serves students in this way. This is known as pushing services into the general education environments rather than pulling students out of their regular education program.

Other existing elementary schools currently have makeshift resource rooms, however the function of these could be significantly improved. While other support functions, such as sensory rooms, are currently provided in existing schools, the district may consider a redistribution of these functions throughout school buildings (rather than consolidated), thereby facilitating rapid and natural access for students and staff. The district's overall goal is to continue working toward an inclusive and equitable learning environment for all students.

Program Requirements

For schools being considered for modernization, existing special education resource rooms, classrooms and support facilities should be assessed against target program areas established by the latest elementary education specification. Northwood Elementary represents the latest program of educational space developed for MISD Special Services. This area, having one classroom, one resource room, one occupational / physical therapy room, and associated support areas, requires approximately 1,600 net square feet.

PORTABLE CLASSROOMS

Existing Conditions

The district currently has double portable classroom buildings located at Island Park Elementary (four portable classrooms), Lakeridge Elementary (four portable classrooms), and West Mercer Elementary (four portable classrooms). The district owns these buildings and they are relatively new and in good condition.

Following construction of Northwood Elementary, many old portables were removed from the sites, with those left intended for non-classroom uses. When used as classrooms, these portables create challenges, both for students and staff, including truncation of playground areas and interruption of sightlines (visual supervision) at some sites, limitations on class size, access to technology, safety / security concerns, and isolation from other students and support services.



In addition, direct student traffic via the exterior doors of other classrooms (to access restroom facilities and other school functions) impacts the learning environment of those classrooms. Other operational issues include conflict with stipulations made in staff contract language and difficulty managing "lock down" or other types of emergency drills.

10-Year Program Approach

Ideally, portables classrooms would be eliminated from all district sites, thereby eliminating all current operational challenges associated with them. Since portable use for classrooms is the direct result of enrollment exceeding permanent capacity, it would be necessary to add additional permanent learning space capacity, either through a classroom addition to existing schools or a replacement of schools that would increase total permanent capacity.

Program Requirements

Each existing portable structure contains two classroom spaces. The elimination of portables would require the addition of two to four permanent classrooms per site, cumulatively accommodating approximate 50-100 students per site. The area required for a four-classroom addition is approximately 3,800 net square feet.

MULTIPURPOSE SPACE

Existing Conditions

Island Park Elementary, Lakeridge Elementary, and West Mercer Elementary currently have a "multipurpose" space that serves as the auditorium, cafeteria, and physical education (PE) program space. These elementary schools currently have two lunch periods, with associated set-up and clean-up time.

Daily use of the multipurpose space for both PE and lunch is less than optimal from the standpoint of scheduling conflict. This conflict extends to kitchen/food service operations, with food serving carts at one elementary being stored outside while PE classes are being taught. The configuration of the Island Park multipurpose space also requires that students exit the main building in order to access the space. This arrangement is less than desirable from a safety/supervision standpoint.

10-Year Program Approach

The district's latest elementary education specification provides for separate food service and gymnasium (PE) functions. Ideally, all elementary schools would align with programmatic spaces identified in this district document. This could be accommodated by adding a physical education space or food service space to existing schools. The additional programmatic space could also be added during the future replacement of an existing school to meet education specification requirements.

The district provides community access to all school gyms and multipurpose rooms outside school use hours. The High School, Middle School, and Northwood Elementary School gymnasiums are generally used by the community until 10:00 each weeknight and on weekends. A number of requests are not able to be accommodated due to demand. Additional gymnasiums would also be an asset that could be utilized by the community during non-school hours.

Program Requirements

Ideally, all elementary schools would have a dedicated elementary-sized gymnasium and a separate cafeteria/dining area that seats 250 students.

The area required for an elementary-sized gymnasium can range from approximately 3,500 net square feet to 5,500 net square feet, and may also need to include associated support such as office, storage, and restrooms. However, the age of the district's three older existing elementary schools (between 56 and 66 years old, with one significant renovation) should also be considered when determining if adding new permanent square footage is the best option.

EDUCATIONAL SUITABILITY / FLEXIBLE LEARNING SPACE

Existing Conditions

Island Park Elementary, Lakeridge Elementary, and West Mercer Elementary were all constructed over fifty years ago and renovated in the early 1990's. Consequently, they do not reflect current thinking around teaching and learning. One critical element is flexible learning space, such as learning areas outside of the classroom and varying types of learning spaces for different learning styles and group sizes. Volunteers and support staff must use crowded hallways with frequent distractions to work with individuals and small groups of students.

Area per student is one metric that can be used to evaluate educational suitability in school facilities. Area per student is determined by taking the total gross square footage of a facility and dividing it by the total student capacity of the building. This takes into account all spaces within the building and provides the average amount of total space per student.

However, due to variation in the types and sizes of district programs beyond general education in each elementary school, such as preschool and special educations, it is difficult to use this high-level metric for comparison.



10-Year Program Approach

Ideally improve educational suitability at all elementary schools to provide parity among schools. However, it may not make sense to adapt older facilities.

Program Requirements

Each of the classic elementary schools contain approximately 18 to 20 general education classrooms. In order to improve educational suitability, four shared instructional areas of approximately 400 net square feet can be added per school, creating learning clusters of four to five classrooms.

Implementation would require both modernization of existing space and adding new building area, as some existing classrooms would be displaced and need to be replaced. Specific space requirements need to be determined on a school-byschool basis, however given a school's age and condition, this may not be the recommended approach.

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

Special education programs at Islander Middle School are currently distributed into two separate buildings.

10-Year Program Approach

Ideally, all special education programs would be accessible throughout the learning spaces to allow for an inclusive educational experience for all students. The spaces should be flexible in their use to allow for all related special education services to be delivered.

Program Requirements

Further evaluation is needed to determine the specific program requirements for combining middle school special education spaces, however it is likely that this can be accommodated through modernization of existing space rather than new construction.



HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION

Existing Conditions

The district has an alternative high school program, located in the Crest Learning Center. This program primarily accommodates MISD students on a flexible, part-time basis, with a small number of full-time students. The program serves students that need additional support or an alternative learning setting to the comprehensive high school environment. Additionally, CREST is home to the district's online learning program.

Currently, enrollment in this program is limited by the amount of physical space. It is estimated that the current enrollment demand is as much as double what current facilities can accommodate.

- > 108 courses taken at CREST (fall semester 2019)
- > 93 students taking one or more classes at CREST each day

10-Year Program Approach

In order to accommodate the growing demand for this type of education enrichment and an alternative environment, an increase in the amount of facility space for the alternative high school is needed. In addition to providing adequate space for existing functions, additional space is needed for online learning and small group / shared learning areas.

There is no plan to expand alternative education programming to the middle or elementary levels.

Program Requirements

Provide an alternative high school facility that is double the size of the current facility that is being used by the program (15,000 gross square feet). The existing Crest Learning Center is approximately 10,000 gross square feet, with 2,500 gross square feet currently being used by the Adult Transition Program.

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, as well as the best location in the district for the Crest Learning Center program (near, with, or away from the comprehensive high school).

COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS (CCR)

Existing Conditions

College and Career Readiness, sometimes referred to as Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses, offer the opportunity to explore and prepare for post-secondary education through realworld learning experiences that develop leadership, professionalism, and project management skills. Although the district offers a number of College & Career Readiness (CCR) courses at the high school and middle school levels, there is a significant unmet need in this area, in terms of the breadth of courses offered and appropriate facilities to accommodate CCR programs.

Currently, MISD sends students out of the district to access some CCR courses, which creates issues related to both travel time and cost. The lack of appropriate space has limited the type of CCR classes that can be offered. Many of the programs that currently exist are held in makeshift spaces that do not provide adequate learning space, accommodate equipment, and/or limit participation.

Current district CCR offerings include:

- > Arts, Communication, & Design

 / Multimedia: video arts, radio
 broadcasting, digital photography, metal and jewelry design, music technology, graphic design, AP studio art, journalism, and yearbook
 - Radio (small studio space with breakout and two offices; classroom is remote, so hard to monitor live radio and classroom of students at the same time)
 - Jewelry and metalworking have limited, space
- > Business & Finance: AP micro- and macro-economics, accounting, personal finance, business law, business communications and technology
- Computer Science & Engineering: computer science, AP computer science, engineering technology, and robotics

- Materials science classroom (used for robotics, too small to accommodate all students and is used until nine pm)
- Spaces for students to work in teams and individually on projects are needed
- Health science: health, family relations, child development, AP psychology, biotech research and ethics
 - Growth of this pathway, would have future facility needs
- > Horticulture: greenhouse
- Marketing: marketing, international entrepreneurship, and retail store management
 - Store and DECA room cannot accommodate demand

10-Year Program Approach

Students are required to earn two CCR credits to graduate high school. More importantly, completing a CCR pathway is one of eight ways students can meet the English Language Arts and Mathematics proficiency requirements. Students who struggle on standardized tests are disadvantaged by a limited offering of CCR options.

Create a stronger connection between all communications programs, to create a "multi-media" pathway (radio, journalism, marketing, newspaper, yearbook, and video production).

Add a new large, flexible space that includes robust hands-on learning environments such as a wood shop, metal shop, composites lab, innovation lab, and clean tech lab, for high school students.

Create a stronger connection to the alternative high school and look at the potential for shared use between CCR, alternative education, and a professional learning space.

Program Requirements

Modernize existing space in the high school to create stronger connection between communications programs, including a 50% space increase for the radio program (increase studio size and adjacent instructional space). Develop a new skills center with a number of hands-on shop spaces. Further evaluation of CCR pathways is needed to determine which specific programs and spaces would be the best fit for the district.

SCIENCE LABS

Existing Conditions

The high school currently has a total of 12 science labs, including eight science labs in their original 1997 configuration. These rooms need to be modernized, equipped, and sized to accommodate the current programs.

10-Year Program Approach

Modernize the older science labs at the high school to be equivalent to the new science labs that were recently added in 2014.

Program Requirements

Modernize approximately 15,000 square feet of existing space at the high school, include eight science labs and associated support spaces.

ATHLETIC SPACE

Existing Conditions

Mercer Island High School has a robust athletic program with nine fall sports, six winter sports, and 11 spring sports. The existing high school facility does not have enough space to accommodate all of the athletic teams, including gymnasium space for practice and locker / team room space. Currently, some teams are using the PEAK facility or the Northwood gymnasium for practices.

10-Year Program Approach

Modify existing space at the high school as needed to provide equitable practice and locker / team room space for all high school teams.

Program Requirements

Specific requirements associated with athletics improvements have yet to be developed.



SUPPORT / OTHER PROGRAMS

ADULT TRANSITION PROGRAM (ATP)

Existing Conditions

The Adult Transition Program (ATP) serves any student with a disability (typically medically fragile students) who would like to stay in school until they are 21. The program focuses on independent living and employment, with most students traveling to jobs off site daily. Currently there are approximately 14 students in the program.

ATP is currently located at the Crest Learning Center and does not have adequate space to meet program needs.

10-Year Program Approach

Growth is not expected in the program as it is currently implemented, but ideally the program would expand to provide job coaching services for high school students who are not ready for college as well, particularly at the alternative high school.

Program Requirements

Provide ATP program space at approximately 150% of the current area (3,800 gross square feet). The facility should include three teaching areas, including an apartment-like space for life skills, a flexible worksite-like space for job training, and a learning space for education. Additional needs include office, restroom, and other support areas.

Further evaluation is required to determine specific program requirements, as well as the best location in the district for the ATP program (with or separate from the Crest Learning Center).

LIBRARIES

Existing Conditions

Particularly at Mercer Island High School, but also at the classic elementary schools, library / multimedia centers are outdated for the current and projected delivery model. These spaces offer the opportunity to redefine existing space to integrate book collections, technology resources, and collaborative small-group work areas.

10-Year Program Approach

Modernize existing library / multimedia centers to provide space for functions beyond traditional library programs.

Program Requirements

Specific program requirements will need to be determined on a school-by-school basis.

TECHNOLOGY SPACE

Existing Conditions

Currently the district has limited space to store and securely store mobile technology.

10-Year Program Approach

Provide a dedicated space in every school facility to repair mobile technology and store securely in the summertime.

Program Requirements

Dedicated space should accommodate 12 carts of laptops and a repair/work



area. Specific technology space needs will be determined on a site-by-site basis, however it is estimated that approximately 200 net square feet will accommodate this function. Consider the potential to repurpose underutilized existing space in each school to address this space need.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Existing Conditions

With the increased emphasis on professional learning, there is currently not enough space available to accommodate the need for large meeting spaces for teachers and staff during the school day. Each school has professional learning at least three times per month, with the largest meetings between 60-70 people.

Currently, smaller meetings are held at the Administration Building, with larger ones having to utilize rented space at a nearby church or the Mercer Island Community Center. The PEAK facility is used only occasionally due to schedule conflicts with PEAK programs as well as suitability of the facility.

10-Year Program Approach

Provide a "learning hub" for teachers and staff that is a robust virtual classroom environment for adult learning, as well as a permanent resource and "think tank" area. This space can also function as communityuse space in the evenings, and may also be able to be used for some additional educational functions during the day.

Program Requirements

Provide a new multipurpose space that seats 70 people, with associated support space (break out spaces, storage). The multipurpose space should be dividable into three smaller areas, for greater flexibility of use, and have appropriate technology for remote learning and large group presentations.

The professional learning space could be part of the administration complex rather than at a specific school, although it could be part of a reconfigured Crest Learning Center Facility.

UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

FLEXIBILITY & ADAPTABILITY OF SPACES [12 VOTES]

- > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces [10 votes] [10 votes]
- > Rethink libraries [2 votes] [9 votes]
- > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim [7 votes]
- > Reduce physical boundaries
- > Consider if lockers are needed at the high school
- > Repurpose old computer labs

SAFETY [10 VOTES]

- > Improve traffic impact around schools [4 votes] [12 votes]
- > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school [3 votes] [4 votes]
- > Reconfigure sites for more functional use and safer traffic [2 votes] [2 votes]
- > Locate all students under one roof [1 vote] [9 votes]
- > Create an environment where students, teachers, and staff feel safe but not under threat [2 votes]
- > Improve pedestrian safety / crosswalks [2 votes]

- > Provide contextualized safety and security [1 vote]
- Provide more welcoming exterior and interior lighting (for health / wellness and safety) [1 vote]
- > Disguise safety features
- Consider safety with regard to both exterior and interior threats
- > Provide structurally sound schools

OCCUPATIONAL LEARNING [8 VOTES]

- > More opportunities for occupational learning [8 votes] [6 votes]
- > Integrate occupational learning / pathways [2 votes]
- Develop more CCR (CTE) programs on campus
- Provide visual access to engineering, science, and CCR programs
- Provide equity and a common experience for students across all schools [1 vote]

SUSTAINABILITY [8 VOTES]

- > Provide visible sustainability (explain why) [7 votes] [3 votes]
- > Address heating, cooling, and sound control in existing buildings [1 vote]

KEV

- > Provide visible solar strategies
- > Reduce the carbon footprint of facilities [2 votes]
- Consider future transportation access options (including new light rail) [1 vote]

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

PROGRAM [7 VOTES]

- > Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science [4 votes] [5 votes]
- > Dedicate space for art [2 votes] [5 votes]
- > Provide more, and well-distributed, unisex bathrooms [1 vote] [2 votes]
- > Provide spaces that stimulate creativity [2 votes]
- Provide surfaces to display art and express community identity [1 vote]
- CHARACTER & FEEL [6 VOTES]
- > Create spaces that students are excited to be in [4 votes] [2 votes]
- > Prioritize aesthetics and beauty in the design of facilities [1 vote] [2 votes]
- > Provide ergonomic seating [1 vote] [1 vote]
- Prevent noise cross-contamination
 [1 vote]
- > Accommodate standing in classrooms

- Provide speech therapist, psychologist, and other similar support spaces
- Consider a second silent library to provide quiet study space
- Provide more accessible mental health space at the high school

- > Foster appreciation of place
- Provide age-appropriate environments in school facilities
- > Provide natural lighting
- Consider appropriate use of color and use non-institutional colors

DIVERSITY OF SPACE TO SUPPORT LEARNING [5 VOTES]

- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools [4 votes] [11 votes]
- > Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school [1 vote] [3 votes]
- > Support the whole student [5 votes]
- Accommodate different learners (not only special needs) [1 vote]

TEACHER SUPPORT [4 VOTES]

- > Provide support spaces for teachers [3 votes] [6 votes]
- > Improve space design to help teacher retention [1 vote]
- > Prioritize the needs of teachers and support staff [2 votes]

KEV

 Provide more small, private work spaces

> Purpose-build spaces and limit

multipurpose space [1 vote]

- Provide small collaborative spaces for teachers [1 vote]
- > Provide teacher adaptability for spaces
- Provide flexibility for teachers to adjust lighting

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

ATHLETICS [3 VOTES]

- > Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields [3 votes] [13 votes]
- > Provide for safe and controllable community use [4 votes]

OUTDOOR SPACE [3 VOTES]

- > Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) [3 votes] [8 votes]
- Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active / passive; play / learning) [3 votes]
- > Develop more covered outdoor areas [2 votes]

TECHNOLOGY [3 VOTES]

- Create adaptable environments that can accommodate future technology needs [3 votes]
- Distribute student technology (quiet spaces) [1 vote]
- > Plan for future technology changes

LEARNING FOR ALL [3 VOTES]

- > Provide a highly-capable program at every school [2 votes] [3 votes]
- > Cross-pollinate spaces and programs to reduce stigma [1 vote] [3 votes]
- > Reduce segregation of the highly capable program [1 vote]
- Create opportunities to see learning happening (transparency) [1 vote]

> Help foster well-rounded kids

(storage and charging)

quiet spaces

- Provide diverse program options in all schools
- Provide a high-needs program at every school
- Locate the Adult Transition Program (ATP) out in the community, rather than in a school facility

FOOD, DINING, & SOCIAL AREAS [3 VOTES]

KEX

- > Recognize that the cafeteria is a place for social / emotional learning; and consider noise impact [2 votes] [4 votes]
- > Replace lockers with social nodes for students [1 vote] [1 vote]
- > Improve common assembly space
- > Provide snack stations around school
- > Explore options around food delivery

mahlum

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



> Add more gymnasium space [1 votes]

- > Provide connections to usable outdoor space [1 vote]
- Maintain some separation of grades at recess

> Dedicate space for mobile technology

> Be mindful of technology impacts on

FPC Long-Range Planning Goals

FPC Long-Range Planning Goals

| | FIRST ROUND FI (18 November 2020) | PC Prioritization | % of Votes | Change | SECOND ROUN (27 January 2020) | D FPC Prioritization | % of Votes |
|----|--------------------------------------|--|------------|--------|----------------------------------|--|------------|
| 1 | ATHLETICS | Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields | 8% | | 1 ADAPTABILITY | Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces | 13% |
| 2 | SAFETY | Improve traffic impact around schools | 7% | | 2 CCR | Provide more opportunities for occupational learning | 11% |
| 3 | DIVERSITY OF SPACE | Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools | 7% | | 3 SUSTAINABILITY | Provide visible sustainability (and explain why) | 9% |
| 4 | ADAPTABILITY | Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces | 6% | | 4 SAFETY | Improve traffic impact around schools | 5% |
| 5 | ADAPTABILITY | Rethink libraries | 5% | | 5 PROGRAM | Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science | 5% |
| 6 | SAFETY | Locate all students under one roof | 5% | | 6 CHARACTER & FEEL | Create spaces that students are excited to be in | 5% |
| 7 | OUTDOOR SPACE | Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) | 5% | | 7 DIVERSITY OF SPACE | Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools | 5% |
| 8 | ADAPTABILITY | Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim | 4% | | 8 SAFETY | Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school | 4% |
| 9 | CCR | Provide more opportunities for occupational learning | 4% | | 9 TEACHER SUPPORT | Provide support spaces for teachers | 4% |
| 10 | TEACHER SUPPORT | Provide support spaces for teachers | 4% | | 10 ATHLETICS | Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields | 4% |
| 11 | PROGRAM | Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science | 3% | | 11 OUTDOOR SPACE | Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) | 4% |
| 12 | PROGRAM | Dedicate space for art | 3% | | 12 TECHNOLOGY | Create adaptable environments that accommodate future technology needs | 4% |

Appendices

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS, CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

MEETING MINUTES

X Andreeves Rosner

Craig Degginger
X Tony Kuhn
X Ty Bergstrom
X Brandy Fox

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------|
| DATE: | 19 December 2019 | FILE NAME: | M002_FPC2_20191216 |
| SUBJECT: | Facility Planning Committee Meeting 2 | Enrollment / Capacity & Fa | cility Condition |
| MEETING DATE: | 16 December 2019 | TIME: | 5:30 - 8:30 pm |
| LOCATION: | Quiet Dining Room, Northwood Elemen | tary School | |
| ATTENDEES: | | | |
| Facility Planning (| Committee | | |
| X David D'Souza | | X Jim Stanton | |
| X Deborah Lurie | | X Bob Olson | |
| X Julie Ogata Ciok | banu | X Anne Hritzay | |
| X Janelle Honeycu | utt | X Kathy Morrison | |
| X Kristina Mehas | | X Pat Turner | |
| X Steve Duncan | | X Lena Hardisty | |
| – Amanda Stoffer | | X Will Atkinson | |
| X Kim Thomas | | X Lin Hao | |
| X Susan Conrad-V | Vang | X Robin Li | |
| X Kate Wise Knec | ht | X Gus Poole | |
| X Dave Cutright | | X Sandra Levin | |
| X Carrie Beckner S | Savage | X Becky Shaddle | |
| X Colin Brandt | | X Zach Houvener | |
| Vickie Cleator | | X Tiffin Goodman | |
| X David de Yarza | | X Sgt. Ryan Parr | |
| – Debbie Hanson | | | |
| MISD Support Tea | m | Mahlum Team | |
| X Donna Coloskv | | X LeRov Landers | |
| X Fred Rundle | | X Jennifer Lubin | |
| – Erin Battersby | | X JoAnn Wilcox | |

– Marijana Misic

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On December 16th, 2019, the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) held its second meeting. This session included a review of the previous meeting (FPC 1), followed by a description and discussion of capacity/enrollment and facility condition need in the district. A PDF copy of the presentation, along with the video recording, can be found on the district website. For additional information, Issue Paper #2: Capacity and Enrollment and Issue Paper #3: Existing Facility Condition, can also be found on the district website.

REVIEW OF FPC 1

- :: LeRoy Landers reviewed the long-range planning process, schedule, and the role of the committee. After this second FPC meeting, a high-level summary of all needs will be shared with the broader community, followed by three FPC meetings focused on developing long-range planning options for the District.
- :: A brief review of FPC 1 content included district core values, vision, and mission, and school design environments that can support the Board goals.
- :: The Committee identified and prioritized goals as a group during FPC 1. These goals were summarized and reviewed, and a complete list is posted on the District website. All goals will be maintained and used throughout the planning process. Major goal themes (in order by number of votes) include:
 - Safety (33 votes)
 - Flexibility and adaptability of spaces (26 votes)
 - Diversity of space to support learning (21 votes)
 - Athletics (18 votes)
 - Program (15 votes)
 - Outdoor space (14 votes)
 - Occupational learning (9 votes)
 - Teacher support (9 votes)
 - Learning for all (8 votes)
 - Sustainability (6 votes)
 - Character and feel (6 votes)
 - Food, dining, and social areas (5 votes)
 - Technology (1 vote)

*Note: Committee members who were absent at the previous meeting added their votes during this meeting. Their votes have been incorporated into the above vote count.

CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT NEED

- :: Existing district capacity
 - The district's Six-Year Capital Facility Plan establishes the capacities of each school in the district, based on target classroom capacities and utilization rates for each grade level, and classroom counts at each school.
 - The existing capacity target for elementary schools in the district is 450-500 students. All existing elementary schools in the district are at or near the desired target capacity range.
 - There is no district target capacity at the middle and high school levels, because there is only one facility for each.

:: Enrollment projections

- Enrollment projections quantify the expected number of students in the district over the next 10 years.
- High, medium and low projections were produced. Typically, districts use the medium range projections for planning purposes. The medium-range projection is currently being used for this long-range plan, but the Committee can discuss if this is the best metric to use.
- Medium-range projections indicate that the elementary (K-5) level is expected to have a seven percent growth rate through 2030, the middle school (6-8) level is expected to have a one percent growth rate through 2030 (relatively flat), and the high school (9-12) level is expected to have a one percent growth rate (relatively flat).
- :: Capacity and enrollment
 - Using the medium-range enrollment projections, existing district facilities are adequate to accommodate projected enrollment through 2030.
 - However, some elementary schools, including West Mercer, may need to manage enrollment with the use of non-permanent (modular) capacity that is already existing on the site.
 - Based on this data, capacity and enrollment is not expected to be a major driver in this long-range facility plan.

DISCUSSION - CAPACITY & ENROLLMENT

- What is the logic for stopping the projections after 10 years? Demographers will tell you that the farther out you go, the fuzzier it gets. A 10-year projection is the standard that is used for most long-range facility plans. If enrollment appears to be problematic in a district, a straight-line extension of the projections can be done to help think about longer term property acquisition (typically in bigger districts).
- How do we accommodate students if the projection is lower or higher? The middle- range projection shows all facilities basically full, so there is not a lot of cushion.
 The Committee can discuss and decide which projection is the most appropriate to use for the longrange facility plan.
- Is capacity the size of overall building or the size we will need? Capacity is calculated differently and varies per grade level. It is a planning metric that reflects the number of students that can be accommodated in a facility. For example, elementary level capacity is calculated by multiplying the number of general education classrooms times the target headcount per classroom (24) time a utilization/efficiency factor (95%). Donna Colosky indicated that the district is fully implemented for McCleary (17:1 student to teacher ratio) in K-3; this ratio also factors in specialists, so is not the same as the target capacity used for planning.
- How much warning did the district have before Northwood was built? How did the decision to build Northwood come about and how quickly was the district able to respond to that increase? Fred Rundle clarified that Northwood was built because the community was interested in having smaller schools, not as the result of an enrollment increase. Previously, the district's three schools were much larger. Part of the community's desire to add a fourth school may have been associated with the fact that existing elementary schools, originally designed to accommodate +/- 450 students, were overenrolled, serving +/- 600 students, far above their designed capacity. Each of these schools had multiple portables on site to accommodate the additional population. Northwood was built on district property that was a former junior high site and was being used as a rental.

- Is it possible to add second stories to existing schools or rebuild as two-story schools? This discussion will happen down the road. The Committee can determine if they feel if this would be an appropriate option or not. More broadly, two-story elementary schools are more the norm in most school districts, however it is not typically possible to add onto existing one-story school facilities, as they do not have the structure to support another level and there would be significant disruption.
- :: Enrollment is usually a big driver for school districts and communities. The Island has finite expansion options, so it is always a huge topic. Adequate attention needs to be given to this topic, and more details may be needed, such as superimposing historical enrollment data with real enrollment by school since 1997.

The district will ask the demographer if he can provide this information for the Committee.

:: There has had significant flux in the enrollment numbers in the past, and the projections were not always accurate.

The demographer noted it is difficult to project accurately at this particular time. The Committee can decide how comfortable they are using the middle-range projection. It is important to understand that using the high-range projection may cause enrollment to become a driver and will have to be addressed in the long-range plan.

:: Consider a planning strategy to plan for a future addition to add capacity and size core areas to accommodate the larger enrollment.

FACILITY CONDITION: MAINTENANCE & RENOVATION

- :: Life expectancy of various building systems
 - How long are building systems expected to last? There are many varying sources for this, but systems and materials do have an expected lifetime. Some are replaced periodically by the district as it wears out, like carpet.
 - Modern buildings typically have a 75-year lifespan. The Committee can determine what age is appropriate for replacement.
- :: Age of facilities
 - Age is only one factor among many that determine the condition of a building.
 - Major overbuild / renovations were done in the 1990s (23 to 27 years ago).
 - A building is a whole series of systems, each is typically scored separately. Scoring used in this
 plan was not destructive scoring, so cannot assess hidden systems, such as the structure. If all
 systems were replaced, it would be a full modernization, which would extend the life of the building.
- :: Seismic condition
 - There were a series of seismic evaluations completed for district facilities in 2011, 2013, and 2016.
 - Seismic condition should be considered in the context of "rolling compliance." New codes are issued every few years and there are some adjustments related to seismic every time. There was no seismic code prior to 1976. Over time, new codes coming out changed zones from low to moderate to high. A question to consider is: How far out of current code compliance is the building? (knowing almost every building is out of compliance) and: Are you comfortable with how far out of compliance it is?
 - Some seismic upgrades have been done in the district over time.

- The seismic evaluation conclusions for district facilities indicate that collapse is not anticipated, however significant damage, that may not be repairable, should be expected. If doing other work at the high school, it is recommended to do additional upgrades there, in a portion of the gymnasium.
- :: Facility condition
 - ICOS scores were developed for district facilities in 2018. ICOS scores rate facility condition, with a higher score being better. The scale includes unsatisfactory, poor, fair, good, and excellent. It is not a reflection of the district's ability to keep schools maintained.
 - District facilities scored very well in general, although not all facilities were scored (only schools).
 Facilities with the lowest scores were the older middle school buildings and Island Park
 Elementary, which is only slightly lower than other older elementary schools. Scoring for each school is also provided by system, rated from fair to poor.
 - A list of significant maintenance needs for each facility was developed by district facilities staff. These are things that have been identified to address in the future.
- :: Facility condition by school (some examples from each school are included below; see presentation slides for full list)
 - Island Park ES roof and mechanical system are the biggest issues. Safety on site / site access is not ideal.
 - Lakeridge ES roof is the biggest issue. Pick/up and drop-off is not optimal. Asphalt cracking throughout. Food carts stored outside during the day because cafeteria is used as a gym also.
 - Northwood ES this facility is new and scores are good.
 - West Mercer ES roof and mechanical system are the biggest issues. Also, lack of security on the site (open campus), storage issues, and accessibility issues throughout. Having a common way for everyone to get to different areas is the target for accessibility. The courtyard was recently redone and is very nice.
 - Islander MS the new building is fine. Scores are for the older 100/200/300 buildings. The roof at the 100/200 Building is a critical problem and needs to be addressed. Overall, scores are generally somewhat lower in these buildings. Work has been done to patch rotting soffits and other issues. Leaks associated with mechanical systems have been repaired.
 - Mercer Island HS generally scored higher than elementary schools and older middle school buildings. New addition areas are in good shape. In other areas, some flooring is wearing out, and exterior stucco in certain areas is in need of repair, which could cause water problems later on.
 - Crest Learning Center roof is the biggest issue. Stucco exterior needs some work.
 - Comparison of all ICOS scores: Island Park and the older Middle School building are the lowest.
 - Other facilities that were not scored: Mary Wayte Pool, administration building, and support facilities. Boys and Girls Club PEAK is a shared facility; the district does not own the building but has shared use of the facility.

DISCUSSION - FACILITY CONDITION: MAINTENANCE & RENOVATION

What are best practices around efficient use of the whole site on existing school sites?
 MISD's elementary sites are not large for elementary school sites; they are appropriately sized. In general, the district is using school sites very efficiently, and should be evaluated on a site-by-site basis.

- The Island Park site is topographically challenged and part of the site is five to seven feet lower in elevation. Another area of the site has a natural area that is not usable for school functions.
- Lakeridge has a big play area. The principal says it is too big for good supervision.
- Why was extreme heat in the summer a complaint at the (classic) middle school? This is due to lack of air conditioning, and is also an issue at the older elementary schools. Older mechanical systems are notoriously hard to balance across the facility. Parts can be cold or hot, especially as systems get older, and more difficult to get replacement parts. Northwood does not have air conditioning throughout, but has a different mechanical system that has been successful in maintaining appropriate temperatures.
- How often is a deep building inspection done to determine condition? There is some concern that issues may be missed since it is not possible to see hidden systems.
 There are systemic things that are very difficult to deal with, such as mechanical, plumbing, and structural systems. These may be underground or inside walls. Tony Kuhns explained that the evaluation does not include scoping the sewers, but they do talk about things at a detailed level during the evaluations (not just a visual inspection).
- What process has been developed for talking to the teachers? As part of the upcoming community outreach sessions, there will be sessions to with meet with both students and staff. Mahlum will collect that information and bring back to the FPC at the first planning meeting. Two broader public outreach meetings will also happen during the same week.
 - It would be good to have specific questions for Northwood teachers about how they are utilizing the new school.
 - Also consider outreach to PTA councils. They may be thinking about projects and should be looped in. Someone from each school PTA is included in the FPC. Also hope to have other PTA members come to the outreach sessions.
- :: Want to know what is already being planned to be repaired, in order to inform Committee planning decisions. Some of these things can be deferred depending on what the long-range plan is. It would be helpful to know what has been spent by maintenance (beyond capital expenditures).
- :: Is there an ongoing capital reserve fund?

Ty Bergstrom explained that there is a specific bucket for capital improvements (the capital projects fund, which is funded out of cap/tech levy, up for renewal in 2022). Average collection is about \$6.5 million, with \$3.5 million to technology and \$3 million per year for other projects. There is no state money to speak of. Out of the last bond, \$3.3 million in matching funds was provided by the state. This is due to a complicated funding formula and is similar in many states. In Oregon, it is only in the last few years that has there been any matching program at all.

- :: Prior to 1993/94, there was no long-term plan for capital or maintenance in the district. It was a group like this that really got things moving.
- How much time from the time the bond was floated to the construction of Northwood? The bond was passed in February 2014 and Northwood was occupied in September 2016 (2.5 years). Some substantial planning was done during the bond process (about six months of work). Typically, it is 3-5 years for design and construction. Facilities can take 18 months to two years to design and 18 months to two years to build.

FACILITY CONDITION: EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

- :: Area per student
 - Square footage per student is one high-level metric that can be used to evaluate educational adequacy and equity across a district.
 - National medians at the three grade levels are shown for comparison. At high school level, the national median is 172 GSF/student, middle school is 153 GSF/student, and elementary school is 137 GSF/student. Many new facilities in Washington and Oregon track with these metrics.
 - Older district elementary schools are all below the national median. Older schools tend to have lower square footage per student, because they were designed to serve a different educational delivery model. The middle school and high school are also below the national median.
 - Bainbridge School District's average square footages per student are shown for another, more local comparison, as it may be considered a peer district.
 - What does SF/student really mean? As an illustration, a five square feet per student difference equals 480 additional square feet per four classrooms (at 24 students/classroom). A small amount of area per student can change the way education can be delivered in a school.
- :: Educational adequacy by school (some examples from each school are included below; see presentation slides for full list):
 - Island Park ES multipurpose room usage for PE and food service, lack of flex spaces, centralized SPED area needed, general education classrooms are undersized and don't have enough storage.
 - Lakeridge ES multipurpose room usage for PE and food service, lack of flex spaces, students in modular cut through other classrooms to access, food are carts stored outside.
 - Northwood ES no direct access from health room to restroom, disruption of PE classes to access music room.
 - West Mercer ES multipurpose room usage for PE and food service, lack of flex spaces (would like to have two more pods), special education areas are disjointed, general education classrooms are undersized and don't have enough storage.
 - Islander MS (old buildings) detached buildings cause safety/security issues and make it difficult to create community, corridors don't accommodate break out areas very well.
 - Mercer Island HS older science classrooms should be larger to accommodate instruction, music program continues to grow and could use more space, counseling needs to be consolidated and reconfigured.
 - Crest Learning Center- facility is too small for programs currently housed, need new larger greenhouse.

DISCUSSION - FACILITY CONDITION: EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Consider that Crest is growing because students are not finding what they are needing at the main high school. Is there a way to improve the high school to create smaller environments for more/all students? Many students at Crest only attend part-time. It is an alternative learning program for kids who want that small learning community environment. MIHS is a large comprehensive high school, but is trying to meet the needs of as many students as possible. Crest also includes online learning for students. The Adult Transition Program (ATP) is typically not located with a high school facility. Those are not high school students; best if located in the community.

- Crest area per student is very low, is this an issue? It is typical for alternative programs to have a smaller area per student because they do not have many specialized spaces, such as gymnasiums. Crest doesn't have the small break-out spaces that are needed in this facility.
- Is the Boys and Girls Club not being used by the district anymore? It is difficult to use the space during the day. Do use somewhat for meetings/professional development, but tricky. There is a preschool there. The gymnasium space is used all the time – used from 3-6 pm every day. Did try ATP program there but it didn't work.
- What is driving the special education need at the elementary schools? The issue is both a square footage need and a desire for closer proximity. Northwood meets the needs well, and these types of spaces were not part of older elementary schools. There are elevated needs for students in schools today.
- :: Is the district in compliance with special education regulations? Yes, the district is in full compliance, but of course can always get better.
- What is the amount of need for special education spaces? Special education enrollment numbers continue to grow, staying high even though overall enrollment is flattening. The direction of special education is to not be self-contained. Consider the ability of the entire facility to meet the needs of more types of students (autism, etc.).
- Where is there space in existing classrooms to meet these types of specialized needs? Provide some examples of what a well-designed classroom looks like as a comparison.
 Mercer Island is in the same position as most districts in this area. Biggest area that is changing.
 Northwood classrooms are L-shaped, create a safe space nook, and have both shared learning and the acoustic privacy of a small group room. Most peer districts have similar approaches. The closest thing in existing schools to this approach is the corner classrooms at West Mercer, which have a corner nook space that is furnished differently and well-used. Could you reconfigure existing schools to meet current needs? Yes, but would be a major modernization, including decompression.
- :: How much of the desire for IEPs is due to facility conditions and constraints? This is difficult to determine, but it is likely that the facility environment has some impact.

NEXT STEPS

- :: The district will be engaging in broader outreach sessions in mid-January. Notices will go out before winter break. How many students would we like? As many as possible. The purpose is to use the first part of the session to provide a high-level overview summary of need. People can then ask questions and give other input on needs. All input will be captured and reported back to the FPC.
- :: The next FPC meeting, scheduled for January 27th, will be the first of three planning meetings. The Committee will do exercises to facilitate dealing with planning questions and issues. Be aware it may seem chaotic at first, but we will do our best to lend a bit of order to the process.
- :: It is very important that all Committee members come back for the planning meetings. The district values your input. You have invested time in learning about the need and can use this information to help develop the plan.
- :: The Committee would like to see more examples of progressive local projects that are illustrate what is being talked about. Not knowing what is possible may inhibit the planning. Consider a field trip around Northwood, although there are privacy issues.

Page 8 of 8







Strategic Management of Facilities





Role of FPC

We are asking you to ...

- > Consistently attend meetings and actively participate
- > Work with the "big picture"
- > Express your point of view and be open to other viewpoints
- > Provide input regarding district facilities' ability to support education in your community
- > Offer recommendations regarding what makes sense to you
- > Provide insight into what the broader community might support
- $\,>\,$ Serve as ambassadors for the process and the proposed plan

We are not asking you to ...

- > Lead the planning process
- > Make final decisions regarding what is done with district facilities
- > Establish policy

What an LRFP Does

Provides a comprehensive summary of facility need

- > Studies district facilities' ability to accommodate educational programs
- > Tracks district's capacity with respect to projected enrollment
- > Documents the condition of district's facilities and sites

Serves as a tool for strategic management of district facilities over time

- > Explores modernizations, additions, replacement, and new construction
- > Identifies desirable school sites and site acquisition schedules if needed
- > Targets opportunities for more efficient use of sites and facilities
- > Creates a prioritized plan that aligns with community support

Core Values, Vision & Mission

VISION

Inspiring our students to

create their futures.

be lifelong learners as they

CORE VALUES

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- Supporting the whole child
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive
- Providing rigorous and challenging learning

MISSION

Mercer Island School District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively.

OE -1 Fundamentals



- Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, studentcentered education and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.
- Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical fitness; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science; and educational technology.
- Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decisionmaking and citizenship.

OE -1 Fundamentals



- Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.
- Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- 6. Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- 7. Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.

Education Programs



Learning Standards (ELA, Math, Science, Environment and Sustainability, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Health and Physical Education, Financial Education, Computer Science, Educational Technology)

Special Education Services (Pre-K - Adult Transition)

College Career Readiness (CTE)

Alternative Education (including online learning)

Before and After School Care

Athletics/Extra-Curriculars

Multiple Intelligences

Verbal | Linguistic Mathematic | Logical Spatial Bodily | Kinesthetic Musical | Auditory Interpersonal Intrapersonal Naturalist

ASIBLE SOLAR STRATEGIE



Goal Exercise



Improve target friengent accusal school (2) (10 colos) Locate all Indication school reven (6) (volter) Telle for sale pecketrian (17 colosa da for 2 tente) Locate all andices school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste an annivorment school school (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste and (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste and (2) (colosa da for 2 tente) Deste and (2) (colosa da for 2) (colosa da for 2)

Instante (20 Internate) Provide anal. Joshibarative spaces throughout the schools (11 vo Support the which subter (5 Joshe) Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school (3 votes) Accommodate different isamers (1 vote) Provide more accessible mental health space at the high school



MORE OPP. BR

FPC Planning Goals

Safety [29 votes total]

- > Improve traffic impact around schools [10 votes]
- > Locate all students under one roof [9 votes]

Flexibility & Adaptability of Spaces [25 votes total]

- > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces [10 votes]
- > Rethink libraries [8 votes]
- > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim [7 votes]

Diversity of Space to Support Learning [21 votes total]

- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools [11 votes]
- > Support the whole student [5 votes]
- > Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school [3 votes]

| FPC Planning Goals | FPC Planning Goals |
|--|--|
| Athletics [18 votes total] | Teacher Support /9 votes total/ |
| > Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields [13 votes] | > Provide support spaces for teachers (6 votes) |
| > Provide for safe and controllable community use [4 votes] | |
| | Learning for All /7 votes total |
| Program [15 votes total] | Cross-pollinate space and programs to reduce stigma (3 votes) |
| > Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science [5 votes] | |
| > Dedicate space for art [5 votes] | Character & Feel /6 votes total/ |
| | |
| Outdoor Space [14 votes total] | Food, Dining, & Social Areas (4 votes total) |
| > Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during rainy season) (8 votes) | Recognize that cafeteria is social space / emotional learning; consider noise impact [4 votes] |
| > Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active / passive ; play / learning) [3 votes] | |
| | Sustainability [2 votes tota] |
| Occupational Learning /9 votes total/ | > Provide visible sustainability (as to why) [5 votes] |
| > More opportunities for occupational learning [6 votes] | |
| | Technology (7 vote total) |
| € 399 Mahaming Peters | 2 Ziziteon uuluu ekse |





Capacity & Enrollment

Reference Documents

Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024 Mercer Island School District No. 400 Adopted June 27, 2019

Mercer Island School District Updated Projections Educational Data Solutions, LLC December 2019







Facility Condition

Reference Documents (Maintenance & Modernization)

Study and Survey Update: Mercer Island School District BLRB Architects September, 2018

Average Life Cycle in Years

| Permanent Structure | 55 |
|---------------------|----|
| Portable | 25 |
| Foundation | 50 |
| Frame | 50 |
| Floor Covering | 15 |
| Carpeting | 5 |
| Computer Flooring | 10 |
| Exterior Walls | 50 |
| Roof Covering | 10 |
| | |





Seismic

| WA Year Built | | | Seismic Zone Area | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---|---------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Start Year (Code Ed.) | Through End Year | UBC Zone | Coastal | Puget Sound | Extended Puget Sound | Eastern | Notes |
| 0 | 1975 | N/A | Pre-Code (Pending Engineer Override) | | | 1949: WA designated Zone 2, but no state building code 1952-1958: WA designated Zone 3, but no state building code No state building code before 1975 | |
| 1976 (*73 UBC) | 1977 | 2/3 | Pre-Low | Low-Moderate | Pre-Low | Pre-Low | 1973 UBC Paget sound region designated Zone 3 out of 3 1973 UBC coastal and eastern WA designated Zone 2 out of 3 |
| 1978 ('76 UBC) | 1984 | 2/3 | Low | Moderate | Low | Low | 1976 UBC Paget sound region designated Zone 3 out of 4 1976 UBC coastal and eastern WA designated Zone 2 out of 4 |
| 1985 ('82 UBC) | 1986 | 2/3 | Low | Moderate | Low | Low | 1982 UBC Paget sound region designated Zone 3 out of 4 1982 UBC coastal and eastern WA designated Zone 2 out of 4 |
| 1987 (*85 UBC) | 1989 | 2/3 | Low | Moderate | Low | Low | 1985 UBC Paget sound region designated Zone 3 out of 4 1985 UBC coastal and eastern WA designated Zone 2 out of 4 |
| 1990 ('88 UBC) | 1992 | 2B/3 | Low-Moderate | Moderate-High | Moderate-High | Low-Moderate | 1988 UBC Paget sound region gets larger from 1985 designated Zone 3 out of 4 1988 UBC Eastern and Coastal regions designated Zone 2B out of 4 |
| 1993 ('91 UBC) | 1995 | 2B/3 | Low-Moderate | Moderate-High | Moderate-High | Low-Moderate | 1991 UBC Puget sound region designated Zone 3 out of 4 1991 UBC Eastern and Coastal regions designated Zone 2B out of 4 |
| 1996 ('94 UBC) | 1998 | 2B/3 | Moderate-High | Moderate-High | Moderate-High | Low-Moderate | 1994 UBC Paget sound (including extended Paget sound) region and costal region is designated Zone 3 out of 4 1994 UBC Eastern WA designated Zone 2B out of 4 |
| 1999 ('97 UBC) | 2004 | 2B/3 | High | High | High | Moderate | 1997 UBC requires additional detailing requirements |
| 2005 (IBC) | Present | N/A | High | High | High | Low-Moderate | 2002 WA State adopted the IBC. Eastern WA seismicity decreases from UBC |

Source: Washington State Building Code History Degenkolb Engineers, February 9, 2017

Seismic

Island Park Elementary Upgrades: 1995

Upgrades: 1995 Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Lakeridge Elementary

Upgrades: 1995 Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Northwood Elementary

Upgrades: Building completed 2016 Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

West Mercer Elementary Upgrades: 1995

Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

(Note: A Maximum Considered Earthquake event 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years.)

Source: Structural Evaluation Reports PCS Structural Solutions, November 21, 2011

Seismic

Mercer Island Middle School (pre-2016)

Structural Upgrades: 1995 Condition: Not considered a concern for collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (new wing)

Upgrades: Building completed 1016 Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

Mercer Island High School

Structural Upgrades: 1997 and 2013 Condition: In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, damage may exceed that which is repairable. While portions of the building were seismically upgraded in the 1990's, it is recommended that roof/wall connections at the gymnasium be improved when future construction work is performed in these areas.

(Note: A Maximum Considered Earthquake event 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years.)

Source: Structural Evaluation Reports PCS Structural Solutions, November 21, 2011



Facility Condition: Island Park

Significant Maintenance Needs
Roof replacement
Fencing repair/replacement
Parking lot grind/asphalt
ADA exterior improvements
Drainage improvements
Stucco and CMU Repairs
Exterior paint
Interior paint
Flooring replacement
Furniture replacement
Stichen equipment replacement
Kitchen hood replacement



Facility Condition: Island Park





Facility Condition: Lakeridge



Facility Condition: Lakeridge





Facility Condition: Northwood



Facility Condition: West Mercer

Significant Maintenance Needs Roof replacement Fencing repair / replacement Parking lot grind/asphalt Drainage improvements ADA interior improvements ADA exterior improvements Drainage improvements Stucco and CMU Repairs Exterior paint & Interior Paint Flooring replacement Toilet partition replacement Furniture replacement Boiler replacement Fire alarm replacement HVAC controls upgrade Kitchen equipment and hood replacement



Facility Condition: West Mercer



Facility Condition: Islander MS

Significant Maintenance Needs Roof replacement (critical at 100/200) Toilet partition replacement / re-configuration Fencing to create secure campus Bus loop asphalt replacement (grind / overlay) Bus loop lighting replacement Drainage improvements Stucco repair Exterior paint Interior paint HVAC equipment replacement HVAC controls upgrade Track and field replacement



Facility Condition: Islander MS



Facility Condition: Islander MS



Facility Condition: Islander MS



Facility Condition: Mercer Island HS

 Significant Maintenance Needs
 Struct

 Locker replacement in gym locker rooms
 Toilet partition replacement / re-configuration

 Theater lighting and seating replacement
 Exter

 Furniture replacement
 Brick cleaning and sealing

 Exterior paint
 Image: State of the seating replacement

 HVAC controls upgrade
 Exhaust fan replacement

 Kitchen equipment and hood replacement
 Exterior

 Gym bleacher replacement
 Mechant



Facility Condition: Mercer Island HS



Facility Condition: Mercer Island HS



Facility Condition: Crest Learning Center



Source: Mercer Island School District Study and Survey Update. September 2018

Facility Condition: Crest Learning Center



Facility Condition: Crest Learning Center

Facility Condition: Comparison by System



Facility Condition: Mary Wayte Pool

Significant Maintenance Needs Wood repair Exterior paint Interior paint ADA improvements at locker rooms Locker room renovation

Under contract for 2020-2021 Boiler replacement Hot water tank replacement Air handler replacement Ductwork replacement Circulation pump replacement Controls upgrade



Facility Condition: Administration Bldg



Facility Condition: Administration Bldg

Significant Maintenance Needs Roof replacement Parking lot grind / asphalt ADA improvements

ADA improvements Drainage improvements Wood repair Exterior paint Interior paint Flooring replacement Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration Furniture replacement Boiler replacement Hot water tank replacement HVAC controls upgrade Exhaust fan replacement Fire sprinkler installation Kitchen equipment replacement



Facility Condition: Support



Facility Condition: Support



Facility Condition: Boys & Girls Club/PEAK







Educational Adequacy



Example: impact of 5 sf / student



24 students/classroom x 5sf/student = 120sf/classroom

120sf/room x 4 classroom = 480sf

360sf shared by classroom pod 120sf distributed to other functions

Educational Adequacy: Island Park

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria (1hr 20min/day)
- "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas
 Centralized SPED area with new special education
- classroom and OT/PT therapy room
 General Ed. classrooms are small and do not have
- sufficient storage. Acoustics separation is poor.
 Multiple distributed sensory rooms or "safe spaces"
- > Multiple disconnected buildings
- > Administration area improvements
- Dedicated Art/science classroom(s)
- Student restroom adjacent to kindergarten classrooms
- > Hard surface play too close to classrooms



Educational Adequacy: Lakeridge

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria
- "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas
 Students in modular cut through other classrooms to
- access restrooms and other support services > Library utilized for guest speakers disrupts library function
- General Ed. classrooms are small and do not have sufficient storage. Acoustics separation is poor.
- Music room too far from stage, should be adjacent
- > Administration area improvements are needed
 > Dedicated Art/science classroom(s)
- Student restroom adjacent to kindergarten

classrooms

> Hard surface play too close to classrooms



Educational Adequacy: Northwood

- > Direct access from health room to restroom ideal
- > Disruption of PE classes to access music room
- Acoustics are challenge in gym, dining, entry and stairwells



Educational Adequacy: West Mercer

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria
- "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas, ability to create two more "pods" would be highly desirable
- SPED areas are disjointed and should be better located. Need for an additional classroom. Acoustics separation is poor.
- Gen. Ed. classrooms are too small and have inadequate storage
- > Library needs additional storage and more natural light
- > Administration area improvements
- > Playground is remote from cafeteria
- > Fields have poor drainage that limits use



Educational Adequacy: Islander MS

- Multiple detached buildings create lack of connection between both students and programs
- Common areas in the "Classic building" are difficult to supervise
- > Corridors need to accommodate small break-out spaces
- Reorganize classrooms in older buildings into effective, smaller, personalized learning communities
- Building 300 science classrooms do not support STEM adequately and need more storage
- Sound transfer between classrooms can be disruptive
 Provide a new school broadcast studio and editing room
- > Modernize library space and increase flexibility



Educational Adequacy: Mercer Island HS

- Older science classrooms should be larger to accommodate instruction
- Music programs continues to grow, additional space would be useful particularly for larger classes (band)
- Reconfigure and consolidate counseling and nurse's room to provide access and confidentiality
- Provide separate black box theater to enhance drama program and all theater to be used by more programs
- Improve / replace theater technology sound, lighting, projection, curtain Improve acoustics.
- Reconfigure library into flexible learning spaces that will encourage better utilization by students and small groups
- Improvements and connectivity could be made to CCR programs (i.e. broadcast programs)



Educational Adequacy: Crest

- > Too small for programs currently housed
- > Need new larger greenhouse
- Centralized SPED area with new special education classroom and OT/PT therapy room









MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN

Issue Paper 2: Capacity & Enrollment

16 DECEMBER 2019




ENROLLMENT & CAPACITY

Mercer Island School District currently serves approximately 4,300 students in kindergarten through 12th grade. The success of the district's educational programs is fostered in part by the ability of each school to house the students, teachers, and spaces needed for effective teaching and learning.

Planning for fluctuations in student enrollment is critical, as the state funding formula for education is allocated, and teachers are assigned, based on the number of students anticipated each year.

DISTRICT CAPACITY

DETERMINING CAPACITY

Existing facility capacity is a planning metric that reflects the number of students that can be accommodated in a particular building. It does not take into account specific variations in classroom sizes and configurations, and also does not signify the maximum number of students that can be accommodated in a school. The number of students actually enrolled at a school may be higher or lower than its capacity.

Facility capacity can be determined in a variety of ways. MISD determines capacity as follows:

Number of general classrooms (elementary schools) *or* Number of teaching stations (middle and high schools)

Х

Target number of students per classroom

Х

Utilization factor

Number of Classrooms / Teaching Stations General classrooms at the elementary level include grade-level classrooms, but do not include specialized teaching spaces such as music rooms, gymnasiums, and special education classrooms. At the middle and high school levels, all scheduled teaching stations are included when determining capacity, with the exception of dedicated special education classrooms.

Target Students per Classroom

The target number of students per classroom is a planning parameter that reflects an "ideal" class size target for a given grade level. Actual class sizes vary, and may be larger or smaller than the targets, depending on many operational factors.

For MISD, capacities are based on the following class size targets:

- > Elementary: 24 students per classroom
- > Middle: 26 students per classroom
- > High: 28 students per classroom
- Special Education: 10 students per classroom

EXISTING DISTRICT CAPACITY (2019)



These capacities reflect the targets included in the district's Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024, adopted in June 2019. This is a "living document" that is updated annually. Target classroom capacities will continue to be evaluated, and may be revised in the future, based on the findings of this long-range planning process or other developments in the district. They do not represent district policy, actual student count, or an absolute cap.

Utilization Factor

A utilization factor is applied, to reflect for the amount of time the classroom can be used for teaching each day. Target utilization factors vary between districts and grade levels, depending a number of factors, including the number of periods in the school day and whether teachers use their classrooms for planning. It is not possible to achieve 100% utilization because of scheduling conflicts for student programs, the need for specialized rooms for some programs, and the need for teachers to have space to work during planning periods. Lower utilization factors indicate that classrooms are unused for one or more periods of the day, due to teacher planning time and/or scheduling requirements, which is typical for most middle and high schools. For example, 80 percent utilization reflects classroom usage for four out of five periods a day.

For MISD, the utilization factors used in determining capacity are as follows:

- > Elementary school: 95 percent utilization
- > Middle school: 86 percent utilization
- > High school: 90 percent utilization

These utilization factors are also based on the information in the district's Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan 2019-2024, and will continue to be evaluated. They are intended to reflect an average "snapshot" of utilization at each level.

The district's utilization factors are all within the typical ranges for each grade level. The high school has a higher utilization factor than the middle school because teachers have dedicated planning areas at the high school and therefore do not need to plan in their classrooms. This allows classrooms to be scheduled for more periods per day.

EXISTING FACILITY CAPACITY

Permanent Capacity

The district has a total permanent capacity of 4,743 students in grades K-12.

The existing permanent capacity at the elementary level, which encompasses kindergarten through fifth grade, is 1,798 students. Capacities at each of the district's four elementary school are within a similar range, with between 420 and 456 each.

The existing permanent capacity at the middle school level, including sixth through eighth grades, is 1,314 students. All district middle school students are housed at Islander Middle School.

The existing permanent capacity at the high school level (grades 9-12) is 1,631 students, including both Mercer Island High School and the alternative high school, Crest Learning Center.



MERCER ISLAND RESIDENT POPULATION FORECASTS, 2019 TO 2030

Mercer Island School District Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December 2019

Portable Capacity

Three elementary schools in the district currently have modular (portable) classrooms on site, including Island Park, Lakeridge, and West Mercer. Each school has four portable classrooms. Because of the temporary nature of modular facilities, portable capacity is typically not considered when determining future capacity need in a long-range facility plan.

TARGET FACILITY CAPACITY

Target capacities at various grade levels are based on current thinking regarding the number of students needed to meet the district's program goals and provide an optimal learning environment. These capacities may vary through the years, as educational program models and funding levels change.

Mercer Island School District has established a target capacity for elementary facilities of between 450 to 500 students per school. It is generally assumed that existing schools that are near the target capacity are best suited to provide the opportunity for full academic programming. All of the district's elementary schools are either within or very close to the district's target capacity range.

The district has not established target capacities at the middle school and high school levels. Since there is only one district facility for each of these levels, facilities must be sized to accommodate all district students at those levels.

ENROLLMENT FORECASTING

Enrollment forecasts are used, in part, to determine whether the district will need to add or modify facility space to meet school program or configuration needs. Student enrollment forecasts, combined with a methodology for determining student capacity in each school, provide a framework for facility needs to better serve student achievement. As such, student enrollment forecasts comprise an important component of the Long-Range Facility Plan.

ENROLLMENT REPORT

The district received updated student enrollment projections prepared by Educational Data Solutions LLC in December 2019. Enrollment forecasts are typically updated annually to incorporate new enrollment data, as well as newly released birth and housing data.

The 10-year enrollment forecast integrates district enrollment trends with local area population, enrollment, and housing trends. Summary information from the report is included on the following pages.

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT TREND, 1997 TO 2019



Mercer Island School District Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December 2019

POPULATION TRENDS

- > The population of King County grew at a faster pace than expected between 2012 and 2019. Growth slowed between 2017 and 2018, but the estimated net population gain in 2019 was similar to the large gains between 2014 and 2017.
- > Much of this growth has been driven by a strong economy anchored by extensive hiring at Amazon. The company is expected to reach its hiring goal in the Seattle area over the next one to two years. After that, they are expected to maintain current employment levels (based on newspaper reports).
- > The State is predicting that population growth in King County will be more moderate over the next decade, compared to trends over the past decade.
- > Mercer Island is expected to grow at a lower rate than the overall County over the next decade.
- > The Puget Sound Regional Council's land use forecast assumes a growth trend that is similar to the City's comprehensive plan. It assumes greater density is possible, and thus greater population growth.

ENROLLMENT TRENDS

- Enrollment in the Mercer Island School District is tracking below the previous projection, completed in 2017.
- > Enrollment growth in King County has slowed over the past two years. Based on the most current year of enrollment data, K-12 enrollment in the Puget Sound is continuing to increase with more growth migrating to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish County.
- Mercer Island's share of the King County K-12 population has declined over the past five years, indicating the District is growing at a slower rate than the rest of the County.
- > Based on the latest birth and population forecasts for King County, we expect
 K-12 enrollment growth in the County to continue growing over the next decades.
- > Given the latest birth data, less K-12 enrollment growth in King County and Mercer Island is predicted over the next decade than was predicted in 2017.
- > There is no evidence that private schools are having a significant impact on district enrollment, however, data for the 2018-19 school year is not available from the State at this time.

HOUSING TRENDS

- > Home sales in Mercer Island have dropped in 2018 and 2019, compared to the trends between 2013 and 2017.
- > Over 1,100 units were added to the District's housing stock between the 2000 and 2010 census period, while about half as many units have been added between 2010 and 2019.
- It is predicted that just over 500 additional units will be added to the District's housing stock by 2030. This is much lower than the period between 2000 and 2010, and may result in less enrollment growth and even declines in enrollment in the near-term (2020 to 2025). The bulk of additional housing development is expected to occur between roughly 2023 and 2030.
- > A net gain of housing might occur in cases where an existing single family unit is torn down and replaced with two or more units. Greater density, as well as the development of new land, can result in housing increases.
- Based on the City comprehensive plan and the PSRC documents, some increase in multi-family housing units is expected,

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS



Mercer Island School District Updated Projections, Educational Data Solutions LLC, December 2019

relative to single family over time. But it is likely that single family units will still make up between 65%-70% of the City's housing stock.

> Based on 2010 Census data, there are approximately 42 students for every 100 housing units in the District. This number is higher than Lake Washington, Bellevue, or Seattle. The 2019 estimate for the District has not changed.

PROJECTED DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

The 2019 enrollment forecast presents three forecasts ("Low," "Middle," and "High") for a 10-year horizon from 2019-20 to 2029-30, as shown in the chart above. The middle range forecast is considered the most likely to occur. The low forecast considers the effect of less robust local area population and housing growth than anticipated during the forecast period, and the high forecast assumes stronger than anticipated growth. For the purposes of the long-range facility plan, the middle range forecast is used.

District enrollment projections for the next 10 years indicate an overall increase in student enrollment at the elementary level, and relatively flat enrollment at the middle and high school levels. As shown in the chart above, it is anticipated that MISD enrollment will flatten out and even decline some between 2020 and 2025, with enrollment growing again in the latter part of the forecast period (2025 to 2030) when more development activity and population growth is expected.

The current district enrollment is 4,387 students. Over the next ten years, total district enrollment is projected to increase by approximately 133 students, resulting in a total of 4,520 total students by 2029-30. This is an overall increase of approximately three percent districtwide.

Elementary Level

At the elementary level, growth is projected to increase by approximately six percent over the next ten years, resulting in a projected K-5 enrollment of 1,842 students. This reflects an anticipated total increase of 104 elementary students. As a districtwide average, this equates to an additional one to two students per classroom.

Enrollment projections have not been provided by school at the elementary level, however it is assumed that the proportion of students between the district's four elementary schools will remain relatively constant. This is monitored annually by the district. Enrollment balancing between schools can be achieved through special program assignment or boundary adjustment, in the event that it is needed in the future.

For the purposes of long-range planning, projected elementary enrollment has been allocated to individual schools based on the percentage of current student enrollment distribution.

Middle School Level

Middle school enrollment is projected to decrease by 0.8 percent over the next ten years, resulting in a total of 1,130 middle school students districtwide. This reflects an anticipated decrease of nine students.

High School Level

High school enrollment is projected to increase by 2.5 percent over the next ten years, resulting in a total of 1,548 high school students districtwide. This reflects an anticipated increase of 38 students.



EXISTING DISTRICT CAPACITY & PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

Preschool

Preschool enrollment was not included as part of the enrollment forecast. Although there are many thriving and growing private preschools on the Island, their enrollment is not restricted to Mercer Island residents and cannot be easily translated to determine future kindergarten population within the district.

The district has a developmental preschool program, which has a primary focus of providing support to children with a documented disability who reside in the MISD attendance area. In terms of enrollment for this preschool program, it is currently near capacity due to the amount of available space. If preschool enrollment needs increase, the district may consider expanding the preschool program in the future.

Other Program Considerations

Like many school districts, MISD offers programs and special services beyond K-12 general education instruction, to support students whose needs are not met in traditional school settings. The district currently provides alternative education options and special services such as special education and online learning. The district also provides full-day kindergarten throughout the district and an early learning program at one elementary school.

These programs typically have space and facility requirements that were not anticipated during the design and construction era of the older district facilities. It is clear the increased success and demand for these programs fosters space needs that must be designed and integrated districtwide into the overall program delivery for each school.

EXISTING FACILITY CAPACITY & PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

The chart above and the table on the following page compare existing capacity and projected enrollment for each school in the district. This comparison assumes current school boundaries, programs, and conditions. Based on this analysis, all of the district's school facilities have enough existing capacity to accommodate projected enrollments through 2029-30, including both existing permanent and existing portable capacity. At the high school level, projected enrollment can be accommodated at both the MIHS and Crest Learning Center facilities, which together accommodate 1,631 students.

EXISTING DISTRICT CAPACITY & PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

| | ENROLLMENT | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Facility | Current Enrollment (2019-20) | Projected Enrollment (2029-30) | Change (Number of Students) | Change (Percent) | Over/Under Permanent Capacity | Over/Under Total Capacity | | |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | | | | | | | | |
| Island Park Elementary | 410 | 434 | 25 | 6.0% | 14 | -77 | | |
| Lakeridge Elementary | 450 | 477 | 27 | 6.0% | 21 | -70 | | |
| Northwood Elementary | 408 | 432 | 24 | 6.0% | -34 | -34 | | |
| West Mercer Elementary | 471 | 499 | 28 | 6.0% | 43 | -48 | | |
| | 1,738 | 1,842 | 104 | | 44 | -230 | | |
| MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | | | | | | |
| Islander Middle School | 1,139 | 1,130 | -9 | -0.8% | -184 | -184 | | |
| | 1,139 | 1,130 | -9 | | -184 | -184 | | |
| HIGH SCHOOL / OTHER | | | | | | | | |
| Mercer Island High School | 1,510 | 1,548 | 38 | 2.5% | -83 | -83 | | |
| Crest Learning Center | | Crest enrollment is included in MIHS | | | | | | |
| Mary Wayte Pool | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| | 1,510 | 1,548 | 38 | | -83 | -83 | | |

mahlum

MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLAN

Issue Paper 3: Existing Facility Condition

16 DECEMBER 2019



MISD: Data Summary DRAFT

| | FACILITY COND. | | FACILITY SIZE | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Facility | Original Constr. Date | ICOS Score (2018) | Area (Perm. GSF) | Area/Stud. (Perm. GSF) | Recent Capital Expenditures | |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | | | | | | |
| Island Park Elementary | 1956 | 76.32 * | 49,399 | 118 | \$125,000 | |
| Lakeridge Elementary | 1953 | 80.92 | 51,946 | 114 | \$75,000 | |
| Northwood Elementary | 2016 | 98.91 | 77,277 | 166 | \$33,000,000 | |
| West Mercer Elementary | 1964 | 85.86 | 54,221 | 119 | \$50,000 | |
| | | | 232,843 | 129 | \$33,250,000 | |
| MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | | | | |
| Islander Middle School | 1958 | 74.07 * | 169,085 | 129 | \$33,850,000 | |
| | | | 169,085 | 129 | \$33,850,000 | |
| HIGH SCHOOL / OTHER | | | | | | |
| Mercer Island High School | 1955 | 85.40 | 223,719 | 137 | \$13,450,000 | |
| Crest Learning Center | 1960s | 84.63 | 10,058 | 100 | \$0 | |
| Mary Wayte Pool | 1973 | - | 16,263 | - | \$2,415,000 | |
| | | | 250,040 | 118 | \$15,865,000 | |
| SUPPORT FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| Administration Building | 1966 | - | 16,100 | - | \$150,000 | |
| MOT Building | 2011(est.) | - | 2,532 | - | \$500,000 | |
| Maintenance Shop/Bus Lot | 1997 | - | 4,778 | - | \$200,000 | |
| | | | 23,410 | | \$850,000 | |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | | 675,378 | | \$83,815,000 | |
| | | | | | | |
| SHARED FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| Boys & Girls Club PEAK | 2011(est.) | n/a | 44,968 | n/a | n/a | |
| | | | 44,968 | | | |

* Represents an average of multiple building scores. See individual facility summaries for more detailed information.

EXISTING FACILITY CONDITION

Mercer Island School District's educational and support facilities, identified in the table at right, vary in age, condition, and level of educational adequacy.

Information about the physical condition of existing district facilities provides a metric for evaluating one area of district need.

FACILITY AGE COMPARISON



FACILITY AGE

District educational facilities vary significantly in age, with original construction dates as early as 1953 and as recent as 2016. Although facility age does not solely determine building condition, it is a significant factor that should be considered. The chart above illustrates the age of all district facilities.

Many district facilities have received renovations and additions since their initial construction. The following facilities have undergone major renovations that included the addition of a new roof structure and replacement of exterior walls: Island Park Elementary School, Lakeridge Elementary School, West Mercer Elementary School, Islander Middle School (Main Building), and Mercer Island High School.

This work is indicated in blue in the chart above, and illustrates that the renovations are now more than 20 years old. With this in mind, it is important to understand that major building systems and components, such as foundations, structure, and exterior materials, continue to degrade over time, eventually requiring replacement. In addition to age-related degradation, older school facilities were generally not designed to accommodate current models of teaching and learning. Building configurations were typically designed to support one teacher with a group of 20-30 students, providing limited flexibility for team-teaching or convening a variety of student group sizes.

Older schools commonly have no space outside of the traditional classroom for private conversations, individualized instruction, or group project work. Shared facilities, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums, restrooms, and administration areas are also often undersized for current functions and needs.

NEWER SCHOOLS

The district's newest facility is Northwood Elementary School, constructed in 2015 and opened in 2016. A new building was also added to Islander Middle School in 2015, and additions to Mercer Island High School increased its size by approximately 17,000 square feet between 2012 and 2015.

OLDER SCHOOLS

Island Park Elementary, Lakeridge Elementary, West Mercer Elementary, Islander Middle School (Main and 300 Buildings), and Mercer Island High School were all built between 1953 and the mid-1960s, making them more than 50 years old. All of these facilities underwent major renovations in the mid-nineties.

Due to the similar dates of original construction, these facilities can be expected to reach the end of their useful life around the same period of time. While immediate replacement may not be warranted, incremental replacement implemented over the course of several decades should be considered. This proactive approach may be used to ensure that the district is not faced with the burden of replacing multiple facilities within a short period of time.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS

Even though some of the district's facilities are old, none of them are currently identified for historic preservation. They are not listed with the National Historic Register, State Historical Preservation Office, or any local historic building lists.

FACILITY ASSESSMENT COMPARISON



FACILITY CONDITION ASSESSMENT

A separate architect and engineering team (BLRB) conducted an evaluation of the district's existing facilities in 2018 using OSPI's Information and Conditions of Schools (ICOS) evaluation method, which establishes a numerical score for each facility.

ICOS is a web-based system where information and condition details about facilities and sites operated by the district are documented and stored. ICOS assists OSPI with the increasing demand for accurate school facility information and building condition data that supports statewide programs such as the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), district facility management, and school facility information requests or policy decisions.

This information is also used to support the OSPI requirement for their performancebased Asset Preservation Program which gauges how well the facilities, buildings, and sites are maintained. ICOS benefits school districts by providing functionality for inventory tracking, condition rating, record keeping, and comparative and report analysis. Scores reflect building and site facilities in terms of their construction components and related deficiencies.

The following components were evaluated:

- > Structural condition and code compliance
- > Exterior building condition
- > Roof condition
- > Interior building condition
- > Electrical building condition
- > Mechanical building condition

Site condition and accessibility evaluation were evaluated separately and are not incorporated into the assessment scores.

Assessment scores, shown in the chart above, are from the MISD Study and Survey Update, September 2018. Functional deficiencies were not incorporated in the overall score, but are described in the following sections for each facility. District support facilities were not assigned ICOS scores, but their condition was considered and is also described in this document.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT (BCA) SCORING

The following scale is used for the BCA scores the 2018 Study and Survey Update:

EXCELLENT: Score of 95 - 100 percent; the building is in "new" or "like new" condition.

GOOD: Score of 85 - 94.9 percent; the building is in "good" condition and requires routine maintenance.

FAIR: Score of 62 – 84.9 percent; the building is in "fair" condition and requires minor maintenance.

POOR: Score of 30 - 61.9 percent; the building is in "poor" condition and requires major maintenance.

UNSATISFACTORY: Score of 0 - 29.9 percent; the building and/or many of its systems are in "unsatisfactory" condition and building replacement should be considered.





Secure building entry: Island Park ES

ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Recently constructed facilities, including Northwood Elementary School and the new Islander Middle School building, scored over 95 percent, indicating that they are in excellent condition.

All other district facilities, which are older, still had relatively high assessment scores, all between 71 and 85 percent. West Mercer Elementary School and Mercer Island High School fall into the "good" condition category and all other facilities are in the "fair" condition category. This is likely due to the substantial renovation of these facilities that was done in the mid-nineties, and because they have been well maintained by the district. None of the facility assessment scores indicate a need to replace a school facility solely based on its condition.

Summaries of each facility, including more detailed assessment information specific to each building, are included at the end of this document.

Secure building entry: Lakeridge ES

SAFETY & SECURITY

SECURITY

Security is a top priority for the district. Cameras are installed at key locations in all school buildings to facilitate investigations as needed. No cameras are installed in classrooms, offices, restrooms, etc. Their primary focus is exterior doors, hallways, and gathering spaces such as gymnasiums, commons, cafeterias, and libraries.

Secure entries were installed at Mercer Island High School in 2019 and at the three older elementary school sites in 2017. Newer facilities, including Northwood Elementary School and Island Middle School, were designed and constructed with secure entries. The secure entry at Islander Middle School is not currently used, due to the configuration of multiple buildings on the site.

SEISMIC

In 2011, MISD hired PCS Structural Solutions to complete a structural / seismic review for all school buildings. In 2016, a structural / seismic review was performed on the Administration Building.

As stated in the PCS report, the International Building Code (IBC)performance goal for new construction, with a 1.25 importance factor, is for the building to survive a Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE 2% probability of exceedence in 50 years) with some structural damage that would be repairable after the earthquake. A Seattle fault earthquake that is shallow could generate this kind of earthquake and would be in the range of four times the shaking of the more recent 2001 Nisqually earthquake. For a design earthquake (10% exceedence in 50 years) you would expect minor structural damage and the building remaining occupied.

Seismic assessment summaries of all school facilities are included on the following page.



Secure building entry: West Mercer ES

Island Park Elementary School

- > Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Lakeridge Elementary School

- > Upgrades: 1995
- Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Northwood Elementary School *

- > Upgrades: Building completed in 2016
- Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

West Mercer Elementary School

- > Upgrades:1995
- Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however,

significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (pre-2016)

- > Structural Upgrades: 1995
- > Condition: Not considered a concern for collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (new building) *

- > Upgrades: Building completed in 2016
- Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

Mercer Island High School

- > Structural Upgrades: 1997
- > Condition: The building does not meet current code. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, damage may exceed that which is repairable, and while portions of the building were seismically upgraded in the 1990s,

Secure building entry: Mercer Island HS

it is recommended that roof / wall connections at the gymnasium be improved when future construction work is performed in these areas.

* Note: Recently completed buildings (Northwood Elementary and Islander Middle School) were not assessed by PCS.

WATER QUALITY

Water testing has been done annually at each school building over the past five years. Sampling of drinking water at random fixtures has shown no copper, asbestos, and lead levels have been within standards. Reports are posted on the district website. Given the results over the past five years, at the recommendation of the testing company, sampling is currently scheduled for every two years.

AIR QUALITY

Annual air quality testing is done on an as-needed basis. Typically, testing occurs at several facilities during the year. No findings of contaminates have been found.



Lakeridge Elementary School: Hallway use for pull-out learning activities and lack of natural light

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Educational adequacy addresses the following question:

How well does the facility create a successful environment for learning, inspiring, and building community?

Although educational adequacy can be difficult to quantify, a 2010 Study and Survey of district facilities evaluated this facility-related consideration in a number of different areas, including area per student, building configuration, and other environmental components such as natural light and ease of wayfinding. A summary of educational suitability for each school site can be found in the facility summaries, beginning on page 11.

SHARED LEARNING

Modern learning environments tend to offer several options that support large group, small group and individual learning needs. Currently, two options exist in many of Mercer Island School District's older schools. These options are the general classroom environment and the hallway. Facility considerations related to shared learning include:

- Limited or no shared learning areas in older schools
- Limited or no space for one-on-one, group projects, etc.
- Limited ability for outside of classroom supervision
- > Disruption caused by use of learning space as a thoroughfare

CLASSROOMS

Characteristics associated with classroom suitability include:

- Classrooms do not allow for flexible learning
- Limited or no connection to other learning areas
- > Functionally limiting

NATURAL LIGHT

Access to daylight is a key element of a healthy learning environment. Research over the last two decades has shown that lighting impacts physical health, psychological well-being, and academic performance.

Characteristics related to the level and quality of natural light and educational suitability include:

- > Little or no opportunity for visual relief
- Numerous spaces that are dark and uninviting

WAYFINDING / CHARACTER / COMMUNITY

Supervision and wayfinding are important considerations in modern learning environments. Characteristics that can impact the educational suitability of a facility include:

- > Spatially constrictive
- > Restricts observation of students
- > Not particularly welcoming





Island Park Elementary School: Classroom with limited storage and functional limitations



Mercer Island High School: Long corridors can make wayfinding difficult (and have limited or no natural light)

AREA PER STUDENT

Gross square footage per student (GSF/ student) is one metric that can be used to compare educational suitability in school facilities. GSF/student is determined by taking the total gross square footage of a facility and dividing it by the permanent student capacity of the building. It is important to note that this metric is not necessarily a reflection of classroom size, as it takes into account all spaces within the building and provides the average amount of total space per student.

According to the 2013 Annual School Construction Report, published by School Planning and Management, the national median for GSF/student in new schools completed in 2012 was 137 for elementary schools, 153 for middle schools and 172 for high schools.

The Office of Public Instruction (OPSI) has student space allocations that are much lower: 90 for grades K-6, 117 for grades 7-8 and 130 for grades 9-12. However, these metrics are used solely as funding drivers for the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), and do not represent space planning or design recommendations for districts. OSPI is currently working on development of a capital funding model that is intended to align gross instructional square feet per student with typical staffing requirements on the operations side, which will be more reflective of actual space needs in schools.

A small amount of difference in area per student can have a big impact on the amount of space in a facility and how it is used. For example, the difference between Lakeridge Elementary and West Mercer Elementary is only five square feet per student. However, when this is multiplied by the number of students per classroom (24), it equates to an additional 120 square feet per classroom, or an additional 480 square feet for a cluster of four classrooms.

This additional space is enough to provide break-out areas and/or other types of teaching and support space for the classrooms that a school with a lower area per student would not be able to have, as shown in the diagram above right.



Distribution and configuration of space is also important to consider. Adding onto an existing school can increase the area per student, but does not always provide the desired types and relationships of spaces, such as break-out spaces adjacent to classrooms.



AREA PER STUDENT COMPARISON (PERMANENT CAPACITY)

A comparison of area per student in the district's school facilities is shown in the chart above.

Elementary School Level

The three older elementary schools in the district have similar areas per student, all of which are less than 120 GSF/student. These are below the national median of 137 GSF/student, and the district target of 139 GSF/student, developed in the MISD Elementary School Education Specification, January 2014. It was noted by the district that although these facilities provide fairly large classrooms, they do not provide enough flex space.

The recently constructed Northwood Elementary School has a much higher area per student of 166 GSF/student. This is due in part to additional program areas that increase it from the district target size. Such areas include specialized space for a developmental preschool, a high-needs special education program, and an enlarged gymnasium to accommodate community use. These programs were determined to be added into the Northwood facility, but are not part of the district elementary school education specification program.

As a comparison, Bainbridge School District elementary schools have an average of 151 GSF/student, with individual facilities ranging from 133 to 165 GSF/student. Bainbridge's most recent elementary school (Wilkes Elementary) was constructed in 2013 and provides 157 GSF/student.

Middle School Level

The 129 GSF/student at Islander Middle School is significantly less than the national median of 152 GSF/student. This is likely due, at least in part, to the fact that part of the school is housed in an older facility that is not configured for modern learning. The district does not have a middle school target for area per student.

In comparison, Bainbridge School District's two middle schools range from 114 to 151 GSF/student, with an average of 132 GSF/ student. Both schools were built in the 1990s.

High School Level

At 137 GSF/student, Mercer Island High School is significantly below the national benchmark of 172 GSF/student. Similar to Islander Middle School, the majority of the school is in an older facility that is not configured for modern learning, which contributes to this discrepancy. The district does not have a high school target for area per student.

In comparison, Bainbridge High School provides 168 GSF/student. The high school was constructed in 1970.

Crest Learning Center is also significantly below the national benchmark in terms of area per student, with approximately 100 GSF/student. However, it is not unusual for an alternative program to have a lower area per student, due to limited offerings that eliminate the need for some specialized spaces, such as gymnasiums.

RECENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURES: FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS



RECENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURES: NEW FACILITIES & ADDITIONS



RECENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Understanding the relative amount of recent investment in district facilities can help in determining and prioritizing planning approaches for a long-range facility plan.

Mercer Island School District has completed a number of improvements to existing facilities over the last 10 years, in addition to constructing a partial replacement school facility at Islander Middle School and a new elementary school, Northwood Elementary. Both facility improvements and new additions were completed at Mercer Island High School. A list of the total capital expenditures per district facility is included below, and illustrated in the charts above.

- > Island Park ES: \$125,000
- > Lakeridge ES: \$75,000
- > West Mercer ES: \$50,000
- > Northwood ES: \$33,000,000 (new facility)
- > Islander MS: \$33,600,000 (new facility) \$250,000 (improvements)
- > Mercer Island HS: \$9,000,000 (additions) \$2,550,000 (impr.) \$1,900,000 (stadium)
- > Mary Wayte Pool: \$2,415,000
- > Administration: \$150,000
- > MOT Building: \$500,000
- > Maintenance Shop: \$200,000

The breakdown of the work done and associated cost of each project is outlined in the following individual facility summaries.



MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES

FACILITY SUMMARIES

In order to provide a comprehensive understanding of existing facility condition in the Mercer Island School District, information for each facility is included on the following pages. Information includes basic facility data, building history, a summary of the 2018 building condition assessment completed by BLRB, a list of deferred or upcoming maintenance items anticipated by the district, safety and security issues (if applicable), and an educational adequacy summary that includes both site and building / program issues.

Facility summaries have been developed from a variety of sources, including BLRB's 2010 and 2018 facility assessments, building tours and school principal interviews, and information provided by the MISD facilities department. Information will continue to be developed throughout the long-range planning process, as more input is received.



North Mercer Campus (AKA Complex)

NORTH MERCER CAMPUS

A number of district facilities are housed on the North Mercer campus (or "Complex"), including:

- > Northwood Elementary School
- > Mary Wayte Pool
- > Boys and Girls Club PEAK Facility
- > Maintenance Shop
- > Bus Lot

- Maintenance Operations & Transportation Building (MOT)
- > Administration Building
- > Mercer Island High School
- > High School Stadium

More details are provided on these facilities in this summary, but it is important understand the proximity and relationship of these facilities to each other.



Island Park Elementary School Site

ISLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1956 (Original Construction) 1966, 1995 (Addition/Renovation)

BUILDING AREA 49,399 gross square feet

SITE AREA 9.37 acres

PERMANENT CAPACITY 420 students

AREA PER STUDENT 118 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 76.32 (Classroom Building) 76.27 (Multipurpose Building)

Island Park Elementary School Entry

HISTORY

Island Park Elementary School was originally built in 1956 and was added onto in 1966. In 1995, it was added onto again and renovated. The internal courtyards were infilled to create space for the new music room and the library. The multipurpose building was expanded to the north to allow for additional storage. The restrooms in this building were reconfigured to make them accessible and a storage room flanking the stage was modified into a ramp to make it accessible and to create a dressing room.

The renovation included removal and replacement of all existing windows, addition of a sloped trussed-framed system over the existing roofs and replacement of interior and exterior finishes. Most of the existing exterior walls of the classroom building were removed and new walls were constructed on the existing footings. The existing concrete slabs were reused as well. Interior walls between classrooms were removed and replaced with operable partitions.

New casework along with markerboards and tackboards were installed. All doors and frames were replaced. New toilets, fixtures, and lighting were installed. Flooring throughout the facility was replaced.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

The following summary includes physical condition deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The two buildings have no serious structural issues. However, the seismic design does not meet current code standards. Specific seismic information is included on page 6.

The building is also moderately noncompliant with the accessibility code.

Exterior / Roof

The building exteriors are in good to fair condition. Observed issues include minor water intrusion. The roofs are due for replacement in the near future.

Interior

Building interiors are in good to fair condition. Observed issues include water damage to Classroom Building ceilings in



Island Park Elementary School Classroom



Island Park Elementary School Corridor

several locations, and there are missing acoustical ceiling tiles in the multi-purpose room.

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Electrical systems are in fair to good condition. Telecommunications cabling does not support current transmission standards. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, a deficiency relative to the National Electrical Code (NEC).

Mechanical systems are in fair to poor condition. The ventilation is inadequate in student restrooms, corridors, and the electrical room. There is a duct leak in the attic above the multipurpose building. The boilers and heating water pumps are nearing the end of useful life. Sewer backups have been reported in the past few years.

Site

The site area is in good to fair condition. The play are is adjacent to Island Crest Way, which is not ideal. Other site-related concerns include obstruction of site lines by trees and light poles, and cracking/ settlement at the parking lot.

ISLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: ICOS SCORING



DEFERRED / UPCOMING MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Roof replacement
- > Fencing repair / replacement
- > Parking lot grind / asphalt
- > ADA exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > Flooring replacement throughout
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Controls upgrade
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

SAFETY / SECURITY

The school is located just off Island Crest Way, the main north / south arterial for the Island. The site area for parking and bus loading is constrained by the playground to the south, the school and play field to the west, and Island Crest Way to the east.

The consequence of having access to a school from a main arterial will always be challenging, but this situation is made worse by the limited area available to accommodate buses, student pickup and drop-off, parent parking, and staff parking. There are traffic backups on Island Crest Way and a general sense of chaos for both morning drop-off and afternoon pickup. The congestion further increases safety concerns for pedestrians.

The school's proximity to this busy street and the challenges presented to fencing decrease the time it takes for a student to leave a supervised area and be either in the parking area or on the street.



Island Park Elementary School: Small group learning / pull-out areas in hallways

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at Island Park Elementary School by the school principal, the MISD facilities department, and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

- > The campus is not secure. This is primarily due to multiple disconnected buildings on the campus.
- Portable classrooms are disconnected from other buildings, creating security issues for access. They have no covered entry, causing water intrusion at the doors, and they do not provide adequate storage or pull-out space.
- > Parking is challenging. Vehicular circulation creates traffic congestion in the neighborhood during pick up/ drop off times and during events. This also creates egress difficulties for staff, and causes parking overflow in the neighborhood. The circulation issue is further exacerbated by poor pedestrian connections in neighborhood.
- Outdoor play fields have drainage issues which limit their usability during the rainy season.

- Hard surface play areas are currently too close to southern classrooms. Play area between multipurpose building and classroom building gets congested.
- Covered play area is not large enough to meet program need.

Building / Program

- Multipurpose room is used both as a cafeteria and gymnasium, causing scheduling issues and resulting in a reduction of instructional time for PE and available time for lunch. This space also has poor acoustics.
- > Special education program does not have adequate space. There is a need for a new special education classroom and OT/PT therapy room. Speech and resource rooms are located too close to the music room. Most importantly, having a centralized special education area would provide a better opportunity to connect with other students.
- Classrooms are too small, and do not have sufficient storage. There is deficiency of flex / project spaces distributed throughout the school, as well as a need for more tackable wall surfaces. Acoustics between classrooms are poor.



Island Park Elementary School: Covered play



Island Park Elementary School: Gym / cafeteria

- > There is a need for small group learning / pull-out areas to support general education distributed throughout the school
- > Expansion of administration area to accommodate an adequate health room, nurse's office, staff workroom, staff lounge, records storage, conference room, and PTA room.
- > Permanent facilities for the before / after care program are desired.
- > There is a need for small group learning / pull-out areas distributed throughout the school to support general education.
- > Dedicated art/science classroom is needed.
- Library needs additional storage and more natural light.
- > Multiple sensory rooms or "safe spaces" would be very useful. These would ideally be distributed throughout the school and easily accessible.
- > There is a need for student restrooms in or adjacent to kindergarten classrooms.
- > Additional staff restrooms are needed.

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2017: Lighting (bulbs only) converted to LEDs (\$50,000)
- > 2017: Fire alarm replacement (\$75,000)



HISTORY

were installed.

The school was originally constructed

comprised of two classroom buildings,

a multipurpose building, a mechanical building, and a covered play shed, which

were all connected by covered walkways.

In 1995, the existing multipurpose building

and mechanical building were demolished

modernized. These classroom buildings

construction. The addition is a slab on

The renovation included removal and

replacement of all existing windows,

were connected and added onto with new

grade with wood framing, roof truss joists,

and asphalt shingles. Aluminum windows

addition of a sloped trussed framed system over the existing roofs and replacement of

interior and exterior finishes. New casework

along with markerboards and tackboards

were installed. Doors and frames were

replaced. Some of the classrooms had

new wood framed walls. A secured entry vestibule has been added recently.

and the classroom buildings were

in 1953. Until 1995, the campus was



Lakeridge Elementary School Site

LAKERIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1953 (Original Construction) 1995 (Addition/Renovation)

BUILDING AREA 51,946 gross square feet

SITE AREA 9.48 acres

PERMANENT CAPACITY 456 students

AREA PER STUDENT 114 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 80.92

Lakeridge Elementary School Entry

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

The following summary includes physical condition deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards. Specific seismic information is included on page 6.

Exterior / Roof

The building exterior is in good condition. Doors and frames are generally in good repair, but should be cleaned and repainted. There are few exterior door thresholds that exceed the allowed height prescribed by current accessibility codes. The soffits around the perimeter of the building need to be painted.

The roof has been known to leak and is due for replacement in the near future. There is significant moss buildup on the roof, particularly in shaded areas. Some of the gutters are not sloped properly to drain.



Lakeridge Elementary School Library





LAKERIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: ICOS SCORING



Lakeridge Elementary School Multipurpose

Interior

The building interior is in good to fair condition. Sheet vinyl flooring in the restrooms is nearing the end of its serviceable life.

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Electrical systems are in fair to good condition. Video surveillance, fire alarm, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wallmounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. The generator and security systems were reported by district maintenance as showing signs of age and may need to be planned for future replacement. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

Mechanical systems are in good to fair condition. The boilers and heating water pumps are nearing end of life and will need to be replaced soon. HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) duct

distribution is in need of cleaning. There is an outdated centralized air distribution system with reheat coils. The control system appears to be relatively newer. Fire service header is in good condition, but sprinkler heads in classrooms are not quick response (but were code at the time of construction).

Site

The site area is in good to fair condition. Fencing does not adequately secure the property, the covered play area is too small, the parking lot and hard surface areas are cracked and settled, and there are problems with drainage on the site.

The building and site are moderately noncompliant with accessibility code, due to the last time the school was modernized. Security is compromised due to inadequate fencing.

DEFERRED / UPCOMING MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Roof replacement
- > Fencing repair / replacement
- > Parking lot grind / asphalt
- > ADA interior improvements (ramp)
- > ADA exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Exterior and interior paint
- Flooring replacement throughout >
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Hot water tank replacement
- Controls upgrade
- > Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.



Lakeridge Elementary School: Small group learning / pull-out areas in hallways

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at Lakeridge Elementary School by the school principal, the MISD facilities department, and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

> Students in modular classrooms cut through other classrooms to enter the building, use the restrooms, or go to the office.

Building / Program

- There are no small group learning / pullout areas to support general education.
 Classrooms, hallways, and the library are used for these functions.
- > Multipurpose room is used both as a cafeteria and gymnasium. This shared use results in limited lunch set up time, impact on PE programming, and food service carts having to be stored outside during PE. This space also has poor acoustics.



Lakeridge Elementary School: Gym/cafeteria



Lakeridge Elementary School: Lunch carts stored outside during the day

- > Library is currently being utilized for hosting guest speakers, which disrupts the library functions. It is also desirable to have smaller reference area, more computers/ technology.
- Classrooms are too small, and do not have sufficient storage or adequate adjacent pull-out space.
- > Art and science need a dedicated classroom and more adequate storage.
- > Music room location is too far from the stage and should be adjacent.
- > Administration area is undersized and needs additional space for staff workroom, conference room, and records storage.
- > Restrooms are in need of reconfiguration, they are currently inconveniently located (especially in relationship to kindergarten classrooms). In general, there is a need for more restrooms.

RECENT UPGRADES

> 2017: Fire alarm replacement (\$75,000)



Lakeridge Elementary School: Library



Lakeridge Elementary School: Covered play





Northwood Elementary School Site

NORTHWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES 2016 (Original Construction)

BUILDING AREA 77,277 gross square feet

SITE AREA 8.40 acres

PERMANENT CAPACITY 466 students

AREA PER STUDENT 166 gsf / student *

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 98.91

* Includes additional program areas.

Northwood Elementary School Entry

HISTORY

Recently constructed in 2015-16, this facility is in excellent condition. The building has 99.9 kilowatt hours of solar panels.

The school's 22 general classrooms, pullout shared areas, a library, gymnasium, and lunch room are serving grades K-5. Spaces are flexible and adaptable with lots of transparency.

The building has a partial green roof and photovoltaic (PV) panels on the roof, as well as energy dashboard technology that can be used as a teaching tool.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

All systems (structural, exterior, roof, interior, mechanical, electrical) are new and in excellent condition.

DEFERRED / UPCOMING MAINTENANCE No deferred maintenance is needed.

SAFETY / SECURITY No deficiencies noted.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

As a recently built school, Northwood Elementary is built for student-centered excellence. The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues, based on recent post-occupancy feedback from the school principal.

- Restroom without direct access from the health room is not optimal.
- > Gymnasium restroom location presents a challenge, both from the standpoint of disruption of PE classes and supervised access from the playground.
- > Acoustics are a challenge in the gymnasium, dining / commons / entry, stairwells, and the main corridor, due to the number of hard surfaces.

RECENT UPGRADES

Not applicable.





West Mercer Elementary School Site

WEST MERCER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1964 (Original Construction) 1995 (Addition/Renovation)

BUILDING AREA 54,221 gross square feet

SITE AREA 8.86 acres

PERMANENT CAPACITY 456 students

AREA PER STUDENT 119 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 85.60

West Mercer Elementary School Entry

HISTORY

The building(s) were originally constructed in 1964. Until its renovation and addition, the West Mercer campus was comprised of five separate buildings and one covered play area. In 1995, the exterior space between the buildings was infilled, creating one uniform building with an open courtyard in the center and an attached covered play area.

Much of the exterior walls and structure remained intact. A roof overbuild was constructed over all of the connected buildings. All doors and windows were removed and replaced. Flooring throughout the facilities was removed and replaced. Toilet rooms were removed and relocated. Extensive mechanical and electrical systems were replaced.

Site work, including concrete walks and landscaping, was done to accommodate the renovated building.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

The following summary includes physical condition deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards. Specific seismic information is included on page 6.

The building is also moderately noncompliant with accessibility code.

Exterior / Roof

The building exterior is in good condition. Exposed steel angles supporting masonry above windows and doors are rusting and there are no weeps in the masonry at those headers. The cedar fascia behind the external gutters should be repainted, and softs should be continuously vented.

The roof over the south covered walkway is in need of attention. The roof over the covered play-shed has poor drainage.

Interior

The building interior is in fair to good condition. The wooden stage in the multipurpose room has a lot of wear, and there is damage to wall corners in corridors.



West Mercer Elementary School Classroom



Structural
Exterior
Roof
Interior
Electrical
Mechanical

WEST MERCER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: ICOS SCORING

Excellent

West Mercer Elementary School Library

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Telecommunications cabling to wallmounted telecommunications devices do not support current transmission standards. Classroom AV systems include only VGA cabling and do not have audio enhancement. The generator and tank are severely rusted and is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

The boilers and pumps need to be replaced. Both HVAC systems and domestic water system are in poor condition, and the control system is outdated.

Site

20

Building site is scored separately and not included on the chart above. It is moderately non-compliant with accessibility code, and overall in fair to poor condition. The outdoor platform is inaccessible, concrete walks are settling due to poor soils, creating tripping and accessibility issues.

DEFERRED / UPCOMING MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Roof replacement
- > Fencing repair / replacement
- > Parking lot grind / asphalt
- > Drainage improvements
- > ADA interior improvements (ramps)
- > ADA exterior improvements
- > Stucco and CMU repairs
- > Exterior and interior paint
- > Flooring replacement throughout
- > Toilet partition replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Controls upgrade
- > Fire alarm replacement
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.



West Mercer Elementary School: Small group learning / pull-out areas in hallways

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at West Mercer Elementary School by the school principal, the MISD facilities department, and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

- Portable classroom buildings located between the main school building and the play field obscure supervision and create security issues. The portables have no covered entry, which causes water intrusion at the door. In addition, they do not provide adequate storage or support space. Students using modular classrooms must leave the portable to use restroom or other school facilities.
- Parking does not accommodate school needs. Some staff members park on Homestead Park's lot where lighting is inadequate, an access to school is not safe for pedestrians. Bus loop parking is not paved, and gets muddy during rainy season.
- > There is poor vehicular circulation on the site.

- > Play fields have drainage issues that limit their usability during the rainy season.
- Playground / play area is remote from the cafeteria.
- > Covered play area is undersized.
- > A restroom that is easy to access from play areas is desired.

Building / Program

- > Multipurpose room is used both as a cafeteria and gymnasium. Shared function of multipurpose room results in a number of PE classes being doubled-up and impacts available time for lunch. The space also needs to be bigger, and have more natural light.
- > Special education programs are disjointed, and should have better placement within facility. The spaces also have poor acoustics. There is a need for an additional special education classroom.
- Classrooms are too small, and do not have sufficient storage or adequate adjacent pull-out space.



West Mercer Elementary School: Multipurpose



West Mercer Elementary School: Administration

- Art and computer science need a shared dedicated classroom.
- > There are no small group learning / pullout areas to support general education. A "pod" configuration is desired.
- Library needs additional storage and more natural light.
- > Administration is undersized and lacks visual connection. Additional needs include an adequate health room/ nurse's office, student waiting area, additional administrative and student service offices, conference room, records storage, an enlarged staff workroom and lounge, and a PTA room.
- > There is congestion in the main corridor during pick-up and drop-off.

RECENT UPGRADES

> 2017: Lighting (bulbs only) converted to LEDs (\$50,000)



Islander Middle School Site

ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1958 (Main / Classic Building) 1994, 2000 (Additions/Renovation) 2016 (New Building)

BUILDING AREA 169,085 gross square feet

SITE AREA 27.36 acres *

PERMANENT CAPACITY 1,314 students

AREA PER STUDENT 129 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 74.07 (100 / 200 Building) 71.46 (300 Building) 96.94 (New Building)

* Includes play fields that are managed by the City.

HISTORY

Islander Middle School (IMS) was originally constructed in 1958. A comprehensive renovation and addition was completed in 1994. The scope of the renovation included small additions to both ends of the 100/200 Building (also referred to as the Main or Classic Building), along with a new roof structure. A small addition to the 300 Building was completed in 2000.

In 2015/16, approximately half of the educational space (gymnasiums, cafeteria, stage, kitchen and music classrooms) was replaced with a new building that included those spaces along with 12 new classrooms.

The new building was designed for modern learning, with flexible and adaptable learning spaces and significantly more transparency than the older buildings. The building has a small green roof over the entry and photovoltaic panels on the commons roof, as well as energy dashboard technology.

BUILDING CONDITION ASSESSMENT

The following summary includes physical condition deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment, and refers to the older buildings only. All systems in the new building (structural, exterior, roof, interior, mechanical, electrical) are new and in excellent condition.

Structural & Code Compliance

The buildings have no serious structural issues. However, the seismic design does not meet current code standards. Specific seismic information is included on page 6.

The buildings are also moderately noncompliant with accessibility code.

Exterior / Roof

The 100/200, and 300 building exteriors are in fair condition with the exception of the roof on the 100/200 Building. It is past the end of its life and in need of replacement.

Windows in 100/200 Building have compromised perimeter seals and defective hardware. The wood fascia has been damaged in different locations.



Islander Middle School: New Building





Islander Middle School: Classic Building

Interior

The 100/200 and 300 Building interiors are in fair to poor condition. Carpet throughout and sheet flooring in the restrooms is at the end of its serviceable life.

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Electrical systems in the older buildings are in fair condition. Video surveillance, access control, fire alarm, and wireless data systems have been upgraded within the older buildings. Power distribution systems within the older vintage buildings are beyond useful life. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices within the older buildings are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. The older buildings are served by a generator with a single transfer switch for mixed standby and emergency loads, which is not allowed by NEC.

The systems are in excellent to poor condition. The new building HVAC and domestic water distribution systems are in excellent condition. In building 100/200, the HVAC and domestic water systems are in poor condition. Access to maintenance in the attic is difficult. The control system is functioning but outdated. In building 300, the boilers and water heaters were replaced in 2011 and still appear to be in excellent condition. The HVAC and domestic water distribution systems are in fair to poor condition.

Site

IMS buildings and campus are now in compliance with accessibility code. The building site is in excellent condition. The southeast parking lot was redone as part of the 2015 campus improvements. Landscaping is in great condition.

There are three separate buildings on the site requiring the student body to move outdoors between buildings during class periods. This approach is not preferred from a security standpoint. In addition, there is no fencing to secure the outdoor student areas or buildings.

DEFERRED / UPCOMING MAINTENANCE

Excellent

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance (for older buildings only) include:

- Roof replacement (*critical* at the 100/200 Building and also needed at the 300 building)
- Toilet partition replacement and restroom configuration throughout
- > Fencing to create a secure campus
- Bus loop asphalt replacement / gridoverlay
- > Bus loop lighting replacement
- > Stucco repairs
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > Flooring replacement
- > HVAC equipment replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- Track and field replacement (currently in partnership with the City of Mercer Island)

ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL: ICOS SCORING



IMS Classic Building: Small group learning / pull-out areas in hallways

SAFETY / SECURITY

The full student population of IMS must move between buildings during each passing period. Currently, the majority of the seventh grade classes are held in the new building while the sixth and eighth grade classes are in the 100/200 and 300 Buildings.

The cafeteria, library, music room, and administration functions are all housed in the new building. This requires nearly two-thirds of the 1,150 students to move between the three buildings during each passing period, which creates security challenges.

The IMS campus is unsecured on three sides. There is a bus loop to the north, street frontage and the main parking and parent drive to the east, and the districtowned, but City managed, South Mercer Play Fields to the south. The play fields include a synthetic field and track used extensively for PE classes, lunch activity, and school sports, as well as significant use by the neighborhood.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at Islander Middle School by the school principal, the MISD facilities department, and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

 Multiple detached buildings on the site create a lack of connection between both students and programs

Building / Program

- Reorganize / expand existing classroom wings in the remaining older buildings into effective, small, personalized learning communities
- > Building 300 science classrooms do not support current STEM programs very well, and also need more storage.
- Provide a new school broadcast studio and editing room
- > Modernize the library space, and increase flexibility to accommodate future needs
- > Common areas in the "classic building" are difficult to supervise



IMS Classic Building: Office in custodial closet



IMS Classic Building: Lack of natural light

- > Sound transfer between classrooms in the "classic building" can be disruptive
- During hot days (from May through June), the classroom areas get so hot that it can interfere with teaching and learning
- Classrooms do not have sufficient storage, and need more flexibility and efficiency.
- > Corridor / public spaces need to accommodate small break-out spaces
- > Areas designated for student work / art is desired

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2017: Fire alarm replaced in Main Building (\$50,000)
- > 2016: Partial facility replacement with a 99,000 square foot new building (\$33,600,000)
- > 2013: Boiler replacement in Main Building (\$150,000)



Mercer Island High School Site (Also the North Mercer Campus, aka Complex)

MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1955 (original construction) 1967, 1997 (Additions/Renovation) 2011, 2014 (Additions)

BUILDING AREA 223,719 gross square feet

SITE AREA 30.90 acres *

PERMANENT CAPACITY 1,631 students

AREA PER STUDENT 137 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 85.40

* Includes Stadium, Crest Alternative Learning Center, Administration Building, MOT, and Maintenance Shop/Bus Lot.

HISTORY

Mercer Island High School (MIHS) was originally constructed in 1955, with additions completed in 1967. In 1996/97, these buildings received extensive overbuilds, renovations, some demolition, and more additions. This means that some of the old structure, roof, and much of the framing of the 1955 and 1967 construction remains in place.

Structural upgrades to current (at that time) codes were done with new structure, along with roofing and finishes, tying the old buildings together.

A new music addition was completed in 2012, and three small additions were added to each of the classroom wings in 2014. The 2014 additions provided four STEM classrooms and six general classrooms, including two that are used for special education.

The new secure entry was upgraded in 2019.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following summary includes deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards. Specific seismic information is included on page 6.

There is minor rust at exposed steel entry canopies.

Exterior / Roof

Overall, the exterior of the building is in good condition. The exterior door to the auxiliary gymnasium has an exposed wood header. There is an exposed steel angle over the doors at the wrestling room and weight room. Downspouts adjacent to the locker room entries on the north side of the building and the south side of the commons should be replaced. Metal flashing at the gymnasium building is faded and peeling.

The roof was replaced in summer of 2018 and is in excellent condition.



Mercer Island High School: Music room addition





Mercer Island High School: Multipurpose lab

Interior

The building interior is in good to fair condition. Walls are in good condition. Floor wear was observed in some areas, and some acoustical ceiling tiles have been damaged by water but with a new roof, this is more than likely taken care of. Flooring is due for replacement in the near future, as it's starting to show signs of wear.

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Electrical systems are in good condition. Existing lighting fixtures have been recently retrofitted with LED T8 type lamps. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded.

Telecommunications cabling to wallmounted telecommunications devices in the older areas of the building are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. In the newer additions, Category 6 cabling has been installed. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC. Mechanical systems are in good to fair condition. The central HVAC systems are in good to fair condition, some systems are nearing end of life. The boilers and pumps were replaced in 2011 and in good condition, the chiller is showing signs of weathering but is in good operation. The domestic water system is in good condition and there is a mix of newer and older controls throughout the site.

MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL: ICOS SCORING

Site

The building and site are moderately noncompliant with handicap accessibility. The bus pullout along 92nd Avenue SE does not have easy accessibility into the building.

The building site is in fair condition. Concrete at the bus pullout along 92nd Avenue SE is in like-new condition, at the pullout along 42nd Street SE, the concrete is in fair condition. Several of the campus' asphalt walks are cracked and settled and can be a challenge to accessibility.

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Locker replacement in gym locker rooms
- Toilet partition replacement and restroom configuration throughout
- > Theater lighting and seating replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Stucco repair
- > Brick cleaning and sealing
- > Exterior paint
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- > Exhaust fan replacement
- Kitchen equipment and hood replacement
- > Gym bleacher replacement

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.





Mercer Island High School: Undersized broadcast program areas

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at Mercer Island High School by the school principal, the MISD facilities department, and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

 Stadium seating and restrooms need to be renovated.

Building / Program

- Older science classrooms / labs should be larger to accommodate instruction.
- Additional science department storage is needed.
- Music program continues to grow.
 Additional space is desired.
- Counseling area and health room should be reconfigured to provide better access and confidentiality.
- > A separate black box theater (200 seats) is desired, to enhance the drama program and allow the theater to be used by more programs.





Mercer Island High School: Inadequate health room and counseling area

- > Theater technology / equipment (i.e. lighting, sound, projection, curtain, etc.) and acoustics could be improved.
- Reconfigure the library into flexible learning spaces that will encourage better use by students and small groups.
- Improvements and connectivity could be made in College and Career Readiness programs (i.e. broadcast programs).

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2018: Full replacement of shingle and membrane roofs, and partial downspout replacement (\$2,000,000)
- > 100 / 200 / 300 Wing additions (\$7,000,000)
- > 2012: Music wing was added (\$2,000,000)
- > 2012: Boiler was replaced (\$300,000)





Mercer Island High School: Robotics classroom in the old gas engine shop





Crest Learning Center Site

CREST LEARNING CENTER

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1960 (Original Construction) * 1997 (Additions/Renovation)

BUILDING AREA 10,058 gross square feet

SITE AREA Part of North Mercer Campus (30.90 acres)

PERMANENT CAPACITY 101 students

AREA PER STUDENT 100 gsf / student

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) 84.63

* Approximate date of construction.

Crest Learning Center Exterior

HISTORY

Crest Learning Center was renovated and added onto in 1997. The renovation was approximately 4,040 square feet and the addition totaled 6,870 square feet (including the built greenhouse). Selected walls and roof were demolished to accommodate the new program. The existing floor and acoustical ceiling panels were replaced, and additional walls were wood-framed.

The new addition included a math classroom, science lab, computer lab, great room, offices, and restrooms. A greenhouse was added at the northwest corner of the new construction.

New and remodeled areas received new plumbing fixtures with new domestic water piping. Portions of the existing belowground waste piping were used. The HVAC system was replaced with a new gas-fired furnace.

The scope of 1997 renovation included replacing existing flooring and acoustical ceilings. The addition was constructed on a concrete slab-on-grade, and some of the finishes included plastic laminate casework, carpet, sheet vinyl, VCT, rubber base, acoustical ceiling panels and tiles, and vinyl wall covering. New plumbing fixtures and new domestic water piping were installed, and the HVAC system was replaced at this time.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following summary includes deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards.

Exterior / Roof

The building exterior is in good condition. The soffit panel, fascia, and covered work area door from the corridor should be repainted.

The roof is nearing the end of its useful life and is due for replacement.

Interior

In general, the building interior is in fair condition, due to 22 years of wear and tear. Floors are in good condition.



Crest Learning Center: Classroom



Crest Learning Center: Great Room

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

Electrical systems are in fair to good condition. The exterior utility transformer is weathered/ rusting. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wallmounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards.

Mechanically, the building is in fair condition. The electrical / telecommunications room has poor ventilation, the exhaust is poor in the student restrooms, and no exhaust has been provided for the teacher workroom. The domestic water system is in good condition and there is a new water heater. The HVAC systems are dated, 80% efficient gas furnaces, but functioning and in good condition.

Site

The building and site are moderately noncompliant with handicap accessibility. The designated handicap parking stall is not accessible, and the accessible main entry had at the time of review, malfunctioning hardware.

CREST LEARNING CENTER: ICOS SCORING



DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Roofing replacement
- > Site ADA improvements
- > CMU and brick repairs
- > Brick cleaning / sealing
- > Flooring replacement
- > Furniture replacement
- > Furnace replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- > Exhaust fan replacement
- > Fire alarm upgrade / replacement
- Greenhouse upgrade and replacement of stand-alone greenhouse

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

The following summary includes programmatic needs and issues identified at Crest Learning Center by the MISD facilities department and the 2010 Study and Survey report.

Site

> The parking lot will require reconfiguration to fully comply with requirements necessary to an accessible stall

Building / Program

- Crest Learning Center is too small for programs currently housed within the facility
- > New larger greenhouse
- > New science classroom or expand / improve existing classroom to support high school science program

RECENT UPGRADES

There were no recent upgrades at Crest Learning Center.


MIHS Stadium Site

MIHS STADIUM & FIELDS

CONSTRUCTION DATES

Unknown (Original Construction) 1978 (Addition) 2001, 2009, 2017 (Field Upgrades) 2001, 2010, 2017 (Track Upgrades) 1979, 2018 (Lighting)

BUILDING AREA N / A

SITE AREA Part of North Mercer Campus (30.90 acres)

PERMANENT CAPACITY

AREA PER STUDENT N / A

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) N / A

HISTORY

The construction date of the original grandstand is unknown, however it was added onto in 1978.

The natural grass field was converted to synthetic turf (field turf) in 2001 and replaced in 2009. In 2017, the turf was again replaced, and a paved pad was installed below to ensure compliance with GMax safety standards. The 2017 infill material for the turf was also changed from crumb rubber to cork.

The track was rebuilt in 2001, painted in 2010, and re-sprayed in 2017. Periodic restriping of lanes and markers is required every few years.

The stadium light poles were installed in 1979. A structural review of the poles was done prior to the LED lighting replacement in 2018.

The press box was constructed in 2013 and fencing around most areas of the stadium was replaced in 2018.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT SUMMARY Not applicable.

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- Reconstruction or significant repair to grandstands including isle handrails
- Reconstruction or replacement of restrooms
- Reconstruction or replacement of ticket booth

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Not applicable.

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2018: Field lighting replacement (\$500,000)
- > 2017: Synthetic turf and track replacement (\$1,100,000)
- > 2016: Field event area constructed (\$300,000)
- > 2014: Press box added (\$250,000)



Administration Building Site

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

CONSTRUCTION DATES

1966 (Original Construction) 1987 (Tenant Improvement)

BUILDING AREA 16,100 gross square feet

SITE AREA Part of North Mercer Campus (30.90 acres)

PERMANENT CAPACITY N / A

AREA PER STUDENT N / A

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) N / A

Administration Building Entry

HISTORY

This building was originally constructed in 1966 and some tenant improvements were made in 1987. It houses all district administrative offices as well as conference rooms, a board room, and on the lower level, a loading dock and the district warehouse and records storage.

The building and site are severely noncompliant with handicap accessibility. Accessible parking requires patrons to cross vehicular traffic, entry paths are not fully compliant, there is no elevator or accessible path around the building, the employee kitchen is not accessible, the upper floor restrooms are not accessible, and many of the door handles do not have levers.

The building is not compliant with standards for fire separation, and egress. There is no fire separation between the warehouse and adjoining spaces, the rated one-hour corridor does not appear to meet current standards, the upper floor only has one direct access to the outside, egress out of the bottom floor corridor and secondary egress out of the board room terminates into a planter. In addition, only a very small portion of the building is covered by fire sprinklers.

Any moderately significant work on this building will require a full upgrade to all ADA and Life Safety codes.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following summary includes deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards.

Exterior / Roof

The building exterior is in overall good to fair condition.

Interior

Walls and floor are worn and a few acoustical ceiling tiles are water damaged. Kitchen and upper floor restrooms are not accessible, and many of the door handles do not have levers. There is no fire separation between the warehouse and adjoining spaces, the rated one-hour



Administration Building Exterior

corridor does not appear to meet current standards. The upper floor only has one direct access to the outside. Egress out of the bottom floor corridor is being obstructed by boxes and does not have panic hardware. Secondary egress out of the board room terminates into a planter.

Electrical / Mechanical

The main electrical panel is at end of usable life. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards.

HVAC systems need to be replaced. The second floor warehouse is not sprinklered.

Site

Building site is scored separately and not included on the chart. It is in fair condition, severely non-compliant with accessibility code.

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Roof replacement
- > Parking lot grind/asphalt
- > ADA interior improvements
- > ADA exterior improvements
- > Drainage improvements
- > Wood repairs
- > Exterior and interior paint
- > Flooring replacement throughout
- Toilet partition replacement and restroom reconfiguration
- > Furniture replacement
- > Boiler replacement
- > Hot water tank replacement
- > Controls upgrade
- > Kitchen equipment replacement
- > Fire sprinkler installation

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Not applicable.

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2018: Heat pump replaced (\$150,000)
- > 2010: New data cabling installed (total cost for this work is unknown)
- > 2012: Generator replacement (total cost for this work is unknown)





Mary Wayte Pool Exterior

MARY WAYTE POOL

CONSTRUCTION DATES 1973 (Original Construction)

BUILDING AREA 16,263 gross square feet

SITE AREA 1.64 acres

PERMANENT CAPACITY

AREA PER STUDENT N / A

2018 ICOS SCORE (OSPI) N / A

HISTORY

Mary Wayte Pool was originally constructed in 1973 by King County Parks through a property lease with the district. The district took ownership of the building from King County in 2011.

The pool is currently managed by Olympic Cascade Aquatics (OCA). District swim, diving, and one water polo team use the facility, as do numerous Island residents through the recreational programs provided by OCA. OCA also rents space to a variety of off-Island pool users, including swim teams from Bellevue. The facility is not utilized for instruction by the Mercer Island School District.

OCA is responsible for all operational and utility costs associated with the operation of the pool. The district is responsible for all capital costs of the facility. The City of Mercer Island makes an annual monetary contribution to the operation of the pool and the district pays OCA for MIHS team usage fees.

The 2016 Cap/Tech Levy provided approximately \$3 million for improvements

to the facility. Recent improvements have included re-fiberglass of the pool tank, pipe lining of the supply and return water lines under the pool, electrical switchgear and panel replacement, and roofing. In addition, the district has secured a grant of \$300,000 that will be added to district funds for energy upgrades over the next two years. These include replacement of the air handling units, ductwork, boilers, hot water tanks, and controls systems.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following summary includes deficiencies noted in the 2018 facility assessment.

Structural & Code Compliance

The building has no serious structural issues. However, its seismic design does not meet current code standards.

Exterior / Roof

The building exterior is in good to fair condition.

The roof was replaced in 2019.



Mary Wayte Pool Interior

Interior

The building interior, including walls, floors, and ceilings, is generally in good to fair condition.

Electrical / Mechanical Systems

The building is in fair to poor condition. Branch wiring devices throughout appear damaged and show signs of corrosion.

Lighting fixtures in some areas show corrosion and some are missing lenses. There is not a facility-wide telecommunications system; all data access is based on a residential-style service with router and distribution within the administration area only. There is no fire alarm system in the building.

Mechanically, systems are in fair to poor condition. There is extensive corrosion throughout the HVAC and plumbing systems. There is no fire protection system (and it is unknown if one would be required). The pool supply and drainage system was recently relined and appears to be functioning well. Plumbing fixtures are dated and showing signs of wear and corrosion. Toilets and urinals are not low-flow style. There is inadequate ventilation throughout the building.

In addition, the facility does not have a sprinkler system, and the egress does not meet building safety or accessibility code requirements. Accessibility is extremely poor in the building. Tenant improvements would be required to bring it up to current standards. Parking lot improvements and site work are also required to make the building accessible.

Site

The site is in fair condition and has remained relatively unchanged since its construction.

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Deferred or upcoming maintenance items of significance include:

- > Wood repairs
- > Exterior and interior paint
- > ADA access improvements to locker rooms



Mary Wayte Pool Interior

> Locker room renovation

Items under contract for 2020-21 include:

- > Boiler replacement
- > Air handler replacement
- > Ductwork replacement
- > Hot water tank replacement
- > Circulation pump replacement
- > Controls upgrade

SAFETY / SECURITY

No deficiencies noted.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Not applicable.

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2019-20: Boiler, HVAC, and controls are currently being replaced through an ESCO contract and DOC grant (projected cost is \$1,800,000)
- > 2019: Switchgear and panel replacement (\$75,000)
- > 2019: Roof was replaced (\$450,000)
- > 2018: Supply and drain lines were lined from pool to mechanical room (\$90,000)



Maintenance Shop

DISTRICT SUPPORT FACILITIES

The district has additional support facilities, including the Maintenance Shop, the MOT (Maintenance/Operations/Transportation) Building, district storage, and the bus lot. Existing conditions of district support facilities were not evaluated in the 2018 facility assessment.

MAINTENANCE SHOP

The shop was reconstructed in 1997 and an addition was built during the construction of Northwood, due to fire lane access. There is no significant maintenance or system replacement needed for this building.

MAINTENANCE OPERATION & TRANSPORTATION BUILDING (MOT)

When the Boys and Girls Club PEAK facility was constructed, the district's old MOT building was demolished. As part of the Club's work, they replaced building with a 2,500 square foot modular building that sits between Crest and the Bus Lot. This building houses a conference room, small offices for maintenance, custodial, and facility scheduling, along with transportation offices, dispatch, and a bus driver workroom. There is no significant maintenance or system replacement needed for this building.

BUS LOT

This lot is home to all large, small, and spare buses for the district. Very light maintenance is provided out of the small blockhouse on the west edge. More intensive maintenance, along with fluid changes, is provided by a shop in Bellevue.

This lot is also the location of the fueling station for both diesel and gasoline. City vehicles also use the pumps. The tanks are up-to-date with permitting and inspections, but likely will require replacement in the next 10 years. Contamination should be anticipated, but cannot be quantified until excavation occurs.

Since the late 1990s, the district has repeatedly explored the possibility of relocating the bus lot and recapturing the space for field space. Given the limited property on the Island, the cost of any such property, and the neighborhood hurdles associated with locating a facility of this type, it remains on the campus.



Maintenance Shop

DISTRICT STORAGE

For many years the district used a portion of the old Mercer Crest Junior High School that was located where Northwood Elementary now sits. When the buildings were demolished to make way for Northwood, MISD searched for space on-Island, but had to rent space in Bellevue for two years. Since Islander Middle School ended up with a net gain of space following the 2016 new building, the district took over the old library and adjacent offices.

Storage includes extra student desks and chairs for all grade levels, teacher furniture, extra kitchen equipment, and transition space for surplussed items. When/if Islander Middle School's 100/200 Building is replaced, 10,000 square feet of storage space will be needed. This could be accomplished by adding space at each site or at one central location.

RECENT UPGRADES

- > 2015: Maintenance Shop addition to accommodate loss of storage at demolished North Mercer Junior High (\$200,000)
- > 2011: New modular MOT Building provided by Boys & Girls Club to replace demolished building (\$500,000)







Boys & Girls Club PEAK Exterior

SHARED FACILITIES

BOYS & GIRLS CLUB PEAK

In 2005, the district began conversations with the Boys & Girls Club about the potential of the Club constructing a facility on district property to serve the needs of Island children.

In 2011, this building was completed with a \$1 million contribution by both the district and the City. The Club signed a long-term lease with the district for the land.

In return, for the \$1 annual lease and the financial contribution, the district may use the facility during school hours, has dedicated practice time available for school sport team practice / games, and the Club is required to maintain a preschool space in the building.

MISD does make use of the facility, but has found it somewhat challenging to permanently assign a program to the facility. In addition, due to the heavy use by students before and after the school day, the facility is often not in a condition appropriate for large group meeting space. Boys & Girls Club PEAK Interior

The Club is required to pay for all maintenance and capital costs. The district has no operational or financial obligations to the club for use of the facility.

Mercer Island School District Updated Projections

Prepared by

William L. ("Les") Kendrick Ph.D. Educational Data Solutions, LLC P.O. Box 9693 Seattle, WA 98109

Educational Data Solutions, LLC December 2019

Introduction

The following is an update of an enrollment forecast that was completed for the Mercer Island in early 2017. Since the 2017 update some demographic conditions have changed. Enrollment growth in King County, overall, has slowed in the past two years with more families opting to live in the outlying regions of King County, and even further north and south in Pierce and Snohomish County. In addition, births in King County were lower in 2017 and 2018, primarily due to women having fewer children. We do not know if this is an enduring or temporary trend. We should also note that home sales and prices in King County and Mercer Island were on an upward swing between 2012 and 2017, but recent data shows a slowing of home sales in Mercer Island and the County as a whole, perhaps because prices have increased so rapidly.

Perhaps as a result of these trends Mercer Island's enrollment growth has slowed and even declined some over the past two years. At this time we expect enrollment in Mercer Island to flatten out and even decline some between 2020 and 2025, We expect enrollment to start growing again in the latter part of the forecast period (2025 to 2030) when we expect more development activity and population growth.

Introduction

Given the current demographic conditions and the uncertainty inherent in predicting the future we recommend that the District give ample attention, not only to the main forecast, but also to the low and high alternatives that show what might happen if population and housing growth in Mercer Island and King County were to be lower or higher than what we have assumed in our main model.

It is possible that Mercer Island could see larger enrollment declines in the near term than we have assumed in the medium range forecast, given recent demographic trends. We believe, however, that looking out over the decade it is also likely that these declines will eventually cease with a turn toward the more positive trend that we see in the medium range forecast. The comprehensive plan from the City speaks to the need for additional housing in the City and we believe that given continuing growth in the Puget Sound, additional housing and population growth will eventually work its way into future city planning, especially with the extension of light rail across the the region.

The assumption of greater population and housing growth between 2025 and 2030 is one of the guiding assumptions of our forecaset. This forecast also assumes that we will see continuing population growth in King County and the Puget Sound, but that the growth trends going forward will be more modest than the trends we saw between 2012 and 2017 when Seattle and the region was booming. Amazon is reported to be finishing their hiring for the Seattle area over the next one to two years. For this reason we may see more modest population growth trends in the near term, consistent with the County forecasts obtained from the State of Washington.

3

Introduction

It is possible, of course, that Amazon or some other large employer in the region will increase their hiring at a more rapid pace than expected resulting in continuing large population gains over the next decade. The high range forecast in this document recognizes that possibility and the District should give some consideration to what steps might be taken if enrollment were to trend higher than expected.

As a general rule enrollment trends on the Island are dependent on either the turnover of existing homes, resulting in net gains of families with children, or the development of new housing that brings additional families with children to Mercer Island. Home sales and new home development are two critical factors to keep an eye on in gauging the potential for future growth.

The next section of this report provides an executive summary of our findings in the form of bullet points. After this presentation we present specific data on enrollment, births, population, and housing. Each section is preceded by a set of bullet points that highlight the important information to keep in mind when viewing the charts and tables. The final section presents a series of alternative forecasts that were used to help us develop our main forecast. After this, there is a brief presentation of the methodology used to created the forecast and detailed numbers by grade level for the low, medium, and high range forecast options that are recommended for planning.

- Enrollment in the Mercer Island School District is tracking below the medium range forecast that was completed in 2017.
- Enrollment in the District has declined in the past two years.
- The 2017 forecast predicted that elementary enrollment growth would slow some between 2017 and 2020, but it has slowed even more than expected with smaller than expected kindergarten classes.
- A look at the data suggests that while the District still sees more families with preschool age children move in than move out of the District prior to those children reaching school age, the District's share of the kindergarten population has declined in the past two years. This suggests that either more families than usual are leaving before their children reach school age, or fewer families with preschool age children are moving in (or, of course, a combination of the two).
- K-12 enrollment growth in King County has slowed considerably over the past two years compared to the period between 2012 and 2017.

- There is evidence in the latest Puget Sound enrollment data that some families with children have been migrating to the outlying regions of King County and even into Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish County where housing is more affordable.
- This is not a universal trend, however, since there are still affluent families opting to live in areas that are close to Seattle and other urban job centers. Lake Washington saw tremendous enrollment growth over the past year and the Seattle School District saw a net gain of over 600 students.
- There are still families migrating to the Puget Sound who are relatively affluent and can choose to live in more expensive areas, but this population is generally smaller than the population of families that are opting to live in the outlying regions.
- Births in King County in 2017 and 2018 were lower than the numbers that we saw between 2012 and 2016. This is primarily due to women having fewer children. As a result of this trend, we have lowered our long range forecast of the King County K-12 population, predicting less growth than the model that we were using for the 2017 forecast.

- The lower birth forecasts means that we are predicting less K-12 growth over the next decade in King County and Mercer Island than the model completed in 2017.
- Home sales and prices have also started to moderate and even decline some after the rapid increase that we saw between 2012 and 2017. A continuing drop in prices could eventually result in more sales and more population growth of families with children on the Island, especially if home prices moderate a bit.
- We are still predicting that King County K-12 enrollment will grow over the next decade but due to the recent change in births we are predicting less growth and we expect continued migration to more affordable areas in King County and even to the outlying regions in Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish County by residents that are new to the region.
- In Mercer Island specifically, we are predicting that the recent trends will result in less growth and even enrollment declines in the near term (2020 to 2025) with enrollment eventually trending up in the latter part of the forecast period (2025 to 2030). During the latter period we expect the extension of light rail to spur some additional development on the Island resulting in improving K-12 enrollment trends. This assumption is consistent with the City's comprehensive plan goals for more affordable housing options in the future.

- As always, there is uncertainty when predicting the future. For this reason we have developed low and high alternatives to our medium range forecast which show what might happen if population and housing growth were to be lower or higher than what we have assumed in our medium range model.
- As noted in the introduction, K-12 enrollment growth on the Island is dependent on the turnover of existing homes or the development of new housing which brings more families with children into the District. Home sales and new home development are critical factors to keep an eye on when planning for the future.
- The District should also pay particular attention to Kindergarten enrollment. There are still some fairly large birth cohorts projected to enter the schools over the next couple of years (2020 and 2021). If the District's share of the birth cohort continues to drop, enrollment will likely drop more dramatically than what we have assumed in the medium range forecast. On the other hand, if the District's share stabilizes or shows a marked increase, enrollment may well remain at its current level or even increase some.

• Although we are predicting some decline in middle school enrollment in the near term, this is primarily due to the size of the cohorts that are rolling in at 5th grade (in some years smaller than usual) or rolling out at the 8th grade (in some years larger than usual). In general, the District sees a net increase at the secondary grades from migration (more families moving in than out) suggesting that the District may be a "move-up" choice for families who are looking to buy a bigger home when their children are older. This is why the turnover of new homes or the development of additional housing are critical factors for enrollment trends.

Enrollment Trends Mercer Island and King County

Enrollment Trends

- Enrollment in the Mercer Island School District is tracking below the projection completed in 2017.
- Enrollment growth in King County has slowed over the past two years. Based on the most current year of enrollment data, K-12 enrollment in the Puget Sound is continuing to increase with more growth migrating to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish County.
- Mercer Island's share of the King County K-12 population has declined over the past five years, indicating the the District is growing at a slower rate than the rest of the County.
- Based on the latest birth and population forecasts for King County, we expect K-12 enrollment growth in the County to continue growing over the next decades.
- Given the latest birth data (see the section on births) we are, however, predicting less K-12 enrollment growth in King County and Mercer Island over the next decade than we were predicting in 2017.

Forecast from 2017 Compared to Actual Enrollment



District Enrollment Trend

P223 Enrollment (October) Does Not Include Full-Time Running Start Students or Students Enrolled in Open Doors



King County Public Schools Enrollment Trend and Mercer Island Market Share



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Public School Enrollment for the Puget Sound King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish County





Trends and Projections – Dec 20196

Annual Net Change in Enrollment by County Since 2012 (Numbers may have changed since the original reporting date)



King County Public School Districts Change in Enrollment Between Oct 2018 to Oct 2019



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Kitsap County Public School Districts Change in Enrollment Between Oct 2018 and Oct 2019

Please Note: Bremerton's enrollment includes the Skills Center



Trends and Projections - Dec 2019

Pierce County Public School Districts Change in Enrollment Between Oct 2018 and Oct 2019



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Snohomish County Public School Districts

Change in Enrollment Oct 2018 and Oct 2019



Forecast of the King County K-12 Population

Using Cohort Survival, Actual Births, Birth Forecasts and Projected Changes in Population Growth During Certain Time Periods



Enrollment Patterns Mercer Island School District

Note: The bullet point comments in this section are the same as those in the 2017 report. Only the data has been updated. The comments still apply.

Enrollment Patterns

- Grade progression rates show the net gains or losses that occur when families with children move in and out over the course of a year. A rate greater than one indicates a net increase and a rate less than one indicates a net loss.
- To create a grade progression rate you divide the enrollment at a particular grade (say second grade) by the enrollment at the prior grade from the previous year (say first grade). These are also known as cohort survival ratios. This is the method that the State facilities department uses when doing forecasts for all school districts in the State.
- In Mercer Island the cohort survival/grade progression rates are greater than one at most grades indicating that more families with children move in than move out over the course of the year at most grades.
- The exception to this pattern occurs mostly at the 11th and 12th grade where dropouts, or students opting for full-time Running Start programs can sometimes lead to net losses in enrollment.

Enrollment Patterns

- Grade progression rates do not apply to kindergarten since there is no previous grade.
- At the kindergarten level we can compare enrollment in a given year to births that occurred five years prior. We can compare enrollment to the County births to get a sense of overall market share in the County.
- We can also compare enrollment to births on Mercer Island.
- Kindergarten enrollment generally exceeds the number of births on the Island that occurred five years prior to each enrollment year. This indicates that the number of families with preschool age children who move into the District over a five year period generally exceeds the number who move out.
- Because many families move in at the secondary level the high school graduating classes are generally substantially larger than the following year's kindergarten class. The District will only grow if it sees larger kindergarten classes or large net gains of students at the continuing grades.

Grade Progression Rate Example

- Rates for Different Grade Levels:
 - Elementary: K-4 moves into Grades 1-5
 - Middle schools: Grades 5-7 move into 6-8
 - High school: Grades 8-11 move into 9-12
 - A ratio greater than 1 indicates a net gain from families moving in over the course of a year; less than 1 indicates a net loss (more moving out than moving in).

| Grade | <u>2007</u> | <u>2008</u> |
|-------|-------------|-------------|
| K | 232 | 254 |
| 1 | 276 | 270 |
| 2 | 294 | 290 |
| 3 | 255 | 305 |
| 4 | 311 | 281 |
| 5 | <u>279</u> | <u>318</u> |
| | 3654 | 3726 |
| | K-4 Total | Gr1-5 Total |

| -4 Total | Gr1-5 Total | <u>Ratio</u> |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| 1368 | 1464 | 107% |

Average Grade Progression Rates (3, 5, and 10 Year Averages) Cohort Ratio Averages for the Mercer Island School District



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Mercer Island

K Enrollment as a Percent of King County Births



Mercer Island K Enrollment as a Percent of City Births



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019
Birth Trends

Births and Enrollment

Key Points and Highlights

- There were approximately 2,700 more births per year on average in King County between 2006 and 2015 than in the previous decade (1996 to 2005). This trend continued into 2016, but births dropped to a lower than expected level in 2017 and 2018, primarily because women are having fewer children.
- Based on the latest births, fertility rates, and subsequent birth forecasts we expect a lower K-12 enrollment growth trend in King County over the next decade than we were predicting in 2017.
- We still expect overall kindergarten and elementary enrollment in the County to grow over the next few years, as the recently larger birth cohorts enter the schools.
- Comparing City of Mercer Island births to Kindergarten enrollment five years later we can observe that more families with preschool age children move in, than move out, of the City prior to the children reaching school age. The District's share of the kindergarten population has dropped, however, in the past two years.

Average Annual Births by County

Source: State of Washington Department of Health Birth Files



King County Births

Source: Washington State Health Department



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

King County Birth Projections

(Based on the Average of 2016 to 2018 Fertility Rates and Projected Growth in Females in Their Child-Bearing Years Using the OFM Medium Range Population Forecast)



Population Trends

Population Trends

- The population of King County has been growing at a faster pace than expected between 2012 and 2019. Growth did slow some between 2017 and 2018 but the estimated net population gain in 2019 was similar to the large gains we saw between 2014 and 2017.
- Much of this growth has been driven by a strong economy anchored by extensive hiring at Amazon. The company is expected to reach its hiring goal in the Seattle area over the next one to two years. After that time period they are expected to mostly maintain current employment levels (this is based on newspaper reports about the company rather than first hand information).
- The State is predicting that population growth in King County will be more moderate over the next decade compared to the trends that we saw over the past decade.
- We expect Mercer Island to grow at a lower rate than the overall County over the next decade.

Population Trends

- We developed low, medium, and high range population forecasts for the District based on information about projected growth in the City from the Puget Sound Regional Council.
- The Council's land use forecast assumes a growth trend that is similar to the City's comprehensive plan.
- The Council's land vision forecast from two years ago, assumes greater density is possible and thus greater population growth.
- We applied the assumed growth rates from each of these forecasts to the current estimated population in 2019 to create low and high forecasts of the District's population. We also created a medium range estimate that is in-between these two numbers.
- These population forecasts were used to help us create low, medium, and high range forecasts of the District's enrollment.

County Net Population Change and Projections Puget Sound Counties

Source: Office of Financial Management of the State of Washington

Projections for 2020, 2025 and 2030 are from the Growth Management Medium Range Projections Released by the State in December 2017.

Note: Growth Management Projections Will Most Likely Be Updated After the 2020 Census



Trends and Projections - Dec 2019

Mercer Island Population Census and State Estimates



Mercer Island Resident Population Forecasts

Alternative Forecasts Based on Different Assumptions About Growth. We used the Puget Sound Regional Land Use* and Land Vision Forecasts from two years ago to help us calibrate these forecast estimates. Rather than take the specific numbers from those forecasts we took the projected growth rates and applied them to the current estimate of the population (2019) to get our low and high numbers. The medium estimate is in-between the high and low estimates.



*The PSRC Land Use Baseline forecast is similar to the Mercer Island City Comprehensive Plan Assumptions.

40

- Home sales in Mercer Island have dropped some in 2018 and 2019 compared to the trends we saw between 2013 and 2017.
- Over 1,100 units were added to the District's housing stock between the 2000 and 2010 Census period. About half as many units have been added to the District's housing stock between 2010 and 2019.
- Based on permit activity, data from MetroStudy, and forecast data from the Puget Sound Regional Council we are predicting that just over 500 additional units will be added to the District's housing stock by 2030. This number is much lower than the period between 2000 and 2010 when the town center units were added and may well result in less enrollment growth and even declines in enrollment in the near term period of the forecast (2020 to 2025). We are expecting the bulk of additional housing development to occur between roughly 2023 and 2030.
- As mentioned in the 2017 report, a net gain of housing might occur in cases where an existing single family unit is torn down and replaced with two or more units. Greater density as well as the development of new land can result in housing increases.

- We have created alternative forecasts of future housing growth. Similar to our population forecasts we have used the PSRC land-use and PSRC land-vision forecasts, as well as an alternative that is somewhere in the middle.
- Based on our reading of the City comprehensive plan and the PSRC documents we expect some increase in multi-family housing units, relative to single family over time (especially with the high forecast estimate). But it is likely that single family units will still make up between 65%-70% of the City's housing stock.
- Based on 2010 Census data there are approximately 42 students for every 100 housing units in the District. This number is higher than either Lake Washington or Bellevue, and well above the rate in Seattle (see page 48). The 2019 estimate for the District shows a similar number (42 students per 100 homes). It has not changed.

- Assuming this number remains the same we can estimate how many students might be enrolled in the future by multiplying the number of students per house by our alternative housing forecasts.
- A forecast based on the low, medium, and high range housing numbers is presented in the forecast section of this report.

Home Sales in Mercer Island

Source: MetroStudy Assessor's Data



Puget Sound Regional Council Estimate of Permitted Units in Mercer Island

| Year | JURIS | NEWUNITS | LOSTUNITS | NETUNITS | SF | MF1-2 | MF3-4 | MF5-9 | MF10-19 | MF20-49 | MF50+ | MH | OTH |
|------|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-------|----|-----|
| 2011 | MERCER ISLAND | 196 | -21 | 175 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | MERCER ISLAND | 121 | -21 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | MERCER ISLAND | 66 | -45 | 21 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2014 | MERCER ISLAND | 272 | -43 | 229 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | MERCER ISLAND | 67 | -40 | 27 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 | MERCER ISLAND | 20 | -12 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | MERCER ISLAND | 89 | -38 | 51 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 831 | -220 | 611 | 114 | 30 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 461 | 0 | 0 |

Permit data is collected by the Puget Sound Regional Council from Cities and Counties on an annual basis. Data for 2018 is not yet available

LostUnits = Demolished units NetUnits = Difference between New and Lost SF = Single Family Units MF# = Multi-family units with differing numbers

Number of Housing Units

Source: Office of Financial Management, State of Washington



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

| | | | | Rounded | Rounded |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | | Census 2010 | Census | Estimated | Estimated |
| | P223 Oct | Total | 2010 | K-12 Students | K-12 Students |
| School District | <u>2010 Enroll</u> | Housing Units | Occupied Units | <u>Per 100 Homes</u> | Per 100 Occupied |
| Tahoma | 7,394 | 13,835 | 13,153 | 53 | 56 |
| Snoqualmie Valley | 6,019 | 13,693 | 12,635 | 44 | 48 |
| Auburn | 14,343 | 32,762 | 30,704 | 44 | 47 |
| Kent | 26,630 | 60,010 | 56,621 | 44 | 47 |
| Issaquah | 16,881 | 38,765 | 36,642 | 44 | 46 |
| Federal Way | 21,724 | 50,518 | 47,551 | 43 | 46 |
| Mercer Island | 4,177 | 9,930 | 9,109 | 42 | 46 |
| Enumclaw | 4,472 | 10,516 | 9,877 | 43 | 45 |
| Riverview | 3,152 | 7,470 | 7,019 | 42 | 45 |
| Tukwila | 2,908 | 7,353 | 6,817 | 40 | 43 |
| Northshore | 19,390 | 49,801 | 46,787 | 39 | 41 |
| Highline | 18,101 | 50,913 | 47,160 | 36 | 38 |
| Bellevue | 18,008 | 56,376 | 50,892 | 32 | 35 |
| Lake Washington | 24,592 | 76,389 | 71,711 | 32 | 34 |
| Shoreline | 8,808 | 28,028 | 26,561 | 31 | 33 |
| Vashon Island | 1,421 | 5,552 | 4,606 | 26 | 31 |
| Renton | 13,558 | 48,991 | 45,526 | 28 | 30 |
| Seattle | 46,794 | 308,858 | 283,793 | 15 | 16 |
| Skykomish | 49 | 823 | 330 | 6 | 15 |

K-12 Public School Students Per House (King County Districts)

*Note: The number of K-12 students per house is estimated using Census housing counts and the October 2010 P223 enrollment. The number of students per 100 homes was rounded to the nearest whole number.

Private Schools

Private Schools

- Students on Mercer Island may attend private schools that are located on the Island, in Seattle, or in other areas around the Puget Sound.
- Private school enrollment in King County has increased some since 2010 but still makes up between eleven and twelve percent of the County's overall school enrollment. This percentage has remained relatively constant over the decade.
- Private school enrollment has been declining in Pierce and Snohomish County over the past decade.
- Enrollment for private schools located on Mercer Island, has declined by about 35 students since hitting a peak in 2010.
- There is no evidence at this time that private schools are having a significant impact on Mercer Island's enrollment, however, data for the 2018-19 school year is not available from the State at this time.

Public and Private School Enrollment King County (K-12 Only) Source: P223 and P105 Report --State of Washington Headcount



Private Schools Public Schools

Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Enrollment for Private Schools Located in Mercer Island's Service Area

Source: OSPI Private School Enrollment Data



Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

Enrollment Projections

Alternative Projections Based on Different Models

- Before creating our final forecast models we created a set of alternative forecasts based on different methods. Some of the alternative forecasts (like the cohort models) consider births and enrollment trends by grade. Other forecasts predicted the total enrollment only based on housing, population and births. A description of each forecast is provided below.
- **3, 5, and 10 year Cohort Models:** These models show what might happen if the average of the grade level enrollment trends for the past three, five, and ten year period were to continue into the future. These models can be good if you believe that the most recent trends (e.g., the most recent three years) will not change much in future years. They are less reliable when future demographic trends look different from the recent past.
- Linear Models Based on County Births and Local Population: These models use the number of County births, and projected births along with the three alternative forecasts of Mercer Island's population to predict K-12 enrollment. Generally the higher the births and the population the higher the enrollment since these two indicators are highly correlated with enrollment. This is not universally true, however, especially if population consists mostly of young singles, or older childless couples.

Alternative Projections Based on Different Models

- Housing Yield Forecasts: These models apply the number of K-12 public school students per house from the 2010 Census to the alternative projected totals of future housing units in the District. These models assume that the number of students per house remains relatively stable over the course of the forecast. This is a reasonable assumption for the initial years of the forecast though it is possible that the number of students per house could change in future years based on the specific combination of housing types (multi-family versus single family) and/or based on changes in the percentage of the population that is school age. The assumptions that it will remain stable is supported by the latest data for 2019 which shows about the same number of students per house as the 2010 Census count. It has not changed much over the past decade.
- **Results:** The results of these different models are shown on the following pages. In general the average of multiple forecasts is often a better indicator of the future than any one forecast. Our final forecast numbers were adjusted for predicted growth and gains in housing and population so that they would correspond relatively close to the low, medium, and high range estimates presented here. As can be observed from the graph on page 57 there is substantial variation in the different models which suggests we are facing a high degree of uncertainty about the future.

Forecast Estimates Using a Variety of Methods

| Cohort Forecasts* | <u>2019</u> | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021</u> | <u>2022</u> | <u>2023</u> | <u>2024</u> | <u>2025</u> | <u>2026</u> | <u>2027</u> | <u>2028</u> | <u>2029</u> | <u>2030</u> | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 4,387 | 4,379 | 4,372 | 4,321 | 4,277 | 4,233 | 4,179 | 4,149 | 4,128 | 4,132 | 4,115 | 4,084 | |
| 5 Year Avg. Cohort | | 4,387 | 4,384 | 4,389 | 4,352 | 4,321 | 4,281 | 4,241 | 4,222 | 4,214 | 4,230 | 4,232 | 4,218 |
| 10 Year Avg. Cohort 4, | | | 4,420 | 4,459 | 4,448 | 4,443 | 4,423 | 4,401 | 4,400 | 4,408 | 4,443 | 4,460 | 4,458 |
| Linear Models (Bas | sed on Total Enrollme | ent Only 1 | 0 Year His | tory) | | | | | | | | | |
| County Births and MI Pop (Low) 4 | | | 4,491 | 4,540 | 4,486 | 4,416 | 4,482 | 4,502 | 4,491 | 4,479 | 4,557 | 4,546 | 4,544 |
| County Births and MI Pop (High) 4,387 | | | 4,503 | 4,565 | 4,523 | 4,466 | 4,545 | 4,578 | 4,580 | 4,581 | 4,673 | 4,676 | 4,688 |
| Students Per Hous | e Forecast (Based on | Alternativo | e Pop/Hous | ing Foreca | sts | | | | | | | | |
| Student Per House Low Growth | | | 4,424 | 4,437 | 4,451 | 4,464 | 4,477 | 4,491 | 4,504 | 4,518 | 4,531 | 4,545 | 4,559 |
| Student Per House Medium Growth 4,38 | | | 4,437 | 4,464 | 4,491 | 4,518 | 4,545 | 4,572 | 4,600 | 4,627 | 4,655 | 4,683 | 4,711 |
| Student Per House High Growth 4,387 | | | 4,451 | 4,491 | 4,531 | 4,572 | 4,613 | 4,655 | 4,696 | 4,739 | 4,781 | 4,824 | 4,868 |
| Average of all Forecasts | | 4,436 | 4,465 | 4,450 | 4,434 | 4,450 | 4,452 | 4,455 | 4,462 | 4,500 | 4,510 | 4,516 | |

*Kindergarten enrollment in the cohort forecasts is based on the District's average share of the County birth cohort (K enrollment compared to births) for the past three, six, and ten years, multiplied by actual and projected birth cohorts expected to enroll between 2020 and 2030

Graph of Alternative Forecasts



Final Enrollment Projections Methods and Assumptions

An enrollment forecast is based on assumptions and mathematical calculations that convert these assumptions into numbers. The previous sections have identified a number of assumptions about births, grade level enrollment trends, population, and housing growth that are likely to impact the district in the coming years. This section describes the specific assumptions that guided the development of the forecasts.

The forecasts in this document were based on consideration of several factors:

The size of future birth cohorts and the projected share of that cohort that is likely to enroll in Mercer Island kindergartens.

Average grade-to-grade growth as students progress through the grades.

Predicted growth in the K-12 population based on alternative housing and population forecasts for the District.

The number of public school students per house.

٦

The relationship between public and private school enrollment.

Methods and Assumptions

Births and Kindergarten Enrollment

Both county and city births were used to project kindergarten. The number of county births is known through 2018 which means we can predict kindergarten enrollment based on actual births out to 2023. Beyond that point births were projected based on the most recent fertility rates for the county and the forecast of the number of women likely to reach their childbearing years over time, using the medium range county forecast from the State. Births for the city of Mercer Island are also known through 2018. Births on Mercer Island beyond 2018 were predicted based on the correlation between city and county births. On average city births make up about six-tenths of a percent of the births in the county. This trend has been relatively consistent over the past decade.

Projecting Kindergarten Enrollment

Kindergarten enrollments were projected using birth-to-k ratios. The birth-to-k ratio compares the kindergarten enrollment in a given year to births five years prior to that year. The District's birth-to-k ratio has averaged about one percent of county births over the past decade. The District's share of city births is greater than 100% since there are families with preschool age children who move to Mercer Island before their children reach kindergarten age. The projection model uses the six year median birth-to-k ratio for both the city and the county to predict future enrollment, taking an average of the two estimates. This method was deemed reasonable since the number of city births is very small and does not always capture the larger birth trends that are likely to affect K-12 enrollment in the county. We also know from our linear models (reported earlier) that County births together with projected population totals for Mercer Island are highly correlated with K-12 enrollment.

Continuing Grades

Projecting Grades 1-12

The forecasts at grades one to twelve were based on grade level cohort ratios which predict the net gain and/or loss in enrollment as students progress from one grade to the next. We used the average rate from the past three years which reflects the most recent trends. The enrollment at each grade level was multiplied by the appropriate cohort ratio to project enrollment forward and then adjusted for projected changes in population and housing growth over time.

Adjustments for Population Growth

Adjustments for Population Growth

The cohort model shows what might happen if the current trends were to continue indefinitely into the future, with some adjustments for projected changes in the birth trends over time. What we also need to consider, however, is the effect of additional population and housing growth in Mercer Island and the county, especially growth in the K-12 population.

Our previous models based on population and housing provide us with alternative estimates of future enrollment. We applied growth factors to our forecasts to simulate the effects of low, medium and high growth rates. In other words, we tried to get our forecast to align as closely as possible with the low, medium, and high range estimates provided in the earlier section of this report. The numbers will differ to some degree, of course, because they take into account the size of each year's graduating class and each year's entering kindergarten, as well as the way in which students roll up through the grades. The final numbers in all of the models are, close to the low, medium, and high range alternative forecast estimates presented earlier.

The medium range forecast shows the District declining some in the near term with enrollment remaining relatively flat (2020 to 2025). After that time period we are predicting that enrollment will began growing again due the development of additional housing. Our medium range forecast in this report is lower overall than the one from the previous report, due primarily to our projection of lower K-12 County enrollment growth than in our previous forecast (2017).

Considerations

The low and high forecasts show what might happen if housing and population growth were to be lower or higher than what is assumed in the medium range forecast. Enrollments may well decline more than expected over the next few years (similar to the low forecast) if home sales remain low and there is relatively little new development. In addition, we are starting to see slow downs in K-12 population growth in King County. The high range forecast, on the other hand, shows what might happen if housing and population growth were to be higher than expected for a variety of reasons (increased housing density, greater availability of affordable housing, or if the recently greater than expected population growth in Seattle and King County were to continue indefinitely into the future). Currently we are predicting that population growth in King County will moderate some over the next decade, consistent with State forecasts.

There is greater variation between the low, medium, and high range forecasts in this year's report than in our last report. This is due to the greater variation that we are seeing in our alternative forecast models. It also indicates a greater degree of uncertainty when predicting the future.

Finally, these forecasts assume that changes in enrollment are equal from year to year. In reality enrollment may grow a lot in one year, a little in another, decline in another year and stay at the same level in the following year. The recommended forecast assumes a certain amount of growth between now and 2025 and a different rate of growth between 2026 and 2030. The actual growth in a given year may vary from the averages assumed over the different periods of the forecast.

Mercer Island District Forecast Alternative Forecasts 2020-2030

Based on Grade Level Trends and Alternative Projections of Population and Housing



Appendix A

Final Forecast Numbers Headcount Forecasts by Grade Level Mercer Island (October Headcount Enrollment)

| Births | <u>1995</u> | <u>1996</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1998</u> | <u>1999</u> | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>2004</u> | <u>2005</u> | <u>2006</u> | <u>2007</u> | <u>2008</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mercer Island Births | 140 | 130 | 167 | 136 | 121 | 155 | 132 | 150 | 126 | 156 | 143 | 142 | 175 | 150 | 128 | 138 | 145 | 148 | 156 | 179 |
| King County Births | 21817 | 21573 | 21646 | 22212 | 22007 | 22487 | 21778 | 21863 | 22,431 | 22874 | 22680 | 24244 | 24,899 | 25190 | 25057 | 24514 | 24,630 | 25,032 | 24,910 | 25,348 |
| K Enroll as % of Cnty | 1.20% | 1.11% | 1.05% | 1.05% | 0.95% | 1.11% | 1.14% | 1.06% | 1.13% | 1.00% | 1.17% | 1.02% | 1.06% | 1.00% | 0.98% | 0.95% | 0.98% | 1.07% | 0.97% | 0.93% |
| K Enroll as a % of City | 186% | 184% | 136% | 171% | 172% | 161% | 188% | 155% | 202% | 147% | 186% | 174% | 151% | 168% | 192% | 169% | 167% | 182% | 155% | 132% |
| City % of County Cohort | 0.64% | 0.60% | 0.77% | 0.61% | 0.55% | 0.69% | 0.61% | 0.69% | 0.56% | 0.68% | 0.63% | 0.59% | 0.70% | 0.60% | 0.51% | 0.56% | 0.59% | 0.59% | 0.63% | 0.71% |
| | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>2004</u> | <u>2005</u> | <u>2006</u> | <u>2007</u> | <u>2008</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
| K | 261 | 239 | 227 | 233 | 208 | 250 | 248 | 232 | 254 | 229 | 266 | 247 | 264 | 252 | 246 | 233 | 242 | 269 | 242 | 236 |
| 1 | 259 | 276 | 257 | 257 | 260 | 224 | 283 | 276 | 267 | 283 | 280 | 294 | 277 | 298 | 287 | 273 | 256 | 280 | 296 | 259 |
| 2 | 306 | 277 | 291 | 276 | 259 | 274 | 227 | 294 | 294 | 280 | 304 | 294 | 311 | 297 | 317 | 305 | 298 | 261 | 293 | 302 |
| 3 | 330 | 309 | 276 | 308 | 282 | 266 | 290 | 255 | 306 | 311 | 305 | 305 | 310 | 336 | 317 | 343 | 324 | 313 | 2/6 | 303 |
| 4 | 314 | 330 | 309 | 297 | 33U 201 | 292 | 215 | 311 | 281 | 310 | 339 | 320 | 331 | 337 220 | 301 | 320 256 | 350 | 330 267 | 321 | 307 |
| 5 | 300 360 | 310 256 | 33Z 216 | 33 I 240 | 301 241 | 340 201 | 300 252 | 219 | 320 202 | 200 | 320 292 | 341 242 | 32Z 262 | 228 220 | 260 260 | 300 270 | 340 262 | 307 271 | 044 200 | 331 250 |
| 0 | 302 | 364 | 368 | 325 | 341 | 330 | 307 | 290 | 202 | 247 200 | 202 | 343 311 | 348 | 330 370 | 300 | 360 | 202 | 367 | 302 371 | 388 |
| 8 | 3/0 | 352 | 360 | 381 | 340 | 352 | 3/13 | 303 | 365 | 230 | 305 | 357 | 320 | 350 | 374 | 356 | 363 | 408 | 38/ | 303 |
| q | 343 | 347 | 354 | 351 | 392 | 344 | 343 | 334 | 336 | 383 | 320 | 337 | 362 | 332 | 364 | 398 | 368 | 368 | 403 | 386 |
| 10 | 350 | 335 | 343 | 360 | 355 | 387 | 346 | 337 | 341 | 350 | 393 | 335 | 339 | 364 | 333 | 368 | 412 | 367 | 368 | 407 |
| 11 | 340 | 334 | 343 | 333 | 364 | 363 | 379 | 342 | 348 | 357 | 358 | 407 | 336 | 342 | 364 | 332 | 361 | 403 | 360 | 364 |
| 12 | 377 | 343 | 348 | 339 | 340 | 366 | 351 | 369 | 360 | 343 | 351 | 352 | 388 | 329 | 319 | 334 | 320 | 340 | 397 | 353 |
| Tot | 4,301 | 4,180 | 4,133 | 4,140 | 4,131 | 4,103 | 4,048 | 4,004 | 4,058 | 4,083 | 4,177 | 4,243 | 4,270 | 4,284 | 4,358 | 4,371 | 4,409 | 4,450 | 4,437 | 4,387 |
| Growth | 93 | -121 | -47 | 7 | -9 | -28 | -55 | -44 | 54 | 25 | 94 | 66 | 27 | 14 | 74 | 13 | 38 | 41 | -13 | -50 |
| Percent | 2.2% | -2.8% | -1.1% | 0.2% | -0.2% | -0.7% | -1.3% | -1.1% | 1.3% | 0.6% | 2.3% | 1.6% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 1.7% | 0.3% | 0.9% | 0.9% | -0.3% | -1.1% |
| | 1830 | 1749 | 1692 | 1702 | 1640 | 1651 | 1629 | 1647 | 1722 | 1699 | 1822 | 1801 | 1815 | 1859 | 1886 | 1836 | 1824 | 1826 | 1772 | 1738 |
| | 1061 | 1072 | 1053 | 1055 | 1040 | 992 | 1000 | 975 | 951 | 951 | 933 | 1011 | 1030 | 1058 | 1092 | 1103 | 1124 | 1146 | 1137 | 1139 |
| | 1410 | 1359 | 1388 | 1383 | 1451 | 1460 | 1419 | 1382 | 1385 | 1433 | 1422 | 1431 | 1425 | 1367 | 1380 | 1432 | 1461 | 1478 | 1528 | 1510 |
Low Range Forecast

| | | | | | | | | | | | Project | ed Birth | S | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>2020</u> | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| | <u>6 year Tre</u> | nds at Kinde | ergarten | | | City Births | 163 | 162 | 179 | 146 | 150 | 151 | 150 | 149 | 154 | 153 | 152 |
| | <u>Median</u> | <u>SD+1</u> | <u>SD-1</u> | | | Cnty Births | 25,487 | 26,011 | 25,273 | 24,337 | 25,073 | 25,237 | 25,029 | 24,807 | 25,681 | 25,477 | 25,373 |
| % County | 0.98% | 1.03% | 0.93% | | | % County | 1.00% | 0.99% | 1.06% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% | 0.97% |
| % City | 166% | 187% | 145% | | | % City | 156% | 159% | 150% | 162% | 162% | 162% | 162% | 162% | 162% | 162% | 162% |
| City % of County | 0.60% | 0.66% | 0.53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rollup | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rate Used | Adjusted for | or Future Po | p/Housing | Growth | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>3 Year</u> | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021-22</u> | <u>2023-25</u> | <u>2026-30</u> | Private | | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021</u> | <u>2022</u> | <u>2023</u> | <u>2024</u> | <u>2025</u> | <u>2026</u> | <u>2027</u> | <u>2028</u> | <u>2029</u> | <u>2030</u> |
| 0.97% | 0.970 | 0.975 | 0.983 | 0.986 | 1.000 | K | 254 | 258 | 268 | 237 | 244 | 245 | 243 | 241 | 250 | 248 | 247 |
| 1.095 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 1 | 252 | 275 | 279 | 292 | 258 | 266 | 273 | 271 | 268 | 278 | 276 |
| 1.029 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 2 | 260 | 257 | 280 | 286 | 299 | 264 | 282 | 290 | 288 | 285 | 295 |
| 1.045 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 3 | 308 | 269 | 265 | 291 | 297 | 311 | 278 | 297 | 306 | 303 | 300 |
| 1.071 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 4 | 316 | 326 | 285 | 283 | 311 | 317 | 328 | 294 | 314 | 323 | 320 |
| 1.029 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 5 | 308 | 322 | 332 | 292 | 289 | 318 | 323 | 335 | 300 | 321 | 330 |
| 1.045 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 6 | 339 | 319 | 333 | 345 | 303 | 301 | 332 | 338 | 350 | 313 | 335 |
| 1.010 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | (| 354 | 339 | 318 | 335 | 347 | 305 | 313 | 346 | 352 | 365 | 326 |
| 1.049 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 8 | 399 | 368 | 352 | 332 | 350 | 362 | 306 | 315 | 348 | 354 | 367 |
| 1.001 | 0.984 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 9 | 387 | 395 | 365 | 350 | 331 | 348 | 378 | 320 | 329 | 363 | 370 |
| 1.005 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 10 | 378 | 385 | 393 | 364 | 350 | 331 | 353 | 384 | 324 | 334 | 368 |
| 0.985 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 11 | 391 | 369 | 375 | 385 | 357 | 343 | 331 | 353 | 384 | 324 | 334 |
| 0.976 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.996 | 1.000 | 12 | <u>346</u> | <u>377</u> | <u>356</u> | <u>364</u> | <u>374</u> | <u>346</u> | <u>326</u> | <u>315</u> | 336 | <u>365</u> | 308 |
| | | | | | | lot | 4292 | 4258 | 4203 | 415 <i>1</i> | 4109 | 4056 | 4068 | 4098 | 4148 | 41/5 | 41/6 |
| | | | | | | Change | -95 | -34 | -55 | -46 | -48 | -53 | 12 | 30 | 50 | 27 | 1 |
| | | | | | | Percent | -2.2% | -0.8% | -1.3% | -1.1% | -1.1% | -1.3% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 1.2% | 0.7% | 0.0% |
| | | | | | | K-5 | 1698 | 1707 | 1710 | 1680 | 1698 | 1720 | 1728 | 1728 | 1725 | 1757 | 1768 |
| | | | | | | 6-8 | 1092 | 1025 | 1004 | 1013 | 1000 | 968 | 952 | 999 | 1050 | 1032 | 1028 |
| | | | | | | 9-12 | 1502 | 1526 | 1489 | 1464 | 1412 | 1369 | 1389 | 1371 | 1373 | 1386 | 1380 |
| | | | | | | Projection | King Cour | nty K-12 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | KC K-12 | 292,717 | 295,570 | 297,235 | 297,931 | 298,484 | 298,283 | 297,813 | 297,110 | 297,837 | 298,371 | 298,842 |
| | | | | | | Market share | 1.47% | 1.44% | 1.41% | 1.40% | 1.38% | 1.36% | 1.37% | 1.38% | 1.39% | 1.40% | 1.40% |

Medium Range Forecast (Growth Rates Based off of the Medium Range Pop/Housing Forecast)

| | | | | | | | | | | | Projecte | ed Birth | S | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | <u>2024</u> | 2025 |
| | <u>6 year Tre</u> | nds at Kinde | ergarten | | | City Births | 163 | 162 | 179 | 146 | 150 | 151 | 150 | 149 | 154 | 153 | 152 |
| | <u>Median</u> | <u>SD+1</u> | <u>SD-1</u> | | | Cnty Births | 25,487 | 26,011 | 25,273 | 24,337 | 25,073 | 25,237 | 25,029 | 24,807 | 25,681 | 25,477 | 25,373 |
| % County | 0.98% | 1.03% | 0.93% | | | % County | 1.02% | 1.01% | 1.08% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% | 0.99% |
| % City | 166% | 187% | 145% | | | % City | 159% | 162% | 153% | 165% | 165% | 165% | 165% | 165% | 165% | 165% | 165% |
| City % of County | 0.60% | 0.66% | 0.53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rollup | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rate Used | Adjusted for | or Future Po | p/Housing | Growth | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>3 Year</u> | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021-22</u> | <u>2023-25</u> | <u>2026-30</u> | <u>Private</u> | | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021</u> | <u>2022</u> | <u>2023</u> | <u>2024</u> | <u>2025</u> | <u>2026</u> | <u>2027</u> | <u>2028</u> | <u>2029</u> | <u>2030</u> |
| 0.97% | 0.990 | 0.995 | 1.003 | 1.006 | 1.000 | K | 259 | 263 | 274 | 241 | 249 | 250 | 248 | 246 | 255 | 253 | 252 |
| 1.095 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 1 | 257 | 284 | 288 | 301 | 266 | 274 | 281 | 279 | 277 | 286 | 284 |
| 1.029 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 2 | 265 | 264 | 292 | 298 | 311 | 275 | 294 | 302 | 299 | 297 | 307 |
| 1.045 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 3 | 314 | 277 | 276 | 307 | 313 | 327 | 292 | 313 | 321 | 319 | 316 |
| 1.071 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 4 | 323 | 336 | 297 | 297 | 330 | 336 | 349 | 312 | 333 | 343 | 340 |
| 1.029 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 5 | 314 | 332 | 346 | 307 | 307 | 341 | 347 | 360 | 322 | 344 | 354 |
| 1.045 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 6 | 346 | 328 | 347 | 363 | 322 | 323 | 360 | 366 | 379 | 340 | 363 |
| 1.010 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 7 | 361 | 349 | 332 | 352 | 368 | 327 | 340 | 379 | 385 | 399 | 357 |
| 1.049 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 8 | 407 | 379 | 366 | 350 | 371 | 389 | 332 | 345 | 385 | 391 | 405 |
| 1.001 | 1.004 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 9 | 395 | 407 | 380 | 369 | 352 | 374 | 410 | 350 | 364 | 406 | 413 |
| 1.005 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 10 | 386 | 397 | 409 | 383 | 372 | 355 | 382 | 420 | 359 | 373 | 416 |
| 0.985 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 11 | 399 | 380 | 391 | 405 | 379 | 368 | 359 | 386 | 424 | 362 | 377 |
| 0.976 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.006 | 1.000 | 12 | <u>353</u> | <u>389</u> | <u>371</u> | <u>383</u> | <u>397</u> | <u>372</u> | <u>354</u> | <u>345</u> | <u>371</u> | <u>408</u> | <u>348</u> |
| | | | | | | lot | 4380 | 4386 | 4367 | 4355 | 4337 | 4310 | 4348 | 4402 | 44/5 | 4520 | 4532 |
| | | | | | | Change | -7 | 7 | -19 | -12 | -18 | -28 | 38 | 54 | 73 | 45 | 12 |
| | | | | | | Percent | -0.2% | 0.2% | -0.4% | -0.3% | -0.4% | -0.6% | 0.9% | 1.3% | 1.7% | 1.0% | 0.3% |
| | | | | | | K-5 | 1732 | 1757 | 1772 | 1751 | 1776 | 1803 | 1811 | 1811 | 1808 | 1842 | 1853 |
| | | | | | | 6-8 | 1114 | 1057 | 1045 | 1065 | 1062 | 1038 | 1031 | 1090 | 1149 | 1130 | 1126 |
| | | | | | | 9-12 | 1533 | 1573 | 1550 | 1540 | 1500 | 1468 | 1505 | 1501 | 1518 | 1548 | 1553 |
| | | | | | | Projection | King Cour | <u>ty K-12</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | KC K-12 | 292,717 | 295,570 | 297,235 | 297,931 | 298,484 | 298,283 | 297,813 | 297,110 | 297,837 | 298,371 | 298,842 |
| | | | | | | Market share | 1.50% | 1.48% | 1.47% | 1.46% | 1.45% | 1.44% | 1.46% | 1.48% | 1.50% | 1.52% | 1.52% |

Trends and Projections – Dec 2019

67

High Range Forecast

1.029

1.045

1.071 1.029

1.045

1.010

1.049

1.001

1.005

0.985

0.976

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.010

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.020

1.020

1.020

1.024

1.015

1.015

1.015

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.016

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

1.000

| | | | | | | | | | | | Projecte | ed Birth | 5 | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | 2015 | <u>2016</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| | <u>6 year Tre</u> | nds at Kinde | ergarten | | | City Births | 163 | 162 | 179 | 146 | 150 | 151 | 150 | 149 | 154 | 153 | 152 |
| | <u>Median</u> | <u>SD+1</u> | <u>SD-1</u> | | | Cnty Births | 25,487 | 26,011 | 25,273 | 24,337 | 25,073 | 25,237 | 25,029 | 24,807 | 25,681 | 25,477 | 25,373 |
| % County | 0.98% | 1.03% | 0.93% | | | % County | 1.04% | 1.03% | 1.10% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% | 1.01% |
| % City | 166% | 187% | 145% | | | % City | 162% | 166% | 156% | 169% | 169% | 169% | 169% | 169% | 169% | 169% | 169% |
| City % of County | 0.60% | 0.66% | 0.53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rollup | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rate Used | Adjusted for | or Future Po | p/Housing | Growth | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>3 Year</u> | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021-22</u> | <u>2023-25</u> | <u>2026-30</u> | Private | | <u>2020</u> | <u>2021</u> | <u>2022</u> | <u>2023</u> | <u>2024</u> | <u>2025</u> | <u>2026</u> | <u>2027</u> | <u>2028</u> | <u>2029</u> | <u>2030</u> |
| 0.97% | 1.010 | 1.015 | 1.023 | 1.026 | 1.000 | K | 264 | 268 | 279 | 246 | 254 | 255 | 253 | 251 | 260 | 258 | 257 |
| 1.095 | 1.015 | 1.010 | 1.015 | 1.016 | 1.000 | 1 | 262 | 292 | 297 | 310 | 274 | 282 | 290 | 288 | 285 | 295 | 293 |

| Tot | 4467 | 4516 | 4536 | 4560 | 4575 | 4577 | 4644 | 4727 | 4827 | 4893 | 4918 |
|-----|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 12 | <u>360</u> | <u>401</u> | <u>386</u> | <u>402</u> | <u>421</u> | <u>399</u> | <u>383</u> | <u>377</u> | <u>410</u> | <u>455</u> | <u>392</u> |
| 11 | 407 | 391 | 406 | 426 | 402 | 395 | 388 | 423 | 469 | 404 | 424 |
| 10 | 394 | 409 | 426 | 403 | 395 | 381 | 414 | 459 | 396 | 416 | 468 |
| 9 | 403 | 420 | 395 | 387 | 373 | 400 | 444 | 383 | 402 | 453 | 461 |
| 8 | 415 | 391 | 381 | 367 | 394 | 417 | 359 | 377 | 425 | 432 | 448 |
| 7 | 369 | 360 | 345 | 370 | 391 | 350 | 368 | 414 | 422 | 437 | 391 |
| 6 | 353 | 338 | 361 | 382 | 342 | 346 | 390 | 397 | 411 | 368 | 393 |
| 5 | 321 | 342 | 360 | 322 | 326 | 366 | 372 | 385 | 345 | 369 | 379 |
| 4 | 329 | 346 | 309 | 312 | 350 | 357 | 370 | 331 | 354 | 364 | 361 |
| 3 | 320 | 285 | 287 | 322 | 329 | 343 | 307 | 329 | 338 | 335 | 332 |
| 2 | 270 | 272 | 304 | 310 | 324 | 286 | 306 | 314 | 312 | 309 | 320 |
| 1 | 262 | 292 | 297 | 310 | 274 | 282 | 290 | 288 | 285 | 295 | 293 |
| K | 264 | 268 | 279 | 246 | 254 | 255 | 253 | 251 | 260 | 258 | 257 |

| Change | 80 | 49 | 19 | 25 | 15 | 1 | 68 | 83 | 100 | 66 | 25 |
|--------------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Percent | 1.8% | 1.1% | 0.4% | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.1% | 1.4% | 0.5% |
| K-5 | 1767 | 1807 | 1835 | 1823 | 1856 | 1889 | 1898 | 1898 | 1893 | 1929 | 1941 |
| 6-8 | 1137 | 1089 | 1087 | 1119 | 1127 | 1113 | 1117 | 1188 | 1257 | 1237 | 1232 |
| 9-12 | 1563 | 1620 | 1613 | 1618 | 1592 | 1574 | 1629 | 1641 | 1677 | 1727 | 1745 |
| Projection I | King Cour | nty K-12 | | | | | | | | | |
| KC K-12 | 292,717 | 295,570 | 297,235 | 297,931 | 298,484 | 298,283 | 297,813 | 297,110 | 297,837 | 298,371 | 298,842 |
| larket share | 1.53% | 1.53% | 1.53% | 1.53% | 1.53% | 1.53% | 1.56% | 1.59% | 1.62% | 1.64% | 1.65% |

Consultant Background and Experience

Dr. Kendrick was the demographer for the Seattle Public schools from 1990 to 1997. In that capacity he provided enrollment projections to facilitate staffing and facilities planning and helped with the management of the student assignment system He also provided analysis of the relationship between demographics and test scores.

Since 1997 he has worked as a consultant providing demographic analysis and enrollment projections for local school districts. Over the past 20 years his clients have included the following Districts: Auburn, Bainbridge Island, Bellingham, Bellevue, Bethel, Bremerton, Central Kitsap, Edmonds, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Marysville, Mercer Island, Monroe, North Kitsap, Olympia, Renton, Seattle, South Kitsap, Shoreline, Snoqualmie Valley, Sumner, and Tukwila. He also does annual enrollment projection work for the Everett, Highline, Mukilteo, Northshore, Puyallup, and Tacoma School Districts. He has worked in all four counties of the Puget Sound and is familiar with the different trends and patterns across the region. This Study and Survey has been prepared by BLRB Architects on behalf of the Mercer Island School District and under the direction of Superintendent Donna Colosky and the Facilities Department staff. The team's assignment has included, as part of the preparation of this Report, an update to the District's 2013 ICOS Evaluation. Work has been limited to "Chapter 1" of the District's OSPI Study and Survey. It is anticipated additional work on the remaining Chapters (Educational and Facilities Plan, Demographics and Enrollment Projections, and Facility Planning Implementation) will be completed at a future date and submitted to OSPI as a formal update to the District's Study and Survey.

EXISTING AND NEW FACILITY EVALUATION

The consulting team conducted an evaluation of the District's existing facilities using OSPI's Information and Conditions of Schools (ICOS) evaluation method, which establishes a numerical score for each facility. Since 2012, OSPI has changed their approach to evaluating schools. Rather than the hand scoring done through the Building Condition Assessment (BCA), OSPI has turned to ICOS, an on-line version of evaluating facilities.

ICOS is a web-based system where information and condition details, about facilities and sites operated by the District are documented and stored. ICOS meets the increasing demand for accurate school facility information and building condition data that supports statewide programs such as the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), District facility management, and school facility information requests or policy decisions. This information is also used to support the performance-based Asset Preservation Program which gauges how well the facilities, buildings, and sites are maintained.

ICOS benefits the Districts by providing functionality for inventory tracking, condition rating, record keeping, and comparative and report analysis. The scoring system of today does not equate to the system of old, BCA.

The score reflects building and site facilities in terms of their construction components. The educational adequacy and functionality to meet educational program needs at each facility was evaluated in 2009 and is not yet included in this update. However, changes and upgrades to technology have been noted in this report.

Island Park Elementary School

Island Park Elementary School was originally constructed in 1956 and was remodeled in 1995. The campus has two buildings that scored a weighted average of 76.32 overall utilizing the ICOS scoring method.

• Structural

The buildings have no serious concerns. However, their seismic design does not meet current standards.

• Exterior

The building exteriors are in good to fair condition. Some of the observed issues include minor water intrusion. It was noted that the roof on the Multi-Purpose Building could use better access for cleanability. The roofs are due for replacement in the near future.

Interior

The building interiors are in good to fair condition. Some of the observed problems include soiled acoustical ceiling panels but the building is getting a little refresh this summer while the administration area is being reconfigured. The district has added a secure entry vestibule since the last study and survey.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to good condition. Video surveillance, fire alarm, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

• Mechanical

The systems are in fair to poor conditions. Student restrooms and corridors are not ventilated adequately. The electrical room is not ventilated for gas storage and there are duct leaks in the attic above the Multi-Purpose Building. The boilers and heating water pumps are nearing end of life. The control and HVAC systems are functioning but outdated. For the waste system, it was noted that there have been sewer backups in the past few years.

• Site

The buildings' site is in good to fair condition. The play area is adjacent to Island Crest Way which is not ideal, and the parking lot is cracked and settled.

Trees and light poles obstruct sight lines turning out of the parking lot onto Island Crest Way.

There are also two buildings on the site which is not the preferred configuration for security.

Lakeridge Elementary School

Lakeridge Elementary School was originally constructed in 1953 and was remodeled in 1995. It scored 80.92 overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design does not meet current standards.

• Exterior

The building exterior is in good condition. The roof has been known to leak and there are missing and cracked shingles. It is due for replacement soon.

• Interior

The building interior is in good to fair condition. Sheet vinyl flooring is nearing the end of its serviceable life in restrooms.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to good condition. Video surveillance, fire alarm, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. The generator and security systems were reported by district maintenance as showing signs of age and may need to be planned for future replacement. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

Mechanical

The systems are in good to fair condition. The boilers and heating water pumps are nearing end of life and will need to be replaced soon. HVAC duct distribution is in need of cleaning. There is an outdated centralized air distribution system with reheat coils. The control system appears to be relatively newer. Fire service header is in good condition but sprinkler heads in classrooms are not quick response (but were code at the time of construction).

• Site

The building and site are moderately non-compliant with handicap accessibility due to the last time the school was remodeled.

The building site is in good to fair condition. Fencing does not adequately secure the property, the covered play area is too small, the parking lot and hard surface areas are cracked and settled, and there are problems with drainage on the site.

West Mercer Elementary School

West Mercer Elementary School was originally constructed in 1964 and was remodeled in 1995. It scored 85.60 overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design does not meet current standards and minor rusting was observed at exposed steel framing at the covered play-shed.

• Exterior

The building exterior is in good condition. The roof over the south covered walkway is in need of attention. The roof over the covered play-shed has poor drainage.

• Interior

The building interior is in fair to good condition. The wooden stage in the Multi-Purpose Room has a lot of wear, there is damage to wall corners in corridors.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to good condition. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. Lighting fixtures throughout have some mismatched lamp color temperatures. Classroom AV systems include only VGA cabling and do not have audio enhancement. The generator and tank are severely rusted and is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

• Mechanical

The systems are in poor to good condition. The boilers and pumps are in poor condition and nearing end of life. Replacement will be necessary in the near future. The HVAC systems are in fair condition and the attic has poor ventilation. The domestic water system is in fair to poor condition. No cooling is provided at the MDF room and is subsequently operating very warm. The control system is functioning but outdated.

• Site

The building and site are moderately non-compliant with handicap accessibility, and the outdoor platform in the internal courtyard is not accessible.

The building site is in fair to poor condition, due to poor draining soils on site, and uneven settlement in concrete walks present a tripping hazard and makes accessibility difficult.

Islander Middle School

Islander Middle School was originally constructed in 1958 and was remodeled in 1993. Classroom and Multi-Purpose additions to the 300 Building were completed in 2000. The older buildings on campus (100/200, and 300) scored a weighted average of 74.07* (score to be verified) overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring.

The new building constructed in 2015 received a score of 96.94. Constructed in 2015 and occupied in 2016, it was designed for 21st Century learning, spaces are flexible and adaptable with significantly more transparency than the older buildings. The building has a small green roof over the entry and photovoltaics (PV) panels on the roof over the Commons, as well as energy dashboard technology that can be used as a teaching tool.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design of the older buildings does not meet current standards.

• Exterior

The 100/200, and 300 building exteriors are in fair condition with the exception of the roof on the 100/200 building. It is past the end of its life and in need of replacement.

Interior

The 100/200 and 300 building interiors are in fair to poor condition. Carpet throughout and sheet flooring in the restrooms is at the end of its serviceable life. The New Building both interior and exterior is in excellent condition.

• Electrical

All systems in the new building are in excellent condition and address all required functionality. The older vintage buildings are in fair condition. Video surveillance, access control, fire alarm, and wireless data systems have been upgraded within the older vintage buildings. Power distribution systems within the older vintage buildings are beyond useful life. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices within the older vintage buildings are Served by a generator with a single transfer switch for mixed standby and emergency loads, which is not allowed by NEC.

• Mechanical

The systems are in excellent to poor condition. The new building HVAC and domestic water distribution systems are in excellent condition. In building 100/200, the HVAC and domestic water systems are in poor condition. Access to maintenance in the attic is difficult. The control system is functioning but outdated. In building 300, the boilers and water heaters were replaced in 2011 and still appear to be in excellent condition. The HVAC and domestic water distribution systems are in fair to poor condition.

• Site

The buildings and campus are now in compliance with handicap accessibility.

The building site is in excellent condition. The southeast parking lot has been redone under the 2015 campus improvements. Landscaping is in great condition.

There are three separate buildings on the site requiring the student body to move outdoors between buildings during class periods. This approach is not preferred from a security standpoint. In addition, there is no fencing to secure the outdoor student areas or buildings.

Mercer Island High School

Mercer Island High School was originally constructed in 1955 and was remodeled in 1997. Additions were constructed in 2012 for Music and in 2014 as extensions of the `100, 200, and 300 halls. The building scored 85.40 overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design does not meet current standards, there is minor rust at exposed steel canopies at entries.

• Exterior

The building exterior is in good condition. The roof was replaced this summer (2018).

Interior

The building interior is in good to fair condition. Walls are in good condition. Floor wear was observed in some areas, and some acoustical ceiling tiles have been damaged by water but with a new roof, this is more than likely taken care of.

• Electrical

The building is in good to good condition. Existing lighting fixtures have been recently retrofitted with LED T8 type lamps. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices in the older areas of the building are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards. In the newer additions, Category 6 cabling has been installed. The generator is connected to a single transfer switch with mixed emergency and standby loads, which is a deficiency relative to the NEC.

• Mechanical

The systems are in good to fair condition. The central HVAC systems are in good to fair condition, some systems are nearing end of life. The boilers and pumps were replaced in 2011 and in good condition, the chiller is showing signs of weathering but is in good operation. The domestic water system is in good condition and there is a mix of newer and older controls throughout the site.

• Site

The building and site are moderately non-compliant with handicap accessibility. The bus pullout along 92nd Avenue SE does not have easy accessibility into the building

The building site is in fair condition. Concrete at the bus pullout along 92nd Avenue SE is in like-new condition, at the pullout along 42nd Street SE, the concrete is in fair condition. Several of the campus' asphalt walks are cracked and settled and can be a challenge to accessibility.

Northwood Elementary School

Northwood Elementary School was constructed in 2015 and opened in 2016. It scored 98.91 overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring. A two-story elementary school with the administration on the upper level near the parent drop off. The lower level is daylight and has access to the bus drop off area. The lower level has two areas -- the classroom area which can be separate from the gym and the more public area. Built for grades K through 5 it has approximately 22 general classrooms, pull out shared areas, a library, gymnasium, and lunch room.

Built for 21st Century learning, spaces are flexible and adaptable with lots of transparency. The building has a partial green roof and photovoltaics (PV) panels on the roof, as well as energy dashboard technology that can be used as a teaching tool.

• Exterior and Interior

It is in excellent condition.

• Electrical

The systems are new and in excellent condition.

Mechanical

The systems are new and in excellent condition.

Crest Learning Center

The Crest Learning Center was remodeled in 1997. It scored 84.63 overall utilizing OSPI's ICOS scoring.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design does not meet current standards.

• Exterior

The building exterior is in good condition. Roofing is nearing the end of its life and is due for replacement.

• Interior

The building interior is in fair condition. Floors are in good condition.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to good condition. The exterior utility transformer is weathered/rusting. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards.

• Mechanical

The building is in fair condition. The electrical/ telecommunications room has poor ventilation, the exhaust is poor in the student restrooms, and no exhaust has been provided for the teacher workroom. The domestic water system is in good condition and there is a new water heater. The HVAC systems are dated, 80% efficient gas furnaces, but functioning and in good condition.

• Site

The building and site are moderately non-compliant with handicap accessibility. The designated handicap parking stall is not accessible, and the accessible main entry had at the time of review, malfunctioning hardware.

District Administration Building

The District Administration Building was originally constructed in 1966 and had some tenant improvements in 1987. It has not been scored under the ICOS system due to the fact it does not house students. That said it has been entered to ICOS for overall inventory purposes.

• Structural

The building has no serious concerns. However, its seismic design does not meet current standards.

• Exterior

The building exterior is in good to fair condition. Walls, windows, and trim are in good condition.

• Interior

The building interior is in good to fair condition. Walls and floor are worn and a few acoustical ceiling tiles are water damaged.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to poor condition. The main electrical panel is in poor condition and is at end of usable life, making replacement parts not readily available. Video surveillance, access control, and wireless data systems have been recently upgraded. Telecommunications cabling to wall-mounted telecommunications devices are Category 5 cabling and do not support current transmission standards.

• Mechanical

The building is in fair to poor condition. The second floor and warehouse are not sprinklered. The heating water system is poor condition. There is a fairly new chiller that is in excellent condition, but the HVAC systems are in need of replacement.

• Site

The building and site are severely non-compliant with handicap accessibility. Accessible parking requires patrons to cross vehicular traffic, entry paths are not fully compliant, there is no elevator or accessible path around the building, the employee kitchen is not accessible, the upper floor restrooms are not accessible, and many of the door handles do not have levers.

The building site is in good condition.

The building is not compliant in regard to current standards for fire separation and egress. There is no fire separation between the warehouse and adjoining spaces, the rated one-hour corridor does not appear to meet current standards, the upper floor only has one direct access to the outside, egress out of the bottom floor corridor is being obstructed by boxes and does not have panic hardware, and secondary egress out of the board room terminates into a planter.

Mary Wayte Pool

The Pool was originally constructed in 1973 by King County Parks through a property lease with the District. The District took ownership of the building from King County in 2011. The building has always been a pool, designed by Kirk, Wallace, McKinley Architects. It is a wood framed construction single story building with a mezzanine for viewing purposes. The building does not have an ICOS score due to the fact that it is not a facility that is utilized for instruction through the Mercer Island School District. It has been entered into ICOS for district tracking purposes however.

• Site

The site is in fair condition and has remained relatively unchanged since its construction.

• Electrical

The building is in fair to poor condition. The electrical distribution equipment shows significant corrosion and is in need is replacement. Branch wiring devices throughout appear damaged and show signs of corrosion. Lighting fixtures in some areas show corrosion and some are missing lenses. There is not a facility-wide telecommunications system, all data access is based on a residential-style service with router and distribution within the administration area only. There is no fire alarm system in the building.

• Mechanical

Mechanically, the systems are in fair to poor condition. There is extensive corrosion throughout the HVAC and plumbing systems. There is no fire protection system (and it is unknown if one would be required). The pool supply and drainage system was recently relined and appears to be functioning well.

BUILDING AREA SQUARE FOOTAGE SUMMARY AND OSPI COMPARISON

| | OSPI SF Area Inv | ventory Record |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Building | November 2009 | June 2018 |
| Island Park Elementary School | 49,399 | 49,399 |
| Lakeridge Elementary School | 51,946 | 51,946 |
| West Mercer Elementary School | 54,221 | 54, 221 |
| Islander Middle School | 119,935 | 169,085 |
| Mercer Island High School | 206,919 | 223,719 |
| North Mercer Campus | 70,717 | n/a |
| Northwood Elementary School | n/a | 77,277 |
| Crest Learning Center | 10,058 | 10,058 |
| Totals | 563,195 | 635,705 |
| Difference | | (72,510) |

BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SCORE SUMMARY

| | Score | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|--|--|--|
| Facility | 2013 | 2018 | | | |
| Island Park Elementary School | 76.47 | 76.32 | | | |
| Lakeridge Elementary School | 82.65 | 80.92 | | | |
| West Mercer Elementary School | 88.18 | 85.60 | | | |
| Islander Middle School: | | | | | |
| - Main Building | 74.07 | 74.07 | | | |
| - 300 Wing | 71.46 | 71.46 | | | |
| - New Addition | | 96.94 | | | |
| Mercer Island High School | 85.21 | 84.50 | | | |
| Northwood Elementary School | n/a | 98.91 | | | |
| Crest Learning Center | 85.78 | 84.63 | | | |

End of Executive Summary

Appendices

C. PLAN DEVELOPMENT

MEETING MINUTES

X Brandy Fox

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| DATE: | 29 January 2020 | FILE NAME: | M003_FPC3_20200127 | | | | | |
| SUBJECT: | Facility Planning Committee Meeting | 3: Plan Development | | | | | | |
| MEETING DATE: | 27 January 2020 | TIME: | 5:30 - 8:30 pm | | | | | |
| LOCATION: | Quiet Dining Room, Northwood Elemen | ntary School | | | | | | |
| ATTENDEES: | | | | | | | | |
| Facility Planning | Committee | | | | | | | |
| X David D'Souza | | Jim Stanton | | | | | | |
| X Deborah Lurie | | X Bob Olson | | | | | | |
| X Julie Ogata Cio | banu | X Anne Hritzay | | | | | | |
| X Janelle Honeyc | utt | X Kathy Morrison | | | | | | |
| X Kristina Mehas | | X Pat Turner | | | | | | |
| X Steve Duncan | | X Lena Hardisty | | | | | | |
| X Amanda Stoffe | r | | | | | | | |
| X Kim Thomas | | X Lin Hao | | | | | | |
| X Susan Conrad- | Wang | - Robin Li | | | | | | |
| - Kate Wise Knec | nt | X Gus Poole | | | | | | |
| X Dave Cutright | Cavaga | - Sandra Levin | | | | | | |
| X Calin Brondt | Savage | - Becky Shaddle | | | | | | |
| | | X Zach Houvener | | | | | | |
| - David de Varza | | X Sat Rvan Parr | | | | | | |
| Debbie Hanson | | X Carol Gregory | | | | | | |
| MISD Support Tea | am | Mahlum Team | | | | | | |
| X Donna Colosky | | X LeRoy Landers | | | | | | |
| - Fred Rundle | | X Jennifer Lubin | | | | | | |
| – Erin Battersby X Andreeves Rosi | ner | X JoAnn Wilcox | | | | | | |
| – Craig Degginge | r | | | | | | | |
| X Tony Kuhn | | | | | | | | |
| X Ty Bergstrom | | | | | | | | |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On January 27, 2020, the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) held its third meeting. This session included an introduction and brief review of the planning goals and needs from FPC 1 and 2, presentation of new information (in response to committee member questions at the last meeting), reconfirmation of planning committee goals, and a series of initial planning exercises. A PDF copy of the presentation, along with the video recording, can be found on the district website.

MEETING OBJECTIVES & REVIEW

- :: LeRoy Landers reviewed the evening's agenda, provided a schedule update, and provided objectives for the meeting:
 - High-level discussions regarding various approaches to facility management / planning
 - Begin to understand similar and differing opinions in the room
 - Set the stage for more detailed discussions
- :: A brief review of goals and needs included district and FPC goals, educational program need, capacity and enrollment need, and facility condition / educational adequacy need.
 - Educational programs: needs in various areas based on District goals and initiatives
 - Capacity and enrollment: not a driver for the long-range plan
 - Facility condition: Island Park Elementary School and Islander Middle School 100/200 Building are in the worst condition, as well as significant roof issues at Lakeridge Elementary School and Crest Learning Center
 - Educational adequacy: specific needs at each facility, with some common themes

NEW INFORMATION

- :: Comparison of actual versus projected enrollment was provided from 2008 through 2019, in response to a committee member request, including data from 2008, 2002 and 2017 enrollment projection reports.
 - The comparison shows the largest variation of about 200 students districtwide (with the 2008 projection data); this is not "spot on," but not enough to have a significant impact districtwide
 - Subsequent projections are quite accurate (2012 and 2017 projections)
 - The district also does enrollment tracking and projections on an annual basis
- :: Analysis of low, mid, and high projections for 2019-2029 and existing capacity was provided, in response to a committee member request.
 - The mid-range projection is typically used, but all three projections from the 2019 enrollment projection report have analyzed as compared to existing facility conditions.
 - The only small issue is at the high school, where the high growth projection exceeds capacity by a small amount. This is not a big issue because of the scale of the facility.
 - Other district facilities can accommodate even the highest projections within the existing capacity (including portables).
- :: A summary of additional input from staff, students, and community was provided.
 - The district held outreach meetings with each of the three groups during the month of January to communicate the long-range planning process and needs and garner input on additional goals and needs. Meeting minutes and goal summaries from these meetings were distributed to committee members prior to tonight's meeting for review and will also be posted on the district website.

Page 2 of 6

- A committee member asked if there would be more outreach to district staff, since there were a limited number of staff at the outreach meeting, and does the team feel that we have gotten enough staff input from staff at this point. LeRoy noted that yes, the team does have enough input.
- It was suggested that a survey or other strategy could garner wider staff input.
- :: Additional district maintenance/capital improvement information was provided, in response to a committee member request.
 - Information included a chart showing where money has been spent in the district over the last 10 years (significant projects).
 - Total capital improvements included \$78.2 million in major projects (Northwood ES, Islander MS, and MIHS additions) and \$5.7 million in smaller work in facilities across the district.
 - A committee member asked how maintenance decisions are made. Tony Kuhn responded that student safety and security is highest priority. Budget also impacts the choices, and the district tries to process teacher requests as much as possible.
 - It was also asked how bigger ticket items are addressed. Tony responded that there are larger levy
 items that are dealt with separately and typically contracted out. District staff typically do day-today maintenance / handy man work. Donna Colosky noted that the list of levy items is updated for
 the Board twice a year, although there are sometimes shifts in priorities.
- :: JoAnn Wilcox reviewed additional examples of current design for learning environments, in response to committee member requests. Images included districts and facilities that were recently completed in the region.
 - Early learning (elementary) environments, illustrating flexibility, operable walls, and shared learning outside of classroom
 - Intermediate (middle school) environments, illustrating circulation and shared learning, commons / congregation, and connectivity / flexibility, and hands-on maker spaces
 - High school environments, illustrating specialized programs / CCR (more shop spaces and more connections to technology), performing arts spaces (including flexibility between a black box and a traditional theater), and shared learning components

CONFIRMING COMMITTEE PLANNING GOALS EXERCISE

- :: Committee members were asked to review the planning goals previously developed at the first meeting and confirm their top three priority goals. These could be the same goals that were voted for before, or a different goal. There was also an opportunity to add new goals if desired.
- :: The top three vote-getters were:
 - Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces (10 votes)
 - Provide more opportunities for occupational learning (8 votes)
 - Provide visible sustainability (7 votes)
- :: A complete list of the reprioritized goals is attached.

SPECTRUM EXERCISE

- :: Committee members participated in an exercise to evaluate how well existing district facilities are meeting the established planning goals. The exercise asked the question: Does the facility meet the planning goals that have been established?
- : Based on their review of the FPC planning goals and what is known about each building, members were asked to place one dot on each facility where they felt it falls on the spectrum.

:: Overall, results indicated that the two new facilities (Northwood and IMS) are considered to be meeting the goals and the district's older facilities are not, with Island Park, West Mercer and IMS 100/200 Building meeting the least. Complete results are attached.

GROUP WORK SESSIONS

- :: The Committee engaged in a series of exercises intended to provide a very high-level look at facilities and open the conversation about broad thinking and approaches to each of the grade levels.
- :: Members were randomly divided into five table groups of five people and each group nominated a scribe and reporter. The groups discussed, recorded, and reported back on a series of "watershed" questions related to long-range planning at each educational level.
- :: Elementary schools: In the context of the 30+ years (long term), what makes most sense to you regarding management of your existing elementary schools: continual renovation, modernization, or prioritized replacement of existing schools over time?
 - Table 1: Four votes for replacement and one vote for modernization. Current elementary schools are structurally inadequate and need to be brought up to the standard. The only way is to replace over time. The one vote for modernization was due to cost implications and the history of levies that have previously failed on the Island.
 - Table 2: All five votes for replacement. The district needs to start planning now to replace elementary schools. Older elementary schools are in need of significant work. Replacement also improves educational adequacy and other goals and provides a lot of "wins."
 - Table 3: All five votes for full modernization, including educational adequacy. Renovation is going on anyway. The group agreed that if educational goals can be met with full modernization for less cost than replacement, then they would choose that option, noting that it is harder to get community support for a replacement facility.
 - Table 4: Four votes for replacement and one vote for full modernization with educational adequacy. There is a need to do renovations anyway. If do a replacement, there is an opportunity to make sustainability improvements at the same time. The existing facilities are grim and need to be replaced. It would be hard to modify the existing interior layout.
 - Table 5: Four votes for replacement and one vote for full modernization with educational adequacy. Consider the land constraints with each elementary site.
- :: Middle school: The district has previously studied options to fully replace the middle school rather than continually renovate / modernize the existing older buildings (100/200 and 300). Does this approach make sense to you? Why or why not?
 - Table 1: Two votes for replacement, two votes for modernization, and one "in between." It was felt that there was not enough information to decide and there was a desire to know how each option compared in terms of cost.
 - Table 2: All five votes for replacement. The completed Phase 1 building was successful and want to continue that. Phase 2 should connect the buildings. Replacement of middle school facilities impacts every student in the district.
 - Table 3: All five votes for replacement. The 100/200 building is old and needs to be replaced. It was felt that the community would support it because all kids go through the school. It is important that everyone gets something. Consider providing all new gym/cafeterias at all elementary sites, along with the middle school replacement, in the first phase of work and providing special education improvements at all elementary sites in the next phase.

- Table 4: All five votes for replacement. Currently there are three middle school buildings and only
 one is nice and new. It was felt it would not be too difficult to house students during construction.
 The new building is a weird environment now because the buildings are so different and separated.
 One of biggest issues during middle school was the division of students, which was exacerbated by
 having buildings that are so different. Plus, the school is already halfway done.
- Table 5: All five votes for replacement. The middle school experience is very different in each facility. It was felt that modernizing the old building might exceed the cost of new because of the extent of need. The old building feels separated and isolated, has long hallways, and is underutilized. Just connecting the two existing buildings wouldn't be a good solution, as they are too different.
- :: High school level (comprehensive): Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why? (Note: An assumption was made that replacement would be highly unlikely for the high school in the scope of this long-range plan (30-40 years), due to the high facility condition score.
 - Table 1: All five votes for modernization, including all the educational adequacy projects. It was noted that given the need to prioritize, the group would rather replace elementary schools that the high school. Consider collaboration with the City and MICA for the theater and black box.
 - Table 2: All five votes for modernization with educational adequacy. Crest. Consider creating a new building with one floor for CCR spaces, a second floor for Crest and a third floor for district administration. There is still the stigma of going to Crest, and it would be better if co-locate other programs with it. All students take a CCR class, so all would go there, but Crest would still have smaller space. It could be done without impacting the rest of the high school and would solve a lot of different problems.
 - Table 3: All five votes for renovation plus educational adequacy (partial rather than full modernization). For example, don't want to do full seismic upgrade to the entire high school. This would free up funds to do educational adequacy projects, such as CCR, flexible spaces, and library reconfiguration.
 - Table 4: All five votes for educational adequacy, but not modernization. Do not want the wholesale replacement of systems. Educational improvement priorities include teacher offices, counseling, stadium bleachers, and CCR. Want to improve how the high school is used but not implement full-scale modernization.
 - Table 5: All five votes for modernization, with focus on educational adequacy. Question of utilization of existing space is there not enough or is it just not well used? CCR and library improvements are most important because they would benefit the entire student body and be visible improvements.
- :: High school level (Crest): Do you support continued renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or do you also support addressing capacity and educational adequacy at Crest? If so, and assuming ATP (Adult Transition Program) is not part of Crest, what would be the best approach for adding capacity: renovate and expand the existing building or remodel a larger building on the high school site and relocate Crest there, for example, the existing administration building)?
 - Table 1: All five votes for location in or near the high school. The idea of integrating Crest within the high school area is valuable. If Crest remains in the existing location, do not want to spend a lot of money upgrading such a deficient existing building and would support only partial modernization as needed. Don't know if it should be a new facility or the existing building.

- Table 2: Similar to previous question response, integrate Crest with CCR, black box, and other programs. Would like one new building to house all of the programs together, on the high school site.
- Table 3: Crest needs to be relocated. The group was not opposed to it being connected to the high school, but it still needs to feel separate. It was felt that the atmosphere at Crest is important: students like being separate and in a small community. If it is combined with the high school, it still needs a separate entrance and feel. Crest should be relocated because it is now too far from the high school and students lose class time.
- Table 4: Crest should not be part of the high school but should be closer. It should be designed to have flexible spaces and more individualized learning. Consider swapping the pool and Crest, which would provide better proximity and quick access to the high school and put the pool next to PEAK. Crest could be part of administration, if there were separate entrances.
- Table 5: Provide a new multistory facility for Crest, to better utilize space. It should be closer to the high school but have a separate identity. Consider reconfiguring the field and parking space around the high school to move Crest closer.
- It was noted that the district should raise community awareness about what Crest is all about and how valuable it is.
- :: Comments on support facilities (pool, administration, and other support)
 - It was noted that Mary Wayte Pool was mentioned a lot during the outreach meetings. It is felt that there is a desire in the community for a community pool on the Island, as everything else is private.
 - Consider if the maintenance buildings and bus area can that be relocated to a different site to allow development that area for school facilities. The busses aren't even used by high school students. A much nicer sports/pool facility could be built in that area.
 - Think long-term and have a graded-level plan that considers land use utilization at a high level.
 - The Administration Building is inadequate. There are not enough small conference rooms, offices, or project spaces, and it is not ADA accessible. The facility should be fully replaced, perhaps in a different/better location.
 - Consider a master planning effort that looks at all the sites holistically. LeRoy noted that there are a lot of pieces at play on the high school site. All are "big moves," and none but Crest are associated with educational programs. How much support would there be in the community for these projects (Pool, administration, transportation)? It was commented that if the district presents a long-term plan of what will happen and why it's connected so people have a clear picture, then they are more likely to be supported. It was also suggested that non-school projects should be paired with a school or the community won't support them.
 - The idea of partnerships was brought up. LeRoy noted that if partnerships are going to be considered, now is the time to bring them to the table. There needs to be a strong commitment if it is to be counted on. In the context of long-range facility planning, the focus should be on partnerships that will be significant moves, rather than smaller ones.
 - A bus barn that would cover up the busses would be more palatable to the community and extend the life of the busses.

NEXT STEPS

- :: The next FPC meeting, scheduled for February 24th, will be the second planning meeting. The Committee will continue to refine planning questions and issues, including looking at prioritization and how it relates to the short-term needs.
- :: It is very important that all Committee members come back for the next two planning meetings.

Page 6 of 6

UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

FLEXIBILITY & ADAPTABILITY OF SPACES [12 VOTES]

- > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces [10 votes] [10 votes]
- > Rethink libraries [2 votes] [9 votes]
- > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim [7 votes]
- > Reduce physical boundaries
- > Consider if lockers are needed at the high school
- > Repurpose old computer labs

SAFETY [10 VOTES]

- > Improve traffic impact around schools [4 votes] [12 votes]
- > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school [3 votes] [4 votes]
- > Reconfigure sites for more functional use and safer traffic [2 votes] [2 votes]
- > Locate all students under one roof [1 vote] [9 votes]
- > Create an environment where students, teachers, and staff feel safe but not under threat [2 votes]
- > Improve pedestrian safety / crosswalks [2 votes]

- > Provide contextualized safety and security [1 vote]
- Provide more welcoming exterior and interior lighting (for health / wellness and safety) [1 vote]
- > Disguise safety features
- Consider safety with regard to both exterior and interior threats
- > Provide structurally sound schools

OCCUPATIONAL LEARNING [8 VOTES]

- > More opportunities for occupational learning [8 votes] [6 votes]
- > Integrate occupational learning / pathways [2 votes]
- Develop more CCR (CTE) programs on campus
- Provide visual access to engineering, science, and CCR programs
- Provide equity and a common experience for students across all schools [1 vote]

SUSTAINABILITY [8 VOTES]

- > Provide visible sustainability (explain why) [7 votes] [3 votes]
- > Address heating, cooling, and sound control in existing buildings [1 vote]

KEV

- > Provide visible solar strategies
- > Reduce the carbon footprint of facilities [2 votes]
- Consider future transportation access options (including new light rail) [1 vote]

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

PROGRAM [7 VOTES]

- > Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science [4 votes] [5 votes]
- > Dedicate space for art [2 votes] [5 votes]
- > Provide more, and well-distributed, unisex bathrooms [1 vote] [2 votes]
- > Provide spaces that stimulate creativity [2 votes]
- Provide surfaces to display art and express community identity [1 vote]
- CHARACTER & FEEL [6 VOTES]
- > Create spaces that students are excited to be in [4 votes] [2 votes]
- > Prioritize aesthetics and beauty in the design of facilities [1 vote] [2 votes]
- > Provide ergonomic seating [1 vote] [1 vote]
- Prevent noise cross-contamination
 [1 vote]
- > Accommodate standing in classrooms

- Provide speech therapist, psychologist, and other similar support spaces
- Consider a second silent library to provide quiet study space
- Provide more accessible mental health space at the high school

- > Foster appreciation of place
- Provide age-appropriate environments in school facilities
- > Provide natural lighting
- Consider appropriate use of color and use non-institutional colors

DIVERSITY OF SPACE TO SUPPORT LEARNING [5 VOTES]

- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools [4 votes] [11 votes]
- > Preserve quiet study spaces in the high school [1 vote] [3 votes]
- > Support the whole student [5 votes]
- Accommodate different learners (not only special needs) [1 vote]

TEACHER SUPPORT [4 VOTES]

- > Provide support spaces for teachers [3 votes] [6 votes]
- > Improve space design to help teacher retention [1 vote]
- > Prioritize the needs of teachers and support staff [2 votes]

KEV

Provide more small, private work spaces

> Purpose-build spaces and limit

multipurpose space [1 vote]

- Provide small collaborative spaces for teachers [1 vote]
- > Provide teacher adaptability for spaces
- Provide flexibility for teachers to adjust lighting

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



UPDATED: FPC Planning Goals

ATHLETICS [3 VOTES]

- > Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces and fields [3 votes] [13 votes]
- > Provide for safe and controllable community use [4 votes]

OUTDOOR SPACE [3 VOTES]

- > Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) [3 votes] [8 votes]
- Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active / passive; play / learning) [3 votes]
- > Develop more covered outdoor areas [2 votes]

TECHNOLOGY [3 VOTES]

- Create adaptable environments that can accommodate future technology needs [3 votes]
- Distribute student technology (quiet spaces) [1 vote]
- > Plan for future technology changes

LEARNING FOR ALL [3 VOTES]

- > Provide a highly-capable program at every school [2 votes] [3 votes]
- > Cross-pollinate spaces and programs to reduce stigma [1 vote] [3 votes]
- > Reduce segregation of the highly capable program [1 vote]
- Create opportunities to see learning happening (transparency) [1 vote]

> Help foster well-rounded kids

(storage and charging)

quiet spaces

- Provide diverse program options in all schools
- Provide a high-needs program at every school
- Locate the Adult Transition Program (ATP) out in the community, rather than in a school facility

FOOD, DINING, & SOCIAL AREAS [3 VOTES]

KEX

- > Recognize that the cafeteria is a place for social / emotional learning; and consider noise impact [2 votes] [4 votes]
- > Replace lockers with social nodes for students [1 vote] [1 vote]
- > Improve common assembly space
- > Provide snack stations around school
- > Explore options around food delivery

mahlum

[# votes]Second round FPC prioritization (27 Jan 2020)[# votes]First round FPC prioritization (18 Nov 2020)



> Add more gymnasium space [1 votes]

- > Provide connections to usable outdoor space [1 vote]
- Maintain some separation of grades at recess

> Dedicate space for mobile technology

> Be mindful of technology impacts on



Elementary School Level: Table Group.

In the context of 30+ years (long-term) what makes most sense to you regarding management of your existing elementary schools: continual renovation, modernization, or prioritized replacement of existing schools over time? Why?

Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why:



MERCER ISLAND

Elementary School Level: Table Group 3

In the context of 30+ years (long-term) what makes most sense to you regarding management of your existing elementary schools: continual renovation, modernization, or prioritized replacement of existing schools over time? Why?



(except North wood

MERCER ISLAND

Elementary School Level: Table Group 5

In the context of 30+ years (long-term) what makes most sense to you regarding management of your existing elementary schools: continual renovation, modernization, or prioritized replacement of existing schools over time? Why?



MERCER ISLAND

Middle School Level (100/200 & 300): Table Group 2 The district has previously studied options to fully replace the middle school rather than continually renovate / modernize the existing older buildings (100/200 and 300). Does this approach make sense to you? Why or why not? Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why. RENOVATION MODERNIZATION REPLACEMENT (\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$+) (\$\$\$\$) Significant Maintenance Potential 70-Year Building New Alignment with educational > Roof replacement (100/200 critical) Full seismic upgrade specification Full energy efficiency upgrade Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration Alignment with District standards Full plumbing replacement > Fencing to create a secure campus Meets or exceeds current building Full HVAC replacement 1 code Bus loop asphalt replacement > Full electrical replacement > Site improvement opportunities Bus loop lighting replacement Full technology upgrade > Drainage improvements 11 -> Implement Phase 2 of existing design Stucco repair > Educational adequacy improvements: H Interior and exterior paint > Connect buildings HVAC equipment replacement HVAC controls upgrade 1 Track and field replacement E. I shedants i - Conversion / decompression loor Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each person should check only one box on this sheet)

mahlum

Middle School Level (100/200 & 300): Table Group 3

The district has previously studied options to fully replace the middle school rather than continually renovate / modernize the existing older buildings (100/200 and 300). Does this approach make sense to you? Why or why not?

Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why:

(5 - 55)

RENOVATION

- Significant Maintenance
- > Roof replacement (100/200 critical)
- Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration
- > Fencing to create a secure campus
- > Bus loop asphalt replacement
- > Bus loop lighting replacement
- > Drainage improvements
- > Stucco repair
- > Interior and exterior paint
- > HVAC equipment replacement
- > HVAC controls upgrade
- > Track and field replacement



Potential 70-Year Building

(\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$+)

- > Full seismic upgrade
- > Full energy efficiency upgrade
- > Full plumbing replacement
- > Full HVAC replacement
- > Full electrical replacement
- > Full technology upgrade
- > Educational adequacy improvements:
 Connect buildings
 Conversion / decompression



MERCER ISLAND

New

 Alignment with educational specification

1

a.

H.

- > Alignment with District standards
- Meets or exceeds current building code
- > Site improvement opportunities

Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each person should check only one box on this sheet)





MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENTS ARE THE PRIDATTY

High School Level (MIHS): Table Group

Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why?

Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why



High School Level (MIHS): Table Group 3 Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why? Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why: RENOVATION (S - SS) MODERNIZATION (\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$+) Significant Maintenance Potential 70-Year Building Locker replacement in locker rooms Full seismic upgrade Toilet partition replacement / Full energy efficiency upgrade reconfiguration Full plumbing replacement Theater lighting / seat replacement Full HVAC replacement Furniture replacement Full electrical replacement Stucco repair Full technology upgrade Brick cleaning and sealing Meter spaces D o Meter graces - rotatics, etc. Exterior paint Educational adequacy improvements: > HVAC controls upgrade Science Robert remodel Make CC&R addtns./ Exhaust fan replacement > improvements Kitchen equipment replacement > Counselina Kitchen hood replacement practice space improvements Gym bleacher replacement Add team Theater impr. rooms & black box Library Miscellaneous (econfiguration Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each person should check only one box on this sheet). MERCER ISLAND mahlum High School Level (MIHS): Table Group 4 Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why? Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why

MODERNIZATION (\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$+) Significant Maintenance Potential 70-Year Building Full seismic upgrade > Locker replacement in locker rooms Full energy efficiency upgrade Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration Full plupping replacement Theater lighting / seat replacement **Eut HVAC** replacement Furniture replacement Full electrical replacemen Stucco repair Brick cleaning and sealing Exterior paint Educational adequacy improvements: > HVAC controls upgrade CC&R addtns / Science Exhaust fan replacement remodel improvements Kitchen equipment replacement Add athletic Counseling Kitchen hood replacement Gym bleacher replacement improvements practice space stadium blacher Add team Theater impr. rooms & black box covered seats Library Miscellaneous improvements teacher offices Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each

High School Level (MIHS): Table Group 5

Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why?



mahlum

* ATP is the Adult Transition Program, which will be discussed at a future meeting.

MERCER ISLAND

High School Level (Crest): Table Group 2

Do you support continued renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or do you also support addressing capacity and educational adequacy at Crest? If so, and assuming ATP* is not part of Crest, what would be the best approach for adding capacity: renovate and expand the existing building or remodel a larger building on the high school site and relocate Crest there (for example, the existing Administration Building).

Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why



- Roof replacement
- Site ADA improvements
- CMU and brick repair
- Brick cleaning / sealing
- Flooring replacement
- Furnace replacement
- Furniture replacement
- HVAC controls upgrade
- Exhaust fan replacement
- Fire alarm upgrade / replacement
- Greenhouse upgrade / replacement

i.

- Full energy efficiency upgrade
- Full plumbing replacement 5
- Full HVAC replacement 5
- Full electrical replacement
- Full technology upgrade
- Educational adequacy improvements: - Add capacity (50% increase)

- Add program area Larger greenhouse

- Relocate into another existing facility? (likely requiring renovation of both buildings)
- Relocate into an entirely new facility? (site to be determined, such as new building on Administration Building site)

Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each person should check only one box on this sheet).

MERCER ISLAND

High School Level (Crest): Table Group 4

Do you support continued renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or do you also support addressing capacity and educational adequacy at Crest? If so, and assuming ATP* is not part of Crest, what would be the best approach for adding capacity: renovate and expand the existing building or remodel a larger building on the high school site and relocate Crest there (for example, the existing Administration Building).

Spend 9 minutes discussing as a group which philosophical approach you support and why



Potential 70-Year Building

Educational adequacy improvements:

- Add capacity (50% increase)

Full energy efficiency upgrade

Full plumbing replacement

Full electrical replacement

Full HVAC replacement

Full technology upgrade

- Add program area

Larger

greenhouse

Full seismic upgrade

Significant Maintenance

- Roof replacement
- Site ADA improvements
- CMU and brick repair
- Brick cleaning / sealing
- Flooring replacement
- Furnace replacement
- Furniture replacement
- HVAC controls upgrade >
- Exhaust fan replacement
- Fire alarm upgrade / replacement 5
- Greenhouse upgrade / replacement

Relocate into another existing facility? (likely requiring renovation of both buildings) Relocate into an entirely new facility? (site to be determined, such as new building on Administration Building uz New Bid site) able #2 Mer attacked move closer to / Sigh Ser to move an to more the cost ccere Increase SIZE Cite optimization. 1 1 (1) Bidg house both prog parting lots changed ?

MERCER ISLAND

Options

Spend 1 minute recording each group member's vote (each person should check only one box on this sheet)

>

>

mahlum

* ATP is the Adult Transition Program, which will be discussed at a future meeting.

FPC Meeting 3: Plan Development Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan Agenda 27 January 2020 27 January 2020 Introduction & Objectives Brief Review of Goals & Need 10 min WELCOME! Birel retrieved of New Information Enrollment (actual vs. projected & mid/ Summary of teacher / student / comm Maintenance & capital improvements Current design for learning environment 15 min > Please sign in > Grab a drink and snack MERCER ISLAND Confirm Committee Planning Goals 10 min MERCER ISLAND Spectrum Exercise 10 min > Turn off your cell phones or place on "stun" SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL DISTRICT Small Group Work Sessions w/ Break 125 min > Introduce yourself to someone you don't know JDENTS ARE THE PRIOR Next Steps & Questions JDENTS ARE THE PRIOR 5 min



What are your initial thoughts related to a few high-level questions regarding the management of Mercer Island School **District facilities?**





MISD Core Values, Vision & Mission

Inspiring our students to

create their futures.

be lifelong learners as they

VISION

CORE VALUES

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- Supporting the whole • child
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive
- Providing rigorous and challenging learning

MISSION

Mercer Island School District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively.

MISD OE -1 Fundamentals



- Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, student-1. centered education and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.
- 2. Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical fitness; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science; and educational technology
- Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decision-З. making and citizenship.

MISD OE -1 Fundamentals



- Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment
- Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, 5. cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- 6. Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- 7 Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.

Facility Planning Committee Goals

Safety [33 votes total]

> Improve traffic impact around schools [12 vote: > Locate all students under one roof /9 vote > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school [4 votes] Flexibility & Adaptability of Spaces (26 votes total) > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces (10 > Rethink libraries (9 > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim (7 votes) Diversity of Space to Support Learning [21 votes total] > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools (11 votes > Support the whole student /5 vote > Preserve quiet study space in the high school [3 votes]

Facility Planning Committee Goals



Facility Planning Committee Goals

Teacher Support (9 votes total) > Provide support spaces for teachers.

- Learning for All In votes total
- > Cross-pollinate spaces and programs to reduce stigma [3 votes]
- > Provide a highly-capable program at every school (3 votes)

Sustainability 16 votes total Provide visible sustainability [3 votes]

- Character & Feel 16 votes total
- > Prioritize aesthetics and beauty in the design of facilities (2 votes)
- > Create space that students are excited to be in /2 votes

Facility Planning Committee Goals



Additional Community Goals

"Put sustainability at the forefront of development plans. For example, roofs should be constructed with solar panels, or at least be solar panel ready. No fossil fuel infrastructure."

MISD Community Member









Average Life Cycle in Years

10 50 20

| Permanent Structure | |
|---------------------|--|
| Portable | |
| Foundation | |
| Frame | |
| Floor Covering | |
| Computer Flooring | |
| Exterior Walls | |
| Elevators | |
| | |

| Interior Construction | 15 |
|---|----------------------|
| Interior Renovation | 10 |
| Ceiling Finish | 10 |
| Plumbing | 20 |
| HVAC | 20 |
| Electrical | 20 |
| Fire System | 25 |
| | ? |
| Source: Government Finance Officers Association | 2020 MAHLUM ARCHTECT |



Significant Maintenance Needs

Roof replacement (<u>critical</u> at 100/200 Building) Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration Fencing to create secure campus Bus loop asphalt replacement (grind/overlay) Bus loop lighting replacement Drainage improvements Stucco repair Exterior and interior paint HVAC equipment replacement HVAC controls upgrade Track and field replacement


Educational Adequacy: Mercer Island HS

"Think about the every-day aspects of the building and the regular old classrooms that most kids spend most of their time in and that seem long ignored and in need of major updates. Things like: "

MIHS Teacher

- > Lighting
- > Furniture
- > Windows and window coverings
- > Usage / layout of classroom space (so many unused cabinets...not enough whiteboards, etc.)
- Office spaces too many teachers are literally in storage closets
- > Places for students to actually interact with each other that's not a cafeteria (and really far away from our classrooms)
- > Rooms / furniture designed specifically for blocks and co-teaching that can thoughtfully hold large groups of students
- > Comfort, heat
- > Deliberate furniture and design for shared teaching spaces, since most of us do not have our own classrooms





Enrollment Projections (Low / Mid / High) **Enrollment & Capacity** 2019 - 202 5,000 +506 4,800 43 over (2) 67 over (3 - 4) 1.200 35 over (2 4,600 1,000 +133 43 ove 800 4,400 600 4,200 -212 4,000 4.387 4.532

Source: Mercer Island School District Updated Pr Educational Data Solutions, LLC, December 2019

* Includes Crest Learning Center (Assumed average staffing ratio: Elementary 24, Middle School 26, High School 28,

Source: Mercer Island School District Updated Projections Educational Data Solutions, LLC, December 2019

Staff Input: GOALS January 22rd staff outreach meeting

DISTRICTWIDE

- Provide facility upgrades at older schools (technology and aesthetics)
- > Improve indoor air quality and provide healthy environments
- > Provide classrooms sized to accommodate project-based learning
- > Provide acoustical treatment for all music spaces throughout the district > Relocate ATP out of the Crest facility
- ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
- Provide larger elementary classrooms, to allow supervision of collaboration and pull-out activities
- > Provide collaboration space within the classrooms
- Reconfigure older elementary schools to create classroom clusters (similar to Northwood)
- > Provide dedicated visual arts classrooms

- Provide more space and intentionality for special education services
- Provide dedicated spaces for state-mandated individualized testing and professional coaches
- Provide distributed deescalation spaces that can be supervised and calming spaces for students
- > Improve privacy for administration and counselor areas
- > Provide dedicated restrooms for kindergarten and first grade classrooms > Provide sightline supervision of bathrooms
- > Address cleanability of surfaces and materials at the elementary schools

ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL

- Provide a dedicated drama space for teaching and performances
- > Add voice booths for student voice recording (3)

Staff Input: GOALS January 22rd staff outreach meeting

MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL

- > Bring all classrooms up to the standard of new classrooms: flexibility, collaboration, technology aesthetics
- Provide rooms and furniture designed specifically for blocks and co-teaching
- > Provide specialized spaces that meet the needs of specialized programs, including adequate space and support (power and storage)
- > Increase the size of all high school art rooms
- > Increase the size of the robotics/CCR classroom and lab > Reimagine the Performing Arts Center: increase capacity (800-850 seats), increase stage (110 seated performers). optimize sightlines, improve flow, provide modern stagecraft technology, and improve acoustics
- > Provide a dedicated teaching space for drama and dance (blackbox theater) and a smaller performance venue

Provide spaces for student interaction that are close to classrooms (not the cafeteria)

- > Provide space for teacher collaboration
- > Provide adequately-sized teacher offices
- > Reconfigure teacher offices to have a stronger connection to the classrooms
- > Address climate control and temperature regulation
- > Replace small Greenhouse 2 with a professionally automated greenhouse (water, heat, lights, gas)
- > Add a dedicated classroom space in the PE/gym area Provide larger boys' and girls' locker rooms and support (team rooms, teacher offices)

Student Input: GOALS January 15th student outreach meeting

MERCER ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL

- Provide hands-on shop space for robotics and other skil-building programs
- Locate the radio program classroom adjacent to the radio station studio Allow for more cross-pollination of programs (especially
- special education) Provide dedicated space for the highly capable program
- > Expand hands-on opportunities at the middle school and
- elementary school levels Provide more spaces for students to work on online classes other than in the Crest commons
- Provide shared spaces throughout the school to accommodate student collaboration
- > Provide spaces for socializing and studying
- > Provide more windows and skylights to add natural light
- > Provide more gender-neutral bathrooms distributed throughout the school
- > Rethink parking lots and sidewalks to make them safe
- > Provide more parking for students at the high school > Improve the configuration of existing student parking lot
- (add a second exit) > Provide a paved walkway to the front door of Crest

OTHER FACILITIES

- > Provide more garden space at the elementary schools > Decrease reliance on portable classrooms at the
- elementary schools
- > Replace Mary Wayte Pool

- > Provide robotics facilities that meet short-term and longterm program goals (increase space)
- > Expand curriculum for engineering and S.T.E.M. at all levels in the district
- > Provide more unprogrammed "messy" space, including maker space and tools
- > Promote student-led curriculum programs > Provide space to acquire life skills at school (cooking,
- financial planning, etc.) > Create facilities that help kids learn more, make things, and compete
- > Evaluate if recently built classrooms are appropriately
- > Look to the future and prepare to respond to changes that are still unknown
- > Plan for changes in technology on the horizon

- > Put sustainability at the forefront of development plans
- > Consider acoustical performance > Replace Mary Wayte Pool
- > Encourage biking rather than driving to school (and provide infrastructure)
- > Balance community use space across the Island Schools should be seen in the context of the neighborhood (fit and beauty)
- > Consider district and city syneraies: integration
- opportunities and community priorities Consider the district and city as one (city manages facilities / district manages education)
- > Connect to Island planning initiatives
- Recognize that financial affordability is paramount for the long-range plan

Maintenance / Capital Improvements



Community Input: GOALS January 15th community outreach meeting



Current Design for Learning Environments

Current Design for Learning Environments



Current Design for Learning Environments

> Improve heating system > Renovate the Crest facility > Develop a more streamlined system for the lunch line





Current Design for Learning Environments

Current Design for Learning Environments







Current Design for Learning Environments

Current Design for Learning Environments







Current Design for Learning Environments









Confirm Committee Planning Goals

Place one dot each on what you currently think are the <u>three</u> most important planning goals.

 Place on a goal you voted for previously or a different goal

> Add a new goal if needed

6:00 - 6:10





MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Spectrum Exercise

Do district facilities meet the Committee's long-range planning goals?







Elementary School Level

In the context of 30+ years (long term) what makes most sense to you regarding management of your existing elementary schools, continual renovation, modernization, or prioritized replacement of existing schools over time? Why?



Middle School Level (100/200 & 300)

The district has studied options to fully replace the middle school rather than continue to renovate/modernize the existing older buildings (100/200 and 300). Does this approach make sense to you? Why or why not?



Break

Please be back at your tables and ready to start again in ${\bf 5}$ minutes. Thank You!



7:25 - 7:30

Middle School Level (100/200 & 300)

The district has studied options to fully replace the middle school rather than continue to renovate/modernize the existing older buildings (100/200 and 300). Does this approach make sense to you? Why or why not?



High School Level (MIHS)

Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why?



6:25 - 6:35 6:35 - 6:40 6:40 - 6:50



High School Level (MIHS)

Should management of high school facilities focus solely on renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or should need associated with educational adequacy also be included? If so, what educational adequacy need should be addressed and why?



High School Level (Crest)

Do you support continued renovation and modernization of building systems when needed, or do you also support addressing capacity and educational adequacy at Crest? If so, and assuming ATP* is not part of Crest, what would be the best approach for adding capacity: renovate and expand the existing building or remodel a larger building on the high school site and relocate Crest there (for example, the existing Administration Building)?





High School Level (Crest) Do you support continued renovation and modernization of building systems when

needed, or do you also support addressing capacity and educational adequacy at Crest? If so, and assuming ATP* is not part of Crest, what would be the best approach for adding capacity: renovate and expand the existing building or remodel a larger building on the high school site and relocate Crest there (for example, the existing Administration Building)?





MEETING MINUTES

Ty BergstromX Brandy Fox

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| DATE: | 26 February 2020 | FILE NAME: | M004_FPC4_20200224 | | | |
| SUBJECT: | Facility Planning Committee Meeting | 4: Plan Development | | | | |
| MEETING DATE: | 24 February 2020 | TIME: | 5:30 - 8:30 pm | | | |
| LOCATION: | Quiet Dining Room, Northwood Eleme | ntary School | | | | |
| ATTENDEES: | | | | | | |
| Facility Planning | Committee | | | | | |
| X David D'Souza | | X Jim Stanton | | | | |
| X Deborah Lurie | | X Bob Olson | | | | |
| X Julie Ogata Cio | banu | X Anne Hritzay | | | | |
| Janelle Honeyc | cutt | X Kathy Morrison | | | | |
| X Kristina Mehas | | X Pat Turner | | | | |
| X Steve Duncan | | X Lena Hardisty | | | | |
| Amanda Stoffe | r | - Will Atkinson | | | | |
| – Kim Thomas | | X Lin Hao | | | | |
| X Susan Conrad- | Wang | X Robin Li | | | | |
| Kate Wise Kned | cht | X Gus Poole | | | | |
| Dave Cutright | | X Sandra Levin | | | | |
| X Carrie Beckner | Savage | X Becky Shaddle | | | | |
| X Colin Brandt | | X Zach Houvener | | | | |
| Vickie Cleator | | X Tiffin Goodmar | I | | | |
| – David de Yarza | | X Sgt. Ryan Parr | | | | |
| X Debbie Hanson | 1 | Carol Gregory | | | | |
| MISD Support Te | am | Mahlum Team | | | | |
| X Donna Colosky | | X LeRoy Landers | | | | |
| - Fred Rundle | | X Jennifer Lubin | | | | |
| – Erin Battersby | | X JoAnn Wilcox | | | | |
| - Andreeves Ros | ner | | | | | |
| - Craig Degginge | r | | | | | |
| X Tony Kuhn | | | | | | |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On February 24, 2020, the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) held its fourth meeting. This session included an introduction and brief review of the planning goals and needs from FPC 1 and 2, presentation of the findings from FPC 3, and two planning prioritization exercises. A PDF copy of the presentation, along with the video recording, can be found on the district website.

MEETING OBJECTIVES & REVIEW

- :: LeRoy Landers reviewed the evening's agenda, provided a schedule update, and provided objectives for the meeting:
 - Begin to prioritize district need over time and understand the rationale.
 - Understand short-term implications of long-term replacement.
- : A brief review of goals and needs included district and FPC goals, educational program need, capacity and enrollment need, and facility condition / educational adequacy need.

FPC 3 FINDINGS

- :: During FPC 3, Committee members were asked to review the planning goals previously developed at the first meeting and confirm their top three priority goals. A summarized analysis illustrated changes between the first and second round of goal setting. The top three reprioritized goals were:
 - FLEXIBILITY & ADAPTABILITY OF SPACES: Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces (10 votes)
 - CCR: Provide more opportunities for occupational learning (8 votes)
 - SUSTAINABILITY: Provide visible sustainability (7 votes)
- :: Committee members also participated in an exercise during FPC 3 to evaluate how well existing district facilities are meeting the established planning goals. Results from this exercise were reviewed and illustrated that there was relatively strong consensus around which district facilities were meeting the goals.
 - Newer facilities (Northwood and IMS Phase 1) scored highest, the older elementary schools, older IMS buildings and Crest scored lowest, and the high school and administration buildings were in between.
 - There was discussion around why some members scored Lakeridge higher than the other two older elementary schools. Comments included that the site configuration seems better there, and that because the high-cap and other strong programs are located there, there is a perception that the school is successful and not as in-need.
- :: The final exercise at FPC 3 was a very high-level look at facilities and approaches to each of the grade levels. Results from this exercise were summarized.

Elementary School Level

- Elementary school replacement is preferred by a majority of the committee. Full modernization was chosen by Table 3 due to lack of clarity around relative cost.
- Existing elementary schools need significant work and should be brought up to the district standard.

- Facility replacement provides the potential for increased opportunities to improve sustainability, educational adequacy, and building components (such as structure), and provides a lot of "wins."

Middle School Level

- Replacement of older middle school buildings is preferred by a majority of the committee.
- The older middle school buildings have significant deficiencies. The existing middle school environment feels disjointed, due to the extreme differences between the new and old facilities, and the physical separation between buildings.
- The completed Phase One middle school building was successful and there is a desire to continue/complete this process. Phase Two should connect the buildings.
- Replacement of middle school facilities will impact every student in the district and therefore is expected to receive broad community support.

High School Level (MIHS)

- Modernization of the high school, with an emphasis on educational adequacy, is unanimously preferred.
- There is a desire to improve how the high school can be used, but not implement full-scale modernization. Several groups preferred a combination of renovation and educational adequacy, with full modernization only occurring on an as-needed basis.
- A range of educational adequacy improvements were supported, including CCR spaces, counseling, and library improvements, because they would be visible and benefit all students.

High School Level (Crest)

- Expansion and relocation of Crest was supported by a majority of the committee. Separation of ATP and Crest was also supported.
- The existing Crest facility does not meet the needs of the program and is not in good condition. It should be relocated, either closer to or connected to the high school.
- Crest should maintain a separate identity as a smaller-scale learning environment, with flexible spaces and individualized learning.
- It was suggested that Crest could be co-located with other programs, such as CCR and/or a black box theater, to reduce stigma and create a stronger proximity to programs that would benefit Crest students.
- It is important for the district to raise community awareness about Crest and how valuable it is.

PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE: ROUND 1

- :: This exercise addressed the question: "In what order should projects be completed?"
- :: Committee table groups of five randomly selected members each developed a prioritized "timeline" of projects that address district need, based on a number of directions and ground rules. The numbers on the timeline represent the priority ranking and do not indicate a specific amount of time or phase. It is unknown at this time how many priorities may be completed at a time, or how much time there will be between projects/phases of work. Each group then shared their scenario and reasoning with the larger group.
- :: Photos of the round 1 prioritization scenarios are attached, and description highlights are noted below.

:: Group 1:

- The first three priorities cover all school levels, including Island Park (1st), MIHS (CCR and science)/Crest (remodel)/ATP (2nd), and IMS Phase 2 (3rd). The high school has a wide impact and addresses the CCR priority, and IMS affects all students in the district and needs a new roof soon anyway.
- Remaining MIHS projects are later in the prioritization (6th). It was felt that these projects could be good candidates for booster or other outside funding and may be able to happen sooner.
- :: Group 2:
 - The first three priorities include Island Park (1st), IMS Phase 2 (2nd), and West Mercer (3rd). Island Park is central, visible, and has a lot of needs. IMS serves everyone, finishes what was already started (Phase 1 Building), and can create a community showcase for all elementary students to have a place where they are excited to go. West Mercer addresses potential additional population growth from downtown.
 - Crest and administration are combined in one new building (4th), to maximize use of the megablock site and accommodate large growth projections for Crest.
 - High school projects are lower priority and not in a particular order. These projects should continue to be developed in the order of whatever is the most current need for students at that time. Later prioritization may also allow some cross support from other newer projects, such as CCR or athletic space at the middle school.
- :: Group 3:
 - The first three priorities cover different levels, to reach the most students early on: MIHS (1st), IMS Phase 2 (2nd), Island Park (3rd). MIHS affects the most students, so should have good community buy-in. IMS Phase 2 is expected by the community and as it is the first place that students unite from across the district, it is important to have a cohesive facility. Island Park replaces an old building that has had safety issues, does not have good use of the site, and has traffic impacts for the surrounding community.
 - West Mercer (4th) and Lakeridge (5th) follow Island Park, because it is important to impact the elementary schools together, or as close as possible, for equity.
 - Consider using MIHS (PE/athletics and general education) projects to better connect the pool to the high school.
 - Crest is important to have as a new building, preferably combined with administration and possibly ATP.
- :: Group 4:
 - The first three priorities include IMS (1st), the pool (2nd), and a combined new Crest/Admin/ATP building (3rd). IMS impacts the greatest number of students in the district and has greatest facility condition need. The pool serves the greater community and currently is a financial drain due to maintenance costs. A combined Crest facility will create better utilization of the megablock.
 - Island Park (4th) and West Mercer (5th) are the next priorities, with Lakeridge coming later because it is in fairly good condition.
 - MIHS projects that are prioritized include science, CCR, and shared/support areas, to address CCR
 planning goals and respond to student input regarding gathering/flex spaces. Other MIHS projects
 are not as core to student learning and are prioritized last.

Page 4 of 6

:: Group 5:

- The first three priorities are IMS Phase 2 (1st), Island Park (2nd), and West Mercer (3rd). All address significant building condition needs, plus IMS consolidates buildings, Island Park improves traffic, and West Mercer reduces reliance on portables.
- A new combined Crest/CCR/administration building and new JV field house are the next priority. This moves Crest closer to the high school, adds professional development space, and frees up space for parking and additional learning spaces on the megablock.
- Administration (if not part of Crest building) and pool are prioritized last, because they do not directly address educational needs in the district.

PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE: ROUND 2

- :: This exercise addressed the question: "For the projects that are farther in the future, what (if anything) needs to be done in the interim?" It was noted that basic maintenance upkeep and repairs will be taken care of as needed, and this exercise is specifically about addressing additional programmatic needs.
- :: The same five groups revised their prioritization scenarios to include any desired changes based on other group's scenarios and the inclusion of interim projects, using the same basic ground rules.
- :: Photos of the round 2 prioritization timelines are attached, and key changes are noted below.
- :: Group 1
 - Interim projects of new gymnasium or cafeteria addition were included for West Mercer and Lakeridge, after the completion of Island Park.
 - Combined Crest/administration/ATP building was added, similar to other groups.
- :: Group 2
 - Interim projects of new gymnasium or cafeteria addition were included for West Mercer and Lakeridge, prior to the completion of Island Park, to provide something new for all elementary schools. It was noted that there should be strategic placement of gyms so they do not displace students.
 - MIHS projects (CCR and shared/support areas) were all added to priority 1, in order to touch all age groups in the first three phases.
- :: Group 3
 - Interim project of new gymnasium or cafeteria addition was included for Lakeridge as part of priority 1.
 - Combined Crest/administration/ATP building was added, similar to other groups.
- :: Group 4:
 - Interim projects of shared learning areas were included for West Mercer, Lakeridge, and Island Park, as priority 2. This option was chosen because shared learning is an improvement that addressed the way teaching happens today and into the future, whereas the gyms have worked for many years already and do not have a different educational need.
- :: Group 5:
 - Interim projects of new gymnasium or cafeteria addition were included for West Mercer and Lakeridge, after the completion of Island Park. The West Mercer replacement was shifted out to priority 5, after the Crest/administration/CCR building and ATP.

Page 5 of 6

GROUP DISCUSSION

- :: Priorities may change if the costs and percentage of the bond are known.
- :: It is important to touch as many students across the Island as possible.
- :: Determining the right amount of time between the interim projects and replacements was a struggle.
- : Do the prioritization scenarios address the top planning goals that were stated? Not all, but IMS Phase 2 addresses safety, as well as flexibility/adaptability of spaces.
- : How frequently is a long-range plan typically updated? Most districts will revisit after each phase, at least to determine the priorities are still the same.
- :: Elementary parents are very invested and involved and want to be represented in the bond.
- :: Constructing gym additions up front creates better equity. Does that make it okay for those elementary schools to happen later? Is it possible to construct two elementary schools at once?
- :: LeRoy noted some surprise that administration is often towards the front in terms of priority. This typically tends to be at the tail end of everything. It was noted that this has to do with looking at the whole campus megablock planning and combining with Crest. If these are not combined, administration would not be up front. Doing the pool early (Group 4) is also a surprise.
- How many projects do similar districts do at one time? JoAnn noted that Bainbridge has passed approximately one replacement school project every five years, plus additions and improvements, since 2005. The last phase was 10 years due to recession. However, every district is different. Generally, districts go on an 8-10 year cycle, however there can be a "dry spell" for 20+ years if don't get support.
- :: It was noted that there is work on a bill to reduce the bond passage rate from 60% to 50% (not this year), and people should advocate for this because it would make a huge difference.
- :: Messaging is very important. We need to build the whole community and recognize the time will come for everyone. Even if Island Park happens first, most of kids there now will be gone. It is important to look beyond what each individual gets to what benefits the whole community. There should be a united front about priorities.

NEXT STEPS

- The next FPC meeting, scheduled for March 30th, will be the third planning meeting, followed by a final wrap-up meeting scheduled in early June. The Committee will continue to refine planning questions and issues, including looking at consolidation of planning scenarios to take out to the broader community. Ideally we will take fewer than five approaches to the broader community, with one identified preferred approach.
- :: It is very important that all Committee members come back for the next planning meeting, thank you!

Page 6 of 6

FPC4: Prioritization Exercise - Round 1 Results



FPC4: Prioritization Exercise - Round 2 Results





| Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | | FPC Meeting 4: Plan I Agenda 24 February 2020 | Development #2 | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| WELCOME! > Please sign in > Grab a drink and snack > Turn off your cell phones or place on "stun" > Introduce yourself to someone you don't know | MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENTS ARE THE PRIORITY | Introduction & Objectives Review of Need FPC 3 Findings Prioritization Exercise: Round 1 Break Group Discussion Prioritization Exercise: Round 2 Next Steps & Questions | 5 min 5.30 5 min 5.35 10 min 5.40 70 min 5.50 5 min 7.00 15 min 7.05 65 min 7.20 5 min 8.25 | MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENTS ARE THE PRIORITY |
| 2019 2020 JUL AVE SEP OCT NOV DIG JAN FEB MAR APR MAY JUN INCOELANALYSIS FANGE FACILITY PLAN FILE PLAN DEVELOPMENT DOCUME | JUL AUG SEP OCT NOV DEC JAN | Objectives | | |





MISD Education Programs



Learning Standards (ELA, Math, Science, Environment and Sustainability, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Health and Physical Education, Financial Education, Computer Science, Educational Technology)

Special Education Services (Pre-K - Adult Transition)

College & Career Readiness (CCR)

Alternative Education (including online learning)

Before and After School Care

Athletics/Extra-Curriculars

Capacity & Enrollment (Mid. Projection)







Facility Condition: Islander MS



Paper 3. One facility is included here as an example

Educational Adequacy Educational Adequacy: Island Park ES EXISTING AREA PER STUDENT R.O.M. Impact Adds a gym plu 5 – 7 sf/studen > "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas classroom and OT/PT therapy room > Multiple disconnected buildings > Administration area improvements > Dedicated art/science classroom(s) > Student restroom adjacent to kindergarten classrooms > Hard surface play too close to classrooms * This information is provided for all MISD facilities and is shown in Issue Paper 3. One facility

> Need for separate gym and cafeteria (1hr 20min / day)

- > Centralized SPED area with new special education
- General education classrooms are small and do not have sufficient storage; acoustic separation is poor
- > Multiple distributed sensory rooms or "safe spaces"





Confirm Committee Planning Goals





Spectrum Exercise

Do district facilities meet the Committee's long-range planning goals?







Elementary school replacement is preferred by a majority of the committee.

THEMES

- Full modernization was chosen by Table 3 due to lack of clarity around relative cost.
- Existing elementary schools need significant work and should be brought up to the district standard.
- Facility replacement provides the potential for increased opportunities to improve sustainability, educational adequacy, and building components (such as structure), and provides a lot of "wins."



Replacement of older middle school buildings is preferred by a majority of the committee.

THEMES

- The older middle school buildings have significant deficiencies.
- > The existing middle school environment feels disjointed, due to the extreme differences between the new and old facilities, and the physical separation between buildings.
- > The completed Phase One middle school building was successful and there is a desire to continue/complete this process. Phase Two should connect the buildings.
- Replacement of middle school facilities will impact every student in the district and therefore is expected to receive broad community support.



Modernization of the high school, with an emphasis on educational adequacy is unanimously preferred. THEMES

- There is a desire to improve how the high school can be used, but not implement fullscale modernization.
- Several groups preferred a combination of renovation and educational adequacy, with full modernization only occurring on an asneeded basis.
- A range of educational adequacy improvements were supported, including CCR spaces, counseling, and library improvements, because they would be visible and benefit all students.

| Do you support continued renovation and read adequary at Creat? If so, and assuming ATP* a building or remodel a larger building on the hig | tendization of building systems when seeded, or do you is not part of Creat, what would be the best approach fi h school wite and relocate Creat there (for example, th | also support addressing capacity and educational in adding capacity, renovate and expand the existin e existing Administration Building). |
|--|--|--|
| RENOVATION (5 - \$\$) | MODERNIZATION (\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$+) | OTHER APPROACH |
| Significant Maintenance - Morralisment: - Morralisment: - Morralisment: - Morralisment - Morrali | Potential 78-Year Building A Reserve agends A Reserve age | Options • Restarts the ander existing table in billings • Restarts the ander existing table billings • Restarts and an existing table of the ander the ande |
| TABLE 1 | | |
| TABLE 2 | <u>annna</u> | Table 2ablo prelenet Otior Approach but did net com |
| TABLE 3 | | |
| TABLE 4 | | 11111 |
| TABLE 5 | | |

Expansion and relocation of Crest was supported by a majority of the committee. Separation of ATP and Crest was also supported.

THEMES

- > The existing Crest facility does not meet the needs of the program and is not in good condition. It should be relocated, either closer to or connected to the high school.
- > Crest should maintain a separate identity as a smaller-scale learning environment, with flexible spaces and individualized learning.
- It was suggested that Crest could be colocated with other programs, such as CCR and/or a black box theater, to reduce stigma and create a stronger proximity to programs that would benefit Crest students.
- It is important for the district to raise community awareness about Crest and how valuable it is.



Prioritization: Round 1

In what order should projects be completed?



Projects

Prioritization: Round 1

Directions & Ground Rules

- 1. Take 5 minutes and review the list of programmatic improvements that may fall within each of the gaming piece categories.
- Place all colored pieces on the timeline in the order of your group's prioritization. Use the white ("Other") pieces if needed, adding the name of the project.
 - Use <u>ONLY ONE of the two Crest options (either large or small, not both)</u>.
 - Larger gaming pieces (elementary schools, middle school, large Crest, Administration, and Pool) cannot be stacked. Smaller gaming pieces (high school, small Crest, and ATP) can be stacked up to 4 high.
- Below each gaming piece, or stacked grouping, briefly summarize the top 1-3 reasons why your group placed the gaming piece(s) in that position.

Prioritization: Round 1

Prioritization: Round 1

In what order should projects be completed?



Prioritization: Round 1

| Review the list of programmatic improvements | 5 min. |
|---|---------|
| Discuss prioritization, place gaming pieces, and note the reasons/rationale | 40 min. |
| Share back from each table group (5 min. each) (prioritization, reasons why, concerns) | 25 min. |



Please be back at your tables and ready to start again in $5\,\mbox{minutes}.$

Thank You!









Prioritization: Round 2

Directions & Ground Rules

- Place Round 1 pieces either in your group's original prioritized sequence, <u>OR</u>, now that you have heard what other's groups have proposed, you may re-prioritize gaming pieces.
- Discuss and answer the targeted question(s) and determine which, if any, interim projects should be included in your group's prioritization. <u>ONLY ONE</u> interim project gaming piece may be selected per school.
- Add the chosen interim project gaming piece(s) to the timeline in order of your group's prioritization and in combination with pieces from Round 1.
- 4. Below each added interim gaming piece(s), or below other change(s) your group made to Round 1 prioritization, briefly summarize the top 1-3 reasons why you added the interim gaming piece(s) or made the change(s).

Prioritization: Round 2

What interim projects are needed?



Prioritization: Round 2



Prioritization: Round 2

| Discuss and revise chart | 30 min. |
|--|--------------------|
| Share back from each table group (3 min. each) | 15 min. |
| Group discussion | 15 min. |
| Share back from each table group (3 min. each) Group discussion | 15 min. 15 min. |

Prioritization: Round 2

Targeted Question: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Which <u>one</u> (if any) of these key areas should be considered as a critical interim improvement for elementary schools that are not the first project for your group? Why?

- > Add a gymnasium or cafeteria (eliminate shared use of gymnasium)
- Classroom decompression / shared learning areas
- Miscellaneous projects (special education, library, counseling / administration, art / science, restrooms, etc.)

If interim improvements are implemented, what is the least amount of time that should elapse between interim improvements and full replacement of the school?

Prioritization: Round 2

Targeted Question: MIDDLE SCHOOL

Which <u>one</u> (if any) of these key areas should be considered as a critical interim improvement if the middle school is not the first project for your group? Why?

- Improvements to learning spaces outside of general classrooms (shared learning)
- > Connection between the old and new buildings

>

 Miscellaneous projects (science classroom improvements, new broadcast studio, black box theater, voice booths, etc.)

If interim improvements are implemented, what is the least amount of time that should elapse between interim improvements and full replacement of the school?



MEETING MINUTES

| PROJECT: | | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| DATE: 06 April 2020 | | | FILE NAME: | M005_FPC5_20200330 | | |
| su | BJECT: | Facility Planning Committee Meeting 5: Plan F | inalization | | | |
| MB | ETING DATE: | 30 March 2020 | TIME: | 5:30 - 7:30 pm | | |
| LO | CATION: | Remote Meeting via Zoom | | | | |
| AT | TENDEES: | | | | | |
| Fa | cility Planning Co | mmittee | | | | |
| Х | David D'Souza | | X Jim Stanton | | | |
| Х | Deborah Lurie | | X Bob Olson | | | |
| Х | Julie Ogata Cioba | anu | X Anne Hritzay | | | |
| Х | Janelle Honeycut | tt | X Kathy Morrison | | | |
| Х | Kristina Mehas | | X Pat Turner | | | |
| Х | Steve Duncan | | X Lena Hardisty | | | |
| Х | Amanda Stoffer | | X Will Atkinson | | | |
| Х | Kim Thomas | | – Lin Hao | | | |
| Х | Susan Conrad-Wa | ang | X Robin Li | | | |
| - | Kate Wise Knech | t | – Gus Poole | | | |
| - | Dave Cutright | | X Sandra Levin | | | |
| Х | Carrie Beckner Sa | avage | X Becky Shaddle | | | |
| Х | Colin Brandt | | Zach Houvener | | | |
| - | Vickie Cleator | | X Tiffin Goodman | | | |
| Х | David de Yarza | | X Sgt. Ryan Parr | | | |
| Х | Debbie Hanson | | X Carol Gregory | | | |
| М | SD Support Team | | Mahlum Team | | | |
| х | Donna Colosky | | X LeBoy Landers | | | |
| _ | Fred Rundle | | X Jennifer Lubin | | | |
| _ | Frin Battersby | | X JoAnn Wilcox | | | |
| х | Andreeves Rosne | 21 | | | | |
| _ | Craig Degginger | | | | | |
| _ | Tony Kuhn | | | | | |

- X Ty Bergstrom
- X Brandy Fox

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On March 30, 2020, the Facility Planning Committee (FPC) held its fifth meeting, the last of three plan development sessions. This meeting was held remotely, via Zoom. While this type of remote meeting is not the first choice for planning discussions, due to the limitations it imposes on interactive facilitation, the goals and intent of the meeting were still achieved. The session included a brief review of needs and goals, summary and analysis of the findings from FPC 4, and a last round of plan development that resulted in determination of a preferred plan approach. A PDF copy of the presentation and an audio recording of the meeting can be found on the district website.

MEETING OBJECTIVES & REVIEW

- :: LeRoy Landers reviewed the evening's agenda, provided a schedule update, and provided objectives for the meeting:
 - Finalize prioritization of District need over time and understand the rationale.
 - Ideally develop 1-3 scenarios that the Committee is comfortable taking out to the broader community for input.
- :: A brief review included FPC goals, summary of district need, facility management strategies, and a summary of Committee input that has been developed, including goals (what guides the plan), approach (what the plan should do), and prioritization (what is the sequence of the plan).

FPC 4 FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

- :: LeRoy described the prioritization exercise that was completed during FPC4. It was noted that there were some major shifts between the Round 1 and Round 2 sequences, such as Crest moving farther out in one scenario and high school projects moving forward in one scenario. This was primarily due to the requirement of adding interim projects, as well as hearing other groups' ideas and comments.
- :: The Round 2 scenarios are used as the basis for moving forward in the planning process, as they represent the Committee's most recent thinking, and begin to identify the priority of potential interim projects and locate them in a proposed sequence.
- :: Analysis of Round 2 included identification of consistent themes among the five scenarios. Committee comments and rationale from FPC4 were also summarized for each theme, as well as evaluating how well each project addressed the planning goals.
 - Interim projects are consistently located within the first three priority projects.
 - Island Park is always the first priority of the three elementary schools.
 - West Mercer is always the second priority of the three elementary schools.
 - Lakeridge is always the last priority of the three elementary schools.
 - All groups put IMS Phase 2 (Buildings 100/200 and 300) within the first three priorities
 - High school projects are clustered within the first two and last three priorities.
 - Crest prioritization varies widely, but always included pairing with administration and possibly other related high school programs.
 - Four out of five groups prioritized the Crest/Administration replacement in either the first or second round of high school level projects.

- :: Committee comments related to FPC4 findings and analysis
 - Tiffin Goodman noted that Lakeridge has a lower assessment score than West Mercer, even though it was chosen as the last elementary school priority. LeRoy responded that there had previously been consistent Committee discussion about the condition and programs at Lakeridge and perhaps because of the success of programs there, it was generally felt it has the least need.
 - Susan Wang commented that West Mercer is also prioritized because of the growing population on the north end of the Island.

CONSOLIDATION

- :: The five planning scenarios developed by the Committee would ideally be consolidated into one preferred scheme and potentially one or two secondary schemes that can be taken out to the broader community. LeRoy presented the three following strategies to facilitate consolidation of plan proposals. (It is important to note that pre-consolidation plan studies and related discussions will be included in the long-range planning document for future consideration.)
 - Focus on major projects
 - Combine high school level projects
 - Adjust location of "outliers"
- :: Focus on major projects
 - Why: The amount of time between implementation of interim projects and full replacement of schools is not certain, and there is no guarantee that the design and location of interim projects can be incorporated into the best long-term design solution for future replacement schools.
 - Result: For approaches that filled an entire priority position with interim projects, focusing on major projects simplifies prioritization and shifts projects forward. For approaches that combined high school projects with various interim projects in a single priority position, focusing on major projects will allow additional high school projects within the first high school priority position.
- :: Combine high school level projects
 - Why: The size of the Crest/Administration replacement project is significantly smaller than other major replacement projects. Therefore, combining it with other high school projects reflects this distinction and simplifies prioritization. Final prioritization of individual high school projects will be determined in the future, however, replacement of Crest/Administration should be considered as a candidate for the first round of high school projects.
 - Result: The Crest/Administration replacement project combines with other high-priority high school level projects.
 - Prioritization of high school projects based on the average of their numerical positions in the Round 2 scenarios is as follows (lower scores equate to higher priority): 1. CCR (4.2), 2. Shared Support (4.6), 3. Crest/Administration (4.8), 4. Science (6.0), 5. General Education (6.4),
 6. Performing Arts (6.6), 7. PE/Athletics (7.8).
- :: Adjust the location of "outliers"
 - Why: The Committee has discussed the desire for a partnership between the district and city for modernization or replacement of the pool. Pending the outcome of this potential partnership, shifting the pool to align with other plan proposals facilitates consolidation into fewer proposals. The District has also recently invested approximately \$3 million into the pool facility.

- Result: Aligning the pool project with all other proposals shifts all other major projects forward, putting Island Park Elementary within the first three priority positions. The shift of Island Park creates alignment with other plans, with regard to the idea of doing something at every grade level as soon as possible. Priority positions 4-7 become identical sequentially for all scenarios and the discussion now focuses around the priority for positions 1-3.
- :: Committee comments related to consolidation:
 - Sandra Levin asked for additional clarification regarding why interim projects are "off the table" and Crest is moved up, since Crest was in the back 4-7 positions in many of the original schemes.
 - LeRoy noted that interim projects are set aside because it is difficult to know how big of a "bite" will be able to be taken at one time. Therefore, the amount of time between projects isn't clear and the timeline is not known.
 - The Crest project was originally proposed as a larger project that would take up a whole priority position, but when you look at the actual project size compared to the size of a replacement elementary school, it is much smaller. It is a much more accurate representation to size Crest so that it could be combined with other high school projects, and addresses Crest as a high school project more holistically, including consideration of combining with other high school programs.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- :: Plan proposals developed by the Facility Planning Committee illustrate a set of basic tenets which may be used to inform and guide subsequent long-range planning discussions. Summarizing these tenets into a brief list of guiding principles will assist with the consideration of tenets in future community outreach meetings and facilitate use in future plan development. Guiding Principles are be separated into two categories, those that relate to the Committee's overall "approach" to projects and those that relate to the "prioritization" of projects.
- :: Proposed Guiding Principles: Approach
 - Elementary Schools: replace or fully modernize, depending on cost implications
 - Middle School: replace remaining buildings rather than fully modernize
 - High School: implement renovation / limited modernization with an emphasis on educational adequacy / program needs
 - Crest: relocate and expand in a new location that is closer to the high school (and consider colocation with administration or other programs)
 - Implement needed repairs as necessary at all facilities, to maintain operations
- :: Proposed Guiding Principles: Prioritization
 - Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
 - Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects
 - The prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer then Lakeridge
 - Potential first projects at the high school level include CCR, Shared Support, and Crest/Administration
 - Prioritize improvement of spaces with the core function of supporting education
- :: Committee comments related to guiding principles:
 - Jim Stanton noted that transportation was prioritized as a Committee goal and a more holistic approach to planning is needed to improve transportation. There is a need to look at how school facilities connect with the rest of the Island. The City has done two elaborate bike and pedestrian

Page 4 of 7

plans that show schools connecting to each other and to their neighborhoods. The City and School district need encouragement to engage in a conversation.

- LeRoy responded that the question of student safety and transportation comes up regularly for school districts. As soon as implementation of a strategy involves being out of control of the district, it becomes difficult to plan with any specificity what might be able to be done. However, the question brings up the need for a recognition of need to coordinate and partner with other jurisdictional entities on the Island. The long-range facility plan will point out this concern and the need for improvement of pedestrian and bicycle access across the Island and between schools, but implementation is outside of the reach of the plan.
- Tiffin followed up on Jim's point, stating that school design needs to consider and incorporate these connections. It needs to be pushed to not be an afterthought.
- LeRoy reiterated that the plan will identify and extract out very specific areas of need at or around given school sites to include in the document if possible. Ideally the LRFP report would be given to the jurisdiction and could serve as a base for high-level discussions.
- David D'Souza commented that he liked the consolidation of high school projects that is being shown. He also asked if it would be problematic if the elementary schools were next to each other in the prioritization, as they may happen concurrently and impact capacity.
- LeRoy noted that factor should be considered when projects are being implemented. Swing space is not available on the Island, so the district will need to study if existing school operations can be maintained during construction. If both schools are done in the same phase of work, they do not have to be concurrent: one could follow the other, approximately 18 months later.

FINAL PRIORITIZATION

- :: For purposes of consideration by the Facility Planning Committee, an additional approach may be added to the five scenarios, to align with the first Guiding Principle: "Do something at every grade level as soon as you can." This one missing option is as follows: Island Park first, IMS second, and MIHS/Crest third, followed by the same options for positions 4-7.
- :: With the addition of this option, the six options fall into three basic groups of two: Island Park first (IP-1 and IP-2), Islander Middle School first (MS-1 and MS-2), and MIHS/Crest first (HS-1 and HS-2). (Refer to the diagram illustrating the six planning options on the following page for more information.)

COMMITTEE INPUT & RESULTS

- :: The Committee was asked "Which sequence of projects do you most support?" considering:
 - Facility condition (Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.)
 - Greatest benefit (Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. Two-thirds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.)
 - Broadest impact (The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.)
 - Committee goals
 - Community support (In the short-term, more students will experience benefit associated with an Islander MS replacement, and it serves the entire district.)

Page 5 of 7

- :: Committee members voted privately via the chat function, and then stated in a subsequent chat message why they felt their choice was the best sequence of projects.
- Voting results were as follows: IP-1: 2 votes, IP-2: 2 votes, MS-1: 3 votes, MS-2: 19 votes, HS-1: 0 votes, HS-2: 0 votes. MS-2 had the most support, with 73% of the votes. (85% supported doing the middle school first, including votes for MS-1 and MS-2.) Option MS-2 prioritizes IMS first, Island Park second, and MIHS/Crest third, followed by West Mercer, Lakeridge, the remaining high school projects, and finally the pool.



FPC 5: Six Final Planning Options

Page 6 of 7

:: Committee members' reasons for choosing the MS-2 plan sequence fell into common themes, reflected by the following comments:

Why do Islander Middle School first:

- "IMS has the greatest need both from a student perspective as well as a facility maintenance/condition perspective."
- "We should first complete the job we started with the middle school and show the community an excellent result to help gain their confidence in future projects."
- "[It] maintains the momentum of the previous middle school project and brings it to closure."
- "The middle school impacts the most kids and is already partly done."
- "The middle school will be used by all upcoming district students and I feel will be accepted by the community as a project that makes sense."

Why do Island Park Elementary School second:

- "The second priority is Island Park due to safety issues, the condition of the building, and educational programming."
- "Island Park is in a prime location to have a rebuild have a positive impact on the community in that traffic issues could be addressed."
- "IP has poor instructional spaces and has a terrible traffic situation..."
- "IP will have the greatest impact on the MI community due to its positive impact on ICW traffic and student safety, as well as being a location that many...residents see on a regular basis."
- :: Other Committee comments included:
 - "... Need to address transportation issues, especially for bikes and other non-motorized forms, to and between all schools, and ways to reduce or mitigate motor vehicle traffic."
 - "The biggest disconnect in the connected network of bike/ped trails connecting all the schools, particularly IMS and MIHS, is along Island Crest Way in front of IP. Addressing Island Park creates an opportunity to work with the city to fill in this gap."
 - "If you are trying to get the greater MI community to embrace the plan, then MIHS needs to be early in the process. Our community is very college acceptance focused."
 - "As for Crest, I continue to feel the importance that we are providing that segment of our student population with an equitable and consistent learning environment."

NEXT STEPS

- :: Due to the changing nature of the current situation regarding COVID-19, the following milestones are tentatively planned and Committee members will be updated as soon as plans are confirmed.
 - Board update with prioritized plan(s): tentatively April 23rd
 - Staff / student / community outreach: tentatively May
 - Final FPC meeting (to receive community input and finalize long-range facility plan): tentatively June



Summary of Need

Plan Development



MERCER ISLAND

SCHOOL DISTRICT



30 March 2020

Consolidation

Guiding Principles

Final Prioritization

Committee Input

Break

Next Steps

Introduction, Objectives & Review

FPC 4 Findings & Analysis

Review Committee Input

10 min 5:30

20 min 5:40

20 min 6:00

15 min 6:35

10 min 7:00

10 min

15 min 6:20

10 min 6:50

10 min 7:20





Prioritization Exercise: Round 1 & 2



Prioritization Exercise Results





Prioritization Exercise Results

Use Round 2 scenarios as a basis for planning.

- > Represents Committee's most recent thinking
- Identifies priority of potential interim projects and locates them in proposed sequence



Analysis: Interim Projects

Interim projects are consistently located within the first three priority items.

Committee Comments/Rationale

- Completing interim projects early creates better equity
- Interim projects proposed for either one, two, or three elementary schools
- Interim projects proposed either before or after the replacement of Island Park Elementary School
- It was noted that it was difficult to determine the right amount of time between interim projects



Analysis: Island Park Elementary

Island Park is always the first priority of the three elementary schools.

Committee Comments/Rationale

- Central, visible, and has a lot of needs
 Replaces an old building that has had safety issues
- and does not have good use of the site
 Improves traffic impacts for the school and the
- Improves tranic impacts for the school and surrounding community
- Elementary parents are very invested and involved and want to be represented



Island Park ES: Facility Condition



Analysis: West Mercer Elementary

West Mercer is always the second priority of the three elementary schools.

Committee Comments/Rationale

- Addresses potential additional population growth from downtown
- Reduces reliance on portables



Analysis: Lakeridge Elementary

Lakeridge is always the last priority of the three elementary schools.

Committee Comments/Rationale

 Lakeridge happens later because it is in fairly good condition



Analysis: Goals

Preferred Approach

- > Replacement of existing elementary schools
- > 450 500 student capacity, with flexibility for future expansion





Analysis: Islander Middle School Phase 2

All groups put IMS Phase 2 (Buildings 100/200 and 300) within the first three priorities.

Committee Comments/Rationale

- Affects all students in the district / serves everyone / impacts greatest number of students
- Greatest facility condition need / addresses significant building issues / needs new roof immediately
- Expected by the community / finishes what was already started (Phase 1 Building)
- Potential to create a community showcase: all elementary students to have a place where they are excited to go
- Consolidates buildings / first place students unite from across the district, so important to have a cohesive facility
- Addresses goals: safety, flexibility/adaptability of spaces





Analysis: Mercer Island High School

High school projects are clustered within the first two and last three priorities.

Committee Comments/Rationale (Earlier)

- > Affects the most students/ has a wide impact / reaches the most students early on
- Good community buy-in
- Addresses top planning goals such as providing more opportunities for occupational learning, including CCR

Committee Comments/Rationale (Later)

- Some projects are not as core to student learning
- Possible candidates for booster or other outside funding



Analysis: Goals

Preferred Approach

- Emphasis on educational adequacy / programmatic need
- Programs include CCR, science, performing arts, PE/athletics, general education, and shared support





Analysis: Crest Learning Center / Admin.

Crest prioritization varies widely, but always includes pairing with administration and possibly other related high school programs.

Four out of five groups prioritized the Crest / Administration replacement in either the first or second round of high school level projects.

Committee Comments/Rationale

- Maximizes use of the megablock site and accommodates enrollment projections
- Moves Crest closer to the high school, adds professional development space, and frees up space for parking and learning spaces on the megablock site
- May provide stronger association with other high school programs, such as CCR



Analysis: Goals

Preferred Approach

- > Full replacement of the existing Crest facility that may include expansion to accommodate 200 students (150% of existing GSF) and a second large greenhouse
- Note: may not necessitate removal of the existing building if constructed at an alternate location







Consolidation

Proposals to facilitate consolidation of plan proposals *

- 1. Focus on major projects
- 2. Combine high school level projects
- 3. Adjust location of "outliers"
- Pre-consolidation plan studies and related discussions will be included in the long-range planning document for future consideration.



1. Focus on Major Projects

Why focus on major projects?

- > Amount of time between implementation of interim projects and full replacement of schools is not certain. This factor will play into whether implementation of interim projects makes sense.
- No guarantee that the design and location of interim projects can be incorporated into the best long-term design solution for future replacement schools. Some, or potentially all, interim projects would also need to be replaced.



1. Focus on Major Projects

Result

- For approaches that filled an entire priority position with interim projects, focusing on major projects simplifies prioritization and shifts projects forward.
- For approaches that combined high school projects with various interim projects in a single priority position, focusing on major projects will allow additional high school projects within the first high school priority position.

| 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | |
|----|-----------|------------|------|----------------------|----------------------|----|----------------------|----------|------------|-------|
| I | P | Int. HS | мs | Crest & Admin | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool | | |
| | IL. IS | IP | IMS | wм | Crest & Admin. | LR | HS | Pool | | |
| | nt. IS | MS | IP | wм | LR | HS | Crest & Admin. | Pool | | |
| IN | 15 | Int. | Pool | Crest & Admin. | IP | wм | нѕ | LR | HS | |
| IN | IS | IP | Int. | Orest & Admin. | wм | LR | нѕ | HS | Pool | - |
| | | | | | | | | - 2020 1 | ouncole An | ~ *** |

1. Focus on Major Projects

Result

- For approaches that filled an entire priority position with interim projects, focusing on major projects simplifies prioritization and shifts projects forward.
- For approaches that combined high school projects with various interim projects in a single priority position, focusing on major projects will allow additional high school projects within the first high school priority position.



2. Combine High School Level Projects

Why combine the Crest / Administration replacement project with other high school projects, from the standpoint of prioritization?

- > Size of Crest / Administration replacement project is significantly smaller than other major replacement projects. Therefore, combining it with other high school projects reflects this distinction and simplifies prioritization
- > Final prioritization of individual high school projects will be determined in the future, however, replacement of Crest / Administration should be considered as a candidate for the first round of high school projects



2. Combine High School Level Projects

Prioritization based on average of numerical positions from Round 2:

- 1. CCR (4.2)
- 2. Shared Support (4.6)
- 3. Crest / Administration (4.8)
- 4. Science (6.0)
- 5. General Education (6.4)
- 6. Performing Arts (6.6)
- 7. PE / Athletics (7.8)



2. Combine High School Level Projects

Prioritization based on average of numerical positions from Round 2:

- 1. CCR (4.2)
- 2. Shared Support (4.6)
- 3. Crest / Administration (4.8)
- 4. Science (6.0)
- 5. General Education (6.4)
- 6. Performing Arts (6.6)
- 7. PE / Athletics (7.8)



2. Combine High School Level Projects

Result

- Crest / Administration replacement project combines with other high priority high school level projects.
- > Combination of these projects reflects the size of the Crest / Administration replacement project, relative to other replacement projects, and simplifies prioritization. Priorities shift forward one position.



2. Combine High School Level Projects

Result

- Crest / Administration replacement project combines with other high priority high school level projects.
- Combination of these projects reflects the size of the Crest / Administration replacement project, relative to other replacement projects, and simplifies prioritization. Priorities shift forward one position.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|----|----|------|
| IP | HS/ Crest | IMS | wм | LR | нs | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IP | IMS | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IMS | IP | wм | LR | HS | Pool |
| IMS | Pool | HS/ Crest | IP | wм | LR | нѕ |
| IMS | IP | HS/ Crest | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |

3. Adjust Location of Outliers

Why adjust the location of "outliers"?

- > The Planning Committee has discussed the desire for a partnership between the district and city for modernization or replacement of pool. Pending the outcome of this potential partnership, shifting the pool to align with other plan proposals facilitates consolidation into fewer plan proposals.
- >The District has recently / currently invested approximately \$3 million into the pool facility, including a new roof and replacing mechanical systems.



3. Adjust Location of Outliers

Why adjust the location of "outliers"?

- > The Planning Committee has discussed the desire for a partnership between the district and city for modernization or replacement of pool. Pending the outcome of this potential partnership, shifting the pool to align with other plan proposals facilitates consolidation into fewer plan proposals.
- > The District has recently / currently invested approximately \$3 million into the pool facility, including a new roof and replacing mechanical systems

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-----|------|--------------|----|----|----|------|
| | | | | | | Pool |
| | | | | ĹŔ | | Pool |
| | | ΪΡ | ŴМ | LR | HS | Pool |
| IMS | Pool | 1S/ Trest | | | | HS |
| | | | | | | Pool |
| | | | | | | |

3. Adjust Location of Outliers

Result

- > Aligning the pool project with all other proposals shifts all other major projects forward, putting Island Park Elementary within the first three priority positions. The shift of Island Park creates alignment with other plans, with regard to the idea of doing something at every grade level as soon as possible.
- Positions 4-7 become identical sequentially.
- > The discussion now focuses around the priority for positions 1-3.





Guiding Principles

Why propose a set of Guiding Principles?

Plan proposals developed by the Facility Planning Committee illustrate a set of basic tenets which may be used to inform and guide subsequent long-range planning discussions.

Summarizing these tenets into a brief list of Guiding Principles will assist with the consideration of tenets in future community outreach meetings and facilitate their use in future plan development.

Guiding Principles may be separated into two categories, those that relate to the Committee's overall "Approach" to projects and those that relate to the "Prioritization" of projects.

Guiding Principles: Approach

- > Elementary Schools: replace or fully modernize, depending on cost implications
- > Middle School: replace remaining buildings rather than fully modernize
- > High School: implement renovation / limited modernization with an emphasis on educational adequacy / program needs
- Crest: relocate and expand in a new location that is closer to the high school (and consider co-location with administration or other programs)
- > Implement needed repairs as necessary at all facilities, to maintain operations

Guiding Principles: Prioritization

Proposed Guiding Principals

 Do something at every grade level as soon as you can

| 1 | 2 | _ ³ | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|----|----|----|------|
| IP | HS/ Crest | імз | wм | LR | нs | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IP | імз | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IMS | IP | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |
| IMS | HS/ Crest | IP | wм | LR | HS | Pool |
| IMS | IP | HS/ Crest | wм | LR | HS | Pool |

Guiding Principles: Prioritization

Proposed Guiding Principals

- Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
- Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects



Guiding Principles: Prioritization

Guiding Principles: Prioritization

Proposed Guiding Principals

Proposed Guiding Principals

you can

first three projects

Crest/Administration

>

>

Do something at every grade level as soon as

Island Park Elementary should be one of the

Potential first projects at the high school level

Prioritize improvement of spaces with the core function of supporting education

> The prioritization for remaining elementary

schools is West Mercer then Lakeridge

include CCR, Shared Support, and

- Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
- > Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects
- The prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer then Lakeridge

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|----|----|----|------|
| IP | HS/ Crest | імз | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IP | IMS | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |
| HS/ Crest | IMS | IP | wм | LR | нs | Pool |
| IMS | HS/ Crest | IP | wм | LR | HS | Pool |
| IMS | IP | HS/ Cres | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool |

Guiding Principles: Prioritization

Proposed Guiding Principals

- Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
- > Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects
- The prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer then Lakeridge
- Potential first projects at the high school level include CCR, Shared Support, and Crest/Administration



Guiding Principles: Prioritization

- > Do something at every grade level as soon as you can
- > Island Park Elementary should be one of the first three projects
- > The prioritization for remaining elementary schools is West Mercer and then Lakeridge
- > Islander Middle School should be one of the first three projects
- > The first projects at the high school level include CCR, Shared Support, and Crest / Administration
- Prioritize improvement projects that have primary purpose of supporting education



6:35 - 6:50

Adding One Alternative

- > Positions 4-7 are identical sequentially
- > The discussion now focuses around the priority for positions 1-3

For purposes of consideration by the Facility Planning Committee, an additional approach may be added within options that align with the first Guiding Principle:

"Do something at every grade level as soon as you can".

Planning Options

The six options fall into three

basic groups.

ISLAND PARK FIRST:

MIDDLE SCHOOL FIRST:

HIGH SCHOOL / CREST FIRST:



Adding One Alternative

- Positions 4-7 are identical sequentially
- The discussion now focuses around the priority for positions 1-3

For purposes of consideration by the Facility Planning Committee, an additional approach may be added within options that align with the first Guiding Principle,

"Do something at every grade level as soon as you can".



Question

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

Considering...

IP-1

IP-2

MS-1

MS-2

HS-1

HS-2

 Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.



Question

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

- Considering....
- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/3rds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|----|----|------------|---------------|
| IP | HS/ Crest | імз | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool | IP-1 |
| IP | IMS | HS/ Crest | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool | IP-2 |
| IMS | HS/ Crest | IP | wм | LR | HS | Pool | MS-1 |
| IMS | IP | HS/ Crest | wм | LR | нs | Pool | MS-2 |
| HS/ Crest | IP | імз | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool | HS-1 |
| HS/ Crest | IMS | IP | wм | LR | нѕ | Pool | HS-2 |
| | | | | | | 0 2020 MAH | LUM AROUTECTS |

Question

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

Considering....

- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- > Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/3rds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.
- Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
 The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.



Question

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

Considering....

- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/3rds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.
- Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
 The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.
- > Committee goals (Which project best aligns with top goals?)



Question

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

Considering...

- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- > Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/3rds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.
- > Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?) The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.
- > Committee goals (Which project best aligns with top goals?)
- Community support (Which project(s) will make sense and resonate?) In the short-term, more students will experience benefit associated with an Islander MS replacement, and it serves the entire district.


Questions & Comments

Committee Input

Click "Raise Hand" (in participant window) if you have a question or comment, and LeRoy will call on you.

Remember to unmute your microphone when you are called on.



MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Which sequence of projects do you most support?

Click on Chat, select "To: Host," and type your answer.

Considering....

- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- maintenance issues. 9 Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/2rds of Islander students spend mosi of the day in the older buildings and all laand Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.
- Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
 The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.
- > Committee goals (Which project best aligns with top goals?)
- Community support (Which project(s) will make sense and resonate?) In the short-term, more students will experience benefit associated with an Islander MS replacement, and it serves the entire district.



Why do you feel that is the best sequence of projects?

Click on Chat, select "To: Host," restate your chosen option, and type your answer.

Considering....

6:50 - 7:00

- Facility condition (Which facility is in the worst condition?) Islander MS has the worst facility condition score and some of the most critical maintenance issues.
- > Greatest benefit (Which learning environment is the worst?) Islander MS and Island Park may be the worst. 2/3rds of Islander students spend most of the day in the older buildings and all Island Park students are either in the old building or modular classrooms.
- Broadest impact (Which project impacts the most students?)
 The largest number of students will be positively impacted by the Islander MS replacement. Even though the high school's overall enrollment is larger, most proposed improvements are program specific.
- Committee goals (Which project best aligns with top goals?)
 Community support (Which project(s) will make sense and resonate?)
 In the shorterm, more students will experience benefit associated with an islander
 M3 reglacement, and it serves the entire district.





Which sequence of projects do you most support?



<u>Why</u> do you feel that is the best sequence of projects?





Next Steps

- > Board update with prioritized plan(s): Tentatively April 23rd
- > Staff / student / community outreach: Tentatively May
- > Final FPC meeting to receive community input and finalize long-range facility plan: Tentatively June



Click "Raise Hand" (in participant window) if you have a question or comment, and LeRoy will call on you.

Remember to unmute your microphone when you are called on.

MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENTS ARE THE PRIORITY



Appendices **D. OUTREACH**

MEETING MINUTES

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 |
|--|---|-------------|---------------------------------|
| DATE: | 20 January 2020 | FILE NAME: | Student Outreach Meeting_200115 |
| SUBJECT: | Student Outreach Meeting | | |
| MEETING DATE: | 15 January 2020 | TIME: | 3:00 - 4:30 pm |
| LOCATION: | Mercer Island High School Library | | |
| ATTENDEES: | | | |
| Students & Staff Alex Rosenbaum Finn Ernsdorff, M Norah Evans, MI Meghana Kakub Tristan Moore, M Paul Noone, MI Thomas Short, M Miles Silverman Alexandra Van E Evan Wallin, MI Joyce Zhang, M Winston Zhang, Vicki Puckett, M John Stafford, M Chantel Torrey, J | n, MIHS Student AIHS Student HS Student al, MIHS Student AIHS Student IS Student AIHS Student AIHS Student Berkom, MIHS Student IS Student IHS Student IHS Student IHS Student IHS Teacher MIHS Teacher | | |
| MISD Support Tea Donna Colosky, Ty Bergstrom, M Tony Kuhn, MISI Brandy Fox, Owr Mahlum Team | m MISD Superintendent IISD Executive Director of Finance D Director of Maintenance & Operations ner's Representative, CPM | | |
| LeRoy Landers Jennifer Lubin JoAnn Wilcox | | | |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On January 15th, 2020, members of the planning team held a student outreach session to get student input on the long-range planning process, goals, and needs. Separate outreach sessions will garner community and staff input. There will be another set of outreach sessions in the spring that will focus on long-range plan approaches.

The meeting was held after school and was open to all students in the district. (Staff that attended the session did not provide input. A separate outreach session for staff input is scheduled for January 22nd.)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

LeRoy Landers reviewed the long-range planning process and schedule, as well as the vision and goals developed by the district and Facility Planning Committee (FPC). A copy of the complete presentation and other detailed background information can be found on the district website.

STUDENT INPUT

The following comments were made by students attending the outreach session. These comments have been summarized into a list of goals (attached) that will be presented to the Facility Planning Committee and taken into consideration during the long-range planning process. All comments are regarding Mercer Island High School (MIHS) unless otherwise noted.

Process

- :: If someone has feedback after this, who do they reach out to? Anyone can send an email to Brandy Fox through the district website, and it will be forward to the planning team and included in the planning process. There is also a plan to include a real-time survey at the next set of outreach sessions in the spring. There will be two phases of outreach to gather input: this one (need-focused) and another in the spring (plan approach-focused).
- :: Consider using Google forms or Schoology to get feedback from students who aren't able to attend the outreach meetings. The survey can be divided by class or by the whole student body.
- :: In addition to the survey, students can be a conduit for comments and may even implement the survey. The student representatives on the FPC can also take comments from students.

Educational Program Space

- :: The robotics team and the school as a whole need to have a shop. The current shop space is too small. Programs like robotics are getting bigger. Additional space is needed for safety and for programs to grow. Discussions about "career-building" and "skill building opportunities" are too broad. What is specifically needed is a shop.
- :: Consider integrating hands-on skills programs into the middle school and even into the elementary schools. All students should have the opportunity to create in a physical way.
- :: The radio station program is growing. The radio program classroom is remote from the station, which is not good. It should be located next to the radio station studio. The studio itself is okay.
- :: Program facilities for highly capable students are really important. More resources should be put into expanding what is possible for highly capable students.

:: There should be better cross-pollination of programs. The special education area feels like it is the corner and remote. It doesn't feel like part of the student body. The arts and music program is also somewhat separate, but it is nice to have a separate space for that program.

Collaborative / Shared Spaces

- :: Provide shared spaces throughout the school to accommodate places for students to collaborate and work together. The new middle school building has shared open spaces that are good places for students to work and collaborate.
- :: The high school does have some collaborative spaces (commons, library, etc.), but these are not well utilized. They are centralized and not near the classrooms, and would be better used if distributed throughout the school.
- :: There should be other spaces for kids to have a more quiet and pleasant experience for socializing and studying. Food is not allowed in the library and the commons is too crazy and loud.
- : Students sometimes go to teacher offices, or use window seats or ramps to make their own spaces to hang out. Many students eat lunch in the classrooms.
- : It would be helpful to have more bench seating in the hallways throughout the school. It would be nice to have places to sit.
- :: It is common for students to hang out at the public library after school, and them come back to school for later activities. It would be nice if the school library was open later so students could stay there after school instead of having to leave.
- :: Principal Vicki Puckett noted that students must be supervised at all times (on campus). This limits number of spaces that can be used for gathering. There are also custodial issues; it is consistently difficult for kids to pick up after themselves in shared spaces like the commons. Currently, the school is exploring pulling out some locker bays and putting in seating alcoves in the hallways for students.

Restrooms

- :: More gender-neutral bathrooms should be provided throughout the school. As a queer student, it can take 15+ minutes to find the right bathroom, depending on where you are in the school.
- :: Renovate the 100 and 200 hall bathrooms to be more like the 300 hall bathrooms. It is hard to find a bathroom that is available. If bathrooms are nicer, students will treat them better.
- :: Make the gaps in the stall doors better. They are too big.
- :: The commons bathroom has many stalls, but the hallway bathrooms are too small.

Food Service

- :: There should be a more streamlined system for getting lunch. Currently, there are long lines to get lunch and not enough space to get through.
- : There are two lines for lunch, which gets confusing. There should be a divider. Students have their backpacks with them in line, which further cramps the space.
- :: There should be more food options on or close to campus. It is too expensive to get a balanced meal in the lunchroom.

Building Environment

- : There should be more windows and skylights to bring in more natural light. There is very little light in some classrooms. It is much easier to learn in the new classrooms because they have a lot more light.
- : The auditorium is not conducive for a performance arts experience. As the program grows, it would be nice for kids to be able to experience this to its fullest.
- : There is a desire to have the acoustic benefits of the middle school band room in the high school music spaces also.
- : There should be consistent heating across the facility. Right now there are great variations in temperature, including the "furnace" bathrooms. It is hard to know what to wear throughout the day.

Parking

- :: Rethink parking lots and sidewalks to be safer for students.
- :: There should be more parking for students at the high school. Even as a senior, the parking system is still terrible. Many kids have to spend 10-15 minutes walking to school every day.
- :: It can take up to 10 minutes to get out of the parking lot. There is only one entrance and exit; adding another exit would help a lot.
- :: Other students feel that the parking situation is not that bad.
- :: The pavement from Northwood to the high school is dangerous when it snows and should be salted.

Crest Learning Center

- :: There are a lot of students that take online courses. There should be a space for students to work on online classes other than in the commons.
- :: Crest is a great facility but needs renovations. The Crest classrooms are not to the same standard as other classrooms.
- :: Crest currently doesn't have a paved path to the front door now that there is a single entry, which seems weird. It didn't used to be this way. Principal Vicki Puckett noted that since students had a concern about this, a gravel path was added.

Other Facilities

- :: There should be more garden space at the elementary schools.
- :: The reliance on portable classrooms at the elementary school is too heavy. Students feel more a part of the community if they are not in a portable classroom.
- :: The old Islander Middle School buildings are adequate. They have better shared spaces than the high school and have some nooks. The gigantic common area in the 100 building is nice.
- :: The middle school has already had a large expansion recently.
- :: Mary Wayte Pool hasn't received major changes since the cretaceous extinction. It is not a facility that is pleasant to be in. Replacement of this facility should be considered. This building seems to be in the worst condition.

Page 4 of 4

Student Planning Goals

The following goals were developed from MIHS student comments during an outreach session on January 15th, 2020. Goals refer to MIHS unless otherwise noted. The list of goals will continue to be updated as more student input is received.

PROGRAM

- > Provide hands-on shop space at the high school (for robotics and other skill-building programs)
- > Locate the radio program classroom adjacent to the radio station studio
- > Allow for more cross-pollination of programs at the high school (especially special education)
- > Provide dedicated space for the highly capable program
- > Expand hands-on opportunities at the middle school and elementary school levels
- > Provide more spaces for students to work on online classes other than in the Crest commons

COLLABORATIVE / SHARED SPACES

- > Provide shared spaces throughout the school to accommodate student collaboration
- > Provide spaces for socializing and studying
- > Provide bench seating in the hallways throughout the school
- > Extend school library hours to be open after school

BUILDING ENVIRONMENT

- > Provide more windows and skylights to bring in natural light
- > Improve heating system so that it provides consistent heating across the facility
- > Improve acoustics in the band room and the auditorium
- > Renovate the Crest facility (classrooms are not to the same standard as other classrooms)

BUILDING SERVICES

- > Develop a more streamlined system for the lunch line (faster, more space)
- > Provide more food options on or close to campus (not the lunch line)
- > Provide more gender-neutral bathrooms distributed throughout the school
- > Renovate the 100 and 200 hall bathrooms to be more like the 300 hall bathrooms
- > Fix bathroom stall doors to minimize the gaps

PARKING & SITE

- > Rethink parking lots and sidewalks to make them safer for students
- > Provide more parking for students at the high school
- > Improve the configuration of existing student parking lot (add a second exit)
- > Provide a paved walkway to the front door of Crest

OTHER FACILITIES

- > Provide more garden space at the elementary schools
- > Decrease reliance on portable classrooms at the elementary schools
- > Replace Mary Wayte Pool



MEETING MINUTES

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 |
|--|---|-------------|-------------------------------|
| DATE: | 20 January 2020 | FILE NAME: | Community Outreach Mtg_200115 |
| SUBJECT: | Community Outreach Meeting | | |
| MEETING DATE: | 15 January 2020 | TIME: | 6:00 - 8:00 pm |
| LOCATION: | Northwood Elementary School Quiet Dining R | oom | |
| ATTENDEES: | | | |
| Community Mem | bers | | |
| Marie Bender, R | esident | | |
| Bill Hochberg, C | Sitizen | | |
| Patrick Jordan, | Parent | | |
| Leslie McKelvie | | | |
| Lucia Pirzio-Bir | oliizeli | | |
| Suzanne Skone | Chamber of Commerce | | |
| Ren Yuthok, Citi | zen | | |
| Tsering Yuthok | Short, Parent | | |
| MISD Support Tea Donna Colosky, | ım MISD Superintendent | | |
| Ty Bergstrom, N | AISD Executive Director of Finance | | |
| Tony Kuhn, MIS | D Director of Maintenance & Operations | | |
| Brandy Fox, Ow | ner's Representative, CPM | | |
| Mahlum Team LeRoy Landers Jennifer Lubin JoAnn Wilcox | | | |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On January 15th, 2020, members of the planning team held a community outreach session to get community input on the long-range planning process, goals, and needs. Separate outreach sessions will garner community and staff input. There will be another set of outreach sessions in the spring that will focus on long-range plan approaches. The meeting was open to all members of the community.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

LeRoy Landers reviewed the long-range planning process and schedule, as well as the vision and goals developed by the district and Facility Planning Committee (FPC). A brief overview of district need was provided, covering the areas of educational program, capacity and enrollment, and facility condition. A copy of the complete presentation and other detailed background information can be found on the district website.

COMMUNITY INPUT

The following comments were made by community members attending the outreach session. These comments have been summarized into a list of goals (attached) that will be presented to the Facility Planning Committee and taken into consideration during the long-range planning process.

Vision & Goals

- :: Robotics is a student-led program. It provides an opportunity to motivate and prepare kids for the world of technology. Students can see the pay-off of math and science education, which motivates them to study harder and further a career in STEM. There are a lot of kids in the program that are not getting great grades elsewhere, but they are loving what they are doing. That type of energy can get them motivated. Robotics is part of a national phenomena (First Robotics). Students want to learn more, make things, and compete. The district should step up and provide the resources for this program. The current room for tools is very small.
- :: MISD is a small school district in a small community with a finite budget and ebbs and flows in population. We should think about a school district differently: not as a silo but integrated with the city and other services. For example, develop a theater program that serves both the district and the community. Consider handing over management of district buildings to be managed by the city, so that the district can focus on education, or consider a shared office for city and district administration.
- :: In view of the two failed bond issues, whatever is proposed needs to be financially feasible. LeRoy noted that the intention currently is not building toward a capital measure; it is more about understanding need and what, if anything, makes sense to address the need.
- :: Hands-on skills are important. An ideal school would include areas to teach life skills, such as cooking, financial planning, etc.
- : Provide spaces that the community can use for meetings and recreational / sports activities.
- :: Schools should 'speak' to the neighborhoods in which they preside. School facilities need to be seen in a context and need to fit into the community.
- :: How do you respond to changes in the future? For example, 3D printers are big now but will not be in five years. LeRoy responded that conceptually, considerations around flexibility and adaptability can address this at a planning level. The more detailed level of building design is not part of long-range planning.
- :: Replace the pool.
- :: There should be more high schoolers biking to school instead of driving.

Educational Programs

- :: The robotics program needs more space. There should be a space for practicing (approximately 20' x 20' arena); currently have to go practice elsewhere. These kids have a business team: they do marketing, management, and have an alliance with a special education robotics team. This program is building our kids for the future. It connects a whole bunch of pieces of curriculum, and is an extension of the desire for hands-on skills.
- :: There is a desire to see robotics pushed down to the middle school and elementary school levels. There is a middle school robotics team now and there are competitions available for younger kids also. There is a huge opportunity to grab those kids. This program meets the goal of inclusion; it pulls in all kinds of kids. Superintendent Donna Colosky noted that MISD also has robotics embedded in the curriculum across the whole K-12 continuum.
- :: There is a need for unprogrammed space that can be flex space. This space could be used for the Destination Imagination program. Kids need to be able to get messy and stretch beyond structured limits.

Capacity & Enrollment

- :: What about year-to-year fluctuations in enrollment? LeRoy noted that the district does annual tracking and adjustments based on current conditions.
- :: Does the enrollment projection ignore arrival of mass transit arriving in 2023? There is concern that the number of kids per resident may increase significantly. Ty Bergstrom noted that the current enrollment projection *does* include this consideration and the District will track and assess any changes, and may need to adjust projections if there is a major swing in the enrollment.
- :: Have we examined the student population and the apartments on the north end? That is where they would see the growth. Yes, the demographer considered this. The enrollment report is available on the website.
- :: Is it possible for the long-range plan to build in flexibility? For example, when schools were not fully used, they were used as housing.
- :: The current school levy retires in 2022. Levies are up for renewal every 4-6 years. Capital improvements would be a separate bond issue.
- :: Is it better to delay decisions until changes happen (such as light rail) or adjust/make changes along the way? LeRoy noted that the core planning approaches will be put out to the broader community and they will either corroborate or not. The long-range plan starts to set a framework with regard to how the district and the board can start thinking about strategies for facility management. Having a plan in place will help the district plan for the future.
- :: There is a strong history of collaboration in the Mercer Island community. Let's think big and think of integrating the city together with the district, so they can be flexible to evolve as programs change. Create synergies. The district should be liaising with the city and planning committee.
- :: Transportation is important for both safety and health. Address climate change and make bike transportation safe around the Island. Reduce the number of cars on the Island.
- :: Four new portables were put up at West Mercer Elementary after Northwood Elementary was completed. Are these being used, the plan was supposed to be getting rid of portables? It was noted by the district that these portables are fully utilized.

Page 3 of 4

Facility Condition (Physical Condition & Educational Adequacy)

- :: Replace the Mary Wayte Pool facility. The existing facility should just be torn down. It is uniformly viewed negatively in the community. However, it is needed as the community pool and the high school pool.
- :: Acoustics are important and particularly critical in learning spaces.
- :: West Mercer Elementary School is a former wetland. You can hear water coursing under the site during a rainstorm.
- :: Consider if the district should build larger classrooms in the future. Thinking about the square foot per student metric and whether the new middle school classrooms are working at the size they were designed? They were planned at the smaller size option rather than the bigger option.
- :: What about playgrounds and landscaping? It was noted that this is part of a long-range facilities plan. There are some FPC goals around these topics.
- : The district should encourage kids to bike to school instead of driving. This is a paradigm shift that we need to encourage kids to think about. How about charging students to park at school?

Next Steps & Comments / Questions

- :: The long-range planning process should encourage ways to take a different path.
- :: It is surprising that sustainability did not get a lot of votes from the FPC. LeRoy explained that the group that voted assumed that sustainability would already be included as a priority, and this will be recognized in the planning process.
- :: It would be worthwhile for the district to do a large-scale survey to see if the community agrees with what the Committee thinks, similar to what the city does (1,500+ people). LeRoy noted that there will be a real-time survey of larger community in the next round of community meetings and also an online survey that is open to the broader community.
- :: It is important to communicate to the broader community through other means beyond the district's website and social media, to reach a wider audience. Consider using Nextdoor to tell people what is going on. The planning process should not get ahead of what the community knows and decides.
- :: When is the second outreach meeting going to happen? LeRoy noted that the first community meeting was cancelled due to weather and has not yet been rescheduled.
- :: When will presentation incorporating tonight's goals be available on the website? Brandy Fox noted that it will be available shortly after next the planning meeting, around January 28th.

Community Planning Goals

The following goals were developed from community member comments during an outreach session on January 15th, 2020, and additional emailed comments. The list of goals will continue to be updated as more community input is received.

PROGRAM

- > Provide robotics facilities that meet short-term and long-term program goals (increase space)
- > Expand curriculum for engineering and S.T.E.M. at all levels in the district
- > Provide more unprogrammed "messy" space, including maker space and tools
- > Promote student-led curriculum programs
- > Provide space to acquire life skills at school (cooking, financial planning, etc.)
- > Create facilities that help kids learn more, make things, and compete
- > Evaluate if recently built classrooms are appropriately sized

FLEXIBILITY & ADAPTABILITY

- > Look to the future and prepare to respond to changes that are still unknown
- > Plan for changes in technology on the horizon

FACILITIES

- > Put sustainability at the forefront of development plans (for example, roofs should be constructed with solar panels or be solar panel ready and no fossil fuel infrastructure)
- > Consider acoustical performance
- > Replace Mary Wayte Pool

TRANSPORTATION

> Encourage biking rather than driving to school (and provide infrastructure)

COMMUNITY USE

- > Balance community use space across the Island
- > Schools should be seen in the context of the neighborhood (fit and beauty)

CONNECTIONS & PROCESS

- > Consider district and city synergies: integration opportunities and community priorities
- > Consider the district and city as one (city manages facilities / district manages education)
- > Connect to Island planning initiatives
- > Recognize that financial affordability is paramount for the long-range plan



MEETING MINUTES

| PROJECT: | Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan | PROJECT NO: | 2019911.00 |
|---------------|---|-------------|-------------------------------|
| DATE: | 23 January 2020 | FILE NAME: | Staff Outreach Meeting_200122 |
| SUBJECT: | Staff Outreach Meeting | | |
| MEETING DATE: | 22 January 2020 | TIME: | 4:15 – 6:15 pm |
| LOCATION: | Northwood Elementary School Quiet Dining Roor | n | |
| | | | |

ATTENDEES:

| MISD Staff Members |
|--|
| Dave Bentley, Music Teacher (IMS / MIHS) |
| Parker Bixby, Music Teacher (MIHS) |
| Kristina Getty, First Grade Teacher (Lakeridge) |
| Brian Lawrence, Music Teacher (IMS / MIHS) |
| Katie McConn, English Teacher (MIHS) |
| Alida Mendes, CCR Teacher (MIHS) |
| Jessica Olson, Second Grade Teacher (Lakeridge) |
| John Parker, Theater Tech Specialist (MIHS) |
| Annalise Rockow, Music Teacher (IMS / MIHS) |
| Trina Sherman, Second Grade Teacher (Northwood) |
| Kyle Thompson, Music Teacher (IMS / MIHS) |
| Chantel Torrey, Art Teacher (MIHS) |
| MISD Support Team |
| Ty Bergstrom, MISD Executive Director of Finance |
| Tony Kuhn, MISD Director of Maintenance & Operations |
| Brandy Fox, Owner's Representative, CPM |
| Mahlum Team |
| Becky Hutchinson |
| Jennifer Lubin |
| JoAnn Wilcox |
| |

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

On January 22nd, 2020, members of the planning team held a staff outreach session to get teacher and staff input on the long-range planning process, goals, and needs. Separate outreach session were held to garner student and community input. There will be another set of outreach sessions in the spring that will focus on long-range plan approaches. The meeting was open to all MISD staff members.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

JoAnn Wilcox reviewed the long-range planning process and schedule, as well as the vision and goals developed by the district and Facility Planning Committee (FPC). A brief overview of district need was provided, covering the areas of educational program, capacity and enrollment, and facility condition. A copy of the complete presentation and other detailed background information can be found on the district website.

STAFF INPUT

The following comments were made by community members attending the outreach session. These comments have been summarized into a list of goals (attached) that will be presented to the Facility Planning Committee and taken into consideration during the long-range planning process.

Vision & Goals

- :: MIHS: General Classrooms
 - The average classroom at the high school hasn't been updated since 1995. There is new technology coming in, but there is not the space or infrastructure to accommodate it.
 - The design of classrooms in the recent high school additions is good; existing classrooms should be brought up to the same level as the most recent modernization.
 - Improve classrooms to be more flexible and better accommodate collaboration (furniture, storage, and area).
- :: MIHS: College & Career Readiness (robotics, art, broadcast, etc.)
 - The art rooms at the high school are too small (all three) and don't have enough electricity.
 - The robotics/CCR classroom is too small and is not a good proportion for teaching.
 - The robotics program has a lot of space needs (tools need to be out, etc.), and the existing space was not designed as a shop. It does not have adequate ventilation or the ability to lock up tools.
- :: MIHS: Theater & Music
 - Reimagine the Performing Arts Center (PAC) as a districtwide space. Currently there is not a space that supports these needs adequately. The existing PAC is used as a venue for all grades (all-grades choir concert, increasing use for showcases, MS drama) as schedule allows, and there has been interest in increasing this. It is also used currently for districtwide professional development.
 - Increase the size of the PAC. The existing theater and stage are too small. The existing theater seats approximately 535- 650, depending on stage size/usage), and the existing stage can fit an 80-piece band with the apron. A new facility should have 800-850 seats (about half of the student body) and a stage sized to accommodate 110 seated performers. This is based on looking at enrollment and program growth.

Page 2 of 5

- Improve suitability in the PAC. This space needs to have modern stagecraft technology, so students can learn how to use industry-standard equipment, and improved acoustical treatment.
- Improve the flow of the PAC. The current configuration with only two entries at the upper back is not good for flow or seating.
- Provide a blackbox theater with 150-200 seats. One-third of the high school plays should be in a smaller venue like this. This space could also be used as the drama classroom and would improve availability and reduce conflicts with PAC usage.
- There is a new dance program this year that doesn't have a classroom and is currently held on the stage. It needs a dance studio or shared use with a drama classroom or blackbox theater.
- :: MIHS: Other
 - The heating system at the high school is not good and should be improved. Currently, some rooms are very hot and some are very cold. Many students bring blankets and have to wear layers.
 - Teachers share classrooms at the high school and may use two or three different classrooms. Providing consistent technology between classrooms would make this much easier. The new classrooms are very different from the old classrooms.
 - Cell reception is bad, which is a safety concern.
 - Make learning environments more healthy for students. Think about what is happening in the room and make it safe and efficient.
- :: Islander Middle School
 - Is there a phase two planed for IMS? Brandy Fox noted that question is part of this long-range planning discussion.
 - Consider adding a small blackbox theater at the middle school. When the middle school was remodeled, a performance space was lost. The current space being used as a replacement is not good (can't make it dark). It doesn't currently work to use the high school due to scheduling.
 - The new middle school building has phenomenal collaboration spaces and good lighting.
- :: Elementary Schools
 - The collaborative learning spaces at Northwood have not been used as much as imagined, primarily because there is not enough supervision. Consider limiting those spaces and making the classrooms larger so that collaboration can be accommodated within the classroom.
 - The "cut-out space" within the classrooms at Northwood is most successful if it is located away from the hallway. There is reduced privacy and safety if it is located up against the hallway window.
 - At Lakeridge, there are not spaces for kids who are escalated that are still within eyesight of the teacher.
 - Lakeridge restrooms do not have a good sightlines and currently one set of bathrooms is shared between three grade levels, with kindergarten and first grade classrooms away. Consider dedicated restrooms for kindergarten and first grade.
 - Improve cleanability of surfaces in lower grades.

Page 3 of 5

- The extensive windows in the classrooms at Northwood are great for natural light, but can get very hot in the afternoon.
- Provide dedicated visual arts spaces at the elementary schools, as well as upgraded space at the middle school and high school.
- There should be increased privacy for school counselors and psychologists. At Northwood, these areas are on the main hallway and there are acoustical issues (stairwells are very loud).
- Consider redistribution of space at the older elementary schools to be more like the Northwood model. It is easier for elementary teachers to collaborate if they can be located in the same area.

Educational Programs

- :: More space is needed for special education services. There should be more intentionality about the environment/set-up and distribution, rather than just using whatever room happens to be empty. These rooms should be designed to fit the specific need.
- :: There should be dedicated spaces for state-mandated individualized testing (WA kids).
- :: There should be dedicated spaces for professional coaches, located at every elementary building.
- :: Teacher offices at the high school should be better utilized. Ideally offices would have a stronger connection to classrooms, similar to the recently updated science wing configuration. Provide more intentionality to make offices collaborative spaces for students and teachers.
- :: The "average" classroom, where students spend most of their time, is often forgotten. Existing high school classrooms do not feel like spaces of learning. The paint color is bad, there are small or no windows, and the size/configuration does not accommodate collaboration well. Its distracting how sterile these spaces are.
- :: Provide acoustical treatment for all music spaces throughout the district.
- :: The Adult Transition Program is currently located at Crest and it should be relocated elsewhere.
- :: Northwood is set up well safety-wise for athletics and extracurriculars. It is good having a separate gym and cafeteria.
- :: Provide support for specialized classrooms: must have adequate space to have safety in shops, art rooms, etc.
- :: It was noted by a chemistry teacher (not present) that there is not enough room in the new science labs or they may not have an optimal set up.

Capacity & Enrollment

:: No comments.

Facility Condition (Physical Condition & Educational Adequacy)

- :: The Administration Building is in bad condition.
- :: Reiterate that the comment about high school classrooms that is in the presentation is important: all the classrooms have cabinets that are not used (don't need textbook storage anymore and need more open space instead). It was noted by an elementary teacher that elementary classrooms still need the cabinets. Having whiteboards on the front of storage cabinets, like at Northwood, works well.

Page 4 of 5

- :: New technology takes up space and is not well accommodated in the older classrooms at all levels.
- : A large auditorium does not accommodate smaller drama performances well. It would be good to have a separate blackbox theater to accommodate smaller performances.
- :: For music programs, there is a desire to be able to divide the large auditorium (shrink it down to feel smaller with front audience and back audience areas). This would allow the space to be more useful for multiple programs.
- :: Parking at the high school is difficult when all elementary staff gets together, which happens at least once a month.
- :: The high school has a few courtyards. One is never used and the one by administration is well used.
- :: Elementary schools need a space for indoor recess that is not in the classroom, and more undercover options. Currently at Northwood, students have quiet time in the hallways if they need to stay inside.
- :: Maintain the gardening space at Lakeridge. Have a gardening club and community uses all summer.

Next Steps & Comments / Questions

- :: When will we see blueprints?
 - JoAnn Wilcox noted that the facility master plan will not result in any building designs. It is a highlevel planning exercise to allow the district to understand how to address need over time. When it gets closer to the time to implement a specific project, then building design will happen. The longrange plan is not driving a bond measure and the specific timeline for implementation is not known at this time.
 - Tony Kuhn noted that the long-range plan can also inform the allocation of levy dollars in the nearterm. These funds can be used for some of the small projects that are identified, such as replacing furniture. The long-range plan also provides information to help determine prioritization of projects in the near term, so funds are not spent on projects that are planned to be replaced.

Staff Planning Goals

The following goals were developed from MISD staff member comments during an outreach session on January 22nd, 2020, and additional emailed comments. The list of goals will continue to be updated as more staff input is received.

MIHS: GENERAL CLASSROOMS

- > Bring all high school classrooms up to the standard of the classrooms in the recent additions
- > Improve classrooms to be more flexible and better accommodate collaboration
- Provide a technological and aesthetic remodel for older classrooms (lighting, furniture, windows/window coverings, etc.)
- > Provide consistent technology between classrooms to facilitate shared use by different teachers
- Provide rooms and furniture designed specifically for blocks and co-teaching that can thoughtfully hold large groups of students

MIHS: COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS

- Provide specialized spaces that meet the needs of specialized programs, including adequate support (power and storage) and enough space to create a safe environment
- > Increase the size of all high school art rooms
- > Increase the size of the robotics/CCR classroom and lab

MIHS: THEATER & MUSIC

- Reimagine the Performing Arts Center: increase capacity (800-850 seats), increase stage (110 seated performers), optimize sightlines, improve the functionality/flow, provide modern stagecraft technology, and improve acoustics
- Provide a dedicated teaching space for drama classes, etc. that is separate from the theater (blackbox theater)
- > Provide teaching space for the dance program (shared use of drama classroom or blackbox theater)
- > Consider versatility of spaces for performances

MIHS: OTHER

- > Provide spaces for student interaction that are close to classrooms (not the cafeteria)
- > Provide space for teacher collaboration
- > Provide adequately-sized teacher offices
- > Reconfigure teacher offices to have a stronger connection to the classrooms
- > Address climate control and temperature regulation
- > Improve cell reception (safety issue)



Staff Planning Goals

The following goals were developed from MISD staff member comments during an outreach session on January 22nd, 2020, and additional emailed comments. The list of goals will continue to be updated as more staff input is received.

DISTRICTWIDE

- > Provide facility upgrades at older schools (technology and aesthetics)
- > Implement "22nd century" updates throughout the district
- > Improve indoor air quality and provide healthy environments
- > Provide classrooms sized to accommodate project-based learning
- > Provide acoustical treatment for all music spaces throughout the district
- > Relocate the Adult Transition Program out of the Crest facility

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: CLASSROOMS

- > Provide larger elementary classrooms, to allow supervision of collaboration and pull-out activities
- > Provide collaboration space within the classrooms
- > Reconfigure older elementary schools to create classroom clusters (similar to Northwood)
- > Provide dedicated visual arts classrooms at the elementary schools

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: OTHER AREAS

- > Provide more space and intentionality (function and distribution) for special education services
- > Provide dedicated spaces for state-mandated individualized testing and professional coaches
- > Provide distributed deescalation spaces that can be supervised
- > Provide calming spaces for students
- > Improve privacy for administration and counselor areas
- > Provide dedicated restrooms for kindergarten and first grade classrooms
- > Provide sightline supervision of bathrooms
- > Address cleanability of surfaces and materials at the elementary schools

ISLANDER MIDDLE SCHOOL

> Provide a dedicated drama space for teaching and performances at the middle school





1. Review Vision and Goals of District and Facility Planning Committee

2. Develop an Understanding of Facility-Related Need

3. Receive Input and Answer Any Questions You May Have

Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan

15 January 2020

WELCOME!

> Please sign in

MERCER ISLAND

SCHOOL DISTRICT

IDENTS ARE THE PRIOR

- > Turn off your cell phones or place on "stun"
- > Introduce yourself to someone you don't know

MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENTS ARE THE PRIORITY





What is a Long-Range Facility Plan?

Comprehensive summary of facility-related need

- > Studies district facilities' ability to accommodate educational programs
- > Tracks district's capacity with respect to projected enrollment
- > Documents the physical condition of district's facilities and sites

Tool for strategic management of district facilities over time

- > Explores renovations, modernizations, additions, replacement, and new construction
- > Identifies desirable school sites and site acquisition schedules if needed
- > Targets opportunities for more efficient use of sites and facilities
- > Creates a prioritized plan that reflects community values and is in alignment with community support















MISD OE -1 Fundamentals



- Create a personalized learning environment where differentiated instruction, student-1. centered education and varied learning opportunities are responsive to students' strengths, needs, interests and passions.
- 2 Maintain the highest learning standards in the areas of fine arts; health and physical fitness; English language arts; mathematics; financial education; science; environment and sustainability; social studies; world languages; computer science; and educational technology
- Develop self-awareness, empathy, emotional/social intelligence, responsible decision-3 making and citizenship.

Facility Planning Committee Goals

| VISD Core Values, Vision & Mission | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|--|--|
| CORE VALUES | VISION | MISSION | | |

Students are the priority. We believe in:

- Supporting the whole child
- Creating inclusive and equitable learning settings
- Ensuring our school communities are safe and supportive Providing rigorous and
- challenging learning

| Inspiring our students to be lifelong learners as they create their futures. | Mercer Island School District will foster learning by engaging students in thinking critically, solving problems creatively, and working collaboratively. |
|--|--|

MISD OE -1 Fundamentals



- Encourage and enable students to be academic entrepreneurs and risk-takers who can 4. choose to pursue academic passions and interests beyond traditional curriculum and beyond the traditional classroom environment.
- 5. Cultivate and foster thinking and process skills such as analytical and critical thinking, cross-discipline thinking, creativity, innovation, leadership, collaboration, communication, problem-solving, and information and technology literacy in curriculum design.
- Cultivate global awareness and understanding of real-world problems, issues, concerns, 6 commonalities, differences and interdependence.
- Foster and embrace diversity, inclusiveness, and equity with a focus on respect and acceptance of every student.

Facility Planning Committee Goals

Athletics [18 votes total]

> Improve gymnasium / athletic spaces (13 votes > Provide for safe and controllable community use [4 votes]

Program [15 votes total]

> Provide next-generation project-based learning labs for science [5 votes] > Dedicate space for art 15 votes

- Outdoor Space [14 votes total]
- > Rethink outdoor spaces (for use during the rainy season) [8 votes] > Provide diverse opportunities at recess (active/passive; play/learning) [3 votes]

Occupational Learning [9 votes total]

> Provide more opportunities for occupational learning [6 votes]

Facility Planning Committee Goals

Safety [33 votes total]

- > Improve traffic impact around schools [12 votes > Locate all students under one roof /9 w
- > Plan for safer pedestrian / bike access to school [4 votes]
- Flexibility & Adaptability of Spaces (26 votes total)
- > Provide built-in, flexible, and adaptable spaces (10
- > Rethink libraries [9 vote
- > Plan for future enrollment and flexible use in the interim [7 votes]

Diversity of Space to Support Learning [21 votes total]

- > Provide small, collaborative spaces throughout the schools (11 votes) > Support the whole student /5 votes
- > Preserve quiet study space in the high school [3 votes]





Mercer Island Community Goals

"Put sustainability at the forefront of development plans. For example, roofs should be constructed with solar panels, or at least be solar panel ready. No

- MISD Community Member















Average Life Cycle in Years

| Permanent Structure | 55 | Interior Construction | 15 |
|---------------------|----|-----------------------|----|
| Portable | 25 | Interior Renovation | 10 |
| Foundation | 50 | Ceiling Finish | 10 |
| Frame | 50 | Plumbing | 20 |
| Floor Covering | 15 | HVAC | 20 |
| Computer Flooring | 10 | Electrical | 20 |
| Exterior Walls | 50 | Fire System | 25 |
| Elevators | 20 | | ? |

Source: Government Finance Officers Association

Facility Condition: Maintenance

Reference Documents (Maintenance & Renovation)

Study and Survey Update: Mercer Island School District BLRB Architects September, 2018



Seismic

Mercer Island Middle School (pre-2016)

Structural logrades: 1995 Condition: Not considered a concern for collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Islander Middle School (new wing)

Upgrades: Building completed 2016 Condition: Conforms with current code requirements.

Mercer Island High School Structural Upgrades: 1997 and 2013 Condition: In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, damage may exceed that which is repairable. While portions of the building were seismically upgraded in the 1990's, it is recommended that roof/wall connections at the gymnasium b improved when future construction work is performed in these areas.

Seismic

Island Park Elementary Upgrades

Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Condition: Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Lakeridge Elementary Upgrades:

1995 Condition: Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

Northwood Elementary

Upgrades: Condition: Building completed 2016 Conforms with current code requirements.

(Note: A Maximum Considered Earthquake event 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years.)

West Mercer Elementary

Upgrades: Condition: 1995 Not considered a concern for life safety or collapse, however, significant damage would be expected. In a Maximum Considered Earthquake event, this damage may exceed that which is repairable.

(Note: A Maximum Considered Earthquake event 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years.)

Source: Structural Evaluation Reports PCS Structural Solutions, November 21, 2011

Source: Structural Evaluation Reports PCS Structural Solutions, November 21, 2011



Facility Condition: Northwood ES



Facility Condition: Lakeridge ES



Significant Maintenance Needs Roof replacement Fencing repair/replacement Parking lot grind/asphalt ADA interior and exterior improvements Drainage improvements Stucco and CMU repairs Exterior paint Interior paint Flooring replacement Toilet partition replacement Furniture replacement , Boiler replacement Hot water tank replacement HVAC controls upgrade Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

Facility Condition: Islander MS



Facility Condition: West Mercer ES



Significant Maintenance Needs

Roof replacement Fencing repair/replacement Parking lot grin/dasphatl Drainage improvements ADA interior and exterior improvements Stucco and CMU repairs Exterior and Interior paint Flooring replacement Floring replacement Furniture replacement Boiler replacement HVAC controls upgrade Kitchen equipment and hood replacement

Facility Condition: Mercer Island HS



Facility Condition: Islander MS



Significant Maintenance Needs

Roof replacement (<u>critical</u> at 100/200 Building) Tollet partition replacement/ reconfiguration Fencing to create secure campus Bus loop asphalt replacement (<u>grind/overlay</u>) Bus loop lighting replacement Drainage improvements Stucco repair Exterior and interior paint HVAC equipment replacement HVAC controls upgrade Track and field replacement







Facility Condition: Administration Building



Significant Maintenance Needs Roof replacemen Parking lot grind / asphalt ADA improvements Drainage improvements Wood repair Exterior and interior paint Flooring replacement Toilet partition replacement / reconfiguration Furniture replacement Boiler replacement Hot water tank replacement HVAC controls upgrade Exhaust fan replacement Fire sprinkler installation



Facility Condition: Mary Wayte Pool





Significant Maintenance Needs Wood repair Exterior and interior paint ADA improvements at locker rooms Locker room renovation

Under contract for 2020-2021

Boiler replacement Hot water tank replacement Air handler replacement Ductwork replacement Circulation pump replacement Controls upgrade

Facility Condition: Support



Facility Condition: Educational Adequacy

Reference Documents (Educational Adequacy)

Study and Survey: Mercer Island School District BLRB Architects November, 2009

Facility Condition: Boys & Girls Club/PEAK





Educational Adequacy: Island Park ES

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria (1hr 20min/day)
- > "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas
- Centralized SPED area with new special education classroom and OT/PT therapy room
- General education classrooms are small and do not have sufficient storage; acoustic separation is poor
- > Multiple distributed sensory rooms or "safe spaces"
- > Multiple disconnected buildings
- > Administration area improvements
- Dedicated art/science classroom(s)
- Student restroom adjacent to kindergarten classrooms
- > Hard surface play too close to classrooms



Educational Adequacy



Example: impact of 5 sf / student



Educational Adequacy: Northwood ES

- > Direct access from health room to restroom ideal
- > Disruption of PE classes to access music room
- Acoustics are challenge in gym, dining, entry, and stairwells



Educational Adequacy: Lakeridge ES

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria
- "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas
 Students in modular cut through other classrooms to
- access restrooms and other support services

 Library utilized for guest speakers disrupts library
- function

 General education classrooms are small and do not
- have sufficient storage; acoustics separation is poor > Music room too far from stage, should be adjacent
- > Administration area improvements are needed
- > Dedicated art/science classroom(s)
- Student restroom adjacent to kindergarten classrooms
- > Hard surface play too close to classrooms



Educational Adequacy: Islander MS

- Multiple detached buildings create lack of connection between both students and programs
- > Common areas in the "Classic Building" are difficult to supervise
- Corridors need to accommodate small break-out spaces
- Reorganize classrooms in older buildings into effective, smaller, personalized learning communities
- > 300 Building science classrooms do not support STEM adequately and need more storage
- > Sound transfer between classrooms can be disruptive
- Provide a new school broadcast studio and editing room
- > Modernize library space and increase flexibility



Educational Adequacy: West Mercer ES

- > Need for separate gym and cafeteria
- "Flex spaces" and small group learning areas; ability to create two more "pods" would be highly desirable
- SPED areas are disjointed and should be better located; need for an additional classroom; acoustic separation is poor
- General education classrooms are too small and have inadequate storage
- > Library needs additional storage and more natural light
- > Administration area improvements
- > Playground is remote from cafeteria
- > Fields have poor drainage that limits use



Educational Adequacy: Mercer Island HS

"Think about the every-day aspects of the building and the regular old classrooms that most kids spend most of their time in and that seem long ignored and in need of major updates. Things like:

- > Lighting
- > Furniture
- > Windows and window coverings
- > Usage / layout of classroom space (so many unused cabinets...not enough whiteboards, etc).
- > Office spaces -- too many teachers are literally in storage closets
- > Places for students to actually interact with each other that's not a cafeteria (and really far away from our classrooms)
- Rooms / furniture designed specifically for blocks and co-teaching that can thoughtfully hold large groups of students
 Comfort, heat
- > Deliberate furniture and design for shared teaching spaces, since most of us do not have our own classrooms.*

– Mercer Island High School Teacher

Educational Adequacy: Mercer Island HS

- Older science classrooms should be larger to accommodate instruction
- Music programs continues to grow; additional space would be useful particularly for larger classes (band)
- Reconfigure and consolidate counseling and nurse's room to provide access and confidentiality
- > Provide separate black box theater to enhance drama program and all theater to be used by more programs
- Improve / replace theater technology sound, lighting, projection, curtain, and acoustics
- Reconfigure library into flexible learning spaces that will encourage better utilization by students and small groups
- Improvements and connectivity could be made to CCR programs (i.e. broadcast programs)





Educational Adequacy: Crest Learning Ctr.

- > Too small for programs currently housed
- > Need new larger greenhouse





71 COLUMBIA, FLOOR 4 | SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104 | (206) 441-4151 | MAHLUM.COM