



MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Mercer Island School District Long-Range Facility Plan Update
PROJECT NO: 2023902.00
DATE: 25 May 2023
FILE NAME: MM003_FPC3_230515
SUBJECT: **Facility Planning Committee Meeting 3: Plan Development**

MEETING DATE: 15 May 2023
TIME: 5:00 – 8:00 pm

LOCATION: Library, Mercer Island High School

ATTENDEES:

Facility Planning Committee

✓ Colin Brandt	– Linhui Hao	– Sandra Levin
– Debbie Burke	– Jenny Harrington	✓ Deborah Lurie
✓ Sophie Cartwright	– Ian Henry	✓ Brian Mock
✓ Julie Ogata Ciobanu	✓ Janelle Honeycutt	– Rich Nakatsu
– Jessica Clawson	✓ Andrew Howison	– Jamie Page
– Vickie Cleator	– Robyn Kimura Hsu	✓ Carrie Beckner Savage
✓ Susan Conrad-Wang	– Wen Hu	✓ Becky Shaddle
✓ Jennifer Crespi	✓ Ralph Jorgenson	✓ Toby Suhm
– Dave Cutright	– Jason Kitner	✓ Kim Thomas
– Marcus Engelman-Ost	– Kate Wise Knecht	✓ Lee Tortorelli
– Dan Glowitz	✓ Diana Lein	✓ Asha Woerner
✓ Matt Hall		

MISD Support Team

✓ Fred Rundle
✓ Matt Sullivan
✓ Tony Kuhn
✓ Andreeves Rosner
✓ Brandy Fox

Mahlum Architects

✓ LeRoy Landers
✓ David Mount
– Rebecca Hutchinson

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.

ITEM	DISCUSSION
1.1	<p>Welcome and agenda presented by LeRoy Landers of Mahlum Architects. Goals for the evening include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Understand recent bond and levy work that has been done in the District > Address topics from the last meeting > Review and further definition of potential projects and bond information > Develop preliminary long-range plan scenarios
1.2	<p>Fred Rundle reviewed recent bond and levy successes in the District, including projects from 2010 to the present.</p> <p>Committee member questions and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Is the PEAK Boys and Girls Club a 50-year lease and will it be renewed? <i>Yes, every year there is an interlocal to review operations.</i> > Is there a list of critical items that must be done now, similar to the Lakeridge roof? <i>Brandy noted that all three elementary schools need new roofs, carpeting, boilers, etc. These continue to be pushed off until the long-range planning is done. The District will make decisions regarding what needs to be done based on what is included in the long-range plan.</i> > Were audio and lighting included in the Performing Arts Center plan? <i>Andreeves noted that the audio work is underway with non-levy funds. Phase 1 of the lighting work has been completed and the sound console has been upgraded but the District is waiting on the acoustic report to determine further work.</i> > Deborah noted that although this committee is not a decision-making group, the Board and administration don't have any preconceptions going into this work. Community voices matter and need to be heard. The Committee needs to get to the best place and the Board appreciates the community processes that are brought to them. > Regarding Islander Middle School, the whole project was designed previously. Does that design still exist and make sense? <i>Brandy noted that it was not fully designed, but scenarios for a complete school were tested. The design is still valid but would likely be built at a smaller capacity due to declining enrollment.</i> > Was Northwood designed for an addition to increase enrollment? <i>Yes, a planned addition on the northwest side of the school would bring it up to approximately 600 students.</i>
1.3	<p>LeRoy shared back some of the ideas that came out of the last meeting (FPC2) and additional information related to those ideas. Topics included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Reflect support of performing and fine arts and CCR in the Planning Goals > Consider grade reconfiguration > Fencing at Islander Middle School > Bond scope and cost > Further definition of potential projects / improvements

Committee member questions and comments:

- > Does this group need to decide which schools need to go first? *You can provide input to the Board and they will decide. Your input is valuable to the District and the Board. They want to hear what makes sense to you as a community member and a taxpayer. However, your recommendation does not mean it is guaranteed to happen.*
- > How much does the Clean Buildings Act penalty cost? *Tony noted that \$1 per square foot of the building is the penalty for each facility.*
- > In 10 years, what is the elementary enrollment projected to be? *It is projected to be 1,550 students by 2033.*
- > How did you come up with the 450 and 600-student increments? Are these common school sizes or specific to Mercer Island? *The 450-student size represents the lower range to staff a full building without excessive fractional FTE. Facilities above 600 put pressure on resources and also begin to have issues with fractional FTE.*
- > Are elementary schools typically replaced while students remain on-site? *This varies by district. For districts where there is no 'swing' space, schools must be replaced while occupied. For several MISD sites, and Island Park in particular, it would be extremely difficult to do. A logistics premium is needed to address additional coordination and safety/security issues.*
- > Regarding the cost premium for occupied sites, shouldn't it be more for Island Park? *Every site is unique, and Island Park does have very difficult topography.*
- > Does constructing on an occupied site take longer to build? *Yes, it potentially can take longer because of the need for phased construction and alignment with the school year. It is site-specific. For Mercer Island, it does stretch the timeline out, which is part of the logistics premium. If spending money on a new 75-year facility, think about whether the existing building should limit the potential for your new school.*
- > In 2012, larger schools were a contentious issue and one of the challenges that led to that bond not passing. *Fred noted that as a principal, he would prefer a larger school because of staffing and program opportunities. The previous large school proposals were closer to 650 or 700, which is part of the reason 600 students was determined as the largest size.*
- > Why is the ADA work at Crest not required? *There is always the possibility that if the building is not in compliance, there is a potential for liability. It is also a question of equity. Deborah noted that there are kids that are not able to access the building for education – it is a significant issue.*
- > Do we need the \$3.8M logistics premium for high school and middle school? *No, the premium is already included for these projects.*
- > Can the full middle school enrollment be housed in the main building? *No, 903 students are projected at Islander Middle School and there are not enough classrooms to accommodate that number of students.*

1.4 Committee members were randomly organized into four table groups of 4-5 people and participated in a planning exercise to address the following questions:

- > Do you feel a bond is needed?
- > If YES, what should be done in the first bond?
- > How much would be supported by the MISD community for a bond?

The four Bond 1 scenarios resulting from the exercise are included at the end of this document for reference. It is important to note that these are preliminary exercises and do not represent a final bond plan. Three of the four scenarios are between \$260 - \$270 million and one scenario is around \$140 million. Two of the four scenarios include the middle school and an elementary school, one includes two elementary schools, and one includes the middle school only.

- > Table 1: 2-bond structure / \$264M. Replace Lakeridge for 600 students and all Lakeridge students swing to Island Park and Island Park students are distributed to other schools, resulting in only one move for kids. Also finish the middle school and renovate track. Plan to use Cap/Tech funding for MIHS program improvements. Added a cafeteria/gym at West Mercer because it is not getting replaced in Bond 1, so will be around longer. Shifting elementary students is important to do only once and do as a whole community. It is a lesson learned from Northwood.
- > Table 2: 2-bond structure / \$259M. Finish the middle school and replace one elementary school. We think this proposal would fail because it's too much money for the community, but it's also hard to put through a measure that only focuses on just the middle school or one elementary school.
- > Table 3: 3-bond structure / \$144M. We focused on the middle school because it needs to be completed from the previous bond and people want it. The middle school is also in the worst shape of all the facilities and impacts the greater community. This bond amount felt like it could be palatable to the community.
- > Table 4: 2-bond structure / \$275M. Replace two elementary schools (Lakeridge and West Mercer) and consolidate from four to three schools. We are looking at the fact that 75% of elementary students are in old facilities that need to be modernized. The middle school already has one new facility that everyone uses. We would also like to see a structural engineering report before committing to replacing the stadium seats/wall. We went all-in on the Crest/Admin work. We considered building the schools at 550 instead of 600 to reduce costs.

Additional Committee discussion:

- > Concern about making the bond about closing an elementary school. That could impact the bond's ability to succeed.
- > Just heard a community comment about not considering a bond unless consider closing an elementary school because of under-enrollment.
- > There should be a separate conversation about closing a school with the community that is not related to the bond.
- > Every group determined that Island Park Elementary is the one that should be closed.
- > There needs to be a lot of community discussion before any plan is finalized, no matter what bond plan is chosen. *There will be one more meeting with this committee to come to consensus around a plan proposal. Then a break over the summer and the Board will review. The plan is to do community outreach regarding the plan in the fall through a series of open houses to get community input.*
- > Does polling need to wait until the fall? There is already a lot of conversation, and the rumor mill has already started. It would be good for the District to get ahead of it.

- > Don't want to feel rushed as a parent. There should be time for people to think about and process the information. *Fred noted that the timeline for a bond is probably farther out than next year anyway. The current bond won't expire until 2028/29.*
- > Deborah noted that it's okay to take more than one proposal out to the community if needed.

- 1.5 LeRoy asked the group: If only one flagship project could be undertaken in the bond, which one should it be (middle school or elementary school)? From a show of hands, five chose the middle school and 11 chose the elementary school.
- 1.6 The next planning meeting is scheduled for June 5th and will wrap up plan development for the long-range facility plan. People should be thinking about two things prior to the next meeting: what level of community support is realistic and which project is the priority. It is very important that all Committee members come back for the next planning meeting, thank you!
- 1.7 A copy of the meeting presentation can be found on the District website, for additional information. The four bond scenarios developed during the meeting are included on the following pages.

MISD LRFP Update: FPC 3
15 May 2023

ROUND 1: BOND 1 EXERCISE

Table # 1

	Facility Replacement	Additional Needs		Regulatory Compliance	Condition-Related Improvements	Program-Related Improvements	Total by Facility
Island Park ES 1956	\$95.0M (450) OR \$121.0M (600)	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	\$0.6M	\$1.0M Connect buildings (for safety/security)	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	
Lakeridge ES 1953	\$118.5M	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	\$0.6M	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	Lakeridge leads to to IFE (@ 600) Cohort Shift
West Mercer ES 1964	\$93.4M (450) OR \$119.5M (600)	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	N/A In compliance	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	IFE student (some) move to WM + Northwood no one move for leads
IMS: 100/200 & 300 1958	\$95M	\$59M	OR:	N/A In compliance	\$1.9M Connect buildings (for safety/security)	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	
Mercer Island HS 1955				\$3.2M	\$16.3M	\$48.0M CCR, Science, Performing & Fine Arts, PE/Athletics, General Education, Support Areas	Cap/Tech to flow here
Crest Learning Center 1960s				N/A below size requirement	\$0.3M	\$1.5M Science, Fine Arts	
Administration Building 1966				N/A below size requirement	\$6.0M	N/A	
Total by Category	\$213.5M	\$5.9M		\$3.8M	\$42.6M	\$26.4M	2 Bond Structure

FOR REFERENCE:

\$40.0 M Bond 1: \$0 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$200.0 M Bond 1: \$0.59 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$264.0 M Bond 1: \$0.66 / \$1,000 AV increase
---	---	---

Note: Bond amounts are not intended as suggestions; they are only a reference point for relative taxation levels during planning discussions.

NOTES:

Costs shown are:

- Rough order of magnitude costs for planning purposes only
- Project costs that include construction, demo, site impr, and soft costs
- Escalated to 2028 (assumed midpoint of Bond 1)

Facilities not shown do not have bond-related needs:
Northwood Elementary School
IMS 400/800 Building
Kaiser Middle School

MISD LRFP Update: FPC 3
15 May 2023

**ROUND 1:
BOND 1 EXERCISE**

Table # 2

	Facility Replacement	Additional Needs		Regulatory Compliance	Condition-Related Improvements	Program-Related Improvements	Total by Facility
Island Park ES 1956	\$95.0M (450) OR \$121.0M (600)	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	0.6	\$1.0M <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	0.6
Lakeridge ES 1953	118.5	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	\$0.6M	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	118.5
West Mercer ES 1964	\$93.4M (450) OR \$119.5M (600)	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	N/A <small>In compliance</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	
IMS: 100/200 & 300 1958	95	5.9	OR:	N/A <small>In compliance</small>	\$1.9M <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	100.9
Mercer Island HS 1955				3.2	\$16.3 <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	18.0 <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	37.5
Crest Learning Center 1960s				N/A <small>Below size requirement</small>	0.3 <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	\$1.5M <small>Science, Fine Arts</small>	0.3
Administration Building 1966				N/A <small>Below size requirement</small>	\$1.3 <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	N/A	1.3
Total by Category							259.1

FOR REFERENCE:

\$40.0 M Bond 1: \$0 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$200.0 M Bond 1: \$0.59 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$264.0 M Bond 1: \$0.66 / \$1,000 AV increase
---	---	---

NOTES:
Costs shown are:
- Rough-order of magnitude costs for planning purposes only
- Project costs that include construction, demo, site impr., and soft costs
- Escalated to 2028 (assumed midpoint of Bond 1)
Facilities not shown do not have bond-related needs.

MUSD LRF Update: FPC 3
15 May 2023

**ROUND 1:
BOND 1 EXERCISE**
Table # 3

	Facility Replacement	Additional Needs	OR:	Regulatory Compliance	Condition-Related Improvements	Program-Related Improvements	Total by Facility
Island Park ES 1956	\$95.0M (450) OR \$121.0M (600)	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	.6	1	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	1.6
Lakeridge ES 1953	\$92.5M (450) OR \$118.5M (600)	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	\$0.6M	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	
West Mercer ES 1964	\$93.4M (450) OR \$119.5M (600)	\$3.8M Possible logistics premium (if needed)	OR:	N/A In compliance	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	
IMS: 100/200 & 300 1958	95	\$5.9M	OR:	N/A In compliance	\$1.9M Connect buildings (for safety/security)	N/A Address with Cap/Tech or replacement	100.9
Mercer Island HS 1955			OR:	3.2	16.3	20	39.5
Crest Learning Center 1960s			OR:	N/A Below size requirement	3	\$1.5M Science, Fine Arts	3
Administration Building 1966			OR:	N/A Below size requirement	1.3	N/A	1.3
Total by Category							143.6

FOR REFERENCE:

\$40.0 M Bond 1: \$0 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$200.0 M Bond 1: \$0.59 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$264.0 M Bond 1: \$0.66 / \$1,000 AV increase
---	---	---

NOTES:

- Costs shown are:
- Rough order of magnitude costs for planning purposes only
- Project costs that include construction, demo, site impr., and soft costs
- Escalated to 2028 (assumed midpoint of Bond 1)
- Facilities not shown do not have final costed results.

MIU LRP Update: FPC 3
15 May 2023

**ROUND 1:
BOND 1 EXERCISE**
Table # 4

	Facility Replacement	Additional Needs		Regulatory Compliance	Condition-Related Improvements	Program-Related Improvements	Total by Facility
Island Park ES 1956	\$95.0M (450) OR \$121.0M (600)	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	\$0.6M	\$1.0M <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	X
Lakeridge ES 1953	\$118.5	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	\$0.6M	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	118.5
West Mercer ES 1964	\$119	\$3.8M <small>Possible logistics premium (if needed)</small>	OR:	N/A <small>In compliance</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	119
IMS: 100/200 & 300 1958	\$95.0M	\$5.9M <small>Replace track and field (Required if building is replaced)</small>	OR:	N/A <small>In compliance</small>	\$1.9M <small>Connect buildings (for safety/security)</small>	N/A <small>Address with Cap/Tech or replacement</small>	
Mercer Island HS 1955				\$3.2M 3.2	\$20.4M <small>Theater/Lights (\$1.2M) 18.3M (\$1.4M)</small> 7M	\$48.0M <small>CDR Science</small> 20.8M	31
Crest Learning Center 1960s							
Administration Building 1966				N/A <small>Below size requirement</small>	\$6M 6M	N/A	6
Total by Category							274.5

FOR REFERENCE:

\$40.0 M Bond 1: \$0 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$200.0 M Bond 1: \$0.59 / \$1,000 AV increase	\$264.0 M Bond 1: \$0.66 / \$1,000 AV increase
---	---	---

NOTES:
Costs shown are:
- Rough order of magnitude costs for planning purposes only
- Project costs that include construction, demo, site impr., and soft costs
- Escalated to 2028 (assumed midpoint of Bond 1)