



MEETING MINUTES

**PROJECT:** Mercer Island School District  
Long-Range Facility Plan  
**PROJECT NO:** 2019911.00  
**DATE:** 06 April 2020  
**FILE NAME:** M005\_FPC5\_20200330  
**SUBJECT:** **Facility Planning Committee Meeting 5: Plan Finalization**

---

**MEETING DATE:** 30 March 2020  
**TIME:** 5:30 - 7:30 pm  
**LOCATION:** Remote Meeting via Zoom

---

**ATTENDEES:**

**Facility Planning Committee**

X David D'Souza	X Jim Stanton
X Deborah Lurie	X Bob Olson
X Julie Ogata Ciobanu	X Anne Hritzay
X Janelle Honeycutt	X Kathy Morrison
X Kristina Mehas	X Pat Turner
X Steve Duncan	X Lena Hardisty
X Amanda Stoffer	X Will Atkinson
X Kim Thomas	– Lin Hao
X Susan Conrad-Wang	X Robin Li
– Kate Wise Knecht	– Gus Poole
– Dave Cutright	X Sandra Levin
X Carrie Beckner Savage	X Becky Shaddle
X Colin Brandt	– Zach Houvener
– Vickie Cleator	X Tiffin Goodman
X David de Yarza	X Sgt. Ryan Parr
X Debbie Hanson	X Carol Gregory

**MISD Support Team**

X Donna Colosky  
– Fred Rundle  
– Erin Battersby  
X Andreeves Rosner  
– Craig Degginger  
– Tony Kuhn  
X Ty Bergstrom  
X Brandy Fox

**Mahlum Team**

X LeRoy Landers  
X Jennifer Lubin  
X 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 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 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 co-location 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

- 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.)

- :: 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

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IP-1	IP	HS/ Crest	IMS	WM	LR	HS	Pool
IP-2	IP	IMS	HS/ Crest	WM	LR	HS	Pool
MS-1	IMS	HS/ Crest	IP	WM	LR	HS	Pool
<b>Preferred Option</b>							
MS-2	IMS	IP	HS/ Crest	WM	LR	HS	Pool
HS-1	HS/ Crest	IP	IMS	WM	LR	HS	Pool
HS-2	HS/ Crest	IMS	IP	WM	LR	HS	Pool

- :: 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