

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 1, 2019

Call to Order

The Study Session of the Shoreline Board of Directors was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Darlene Sherrick Room (D105) at the Shoreline Center by President Mike Jacobs on April 1, 2019.

Roll Call

Present: Mike Jacobs, President; David Wilson, Vice President; Heather Fralick, Member; Dick Nicholson, Member; Dick Potter, Member; Soumya Keefe, Shorecrest Student Representative and Saagar Mehta, Shorewood Student Representative.

Kellogg Constructability Review

Presenters:

Karen Wood and David Mount, Mahlum Architects

Dave Johnson and Brent Anderson, Hoffman Construction

Dan Stevens, Manager of Capital Projects

Marla Miller, Deputy Superintendent

Ms. Miller announced that there had been an issue with the page numbering in the report reflecting that there may be missing pages. The report is fully intact, however the final printout missed numbering the following pages: 13, 75, 100, 102, and 120.

Mr. Anderson briefly reviewed and demonstrated the web-based collaboration tool (Bluebeam) that Hoffman uses in concert with Mahlum for making comments on drawings, documents and specifications to ensure projects are completed successfully.

Ms. Miller pointed out that the constructability review process is more technical as opposed to the value engineering process, which comes later, when choices are made based on values and possible budget restrictions. Both reviews are required as part of the state match program.

Mr. Potter asked if there was a checklist in order to monitor items that are in progress or that have been completed so that nothing gets overlooked. Ms. Wood responded that, at a minimum, they go through each comment online, right click on it and identify it as completed. There are also fields in which to provide any relevant comments.

Mr. Potter asked about the type of roofing that is planned for this project. There are two options being reviewed, PVC and TPO, both of which are membrane roofing rather than hot asphalt, and both are popular for schools. Currently, the low bidder is a PVC system, which is sometimes considered better than the TPO because of its longevity.

Mr. Potter inquired about the note on page 70, which indicates in relation to pouring of concrete, "acknowledgement of expected cracking at these locations." It was explained that concrete can be poured either before the steel is erected or after, due in part for aesthetic reasons, to the location on the site. This note indicates the decision was made to pour the concrete after the steel erection was complete and then polish it. It is expected that this will take care of any cracking.

Regarding a note on page 71, "All slab depressions for tile at bathrooms have been removed from the project", Mr. Potter asked if this would cause a trip hazard. Ms. Wood responded that they were planning for transitions in the floor to mitigate that issue.

Mr. Potter asked about the note on page 130 that says, "Exit signs have been removed." This was a situation where there were louvers above the doors, which would have been in conflict with the exit signs. Since they were not needed at that location, it would be more correct to say that the exit signs were relocated.

Study Session Minutes – April 1, 2019

Mr. Potter asked about the note on page 138, “No seismic joints exist in project.” Does that mean there will be earthquake issues? Based on the configuration of the building, there are no areas of concern for movement, even in the elevated library area; this was confirmed through an analysis by structural engineers.

Mr. Nicholson asked the contractors and architects about their experience with Valley Electric and whether or not they were bonded. Hoffman Construction has worked with them for over 20 years and has never had any issues; added that they are probably in the top three of electrical contractors in this area and yes, they are bonded.

At this point, Ms. Mount shared a PowerPoint presentation that featured the most recent design updates for Kellogg Middle School. The new building will be situated at the north edge of the site and as far west as possible to Hamlin Park. The fields and outdoor athletic facilities are on the south end of the property, in front of the main building (rather than behind the building in the current configuration), which is good for visibility and supervisory needs. There is maintenance and emergency vehicle access around the perimeter of the building and the building itself is situated around the central, large courtyard space that opens up visually to the west (Hamlin Park). The presentation included drawings of the interiors as well.

Ms. Mount also shared information about the proposed restrooms. The stated priority from the design team was for more distribution and smaller restrooms or fewer stalls but more evenly distributed around the building (see below).



As can be seen above, each of the four corners on both levels has a core of restrooms. Generally, there is a room with two stalls and is gendered; adjacent to that is an “anyone” restroom. The “anyone” restroom has full gypsum wall partitions and a standard door with a glass window above the door so that individuals can discern vacancy/occupancy by the visual of the lights. The group restroom has two stalls with privacy partitions four inches above the floor and four inches from the ceiling. If the restroom in one corner of the first level is for females, the one stacked above it on the second floor is for males. The restrooms are all near the stairs.

Study Session Minutes – April 1, 2019

The restrooms near the Commons, where there would be higher usage, are designed differently. There are multiple ways in and out; the male restroom has two urinals; and two stalls with changing tables and sinks within the stall. The main sinks are pulled out closer to the hallway. Outside of this core are two additional “anyone” restrooms.

Ms. Fralick expressed concern that there didn’t seem to be enough total toilets; however, Ms. Wood reported that this design that includes approximately 55 toilet/urinals actually exceeds the code requirements by maybe one or two. The building is being built for a capacity of 1,071 students. Ms. Wood reported that there had been earlier conversations about a more extreme gender inclusive design; however this proposed design could more readily be modified in the future if needed, e.g. conversion of a gendered restroom to an “anyone” restroom. Initial placement of urinals would make that more difficult.

Mr. Jacobs asked if having two urinals was typical for new middle schools. In response, Mr. Mount gave an example of the recently renovated Madrona K-8 School in Edmonds that went to a configuration of fully compartmentalized, single occupancy toilets with no urinals and pulled out sinks. They have only been open since January. Mr. Potter suggested asking staff at Madrona how things are going with that configuration, particularly in terms of possible increased custodial issues in the male restrooms.

Ms. Fralick asked what the expense would be to add urinals to the restrooms. Mr. Johnson responded that it isn’t so much a matter of expense as it is about space. Ms. Miner added that our middle school principals might have concerns about how females might feel about using restrooms with urinals.

Ms. Miller reported that the configuration of restrooms were probably the longest conversations with the design team and principals. They spent a significant amount of time reviewing the safety aspect, more so than the cleaning issues. At this point in time, design changes can still be made.

Mr. Jacobs asked if there was a down side to having the male restrooms with two toilets changed to one toilet and one urinal. Ms. Wood revisited the thought mentioned earlier about the flexibility in the future if modifications were needed. There is also a question of changing views/perceptions over the next few decades in terms of males and females using the same restrooms.

Ms. Miller shared that changes have been made at Shorewood High School since it reopened in 2013 to accommodate this same issue. These conversations weren’t common at the time that the two high schools were being designed and built. Ms. Keefe added that Shorecrest and Shorewood have the gendered bathrooms but they’re not as open and accepted as they possibly could be. Students can use them “if they ask about them or they know about them or they get the right key but it isn’t widely known that they are even available.” She likes this new design and feels that students will be more open to use them out of convenience and that will likely take away some of the stigma that is currently attached to their use. She also expressed that in future years she didn’t see a problem with males and females using the same restroom.

Ms. Miner summarized the discussion/questions by asking if we could take the non-ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) stall in the gendered male restroom and plumb for a toilet (in thinking about the future) but install a urinal currently. It would take some work getting inside the wall with the drainpipe and the tile, but in the grand scheme of things, it is doable and not a huge cost, but preferably should be done in the next five or 10 years.

Ms. Miller mentioned that she learned during the early conversations that principals and teachers prefer that students not use the restrooms during the passing periods between classes. The time is too short so it is better for students to excuse themselves from class temporarily to use the restroom

Study Session Minutes – April 1, 2019

and return promptly. Mr. Mount added that they didn't reduce the amount of fixtures in anyway because they would primarily be used during class periods; the schools are actually designed according to specific and consistent standards no matter how the school operates and they are built to accommodate whatever passing time the school implements.

Ms. Fralick asked what the arrangement was for the locker rooms. There are three fixtures (toilets) in each locker room but this may be another location where a urinal might be preferred. There are two adult shower rooms accessible from the hallway and adjacent to the locker room that could possibly be used for students who request them.

Mr. Jacobs asked if there was enough space for an "anyone" bathroom in the locker room area. The response was no.

Mr. Potter asked if there was anything that could be installed to easily trigger custodial attention.

Ms. Miller reiterated that it would be a good idea to talk to some of the other schools regarding some of these issues and how they are being managed.

Adjournment: 6:28 p.m.

Attest: April 15, 2019

Mike Jacobs, School Board President

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary to Board of Directors