



MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Portland Public Schools – Grant High School Modernization
PROJECT NO: 2015909.00
DATE: 22 December 2015
FILE NAME: DAG06.docx
SUBJECT: Design Advisory Group (DAG) 06

MEETING DATE: 16 December 2015
TIME: 5:30-7:25pm
LOCATION: Grant High School Library

ATTENDEES (shown in **bold**)

PROJECT TEAM:

Michelle Chariton, PPS OSM	Bill Dickey, GHS DAG
Kristie Moore, PPS OSM	Katie Davidson, GHS DAG
Rene Berndt, Mahlum	Pam Knowles, GHS DAG
Emi Day, Mahlum	Jack Kolze, GHS DAG
Alyssa Leeviraphan, Mahlum	Connor Kolze, GHS DAG
Diane Shiner, Mahlum	Heather Leek, GHS DAG
Ben Taylor, Mahlum	M. Taylor Matsushima, GHS DAG
JoAnn Wilcox, Mahlum	Monique McClean, GHS DAG
Carol Mayer-Reed, Mayer-Reed (Landscape)	Zack Olson, GHS DAG
Renee Anderson, GHS DAG	Jim Regan-Vienop, GHS DAG
Scott Bailey, GHS DAG	Michael Tom, GHS DAG
Jason Blumklotz, GHS DAG	Tess Waxman, GHS DAG
Carol Campbell, GHS DAG	Daniel Weidman, GHS DAG
Doug Capps, GHS DAG	Abby Williams, GHS DAG
Miriana Clark, GHS DAG	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

Jon Coney	Clint Harpster, Stakeholder
Jason Myers	Matt Kabza, Stakeholder
Aiden Leeman	Dylan Leeman, Stakeholder
	Susan Shea, Stakeholder
	Erich Simon, Stakeholder
	Luke Wisher, Stakeholder

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 ITEM
--------	-----------------

DAG 6.01	DAG Business
-----------------	--------------

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> :: DAG Co-chairs remind the Design Advisory Group of their responsibilities to the community, protocol, outreach, and roles :: Review of DAG goals and mission statement |
|--|---|

DAG 6.02	Program Review
-----------------	----------------

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> :: Flexibility of the Ed Spec <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of small instructional spaces to be utilized by a number of classes that are currently less than 15 students; a few of them can be combined to create a larger teaching area - If necessary, teacher offices may be able to be converted to classrooms - Extended learning areas are also potential teaching areas - Carol will be meeting with the Laurelhurst PTA (January 12-) to talk about the remodel. Michelle and Mahlum will also attend. :: Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sound transfers, how will the removable walls work? Mahlum clarifies that the 'removable wall' between small instructional spaces would be a facilities operation to remove a permanent wall separating two spaces, if it becomes necessary to create more classrooms - Is there still room to discuss the program numbers? Science teachers would like to explore a combined Maker and STEM space. PPS clarifies that we have just begun Schematic Design and will not "lock" anything down until the GMP. - Stakeholder asks if Mahlum believes they've met the teachers' concern to the best of their abilities. Mahlum confirms yes, PPS confirms yes—Carol Campbell confirms that Grant's current program did not fit in the Ed Spec plan but does fit in the current proposed plan. - Is the district going to change the Ed Specs now? Mahlum clarifies that the Ed Spec language is a 'menu' and it has flexibility built within it. - How are we able to be on budget when we are over in square footage? Mahlum clarifies that it is how the new additions are added to the existing building. The exterior skin assembly of the building is usually the highest cost- the 'infill' addition only needs 1 exterior wall - How will value engineering (VE) decisions be made? Mahlum clarifies that the VE process will happen after the DAG process has ended. This is a CMGC process and the contractor will make sure that we make the right decisions based on budget. Stakeholders and DAG members will be notified—communication with DAG co-chairs will be ongoing. |
|--|---|

DAG 6.03	Process Share back
-----------------	--------------------

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> :: DAG Meeting 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overview: DAG business, Visionary questions, Stakeholder information - Synthesis: What should our initial priorities be? - Initial thoughts: Preserve vs. redo construction, Historical character, Collaborative/collegiate style learning - 'What was important' tiles - What makes a school healthy? |
|--|--|

- Feeling when you step into a building is important
 - Emotional ties to school
 - Size of art department
 - Ties that are not tactile; primal, sense of ownership
 - Ideal learning environment: 21st century aesthetics, Promote creativity, Diverse learning styles, Important in reconstruction
 - Spirit of Grant HS: Great schools are communities, Building that works with you instead of against you, Community spirit
 - Involvement in what's going on/events
 - Creation of theater space
 - Sharing arts and music
- :: DAG Meeting 2: We do have an existing building – what makes it special?
- Figuring out what's valued – what should we keep in order to move forward and how does that blend with where we need to go?
 - o Looking at spaces
 - o Context in which it was constructed
 - o Process
 - Preservation drawing
 - o Red areas contribute significantly to historic nature
 - o Green areas contribute less
 - State Historic Preservation Walk process – note elements of existing building that were especially historic
 - Values of what's historic to the community/DAG/staff
 - o Old gym
 - o Columns
 - o Theater
 - Places of memory/historic events
 - o Hallways
 - o Entry/stairs
 - Beloved places
 - o Front face of the building
 - o Choir room
 - o Dugout/grandstands
 - Where is change necessary?
 - o Back of the building
 - o Roof
 - o Theater (beloved but needs change)
- :: DAG Meeting 3
- Spectrum activity to help navigate decisions
 - Community blue, DAG pink, stakeholders green
 - Teaching structures, Classroom clusters, Organization of community spaces
 - What is the heart of campus?
 - Prioritization of new large space opportunity
 - One of our biggest learning curves
 - Good to remember what's happening in our own school

- When we got the ball rolling on adjusting the ed spec
- Discussion after stakeholders came in
- These spectrums are a live process, we will come back to them later in Schematic Design

- :: DAG + Stakeholder Tours
 - Lessons learned, great discussion between DAG and staff on the bus
 - Trips between buildings just as important as what we saw in the buildings
 - Talking to teachers one-on-one was mind-opening
 - Stakeholder responded that surprisingly, DAG community was receptive
 - Unintended consequence of driving time – more time for conversation
 - First pass at the goals were a group effort – design team thought this was important

- :: DAG Meeting 4
 - Visual Listening- Inspiration
 - Red (no) and green (yes) dots
 - What spaces are we attracted to that we'd want to learn in?
 - What did we learn from each other as a community?
 - Images, visual examples of school philosophies that could become part of the design
 - We went in depth about the existing spaces at Grant – Ed Spec
 - Adjacencies activity
 - Also working with staff/stakeholders on each department
 - Diagrams/notes from stakeholders directly implicated into the design from what we heard from you

- :: Masterplan Workshop 1
 - First community workshop regarding the site
 - o Existing information from the community
 - o Partnership with parks and recreation
 - o Prioritization
 - o Sketching exercise
 - Common themes
 - o Pedestrian flow
 - o Bike friendly
 - o Parking
 - o Pool drop-off
 - o One-way
 - o Under 10 acres: crossing boundaries, ignoring property line
 - o Faculty parking relocated
 - o Parking/field ongoing negotiations with Portland Parks and Rec
 - o Front lawn/south edge important to community
 - o Open grassy areas
 - o Courtyards
 - o Room for outdoor activities
 - o Focus on the park
 - o Congregation on campus/inviting
 - o Keep main building
 - o Back edge of building – new construction

- o Go with the grain of existing building
- What is the future of education?
 - o Creative, collaborative spaces
 - o Discussion of preservation of existing building is not a compromise
 - o Point of brilliance – taking what we learned about flexible/open space, access to the outdoors
 - o Busting out of the walls of this space, break out into the back and build a flexible space in-between; magical
 - o Flexible learning characteristics
 - o Socialization supported
 - o Small group rooms, acoustically enclosed with visibility
 - o Technology bars in shared areas
 - o Connection, community and driving daylight

- :: DAG Meeting 5
 - Test fits: the current gym does not fit the projected student body of 1700 students
 - Old gym: tested as aux gym, cafeteria, black box theater, and now arts complex
 - Teacher offices adjacent to classrooms
 - Professional library opportunities
 - Collaboration and working independently
 - Preserving historic character
 - Large stem lab model
 - Analysis of shared model
 - Different sizes of classrooms
 - Configuration of teacher offices
 - Different opportunities for science labs
 - Performance space analysis
 - o Largest performance venue on the east side
 - o Something in between what was in the ed spec, and preserving current space
 - Prioritization of goals, creation of mission statement

- :: Masterplan Workshop 2
 - Diving deeper in second community workshop
 - Top 5 sustainable strategies
 - Focus on adjacencies
 - We are all learners – common themes
 - Focus on master plan findings
 - Importance of historic places/prioritization
 - Focus on project goals
 - Publicly presented/ranked mission statements (top 5)
 - Listening station on performance venue – help understand sweet spot
 - We want to recreate the auditorium and reuse it (agreement across the board)
 - Flexibility of Ed Spec
 - 2065 – what does learning look like?
 - o Synthesis is compelling
 - o Variety of learning spaces to support mental health and well being
 - o Spaces for research, collaboration, gathering

DAG 6.04 Public Comment

- :: We are concerned about the idea of the varsity softball field. We are here for baseball to be maintained and softball to be added. We also think they should be turfed. And half the baseball is on PPR and softball could be entirely on the PPR. The Beaumont softball league put in a written statement to PPS Office of Modernization
- :: Love the design and it will be a big improvement. Football field should have lights: 'Friday Night Lights' would bring a lot of people here. I think the field turf would bring people here to play all year round. My kids go over to another area because of the mud. You don't have to maintain it. I don't know about the cost.
- :: DAG member replies that they have friends of baseball and softball on the design advisory group.
- :: GHS coach- there has been a lot of discussion of lighting the field, there is evidence from the community that they want lights, some neighbors also believe there should be lights- the technology has changed

DAG 6.05 Questions

- :: Where will the trees be? Mahlum clarifies that the city has regulations about trees, requiring approximately 120 more. The current plan includes trees in the courtyard and along the western portion of the building. Mahlum will work with design team to explore locations for tree planting.
- :: Where is the bike parking? Mahlum clarifies that bike parking is planned all along the west side of the building, near the courtyard entrances.
- :: Is there room for grandstands? Stakeholders respond that the community may rally and fundraise for the site amenities that are not included in this project. Mahlum clarifies that they do not currently fit in the site plan.
- :: What is the quality of space in the courtyards? There is an open feeling for the weight room out to the fields. How do you get in and out of the enclosed courtyard? It feels potentially problematic. Mahlum clarifies that these spaces will be refined during schematic design.

DAG 6.06 Outstanding Items

- :: Vehicular circulation and parking
- :: Athletic fields
- There have been many iterations of the site with the GHS Athletic Department, the PPS Athletics, Chief of Office of Modernization, and attorneys about whether and how we can use bond dollars on Portland Parks property
- Mahlum shows 3 of field layouts that are currently being explored
- :: Lighting the football field

END OF MINUTES