



MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Portland Public Schools – Grant High School Modernization
PROJECT NO: 2015909.00
DATE: 16 May 2016
FILE NAME: DAG09.docx
SUBJECT: Design Advisory Group (DAG) 09

MEETING DATE: 28 April 2016
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
Chris Brown, Mahlum	Jack Kolze, GHS DAG
Emi Day, Mahlum	Connor Kolze, GHS DAG
Alyssa Leeviraphan, Mahlum	Heather Leek, GHS DAG
Diane Shiner, Mahlum	M. Taylor Matsushima, GHS DAG
JoAnn Wilcox, Mahlum	Monique McClean, GHS DAG
Anne Samuels, Mayer/Reed	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:

Blue, Student
John Eisman, Choir Teacher
Melody Rockwell, Art Teacher
Erich Simon, Science Teacher
Daniel Wasil, Art Parent
Carol Mayer-Reed, Community Member

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 9.01 Schedule and Process (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Final DAG meeting!
- :: Nearing end of Schematic Design (SD)
- :: May 26th – SD Open House
- :: CM/GC Notice of Intent to Award
 - Andersen-Colas joint venture

DAG 9.02 Site Development – Site Plan Overview (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Site Plan Review
 - Interconnection between site and building and park
 - Softball with U10 soccer to the north
 - Synthetic turf baseball and multi-use field to the west
 - Strong north-south and east-west pedestrian connections through the site
 - Stormwater planters and basins – no water is allowed to go into sewer, manage on site

DAG 9.03 Site Development – Main Entry (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Main front entry
 - universally accessible
 - seating plinth to replace backflow preventer (Grant's tomb)
 - reuse of memorial benches and urns
 - storm water feature front and center
 - moving stairs out with ramps at either side for accessibility
- :: Planting schemes passed around
 - maintenance free
 - slow growth
 - not tall
- :: CPTED – crime prevention through environmental design

DAG 9.04 Site Development – South Courtyard (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Both courtyards are approximately 10 feet below the adjacent grade.
- :: Both courtyards are approximately the same size.
- :: South courtyard is contemplative and introspective in nature.
- :: Colonnade proposed on two sides (north and west) for covered pedestrian access.
- :: Larger exterior space near gym for gathering.
- :: Mounded vegetative areas that define a series of smaller outdoor “classrooms”.
- :: Great place for an introvert to go and get away.
- :: Ramp to south courtyard has been removed from the current design but will be included as an alternate in the cost estimate.
- :: Wheelchair access to the courtyard is through the building.
- :: Some DAG members are passionate about keeping the ramp for access.
- :: Carol noted that there was an earthquake drill recently at GHS, and that it was difficult to get

students out of the building. She asked how someone in wheelchair would be able to exit the courtyard.

- :: Michelle noted that the situation would be similar to those students being on the second floor; who have equipment available to help them down the stairs.
- :: Carol asked if there would be a similar means to help students out of the courtyard.
- :: Michele noted that there could be an area of refuge located at the courtyard level, with a communication device to let responders know they are there.
- :: Power doors into courtyard are yet to be determined.

DAG 9.05 Site Development – North Courtyard (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Both courtyards are approximately 10 feet below the adjacent grade.
- :: Both courtyards are approximately the same size.
- :: North courtyard is more active and extroverted.
- :: Interconnected with the park through a series of ramps and stairs.
- :: Seating areas are located at the upper and lower levels of the courtyard.
- :: Ramp and stairs connect the upper and lower levels of the courtyard.
- :: 8-foot wide ramp for large maintenance equipment access (lifts, wheel barrows, etc.).
- :: Larger gathering spaces with tiered seating facing the upper and lower commons.
- :: Series of double doors connect lower commons to the north courtyard.
- :: Kiosk located at upper courtyard breezeway with adjacent covered and uncovered seating.
- :: Notches to the concrete tiered seating will be added for wheelchair access and companion seating.
- :: No security fencing at north courtyard – Carol prefers cameras as a deterrent for this space.
- :: Protocol for lockdown – all doors lock.

DAG 9.06 Site Development – Amphitheater (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Front terraced plaza area in front of Arts Complex (original 1923 gymnasium).
- :: Bringing back entry stair to harken back to historic character.
- :: Expanded space to south can be used as stage with seating area.
- :: Inspired by theater at Concordia University – simple, clean, open.
- :: Tiered concrete seating within grassed areas.
- :: ADA accessible seating will be integrated.
- :: Mounded slope with southern lawn exposure.
- :: Attractive place for students during lunch time.
- :: Community oriented space large enough for community programs, performances, and events.
- :: Amphitheater is at the center – transition between school and community.
- :: Potential for concert programs, movies in the park, etc.
- :: Design team will explore what types of events they envision happening here which will help to determine the desired size and capacity of the space.
- :: New school is inviting – bringing people into the site. What does that mean for the school in terms of clean up, people coming into site, and how to manage that?
- :: Security question; signage reminding people they are entering school property can be helpful.
- :: This is the tradeoff of having spaces that are attractive to community – it will be a nicer experience and more pedestrians will likely inhabit the area.

DAG 9.07 Site Development – Bike Parking (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Bike Parking – 253 bike spaces required.
- :: Reuse bike racks on site and refurbish.
- :: Enclosure around covered bike parking – 3-sided, permeable, visible, transparent.
- :: Location of covered bike parking is convenient – can park bike, go down ramp and straight into the gym with (4) gender inclusive shower rooms and locker rooms nearby.

DAG 9.08 Site Development – Additional Discussion Topics

- :: DAG QUESTION: What about the previous idea to talk to neighbors about what issues they are most concerned?
- :: RESPONSE: Mahlum can provide materials to reach out to neighbors.
- :: DAG QUESTION: What will happen to Grant’s tomb? Doesn’t it contain a time capsule?
- :: RESPONSE: It does not contain a time capsule. The time capsules are elsewhere and will be saved. “Grant’s Tomb” is actually a vault that holds the waterline back flow preventer. The proposed design is to provide a plinth that is referential to “Grant’s Tomb” but will be lower in height so that you can see the building entry beyond.
- :: DAG QUESTION: Will the smoke stack stay?
- :: RESPONSE: PPS noted that the AT&T antennas are currently housed on the smoke stack. AT&T’s lease runs through 2021. Potential that the stack might stay – good high location, if moved to the building, code requires that it be mounted at a lower height.
- :: Additional Smokestack / AT&T Cell Antennae Comments:
 - Would like for it to remain - reminds us of our past, historic preservation.
 - SHPO would also like for it to stay.
 - Better and safer that cell antennas are further away from students.
 - Disguised well on the smoke stack (you don’t notice them).
 - Hopefully ATT will provide the money for the seismic upgrade.
 - If AT&T does not pay for the seismic upgrade, the smoke stack is planned to come down.

DAG 9.09 Building Development – Focus on Interiors (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Interior design approach – looking back to earlier DAG meetings.
 - Review imagery that grabbed you as a committee.
 - Approach to historic building.
 - Create environments that are respectful to historic character.
 - Tour of Shattuck Hall – transformation of historic corridor, reveal historic detail history and construction history.
 - DAG likes idea of telling the truth about construction materials underneath that historic layer.
 - Balance those areas where we are exposing the roughness of the construction and maintaining the detail and character while inserting the modern elements.
- :: Interior Renderings – highlight the feeling of types of spaces (materials & colors not represented).
- :: Entry – hub, take out and replace stairs because they do not connect all the way down to lower level, flatten floor, open up corner, potential to work with students or artist to design perforated screen element at stair.
- :: Library – glassy aperture, nooks looking out to green courtyard.
- :: Commons (main level) – Supports auditorium, connects to north forum and student store,

- overlooks north courtyard, opportunities for kids that want quieter areas, student study areas.
- :: Commons (lower level) – Connection to exterior courtyard.
- :: Auditorium – Provide light lock, stage projection with orchestra pit, keep murals with cover on either side for large projection, stage construction adjacent to stage; ADA accessible upper house with light lock, new audio recording
- :: Athletics – Lobby and gymnasium.
- :: Learning Edge – modern, lower ceiling in corridor for mechanical duct runs, high windows at corridor to borrow light from classrooms without being able to see in, internal areas with skylights, flooded with natural light, quiet spaces.
- :: Forums – Could be used as classroom, hangout space, study, movies, connection between floors.
- :: STEM – Lab space for future programs not currently at GHS, connects to north and south courtyard, adjacent support space, near science/robotics lab.

DAG 9.10 Building Development – Additional Discussion Topics

- :: Program location adjustments
- :: Maker’s space and stage construction were originally located together to support a burgeoning architecture and construction program.
- :: Scale and size and height of these spaces were at odds with lower ceiling height at location on lower level, therefore these programs were moved out and replaced by STEM and robotics.
- :: Maker’s space has been relocated to the Art’s Complex.
- :: Stage construction has been located adjacent to the stage.
- :: Science/robotics lab and STEM lab with support storage is approximately 4,500 SF combined.
- :: The STEM lab is intended to host multiple programs – not an owned space.
- :: Science department is approximately 1000-1500 SF over masterplan program.
- :: Currently enough science labs for each teacher but in future they could be some sharing.
- :: 12 total science teaching spaces = 11 science labs (including robotics) + 1 STEM lab.
- :: General education classrooms located on the lower level could be programmed for any subject.
- :: Health classrooms intended to be located near biology and physiology labs.
- :: Booster or PTA storage room is accounted for, however still working on its location (currently shown near the weight room).
- :: Previous decision was made with Carol not to secure rest of building from auditorium for after hour use due to the large number of security doors and additional toilet room that would be required by code.
- :: No lockers on proposed for the main level; offers more display areas.
- :: Relites between classroom and corridor will have blinds or shades if needed for security and/or darkening for projection.
- :: Powered door at front entry? Probably not all (3) due to cost but all will be accessible.
- :: Banking of a running track is good for competitive indoor track, however it does not meet ADA.

DAG 2.11 Building Development – Focus on CTE (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: CTE Career Pathways –2016-17 CTE programs presented by Carol.
- :: Other CTE Courses (Little CTE) – connected to CTE but not taught by CTE certified teacher.
- :: Many CTE programs were not at GHS 3 years ago. The programs were started by surveying teachers to see what job they had before becoming a teacher, while also surveying students to

find out what is important to them.

- :: CTE gives students an opportunity to try different things – hands on learning.
- :: CTE classes are continuing to be added and are continuing to grow. Architectural drawing and drafting was recently added and there is already enough interest for two sections.
- :: Introduction to engineering and design currently has little participation; perhaps because they are currently located in the basement and nobody knows they are there. The program is expected to grow.
- :: CTE programs are distributed throughout building rather than clumped together for wider exposure; allowing for integration with visual arts, science, performing arts, as well as other departments.
- :: Evolving programs can occupy the central spine of the upper floor for flexibility and growth.

DAG 9.12 Maker’s Space or “Ideation Lab” located in the original 1923 gymnasium

- :: This space is imagined as a creative, messy, hands-on space for making and displaying all sorts of things – large ceramics, large canvas paintings, building a tiny house, etc.
- :: Propose to install large doors for fresh air, or moving/craning large equipment, supplies and projects. The width of the proposed doors is limited by the structural integrity of the existing walls.
- :: A concern has been expressed on Facebook regarding the location of some of the visual arts classrooms proposed at the lower level of the original gymnasium. Visual arts is concerned that they are moving from one basement to another and that visual arts is the one program that needs good light and access to the outdoors.
- :: The ceramics classroom will have a lot of light. The other classrooms located in the lower level will also have light and are computer heavy art classrooms and photography with an adjacent darkroom.
- :: Visual Arts noted that other places are dug out extensively, and wondered if something similar could be done for the art spaces on the lower level?
- :: The proposed plan does dig out the north side to create a patio, but the amount of digging out is limited due to the parking, drive aisle and property line.
- :: A suggestion was made to flip the programs so that larger ideation lab is on lower level with arts on the main level.
- :: One reason this does not work well is due to the needed height and open area for a maker’s space.
- :: Carol expressed concern that it would be difficult to build large projects in the lower level because the ceiling is not high enough; and feels that the open space on the main level with the high ceilings better fits the program.
- :: One reason the large gymnasium space is proposed to remain intact is that carving the large original gym space up into several smaller spaces does not honor the historic character of the historic gymnasium – SHPO concern.
- :: The CTE engineering lab is shown adjacent to the ideation lab on the main level, with one 2D classroom on the lower level and a second 2D classroom on the upper level.
- :: Mahlum can flip the CTE engineering lab and 2D art so that 2D art is stacked on the main and upper level. This would give the 2D art classrooms daylight from three sides, and will also benefit from borrowed light from the ideation lab skylight.

9.13 Maker's Space/Ideation Lab – Additional Discussion Topics

- :: DAG QUESTION: Does the Visual Arts department feel like they are being heard?
- :: RESPONSE: Visual Arts responded that they do feel like they are being heard but would like to see what comes of it.
- :: DAG QUESTION: What type of equipment will be in the maker's space/ideation lab?
- :: RESPONSE: Michelle can provide a list of the equipment proposed for the maker's/ideation lab.
- :: DAG QUESTION: What program would be building a tiny house?
- :: RESPONSE: Carol noted that it would be a third level engineering class which is not currently offered. GHS also plans to add a geo-tech class (geometry & construction).
- :: DAG QUESTION: What happens that is different between maker's space and Stem lab?
- :: RESPONSE: Mahlum noted that the STEM lab is heavier on the sciences – the idea is that there is a tie to engineering but it's heavier on the robotics side, material research side, or advanced work such as advanced agriculture, biology, or engineering. The whole idea of STEM is that these programs are integrated. Not necessarily an opportunity that GHS have now, but it opens up the possibility of bringing in an advanced student that is working on something that may bridge physics, biology, chemistry, engineering, and gives them the space for all of those things to come together.
- :: DAG QUESTION: Is the Maker's/Ideation space intended for multiple users, open to all?
- :: RESPONSE: Mahlum noted that was correct. The maker's space is not assigned to any specific teacher, program, or department, therefore all students, teacher, and classes can use it.
- :: DAG QUESTION: Did the visual arts department have expectations about how the space was to be used that is different than the way it is being described as being used?
- :: RESPONSES:
 - Visual arts noted that the large gymnasium space was first presented as two teachers teaching in that space with no separation which they felt would not work. It was also envisioned and described as a large exhibit space, however art does their big show once a year; so there have been other teachers that are upset that the visual arts department is owning all this space, the big middle space, that they don't feel they honestly need; so this is actually looking in some ways really exciting as long as their other issues are heard.
 - Mahlum noted that is definitely the feedback we have heard; that there was a bit of a struggle for art to fill that space, and that the maker's/ideation space can touch every teacher and every students. GHS could have an advanced English class that is building something that could use that space. It is not owned necessarily by one program. And because the existing space is much larger than the maker's space ed spec program, there can be more than one project going on. You could be building a tiny house, and doing some type of English project, and building part of the stage, and doing art simultaneously... it's a really large space.
 - Visual Arts noted that they could be building large sculptures, building large canvases, doing our installation art work; saying that there are a lot of different uses for that space if it's not just for them, and everyone is angry with them because they have it all the time. Visual Arts noted that if everyone is engaged in that space it actually activates the space.
- :: QUESTION: Can the track be double or triple in width so that it is more useful space?
- :: RESPONSE: Mahlum did look into expanding the track but noted that it is a very expensive proposition structurally. Because the overall area is larger than the ed spec program, the costs needed to be kept at a minimum, otherwise it will be difficult to meet our target budget. It is definitely possible for something like that in the future.

DAG 9.14 Building Development – Gender Inclusive Restroom Proposal (see PowerPoint slides)

- :: Intention to get honest feedback and input.
- :: Intense issue and debate are happening nationally with K-12 as the nexus of conversation.
- :: Equity provides assists to those that might need more assistance.
- :: Equality says we have equal access.
- :: GHS has intentionally added more gender inclusive toilets than what is noted in the ed spec because of a high awareness of transgender issues by students and staff.
- :: Generally there are a few transgender toilet rooms distributed throughout the school. The question for GHS became, “Is there a way we can go beyond that? Rather than saying boys and girls go here and then if you need something else there is an “other” – can we all benefit from the enhanced level of privacy and inclusion?”
- :: There are difficulties, issues, concerns, and perceptions.
- :: The plumbing code is something we will have to contend with and work closely with the AHJ (authority having jurisdiction).
- :: The current code requires that we have one accessible stall per every six toilets in a bathroom.
- :: The code does not address accessible toilet counts for single occupancy toilet rooms.
- :: Other projects Mahlum has worked on have required ADA accessible toilets at a rate of 1 to 1.
- :: The proposed options target a rate of 1 to 2.
- :: Acceptance of the number of ADA accessible toilets will be determined by the AHJ.
- :: Precedent images: Starbucks – series of independent, individual toilet rooms that are connected to a wash room that provides community access.
- :: Mahlum presented three options for gender inclusive toilets. The proposed models could happen everywhere or they could be intermixed with more traditional toilet rooms if desired.
- :: Each options attempts to maintain two points of entrance. This will not always be possible for every toilet room.
 - Option A: Provide community space that is open for access of the shared sinks, supported by individual toilet rooms that all have floor to ceiling walls with full doors, or full height partition doors. Total of (6) toilets and (6-7) sinks.
 - Option B: Similar to option 1 but offers two private toilet rooms with sinks accessible off the corridor. Total of (7) toilets and (7) sinks.
 - Option C: Single occupancy toilet rooms and a urinal room (would not be labeled girls & boys). Total of (5) toilets, (3) urinals, and (7) sinks.
- :: Urinal rooms are proposed to help with reduction in water use (urinals use less water than toilets) and speed of restroom turnaround time, helps with lines/wait times.
- :: Option A & B:
 - Private space for everyone.
- :: Option B:
 - Provides the most toilets.
 - Provides different levels of privacy.
- :: Option C:
 - Urinals are good for speed.
 - Concern that you wouldn’t easily be able to see in to urinal area.
 - Important to have people be able to see in.
 - Forces people to still make a choice.
 - Might be better if everyone has the same options.
- :: Consensus is that Option A is preferred by the group.

- 9.15 Gender Inclusive Toilets – Additional Discussion Topics
- :: DAG QUESTION: What are the safety ramifications of having full length doors?
 - :: RESPONSE: Carol noted that GHS currently has full lockable doors and they have not had problems. Mahlum noted that there are ways (such as with keypads or special door hardware) where an administrator could gain access to a room if needed.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Any chance to have toilets near gym to be different (more traditional) than the others to help move lines along faster where there is potentially for large general public gatherings?
 - :: RESPONSE: Carol commented that the students use the building all day, and worries that the messaging would be that we have a different type of restroom for the public to use – why?
 - :: DAG QUESTION: GHS bathrooms currently have several toilets in a single bathroom; the options only show 6-7 toilets?
 - :: RESPONSE: Mahlum noted that the proposed layout has more smaller toilet rooms, which does not decreasing the number of toilets but changes the overall distribution.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Is there currently a problem with people waiting in lines?
 - :: RESPONSE: Student noted that sometimes at lunchtime the bathroom gets busy, but thinks it's because people use the toilet stalls to change clothes.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: What is the District standard for bathrooms?
 - :: RESPONSE: Michelle noted that the District standard is boys and girls toilet rooms, with distributed separate gender inclusive toilets rooms. Michelle noted that she is prepared to navigate the District standards.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Would there be more bathrooms if it was a traditional boys and girls set-up?
 - :: RESPONSE: Not necessarily because when we provide traditional boys and girls toilet rooms, we have to be mindful of sitelines into the bathroom, which is less important when there are full doors or full height stalls.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Why wouldn't the bathrooms have main doors going into them?
 - :: RESPONSE: It is PPS's policy that there are not doors into the main student toilet rooms. Allows the bathrooms to be more open which can help with bullying issues.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Can't help but think that kids will go in there and smoke or do other things they are not supposed to?
 - :: RESPONSE: A student noted there are places other than the bathroom to do "bad" things. Carol noted that there have been some problems but it's not usually in the bathrooms. It's about respecting the issue. Students at GHS have lobbied hard for us to be more inclusive. Do we sacrifice all of this for rare instance where something bad might happen?
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Since you done this before, what is the experience for Mahlum?
 - :: RESPONSE: Mahlum noted that we have done this for coed housing projects. It has been very positively received. We have not done this yet at a high school all though a number of high schools we are working on are considering it.
 - :: DAG PARENT: As parent it is no big deal. At first might be surprise, but then becomes the norm.
 - :: DAG QUESTION: Would the staff feel uncomfortable using restroom with students?
 - :: RESPONSE: One of the teachers present said they did not think it would be a problem for staff but wondered if the students would think it was weird using the bathroom next to their teacher.
 - :: RESPONSE: A DAG student noted that they do not think it would be a problem since there would be full height doors.

:: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Boys are not very good aim sometimes. It might be nice to have a separate room for boys.
- Goes both ways, some boys are cleaner than girls.
- Every single person has a gender neutral toilet at home. Use it like you would at home, be respectful.
- Sometimes the private bathroom at GHS is not in good shape but most of the time it is fairly clean.
- Existing urinals are on timers – not desirable.
- Currently the locker rooms and associated toilets are separated as boys and girls.
- There are staff toilets located in the administration area but none in the teacher offices.
- All other toilets are proposed to be gender inclusive for both students and staff.
- Smaller stalls with the door swinging in can be tight, especially with backpack. Mahlum will provide larger stalls with doors that swing out when space allows.
- Mahlum noted that the issues that will probably come up most with the community are: How do students feel about it? Making sure that everyone feels there is more privacy and that it is respectful? What are the privacy issues in regard to safety and security? What if someone has a medical emergency? Make sure there is high visibility – so people can see what is happening.
- Gender inclusive toilet rooms could help with bullying – won't be in there for so long putting on lipstick or fixing hair.
- Signage would not include traditional signage showing the symbols for girls (dress) and boys (pants) but could just be signed as "toilet room" or "water closet" (with the universal ADA symbol as applicable).
- If there were urinal rooms, they would not have to be labeled as boys (symbol with pants) but could just be labeled as "urinal room".

DAG 9.16 Wrap Up

- :: DAG Feedback – Floor plans were distributed to all DAG members at the beginning of the meeting. Each member was asked to think about how they contributed and informed the building and to make notes on the plans which would be collected at the end of the meeting. This exercise is an effort to collect how each DAG member has affected or influenced a turn, change, or decision, in the process. Everyone should take credit, because everyone's involvement was instrumental.

DAG 9.17 Public Comment

- :: Erich Simon (teacher) – Would like to tour old gym space. Kristie will email for a time to tour.
- :: Blue (student) – Can see parents concerned about their kids using the same bathroom of the opposite sex, but doesn't think that should be a concern. Students will find a way to do what they want to do. Doesn't change that environment. Hopes that concern from parents does not undermine the prospect of having all gender inclusive toilets.
- :: Blue (student) Have any other schools that you've worked on done this?
- Mahlum has done this in some of our higher education housing projects and is currently working (2) elementary schools, (1) middle school, and (2) high schools that are considering all gender inclusive toilet rooms.
 - This would be the first high school that has gone to this level that Mahlum has worked on.
 - This would be the first PPS school to have all gender inclusive toilet rooms.

DAG 9.18 Design Advisory Group Process

- :: Moving Forward – This is the last DAG but PPS will keep DAG members informed.
- :: Asked DAG members to write down their expectations moving forward including what they would like to be contacted about and how they would like to continue to participate

DAG 9.19 Group Photo 😊

END OF MINUTES