
Date
09.07.2022

By
Liz Feltz & Becca Cavell

Subject
Comprehensive
Planning Committee
Meeting 3.2

Project Name
Jefferson High School Modernization

Project Number
30087

Present

Members of the CPC Emmeline Car Eliana Machura Jocelyn Beh Kate Piper Rick Hodges Tina Myers Mancala Snyders Nicole Dalton Dan Cohnstadt Jenn Latu	Steve Gonzales Portland Public Schools Kiesha Locklear Steve Effros David Mayne Design Team Chandra Robinson, Lever Jeanie Lai, Bora Becca Cavell, Bora Corey Squire, Bora Scott Mooney, Bora	Liz Feltz, Bora Karim Hassanein, Colloqate Jackie Santa Lucia, Student Engagement Mauricio Villarreal, Place Community Design Organizers Tae Thomas Michael Stevenson Cleo Davis Members of the Public
--	---	---

Minutes

1. ARRIVAL / DINNER / SIGN IN / WELCOME

- A. Becca reviewed agenda, gave a schedule overview, and announced the community design workshop on October 15th.
- B. Becca asked folks to identify themselves as CPC members, Design Team, CDO's and PPS staff. No members of the public were present.

2. SUSTAINABILITY

- A. Corey introduced himself and announced the Climate Response Visioning Charrette on September 14th.
- B. Corey asked the CPC: "What does Sustainability mean to you?"; responses:
 - i. Using as few nonrenewable resources as possible.
 - ii. Designing and advocating for future generations.
- C. Corey explained the considerations that need to be included in a sustainable design process, in addition to budget, schedule, and appearance. This includes health, ecology, and community.

- D. Corey reviewed the PPS Climate Action Vision aiming to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2030 and 100% by 2040.
- E. Corey explained the two types of carbon: operational and embodied.
 - i. Operational – carbon released to generate energy and maintain a building
 - ii. Embodied – carbon released to process and transport raw materials
- F. Corey reviewed general strategies to help JHS achieve PPS’ climate goals.
 - i. Energy efficiency and solar PV
 - ii. Existing building re-use and wood structural systems
- G. Questions from the CPC:
 - i. Is there a reason to not build with wood? Will it create any constraints for the CPC?
 - 1) No inherent benefit of building with steel and concrete. Corey explained that wood structures require a slightly different design process but Scott assured the CPC that community desires in the program still will be fulfilled despite differences with the construction.

3. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- A. Karim shared an overview of Colloqate’s engagement roadmap and welcomed suggestions for future events that the design team can attend.
- B. Karim introduced the community design organizers [CDO’s] in attendance.
- C. Karim updated the group on recent engagement efforts:
 - i. CQ organized vision building exercises with students at Faubion.
 - ii. CQ conducted high school visits at Roosevelt & McDaniel.
 - iii. At the SEI Homecoming Festival, CQ asked “What spaces at JHS are meaningful to you?” and “What experiences have been positive/negative for you?”
- D. Karim shared a list of stakeholders that CDOs and CQ are currently engaging with.
- E. Karim shared emerging themes from the engagement efforts thus far.
 - i. Desires:
 - 1) Welcoming student support structures as a community hub
 - 2) Honoring cultural history and addressing past injustices
 - 3) Investing in CTE and STEM programs
 - 4) Investing in all JHS arts programs (not just dance)
 - 5) Community access and student safety
 - 6) Developing a culturally relevant curriculum
 - 7) Hiring more BIPOC teachers to reflect the community
 - 8) Improved building health, safety, and sustainability
 - ii. Concerns:
 - 1) Lack of awareness about the JHS project timeline and goals, concern about the pace of the project
 - 2) Desire for more info about possible outcomes to help inform community feedback
 - 3) Fear about gentrification, displacement, and a loss of access to JHS resources
 - 4) Questions around the impact on current and future student enrollment
- F. The CDOs gave a progress update from their work in the community.
 - i. Michael is planning a barbeque with JHS alumni for elders in the community to discuss community and heritage – everyone’s invited
 - ii. Cleo is collaborating with Michael on the barbeque planning.
 - iii. Tae is having conversations with JHS teachers and recent grads.
 - iv. Dominique is working with parents and kids to plan a pop-up youth art event.

4. INTERACTIVE EXERCISE: KEY DRIVERS / EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. Chandra reviewed the key design drivers: Cost, Time, Culture & Heritage, and Disruptions.

- B. Chandra explained how the architecture of the school has changed over time. She also explained other factors to be mindful of such as the seismic upgrades to the building and the landmark review process.
- C. The CPC asked the following clarifying questions:
 - i. Can we add categories? Programs, partnerships, and sustainability we brought up as alternate categories.
 - ii. Who decided that JHS was going to become a comprehensive high school?
 - 1) Portland Public Schools
 - iii. Will the CTE programming be the same?
 - 2) It will be up to the community to decide CTE uses.
- D. CPC members divided into 3 groups to discuss and prioritize criteria.
- E. Each group provided a list ranking the importance of each criteria:
 - i. Group 1 (Jenn) – Culture (1), Disruption & Time (2-tie), Cost (3)
 - ii. Group 2 (Steve) – Culture (1), Disruption (2), Time (3), Cost (4)
 - iii. Group 3 (Mancala) – Disruption (1), Time & Culture (2-tie), Cost (3)
- F. As a team, the CPC synthesized their rankings into a few key points:
 - i. Group 1:
 - 1) CPC members were curious how sustainability factors into each of these design criteria.
 - 2) There was concern about maintaining the Middle College program during construction. This could be a key disruption. PCC Cascade Campus could have a program for dual enrollment to help with this.
 - 3) Jenn expressed that JHS is a community hub for alumni who don't even have kids attending the school. This makes it different from other schools in Portland and shows that Culture and Heritage needs to be prioritized.
 - 4) Michael noted that we discussed disruption in the short term but cannot be certain of the long-term impacts of this project within the community.
 - 5) Since it was difficult to understand the complexities of how each factor influences one another, Emily re-organized the factors into a Venn diagram with Culture and Heritage as the center.
 - ii. Group 2:
 - 1) This group felt that most of the heritage lay in retaining the existing building.
 - 2) Steve asked if there was a scenario where paying for portables and temporary structures would be taking away some of the budget from student programs in the new school.
 - iii. Group 3:
 - 1) Mancala shared her concern about how long the students will need to remain in the existing school. CPC members noted that remaining in the old building has its own health and safety risks which are disruptive to current students.
 - 2) There is a feeling that this project is being built for a different audience than the one currently using the space. The team should be considering the disruption to current students and communities during this process.
 - 3) There was emphasis on maintaining relationships with PCC during the process and keep middle college as a resource to current students.

5. INTERACTIVE EXERCISE: KEY SCENARIO PLANNING

- A. Jeanie shared three Modernization/Addition vs Full Replacement Scenarios
- B. Members of the CPC asked the following clarifying questions:
 - i. In which scenarios will the existing 1960's gym stay?
 - 1) Scenarios 2 and 3 have the potential to retain the existing 1960's gym during construction.
 - ii. What will happen to JHS' community partners in each scenario?

- 1) There will be efforts to maintain or relocate all of the services currently used by JHS students, staff, and community members during construction.
- iii. How do we quantify the social impact or benefit of each scenario?
- iv. Can the CPC get a formal tour of the building?
 - i. Yes, the project team will be organizing tours of JHS and other Portland high schools.
 - v. Is it possible to create a new building with elements from the old building?
- C. The CPC divided into 3 groups and worked to rank the level of disruption and representation of culture and heritage for each scheme.
- D. The CPC shared the following takeaways:
 - i. Group 1:
 - 1) Many members of the CPC are concerned that a full demolition of the building will sever the historic culture and memories of the place. They compared it to root shock, meaning that placing the existing community in a new space will have unpredictable outcomes.
 - 2) Michael expressed concern about unequal representation from elders versus students in the design process.
 - 3) Overall, there is concern that eliminating the old building will erase the community who built the JHS legacy. Jenn noted that the elders will still understand the existing building even if it changes on the inside.
 - 4) Jenn shared a story about how parents continue to bring their children to the JHS youth football program, despite the disorganization, because the parents are so passionate about their experiences as Demos and want the same experience for their kids.
 - 5) Jenn noted that the student body will continue to grow but is unsure whether a new building would continue to be a community hub for alumni who have left the area or no longer have kids at JHS.
 - 6) Group 1 left the following notes on their scenario board with additional comments:
 - a) The best-case scenario is to retain and fully replace the materials in the existing building.
 - b) They would like to know more about how the program numbers are determined. Ex: How many therapeutic spaces will there be?
 - c) What is the triage plan for a system change? The plan must involve current students, future students, staff and elders.
 - d) Can the CPC get a full tour of the existing building?
 - e) What parts of the building are empty/underutilized?
 - f) Are there ways for a new building to reflect the historic building?
 - g) Will the replacement of the existing building be a symbol of erasure and past urban renewal efforts?
 - ii. Group 2:
 - 1) This group did not prioritize a scheme.
 - 2) The group felt that the current relationship of the structures and fields with Killingsworth and Alberta made sense in relation to noise and connections with the neighborhood.
 - 3) This group felt that a lot of the disruption was temporary and that long term cultural preservation was the main priority.
 - 4) They wondered what the preservation would look like. Is it saving the 1909 building? Is it saving the version of the building from the 50s and 60s?
 - 5) Jeanie shared that the design team is investigating the current condition of the façade and will report back to the CPC in the future.
 - 6) Group 2 did not leave any additional notes on their scenario board.
 - ii. Group 3:

- 1) There is concern about Scenario 1 and keeping students in the building while the north is constructed. This group wants the students out of the old building as soon as possible and placed into a safer space.
 - 2) Tae expressed a desire to retain the existing athletic fields (Scenario 2 + 3) because they serve as a community hub. This can mitigate some disruption.
 - 3) This group saw potential to maintain the culture and heritage in either the renovation or a new structure. They felt that they needed more time to investigate the nuances around how that can be preserved.
 - 4) Group 3 expressed a strong need for student commons and informal spaces and aren't sure where that would happen if the existing building is retained. There is currently a lot of underutilized space in the existing building because students require teacher supervision to use certain spaces. Increased visibility of each space could help with this issue.
 - 5) Group 3 left the following notes on their scenario board with additional comments:
 - a) Can the CPC get an idea of what happens to the community partners in each scenario?
 - b) The cafeteria and common spaces need to be integrated and visible, no matter which scenario is selected.
 - c) There is a desire for a more significant, welcoming entrance.
 - d) Putting students in a temporary school or portable during construction might still be safer than staying in the old building. Can PCC provide any temporary spaces?
 - e) This group emphasized the importance of well-maintained outdoor spaces to attract alumni and serve as visible outdoor learning spaces for students.
 - f) Maintaining sporting events and athletic spaces will keep the community together throughout the process. Though, there is still a desire to renovate or upgrade those facilities eventually.
- B. In the last 5 minutes of group discussion, the CPC discussed their thoughts on the architectural qualities of the existing building.
- i. Cleo said that maintaining the structure itself is likely more important than the detailing of the façade to the elders that attended JHS.
 - ii. Other CPC members agreed that the spirit of the space mattered more than the details of the building.
 - iii. Becca brought up that there might be qualities of the spaces that evoke certain memories of the place for alumni, such as the layout of the rooms, the entry sequence, or the feeling of the natural light coming in from the windows.
 - iv. Michael expressed that the conversation around preserving certain spatial elements is not totally adjacent to a discussion around the architectural experience. There are certain symbolic elements, like a cornerstone, that might matter more than the amount of light in a space or a scale of a room.
 - v. Jeanie concluded that there will be opportunities to discuss these architectural qualities further and brainstorm design ideas at the next CPC focused on Culture and Heritage.

6. CHAIR + CO-CHAIR ROLE

- A. Steve announced the chair and co-chair election process, describing the responsibilities of the CPC leadership roles. He asked CPC members to use an updated online form that has been sent out to complete the nomination process.
- B. Jenn shared that it would be preferred by the CPC that the chair or co-chair be a person of color, ideally a student, to accurately represent who this project will be impacting the most.

7. NEXT STEPS

BORA

H. Jeanie introduced CPC-4 and some discussion points for CPC members to consider over the next two weeks.

8. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT & ANTI OPPRESSION STATEMENT

A. Kiesha read the PPS Land Acknowledgment and Anti-Oppression Statements.

9. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:15 PM

END OF MEETING MINUTES