



MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Portland Public Schools – Grant High School Modernization
PROJECT NO: 2015909.00
DATE: 1 October 2015
FILE NAME: DAG02.docx
SUBJECT: Design Advisory Group (DAG) 02

MEETING DATE: 24 September 2015
TIME: 5:30-7:25pm

LOCATION: Grant High School Library

ATTENDEES (shown in **bold**)

Project Team:

Michelle Chariton, PPS OSM	Katie Davidson, GHS DAG
Kristie Moore, PPS OSM	Pam Knowles, GHS DAG
Rene Berndt, 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
Brandon Grilc	Nate McCoy, GHS DAG
Kristen Minor, Peter Meijer Associates	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	
Bill Dickey, GHS DAG	

Members of the Public:

Stuart Emmons
Jon Issacs
Dean Marriot
Patrick Gillen
Angel Van Note
Craig Williams



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 2.01 New DAG Member Introductions

- :: **Nate McCoy** – Director of the National Association of Minority Contractors, and representative of Black Parent Initiative.
- :: **Scott Bailey** – three generations from Irvington neighborhood, Grant alumni. Active with PPS.

DAG 2.02 DAG Schedule Updates

- :: DAG 03 has been moved to a standard Thursday slot on October 8th.
- :: Potential dates for the school tours –October 21, 22, or 23.
 - Kristie will send out a Doodle poll to determine the best date.
 - School tours are currently not scheduled for the stakeholders (teachers & staff).
 - Jason noted that it would be beneficial for the stakeholders to participate in the tours, and wondered if there is a way to create a virtual experiences so that others can participate and get involved.
- :: DAG 06 has been moved to Wednesday, December 16th due to a conflict with Grantasia.
- :: Michelle noted that the DAG members are expected to attend the workshops and the open houses in addition to the DAG meetings.

DAG 2.03 Mahlum Experience

- :: 70 years of educational facility design
- :: 54 independent and public school clients
- :: Experience in 33 school districts
- :: 36 high schools and 41 elementary schools in the past 10 years
- :: 44 design excellence and industry awards

DAG 2.04 Design Team (see related PowerPoint slides):

- :: Mahlum (prime architect)
- :: Peter Meijer Architect (historic architect)
- :: Mayer/Reed (landscape architect)
- :: Balzheiser & Hubbard Engineers (civil)
- :: Interface Engineering (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, technology)
- :: KPFF (structural)
- :: Halliday Associates (food service)
- :: PLA Designs (theater)
- :: Morrison Hershfield (envelope)
- :: Karen Braitmayer (accessibility)
- :: Greenbusch Group (acoustics, elevator, audio/visual)
- :: Apex Environmental (hazardous materials)
- :: Rider Levett Bucknall (cost estimating)
- :: Angelo Planning (land use)

DAG 2.05 Describe the CMGC Process

- :: Different than the traditional Design-Bid-Build process where the general contractor is selected at the completion of the design process, in the Construction Manager / General Contractor (CMGC) project delivery method, they are brought on much earlier in the process.
- :: The intent is to start the process by issuing an RFP around the start of the schematic design phase, and to have the CMGC on board soon after. They would then continue on as part of the team through project completion.
- :: The benefits of bringing the general contractor on board early is to utilize their expertise to help the team to make informed decisions.
- :: The CMGC will act as a consultant during the design process and can offer constructability and pricing feedback on different design options and can help to identify risks based on their established means and methods. This can be especially important on projects similar to ours with existing conditions and lots of unknowns.
- :: It's important that we engage them early so that they can provide the most added value related to constructability, cost, and schedule.
- :: Jason Blumklotz Question: When will the request for proposal (RFP) go out?
 - We have discussed the RFP hitting the streets around the start of Schematic Design.
- :: Doug Capps Question: When is the construction cost determined?
 - The guaranteed maximum price (GMP) will be set by the general contractor at the completion of the Design Development phase or later. The general contractor is still required to bid out all of the work to subcontractors.
- :: Scott Bailey Question: At Roosevelt HS - there was a surprise at the end with the brick and the budget. Is there a way to address this?
 - At the project kick-off meeting with the design team and PPS, the meeting started with a lessons learned session from Roosevelt HS & Franklin HS. One topic revolved around the several "value engineering" exercises that occurred late in the project. We hope to minimize that by engaging the CMGC early, and working with them closely to develop cost models that are back checked by our cost estimator. The volatility of the construction costs especially in our current market is hard to predict so we must do our best to be informed throughout the process.

DAG 2.06 DAG Business

- :: Define process & role of DAG
 - Table tents have been setup at each table reminding everyone of the process and role of the DAG.
 - Posters have also been printed and posted as a reminder.
- :: Ratification of Charter
 - There was a discussion around a co-chair and a rotating chair
 - Michelle passed out a description of the responsibilities of a chair
 - Michelle suggested that we ratify the charter to include a co-chair
 - The group will come back to this discussion at the end of the meeting
- :: Community outreach strategy
- :: Post all DAG Materials
 - All DAG material is posted on the Grant HS bond website:
www.pps.k12.or.us/bond/grant
- :: Collect notes and comments

- Notes and comments will be collected as needed and will be represented in the DAG presentation material as applicable.
- :: Start Facebook group
- :: Add reminders when info is posted.

DAG 2.07 What We Learned (see related PowerPoint slides):

- :: DAG – feedback from questions posed at the DAG 01 meeting
- :: Stakeholders – feedback from the same questions
- :: Synthesize – common themes between DAG & Stakeholders (yellow text)
- :: DAG homework is to review and make sure that themes were not missed.

DAG 2.08 Historic Focus (see related PowerPoint slides presented by Kristen Minor)

- :: Grant High is set in a residential context, north of the Hollywood district, has a symmetrical front fronting east to 36st Street.
- :: Snapshots of the plan – first buildings completed in 1923. There was only a main classroom bar and the old gymnasium. Red color means that SHPO has designated it historically significant.
- :: Added units in 1925 and 1927 because there were not many classrooms in the original building.
- :: By 1936, the US was in the middle of the Great Depression. They needed more space but had a limited budget and began using portable classrooms around 1930. These buildings are colored green because they are not historically significant.
- :: It wasn't until after WWII that a real, permanent addition could replace the portables. These were the north wing addition and the new gymnasium.
- :: The 1950s and later additions were all deemed not to have historical significance by the 2009 survey commission by PPS.
- :: The library wing was added in 1959. More portables were constructed in the 1960s, and the science wing was built in 1966.
- :: Grant is eligible for listing on the National Register, but currently it is not listed. The survey sheet accepted by SHPO shows what is historically significant to the state. It also shows that there is one more addition to the north of the new gym in 1970- the mechanic shop.
- :: You may be most familiar with the city regulations and review process, such as in the Irvington historic district or buildings on the National Register. However this building has no city or other formal historic design. Therefore the city is not involved except for building permits.
- :: Because this building is in public ownership, the State Historic Preservation Office is tasked with oversight of any building considered eligible. They are not going to approve or deny a design, but act as a consultant.
- :: Part of the state process is working out appropriate mitigation for any historic losses. There is no "denial" but they are looking to encourage preservation and ultimately can ask agency for mitigation.
- :: We are aiming for documentation submittal towards the end of the Design Development phase late next year. There will be informal meetings leading up to this.
- :: Last Thursday the SHPO staff walked inside and out with PPS & design team. We need to keep them informed as the design develops.
- :: Historical significance of exterior details: can see classical revival detailing, terracotta sculptural details set into brick, terracotta columns in front.
- :: Historical significance of the auditorium: bas relief at top of side pilasters, "Egyptian" detailing;

- the Hoeckner murals were finished prior to the Works Progress Administration- 1935.
- :: Historical significance of the old gymnasium include the banked track, skylight, flooring, bleachers.
- :: Historical significance of public spaces, interior details- the storefront entryways divide stairs from corridors- all the windows originally had these divided lights. In the stairwells there are beautifully detailed curving wood rails, and wood pilaster details at the entry area.
- :: The original architect was William C Knighton. Photo credit to the collection of Bob Clay.
- :: Other buildings that Knighton designed were Deepwood Estate in Salem in the Queen Anne style. It was 1894- he was 27.
- :: Oregon State Supreme Court Building, in Salem 1914- on the capitol mall. Can see some of the classical style details here similar to GHS. Multi-story columns with decorative capitols and strong banding.
- :: The Schnabel House in Portland, built 1907 in the Arts & Crafts style.
- :: The Justice Building in Salem, 1930- a "stripped" classical and less decorative building.
- :: Schools included GHS, Boys Training School in Woodburn, built in 1926 in the Mediterranean revival style with a tile roof, arches, but very similar in form. North Salem HS in 1937- completed one year before he died; and Johnson Hall at UO.
- :: Historical school patterns similar to GHS can be seen at Rose City Park School plan- photo was taken before the 2nd side was finished; and the Kenton school plan- now De LaSalle. The pattern was never completed.
- :: The overall form and historical layout of GHS was based on a public circulation pattern: generous double-loaded corridors with central entry. These were intended to expand into other units toward the west, leaving the front symmetrical and open. In the modern plan, even though additions were made to the west, the pieces have created a lot of unutilized or poorly utilized space on the west side of the site.

DAG 2.09 Historic Focus Questions

- :: What is eligible for historic register? Not clear – just that the building can be registered.
- :: If SHPO is only for consultation, the entire building could be taken down?
- :: For large areas of demolition to historically significant fabric, SHPO could create high bar for mitigation.
- :: SHPO can demand documentation but does not have the authority to require action.
- :: It is true that the SHPO's process is one of "consultation" rather than approval/denial, and SHPO does not really have an enforcement mechanism, but that it was the law and that they would not council PPS to not follow the law.
- :: The construction budget assumes that 75% to 80% of the existing building will be salvaged. If the cost of construction increases then other decisions would need to be made such as space or program cuts in order to meet the budget.
- :: We often think of historic buildings as being inflexible, but the meter of the window and walls actually make it very flexible with regard to what can be done inside these envelopes.
- :: We shouldn't feel that we are locked into something because of SHPO and the budget.
- :: It is a great opportunity to think about how we can transform this building with the flexibility that is there to better match the program needs.
- :: If money is spent on restoration then it may take away from spending money on other important aspects of the building.
- :: Need to understand the trade-offs and the balance of preservation versus new construction.

- :: Modernization is typically but not always more cost effective than new construction.
- :: Not easy to determine at this point what the cost will be for modernization versus new construction.
- :: There is a desire to tour new schools and old schools on our tour.
- :: Community needs to join the discussion. What does the community value and desire.
- :: Historic value of neighborhood (beautiful old homes) and school is part of that. Must look like it belongs to the community. Many comments from DAG & stakeholder questions valued tradition and history.
- :: Cost comparison would create a fair discussion for the DAG and community to decide what they value and desire.
- :: The team will look at cost models and program ramifications from a square footage perspective. Will look at 'ground zero' - what it would take to renovate the entire building, then overlay the educational program, the ed spec, the teaching program, to help us see the points of interest and where we would like to explore.
- :: Explain mitigation.
- :: Hard to give a 1-to-1 example of SHPO mitigation. PPS gives example of seismic improvement of hollow clay tile. \$660,000 project, and told to rehabilitate the windows for \$100,000 as return for the structural improvements made in the hallways. SHPO cannot enforce this mitigation, it's a negotiation of good will. There is no mechanism within the law to force PPS to mitigate.
- :: KPFF did a survey of the building in 2007 for seismic stability, we have strategies to preserve the pieces that are here, such as the stair and elevator cores. Existing structure is pretty sound, and the symmetry of the building helps us a lot.

DAG 2.10 Time

- :: Running out of time
- :: Meeting started late due to DAG members arriving late.
- :: DAG decided to stay late to work through one of the two group work activities.
- :: We will try to do the other activity at a future meeting.
- :: In the future we need to start the meeting on time and respect the overall timeframe.
- :: Suggestion to move parking lot discussion to end of meetings in the future.

DAG 2.11 Community Preservation Priorities – Group Work

- :: Break up into 6 groups, each around a site plan
- :: Draw on the site plan to graphically represent the following questions:
 1. Identify the places that the community values. (blue marker)
 2. Identify places of memory or historic events. (green marker)
 3. What is your most beloved place and why? (yellow marker)
 4. Where is change necessary? (purple marker)

DAG 2.12 Next Steps

- :: Tours
- :: Goalsetting
- :: Adjacencies

DAG 2.13 Proposed Tours (see related PowerPoint slides):

- :: Checklist was distributed and DAG members were asked to note buildings they would like to visit.
- :: Tour schedule will be determined at a future date based on results.
- :: Proposed buildings:
 - Sandy High School, Sandy Oregon
 - Portland State University – Shattuck Hall, Portland Oregon
 - Stadium High School, Tacoma Washington
 - Aviation High School, Seattle Washington
 - Cleveland High School, Seattle Public Schools
 - McKinstry Innovation Center, Seattle Washington
 - Federal Center South Building, Seattle Washington
 - Garfield High School, Seattle Washington
 - Cornish College of the Arts, Seattle Washington
 - Roosevelt High School, Seattle Washington
 - Nathan Hale High School, Seattle Public Schools
- :: Additional Tour Suggestion
 - Reed College Performing Arts Building – new facility at the center of a historic campus

DAG 2.14 Public Comment

- :: Angel – I really like old building, I am asking the committee that if we have to take it apart to please not dump the material; we would like to keep some of it and sell it. Portland is green. Let's recycle!
- :: Dean – A good portion of the school is a part of Portland Parks and we need to visit Portland Parks and Recreation early. The 1st base is in P&R and 3rd base is PPS. Suggest early and vigorous talking to P&R.

DAG 2.15 Facebook

- :: Miriana Clark volunteered to start a Facebook page that is a closed group for DAG Members only.
- :: Abby Williams volunteered to start a Facebook page that is open to people outside of the DAG.
- :: Scott Bailey noted that not everyone is on Facebook and that we have each other's email addresses.

DAG 2.16 DAG Charter Voting

- :: Do we want Carol as the Chair, and to vote for a co-chair?
 - YES (10 votes)
 - NO (8 votes)
- :: Nomination for co-chair
 - Miriana Clark
 - Jason Blumklotz
 - Abby Williams
- :: Abby is elected co-chair based on majority vote.
- :: DAG Charter will be ratified to include 21 chair members and co-chair position.

DAG 2.17 Parking Lot Items (issues to be discussed)

- :: Doodle poll for school tour dates: October 21, 22, 23
- :: Virtual Tours for stakeholders
 - Other planning work
 - Public access via web
- :: Date CMGC is on board
- :: Make slides more visible for people in back or make slides available to follow along.
- :: VE Process discussion
- :: Chair/Co-Chair (today)
- :: What is a "social house"? (from stakeholder)
- :: Address "parking lot" at end of meeting rather than beginning
- :: Reed College tour?

END OF MINUTES