Project Advisory Team Meeting Minutes
Grady Middle School PAT

MEETING NO.: 004
LOCATION: Grady Middle School
DATE / TIME: July 9, 2013, 1 p.m.
ATTENDEES: Ellecia Knolle, Briargrove Elementary School PTO President; Mary Lynn Khater, Grady Parent; Gretchen Kasper-Hoffman, Principal; Carolina Weitzman, Natex Architects; John Haugen, Natex Architects; Julio Urrunaga, Natex Architects; Gordon Richardson, Briarbend HOA President; Heidi Prince, Grady Parent; Penny Butler, Community Member / Grandparent; Jim Rice, Rice and Gardner Consulting, Inc.; Robert Barrera, Rice and Gardner Consulting, Inc.; Gloria Barrera, Vanir Construction Management; Sue Robertson, HISD-Facilities Planning; Kedrick Wright, HISD-Facilities Design; LaJuan Harris, HISD-Facilities Planning

PURPOSE: The purpose of this meeting was to review sketches for Grady Middle School prepared by Natex Architects.

AGENDA ITEMS:
- Introductions
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Review Grady MS Guiding Principles
- Design Presentation (Natex Architects)
- Review Space Descriptions
- What to expect at the next PAT meeting

NOTES:
1. Representatives from Rice and Gardner were introduced to the team as the Program Managers for the Grady 2012 Bond project. The Program Manager will be responsible for making sure the design is carried out on time and within budget.

2. Grady PAT reviewed the Guiding Principles and gave their initial approval of the principles.

3. Natex Architects presented the PAT with sketches from their study of the project.
   a. Seven temporary buildings would relocate from the east to the west side of the property prior to construction of the new addition. Principal Kasper-Hoffman indicated the school may not need all the buildings. Rice Gardner to investigate the possibility of selling some of the temporary buildings. The utility building will be demolished after the utilities are relocated to the mechanical room in the main building.
      i. The temporary buildings are approximately 25 years old. Therefore new buildings may be required if needed.
      ii. Several temporary buildings are empty.
b. The proposed site separated passenger drop-off, bus circulation and parking.
   i. A driveway from Sage to San Felipe traveled along the western and southern boundaries of the site. Principal Kasper-Hoffman was concerned that a lot of supervision would be required to monitor the driveway when students are being dropped-off. An open driveway would create a management problem for the school on weekends and after hours; therefore the area would need to be locked. The school is still held responsible by the adjacent communities for loud and unauthorized activities. The driveway would be an invitation for more unauthorized after school activities.
   ii. The parking lot on the east side of the school was revised to separate the parking area from the bus circulation area. Two Sage Street entrances were available for cars to enter the parking lot. There was only one point of entrance from the bus circulation area. Two schools are located in close proximity on Sage Street, however, heavy traffic caused by school’s dismissal quickly ends within 15 minutes.
   iii. The bus staging area had sufficient length for several buses to line up without blocking traffic on San Felipe.

c. Natex Architects presented a two story versus a three story layout of the new addition.
   i. One grade level would occupy a tower in the two story option while one grade would occupy a floor in the three story option. The PAT agreed that the two story option would allow collaboration and interaction between the grades since all three grade levels would be housed on each floor.
   ii. The footprint of the two story layout limited the amount of green space available between the wings. The space would be sufficient for outdoor science activities.
   iii. Three learning commons were located next to each tower in the two story layout. This arrangement would allow for multiple groups to utilize the spaces. The PAT decided that the learning commons should be a one story space to limit the noise from the area entering the class rooms. The size of the learning commons will be reduced by about ¼ to allow for two floors instead of the open space in a one story space. The three story layout had one learning common which would limit multiple groups from utilizing the space.
   iv. The two story layout did not require an elevator, because the elevator in the existing space was close enough to accommodate the space, however an additional elevator would be required in the three story layout.
   v. The Science labs located on the first floor of the two story layout could utilize the outdoor space. The science labs in the three story option were located on the upper floors and would make it more difficult for students utilize the outdoor spaces.
   vi. One set of restrooms was shown in the new addition. Administration felt one restroom would be easier to monitor and clean. Restroom designs would have no doors, limited sight lines into the space and doors on the restroom stalls.
   vii. Adult restrooms should be located near offices and the 8th grade areas where possible. Adult restrooms can be unisex.

4. Comments and recommendations:
   a. It was determined that the driveway could be added at a later date if the school so desired. Parents would continue to drop off students on the west side of the building. The driveway shown on the three story layout would be more fully developed. The new driveway and trees would provide an inviting space for parents waiting for students.
   b. The buses use the circulation area at the northwest corner of the site presently. The buses will continue to use this area. The buses do not all arrive at the same time, therefore traffic blockage does not become an issue.
   c. It was determined that an additional parking lot entrance on the east side of the building should be allowed to accommodate easier access from the driveway during weekend activities at the school. The entrances could be blocked off when needed.
   d. The two story scheme was selected by the PAT for further development by Natex Architects. Three dimensional massing models of the buildings will also be studied.
5. What to expect at the next PAT Meeting?
   a. Review of Educational Specifications
   b. Schematic Design of two story addition
   c. Three dimensional massing presentation
   d. Schedule for project.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-01</td>
<td>Grady Educational Specifications (Facilities Planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-02</td>
<td>Schematic Design of two story addition (Natex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-03</td>
<td>Three Dimensional Massing Studies (Natex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-04</td>
<td>Prepare Master Schedule (Natex / Rice &amp; Gardner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEXT TWO MEETINGS:**  August 13, 2013 @ 1 p.m.

Please review the meeting minutes and submit any changes or corrections to LaJuan Harris. After five (5) days, the minutes will be assumed to be accurate.

Sincerely,

LaJuan A. Harris, PMP
Facilities Planner, Facility Planning
HISD – Construction & Facility Services
3200 Center Street, Houston, TX 77007
Phone: (713) 556-9300

Attachment: