



Minutes
2012 Bond Project Advisory Team (PAT) Meeting
Madison High School

MEETING #: 16

LOCATION: Madison High School

DATE / TIME: January 19, 2016, 3:00pm

ATTENDEES: (those marked with a check were present)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Chris Royster	Morris Architects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sharon Sanford	Counselor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	William Truitt	Morris Architects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steven Gee	HISD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lina Sabouni	Morris/AutoArch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LaJuan Harris	HISD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brenda Braziel	Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Carlos Hernandez	MA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vivian Harris	Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Linda Scurlock	PAT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dexter McDougald	Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allen Williams	Teacher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Josolynne Reed	Teacher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Richardson	Administration
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Orlando Reyna	Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ray Washington	Community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eric Ford	HISD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jason Pierre	Morris Architects
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joyce Woods	Registrar	<input type="checkbox"/>		

PURPOSE: Discussions focused on Design Development update.

AGENDA:

- Design Development Update
- Questions and Answers
- What to expect at the next PAT meeting

DISCUSSION:

Welcoming by HISD

- a. HISD - Project Manager Steven Gee welcomed all participants to the January 2016 Madison High School Project Advisory Team (PAT) meeting. Mr. Gee opened with a discussion of concerns raised at the previous PAT meeting and community presentation.

Design Development Status:

1. Morris Architects (MA) William Truitt described the choice of materials and rationale behind a variation of façade massing. In order to minimize the impact of the proposed 270,00 sf High School, a series of materials and textures along with variation in school volumes and open

courtyards, work to break down the overall scale of the school and fit it into the texture of the surrounding community.

2. In response to PAT concerns, MA then presented a series of options for a re-design of the front entry.
 - a. Option 1 – Scheme from previous meetings.
 - b. Option 2 – Introduction of a colonnade, prominent signage at vehicle entry, extended canopy, recessed community room, and redevelopment of the front plaza.
 - c. Option 3 - Introduction of a colonnade, prominent signage at vehicle entry, brick pediment over front entry, and redevelopment of the front plaza.
 - d. Option 4 - Introduction of a colonnade, prominent signage at vehicle entry, extended double layer shade system, and redevelopment of the front plaza.
 - e. Option 5 - Introduction of a colonnade, prominent signage at vehicle entry, extended double layer shade system, monumental column marking entry, and redevelopment of the front plaza.
 - f. Option 6 – Introduction of columns at entry, prominent signage at vehicle entry, extended front porch and prominent stairs, extended canopy, and redevelopment of the front plaza.
3. MA discussed an aerial perspective of option 6. The proposed option heightens visibility of the entry through stronger shadow lines and the introduction of columns to the ground.
4. MA discussed a plan render of the redeveloped front plaza. Student activity would be concentrated at the plaza. Alternation of softscape and trees at the neighborhoods with hardscape and seating at the front door would help define the entry.
5. MA discussed a series of perspective renders which included wider views taken from east bound West Orem as requested by the PAT at the previous meeting.
6. Mrs. Linda Scurlock asked about the use of concrete on the Madison project and specifically requested warranty information for the paint to be used on the concrete panels. Her concern is that maintenance will prove to be an issue over the lifespan of the building.
7. Mrs. Scurlock also asked why MA had not used all brick in lieu of concrete.
 - a. Mr. Gee responded that the Madison project was in budget and that an all brick building would not be possible.
 - b. Mr. Truitt explained that a variety of materials was desirable to help minimize the scale of the building, and that budget had not exclusively driven material selection.
 - c. Mrs. Scurlock requested a percentage breakdown of the amount of brick used versus concrete.

8. Councilman Larry Green expressed his concerns about the current design.
 - a. The councilman stated that he appreciated the MA effort in adding emphasis to the entry and that he has heard community concern about visibility of the entry from all directions.
 - b. The councilman stated that MA hasn't changed the basic design of the particular structure and that overall the building just isn't going to fit into the community.
 - c. The councilman stated that the neighborhoods hide the front door and should not front West Orem, and that the proposed school does not look like a high school. Instead the proposal looks like a tin building or a business.
 - d. Councilman Green stated that he was finished and that he was going to take whatever steps necessary to move forward.
9. Mrs. Harris stated that the proposed project is not what she wants to see in her community. Her primary concern is that the neighborhoods project out along Orem.
10. Councilman Green stated that the proposed Yates campus is a good example of a school that does not have exposed neighborhoods. The councilman explained that at Yates the neighborhoods are placed on the back of the school and that the front is even and smooth.
11. Mrs. Harris requested the removal of MA.
12. HISD (Mr. Gee) asked the PAT if an L shaped building would be acceptable since this is what would happen through moving the neighborhoods to the back.
13. Mrs. Scurlock replied that no, an L-shaped building was unacceptable.
14. Councilman Green asked MA if they have tried to achieve the same program objectives by flipping the school about the primary east/west axis.
15. MA (Mr. Truitt) explained that flipping the school would eliminate access to the sports fields for the athletic department, and that the existing Madison campus buildings prevent the neighborhoods from moving to the back.
16. Mr. McDougald asked MA to explain where the neighborhood concept comes from, why has MA proposed this model rather than a traditional classroom layout?
17. Mrs. Harris responded that this was proposed by HISD as another way to damage the community kids.
18. MA (Mr. Truitt) explained that the neighborhoods were associated with a professional curriculum and this allowed students to engage school work in a career oriented environment alongside student and faculty engaged in the same pursuit.
19. Councilman Green asked Principal Reyna how many classrooms would be displaced by the early demolition of the science building.



20. The principal responded that 16 classrooms would be displaced.
21. HISD (Mr. Gee) responded that more importantly than the classroom count, one of the classrooms is the automotive shop and that the equipment could not be relocated on campus. Mr. Gee explained that HISD had explored using other facilities including the car lot at the corner of White Heather but that ultimately the automotive shop would have to stay intact during the construction of the new school.
22. Councilman Green stated that our decision should center on whether or not the disruption of the existing school for a year should undermine the construction of a new campus that will stand for 50 years.
 - a. The councilman stated that a better business decision would be to relocate automotive to T-buildings and de-emphasize the practical side of the education, or to associate Madison with another campus for the period of displacement.
23. MA (Mr. Truitt) explained that the proposed configuration was not a compromised solution, that new projects always face some constraints and issues, but that overall the proposed school is working very well.
24. Councilman Green responded that the building aesthetics were terrible and that the proportions are not correct.
25. Mr. McDougald explained that this was not an opportunity for MA to be defensive about the proposed design, but rather an opportunity to listen, and learn how to communicate with the PAT in order to facilitate a long term solution.
26. Mrs. Harris stated that the proposed MA design had demonstrated that the land was sufficient to build a new school, the problem is the design.
27. Councilman Green stated that he wants to see an L-shaped proposal and that the PAT will have to select the lesser of two evils.
28. HISD (Mr. Gee) responded that he would not confirm that MA would redesign the school, but if they did the L-shaped proposal would be a sketch only and would be issued from HISD.
29. Councilman Green asked that the sketch include the existing campus.
30. HISD (Mr. Gee) proposed that the sketches would be similar to those presented during the charrette.
31. Mrs. Harris requested more brick in the redesign.
32. Mr. McDougald proposed that Morris forgo elements in the program to get a better design.
33. HISD (Mr. Gee) responded that eliminating program components would have to go through HISD academics and was not a decision that Morris could make.



34. Mrs. Harris stated that the PAT would be happy once the neighborhoods were gone.

35. The coach ended the discussion by walking through some proposed changes to the layout of the athletic fields.

WHAT TO EXPECT AT THE NEXT PAT MEETING:

1. Design Development Update

NEXT PAT MEETING: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 4:15 pm, Madison High School Library

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

Sincerely,

Steven Gee

Project Manager

HISD – Construction & Facility Services

3200 Center Street, Houston, TX 77007

Phone: (713) 556-9261

Email: sgee@houstonisd.org