MEETING NO.: 011
LOCATION: Booker T. Washington High School
DATE / TIME: February 11, 2014, 4:00 pm
ATTENDEES: LaShonda Bilbo-Ervin, Principal; Barbara J. Pierce, Parent; Ryan Cozad, Teacher; Martin Lavergne, Parent; Lorraine Gibbs, SDMC; Noe Resendiz, Student; Sue Robertson, HISD-Facilities Planning; Princess Jenkins, HISD-Facilities Planning; Amanda Goodie, RPH/Kwame Building Group; Jim Hepburn, FH/HP; Ed Schmidt, FH/HP; Bob Myers, HISD Facilities Design; Licia Green, FHHP; Kim Jones, One World Strategy Group; Lamar Johnson, JROTC Instructor
PURPOSE: This meeting will focus on the review of the updated design for Booker T. Washington High School.
AGENDA ITEMS:
- Presentation of the Seattle, Washington Trip
- Presentation of the Main Entrance Options
- Preparation for the Community Meeting
- What to Expect at the Next PAT Meeting
NOTES:
Discussion:
Seattle, Washington Trip:
1. The PAT visited five facilities: Four schools: 3 new, 1 renovation and 1 university research building.
2. The trip was a great experience and extremely helpful to PAT members. They were able to personally see materials, structures, lighting, academic configurations and applications.
3. One of the main entry spaces they visited included an airplane hanging from the ceiling. The gave them the idea to possibly include a rocket or some other equipment symbolic of the school in their main entry.
4. Principal Ervin shared about the open reception area at Marysville Getchell. The open space allows for immediate interaction with guests as well as serves as a security measure.
5. She also shared about the creative ways in which signage could be integrated into the space.
6. One facility showcased the building’s mechanical equipment by surrounded the equipment rooms with glass walls.
7. The PAT noted that exterior elements including metal panels, various masonry products and glass were used extensively.
8. Principal Ervin shared that the facility tours provided the opportunity to see the different colors on metal panels that could be used to enhance the exterior elevations.
9. PAT Member, Ms. Gibbs, shared that many of the facilities used the structural (engineering materials) as visual elements in their design and she liked the effect.
10. Seattle, Washington trip attendees agreed that the use of exposed concrete and steel with clean, crisp finishes and the use of finished carpentry (wood with a light finish) in the structure was nicely done. It was described by Fanning Howey /House Partnership Architects as poetic aesthetics and solid engineering.
12. The designs incorporated interesting use of wall coverings: utilized photographs on vinyl on walls & doors, burnished concrete block, acrylics, ceramic tile, and metal rods across a wall to allow for displays to hang.

13. The facilities that were toured showcased different ceiling designs: colored ceilings, floating ceilings, lighting hanging between the floating ceiling panels, ability to pull down power cords, shop equipment and lights from ceilings.

14. The facilities use of flexible space was impressive: large spaces with movable walls, furniture (moveable seating), and pull down plugs. The PAT liked the use of desks as dry erase boards and the walls as dry erase and magnetic boards, moveable glass partitions with mini-blinds and the use of flat screens in the flexible spaces.

15. It was also shared that the flexible spaces were very quiet.

16. A number of facilities utilized roll-up doors. From the outside they looked like windows. Outside space could be used as demonstration space as well as student/theater seating (dual use).

17. There was an opportunity to tour a facility that utilized the classroom work space efficiently, this included - a long wall component of 5 panels that included: dry erase board space, plasma TV underneath, smart board, book cases on the sides with cabinetry on the bottom with locks. Students had the use of a microphone and sound amplification was built into the classroom. This classroom could also be used for distance learning.

18. One takeaway from the tour was they noticed that the students were treated like adults in the flexible space (21st century environmental shift). This shift included students using their cell phones as learning tools, increased self-studying, the building supported student engagement and not they were not closely supervised. The culture of one of the schools is that “trust is assumed until broken”.

19. It was also shared that the use of the white board was a common tool used by all.

20. The facilities toured had different entrance canopies. At one school the columns at the front entrance served as a rain water cistern (collection system).

Design Update:

1. Fanning Howey /House Partnership presented a number of School Entrance options. The consistent messages that they had been hearing from the previous PAT meeting were:
   a. Identifiable / Iconic
   b. Something that “Can become a beacon”
   c. Can be used as a display for the student’s accomplishments

2. Images from the previous conversations were reviewed to bring everyone up to speed.

3. The Architect shared 3 assumptions:
   a. Feature Element – easily identifiable, iconic and memorable
   b. Building Atrium – Soaring (opportunity to display equipment, art in ceiling that celebrates what Booker T. Washington High School stands for or what students are engaged in)
   c. Entrance Canopy – for the purpose of getting from the drop off to the front door (utilitarian in purpose)

4. Three distinctly different schemes were presented and explained.

5. Community Polling – The architects distributed polling devices and ask the attendees for this input. Questions focused on the 3 assumptions were asked with multiple options offered. An overwhelming support, always more that 56% and as high as 75%, was shown for the dramatic building atrium with simple entrance canopy structure.

Community Meeting:

1. The 2nd Community Meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 24, 2014 from 6:30pm – 7:30pm.

2. Principal Ervin shared that the flyers have already gone out in the Monday folders and the meeting notice is already on the marquee of the school.

3. The attendees expressed a desire that the presentation for the Community Meeting needs to include the following:
   a. Academic vision for the new school
   b. Students input and perspective for the future of the school
   c. Seattle, Washington Briefing
   d. Design Update
   e. Real Estate / Land Purchase Update
   f. Project / Construction Schedule
   g. Project Cost Summary
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4. Discussion followed each one of the suggested topics with concern that various members from the community will come to the meeting looking for specific pieces of information and the team needs to be prepared to address the issues.

5. HISD asked for Fanning Howey /House Partnership to prepare a draft presentation for the community meeting based on the conversations in this meeting. They will review and distribute it to members of the team that will be part of the community meeting.

Question and Answers:
1. Questions concerning the purchasing of the existing properties, will someone be at the Community Meeting to answer the questions?
   a. HISD will address these questions internally, and there will be someone present to answer questions concerning the purchasing the existing properties at the Community Meeting.

What to Expect Next PAT Meeting:
1. The Architect will present updated exterior elevations.

NEXT PAT MEETING: The next PAT meeting will be held on March 11, 2014 at 4:00pm.

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

Sincerely,

Amanda Goodie, PMP, AVS
Director, Program Management and Strategic Planning

RPH Consulting Group
Direct 713.504.8606
Office 713.275.4200
Fax 866.704.8917
agoodie@rphconsultinggroup.com