



Project Advisory Team Meeting Minutes
Jack Yates High School

MEETING NO.: 013

LOCATION: Jack Yates High School

DATE / TIME: August 21, 2014, 5:30 pm

ATTENDEES: Ray A. Gatlin, HISD Asst. Principal; Dan Bankhead, HISD General Manager; Kedrick Wright, HISD, Facilities Design; Princess Jenkins, HISD, Facilities Planning; Donetrus Hill, HISD, Principal; Cletus Johnson, HISD; Velda Hunter, HISD; Rennette Lucien, HISD; Amanda Goodie, Asst. Program Director; Marcus Bland, HISD, Asst. Principal; Carl Davis, Alumni; Larry Blackmon, Alumni; Iva Ward, Alumni; Arva Howard, Alumni; Wardell Ross, Moody-Nolan; Maurice Hobson, Parent; Jennifer Topper, HISD, SSO; Martha Griffin, HISD Dean of Instruction; Amie Johnson, Parent; Tenaya Oliveras, Student; Ebony Edwards, Student; Kenyell Banks, Student; Dove Wright, Student; Krishelle Russell, Student; Miracle Haynes, Student; Joylissa Stafford, Student; Tamara Brown, Student,

PURPOSE: The meeting focused on the new Jack Yates High School Site Plan and potential design elements for the school.

AGENDA ITEMS:

- Project Schedule
- Updated site plan
 - Presentation of site plan options
 - Voting on site plan by PAT members
- Presentation of 21st century learning environments to receive feedback on preferences
- Community Meeting set for September 16, 2014
 - Agenda for Community Meeting
- What to expect at the next PAT meeting

NOTES:

Discussion:

1. Principal Hill began the meeting by addressing the main goal – to choose one site option. It was noted that the project is two months behind schedule. He requested the group to let the past go and work together as a team in order to regain progress on the project.
 - a. Mrs. Arva Howard remarked that the project is “not behind because [the PAT] want[s] it to be”, but because information had not been shared. She expressed other concerns including that the PAT was shown the site plan without being given handouts and items requiring PAT approval should be discussed before the meeting so the PAT would not be asked to make a “snap decision”.
 - b. Mr. Dan Bankhead, HISD General Manager – Design stated that there are many items to discuss and suggested that the group begin to do so.
 - c. Mrs. Howard reminded the team that there was discussion of having additional meetings to “catch up” and the time between the last meeting and this one was a month. Mr. Bankhead responded that issue will be addressed.

- d. It was noted that the decision regarding the site will narrow down the approach so the architects can move forward and articulate the building. It was stated that the agreement will be made as a group and that although “design by committee is tough, it facilitates producing a good design”.
 - e. Mr. Albert Ray, Moody-Nolan Architects added by selecting one scheme with which to proceed, the architectural team can move forward with the overall building design.
 - f. An attendee stated that it would be helpful if HISD designated a point person –perhaps the Principal, so that information can be dispersed to the rest of the PAT between meetings to help people make decisions. It was stated that the problem is communication.
 - g. Mr. Bankhead added that all the schemes respond to Scott Street in some way, and each scheme has great advantages and disadvantages. He noted that there will be an opportunity for the PAT’s voice to be heard after the presentation. He added that the design charrette process is usually conducted with other schools. This often brings competition and illustrates common issues for each project. Since the Yates charrette occurred on a Thursday and Saturday this aspect was not included in Yates session. He voiced that he was eager to see Yates get off of the ground. Mr. Larry Blackmon stated that Mrs. Howard had presented a list of desired features and that served as the competition. He also said that Yates PAT did not object to a shared charette, but rather the constant rescheduling of the charette led to the single school session.
 - h. Ms. Amanda Goodie, HISD Project Manager stated that Mrs. Howard’s list consisted mostly of interior features and those would be addressed after the site layout is determined.
 - i. Mr. Blackmon asked about the layout and images from the Seattle trip. Mr. Blackmon stated he looked at all the layouts and suggested images that he liked. He would like the features shown in the images to be incorporated into the building design. It was stated that building design will be the next step in the process. First the PAT must select a site option. The architects will come back with a building scheme and gather feedback from the PAT.
2. Mr. Ray started the presentation by stating that the “L-Shaped” scheme has been omitted per PAT instructions.
 3. The “Open Arms” scheme was presentation by Mr. Ray:
 - a. “Open Arms” is a scheme oriented toward the Scott St./Alabama St. intersection.
 - b. It provides for an inviting facility for both students and the public.
 - c. The JROTC drill pad is located in one of the parking lots.
 - d. Mr. Bankhead asked, “What is the relationship to Scott?” Mr. Ray responded that the land currently occupied by the library could be transformed into a plaza or promenade. The street could be raised and made into an enclosed pedestrian walkway. The scheme provides a good view both to and from Scott Street.
 - e. The aerial view showed the site and the corner that could look similar to a mall and become a control point. The slide presented showed the two story and three story spaces. Mr. Ray stated that the building could be designed to look like a jewel in a crown.
 - f. Mr. Blackmon asked, “What part of the building is two stories”? Mr. Ray stated that the entry is shown as a two-story space.
 - g. Mr. Bankhead clarified that the “Open Arms” design has no back door, but it is clear where the entrance is located. The design creates a space that identifies the main entry.
 - h. It was noted that the basketball and tennis courts are existing and will not be moved. The baseball field and softball field do not overlap.
 - i. Parking is dispersed to service all events in this scheme.
 - j. A street view was presented to illustrate what the building would look like from Scott.
 4. The second scheme presented was “Stately”. This scheme is a modification of the “Stretch” option (presented previously) with an entry on Alabama that allows for an impressive view when approaching the building.
 - a. The street view presented illustrates the two front wings to be of approximately equal size.
 - b. A PAT member stated that the scheme does not show an extra playing field. Mr. Ray responded that the baseball field and softball field could serve a dual function and be used as an extra playing field.
 - c. An attendee asked what the benefit was to this building as the other scheme facing Scott. The Architect team answered that it was more cost effective. Also it is a more efficient building solar orientation. The bus circulation flow is safer, as well.
 - d. The PAT asked if the linear shape was beneficial in any way. Mr. Ray commented that the linear building would allow for a single-phase construction, as well as increased security/student control,
 - e. Mr. Bankhead stated that it would be nice to walk across the site with green space all around.

Improving Lives. Building Trust.

- f. An attendee asked if there are drawbacks to having the fields relocated. Mr. Ray explained relocating the fields would be more costly, increase the construction time, and possibly reduce funds available for the building.
5. It was noted that both site plans offer single-phase construction, which satisfies the ability to not disrupt the school and allow school to continue in the current building.
- a. An attendee stated that she liked the proposed site plans because they are not as tight as past options. The site is more open unlike the “L-Shaped” scheme.
 - b. Mr. Wardell Ross was asked to address parking. He stated that the site plans presented have 375 parking spots. Mr. Ray said that the number of spots required by the City of Houston is 500 spaces. HISD is applying for a variance to reduce the parking to 375 spaces. 375 spaces provide space for the school, additional after-school events, and auditorium parking. Ms. Goodie stated that HISD is also researching a variance to reduce the occupant load.
6. After the two site schemes were presented, other concerns were discussed:
- a. A PAT member asked if there was seating on the fields. Mr. Ray stated that there is definitely room for seating; however, permanent exterior bleachers are not currently in the program.
 - b. Mrs. Howard stated that there is room and money for things like bleachers and the Spark Park, which has been approved. She also stated that the reason she wanted the building facing Scott was due to the possibility of the railway coming down on Alabama in front of the building.
 - c. Mr. Ray pointed out that the expanded Right of Way on Alabama would be 80 feet and the easement is 25 feet; both schemes address this issue. Both schemes show the anticipated 80 feet Right of Way.
 - d. A comment was made about not relocating the sports fields and using the funds for improvements inside the building.
 - e. Mrs. Howard stated that the options had been eliminated without showing them first to the PAT. She does not want to see the football field in the front of the school.
 - f. Mr. Bankhead stated that the “L-Shaped” scheme had been evaluated and the “Open Arms” scheme also meets the criteria previously set forth. It was suggested that the two schemes should be put to the vote.
 - g. A member of the PAT said that there should be a discussion about what happens if the fields are moved and the district sends the athletic team elsewhere for two years.
 - h. Mr. Ray Gatlin said that he showed the schemes to the coaches, and there is a big concern about practice not being on campus. The coaches felt that the track is adequate, but it needs to be resurfaced and the practice field properly irrigated. Mr. Gatlin stated that moving the practices could affect eligibility. It was noted that although other schools have had students moved because the fields were not on the site that Yates did not want the student athletes to be bussed back and forth.
 - i. Mr. Blackmon responded with the fact that the school hadn’t won a championship in a long time, and that it wasn’t “crucial to sacrifice this for the good of the school”.
 - j. Mr. Bankhead reiterated that there are now three potential options (“Open Arms”, “Stately” and L-Shaped) and they should be put to the vote.
7. Several issues were discussed before the voting process began.
- a. Mrs. Howard stated that she was not happy to be looking at University of Houston in the “Stately” scheme.
 - b. When asked by the PAT his thoughts as a professional, Mr. Ray voiced his concern that, as an architect, he did not want to show site plans that didn’t feel right to him.
 - c. Mr. Gatlin did not favor the school being on a dead end street (Adair Street). Mrs. Howard believed that the street continues through to Cleburne. Ms. Goodie said that Adair Street does stop. The access drive for the retail properties is private property.
 - d. Mrs. Howard stated that she wanted to see other schemes that had been discussed.
 - e. Mr. Wally Huerta voiced his concern that the access to the building from Scott Street would be difficult. He was asked why other schemes had not been presented. Mr. Huerta said that the Design Team evaluated all schemes and presented the two which the team believed to have the most promise.
 - f. An attendee stated that the architects need legal documents and a written transfer of property in order to actually design on the land.
 - g. Mrs. Howard made it known that the library was coming into the school, no matter what. Mr. Bankhead offered the idea of a separate building. One that would be connected to the school building by an enclosed bridge.

- h. It is unclear if Adair Street will be shut down. Permission needs to be granted by other businesses first. No one is certain how long that process will take.
8. Other issues concerning the presentation were discussed.
- a. Mr. Blackmon asked Mr. Bankhead, "What do you want to give us"? He stated that the last PAT meeting was a waste of time. He also stated that he believed that most of the issues surrounding the projects are HISD's not the architect's fault.
 - b. Mr. Bankhead again suggested putting the site schemes to a vote. Selecting a site scheme will allow the Design Team to move forward.
 - c. Mrs. Howard stated that none of the schemes presented were what was asked for. She stated that the PAT wants to see the "Stately" scheme parallel to Adair with no athletic fields in the front.
 - d. A PAT member reminded the team that some people liked seeing things visually and no scheme presented shows the building facing Scott.
 - e. Ms. Goodie reminded them that the building would be hidden if placed on Adair.
 - f. Mr. Hill stated that if that were the position of the building, money would be spent on the exterior and not the interior, which he believed is most important.
 - g. Mr. Ray voiced his concern about geotechnical problems, which would create additional costs and leave the school without parking during construction.
 - h. Mr. Blackmon stated that they were better off renovating the school rather than lose everything that they already have.
 - i. Ms. Goodie asked Mr. Blackmon if he were concerned about spending money on the fields when it could be used in the building for the good of the students. Mr. Blackmon stated that he was concerned that HISD had a misconception of the school and that HISD wanted this to be the "best black school", whereas the PAT wants the "best school". Ms. Goodie said that HISD wants Yates to be the best school the district can provide.
9. Mr. Bankhead began the voting process by stating that there are four schemes from which to choose: "Open Arms", "Stately", "Stately facing Scott", and "L-Shaped". If one is picked, the Design Team can proceed.
- a. Mr. Bankhead drew the four schemes and set them in front of the screen. Ms. Goodie passed out pieces of paper with each scheme numbered, and asked the attendees to vote for the one they liked the best.
 - b. Mr. Gatlin reminded the voters to think about whom the building is being built for and who is using it.
 - c. In the voting process, "Stately facing Alabama" got 7 votes, "Stately facing Scott" got 4 votes, "L-Shaped" got 3 vote and "Open Arms" got 1 votes. As a result of the vote the "L-Shaped" and "Open Arms" were ruled out.
 - d. Mrs. Howard stated that the architects had looked at all of the site options and hadn't shown them all to the PAT. She stated that some PAT members live in the neighborhoods and were on the PAT for a reason. She continued that all research regarding things they liked and did not like on their part had been done.
 - e. Mr. Bankhead stated that no decision would be made today. The site scheme choices will be reduced.
 - f. Ms. Goodie stated that no cost model could happen without the site plan approval. Mr. Bankhead said that revamping the fields would only cost \$800,000 -1 million dollars. Relocating the fields would cost 3-3.5 million.
 - g. There was confusion over who could vote. Mr. Gatlin suggested reading out the PAT list.
 - h. An attendee asked about the restaurant properties. It was said that the University of Houston has already approached them about purchasing; however this had not been verified.
10. After much discussion, the PAT decided that "Stately" would be the new shape of the building of Yates High School. There was debate on where it would be located on the site – either facing Alabama or Scott.
- a. Mr. Bankhead stated that on September 4, 2014, further development of the two schemes would be presented and the PAT asked to select one scheme.
 - b. Mr. Heurta was asked which one of the schemes was his favorite. He said "Open Arms" because it has a strong presence on Scott with a panoramic view, a diagonal axis, and inviting presence. He had issues with the scheme facing Scott because of its linear shape facing North and South with windows to face East and West. "Open Arms" that has the best of both worlds. It is a modification of the L-Shaped building.
 - i. Mrs. Howard asked if technology would help with the energy in the building. Mr. Ray responded that it would cost more.

- c. Mr. Hill reminded the team that “Stately” was the building layout choice. “Stately” facing Scott Street and “Stately facing Alabama will be presented at the next PAT Meeting. He also said that they wanted a cost analysis of the two to see what is being given up and what is being gained and also the pros and cons listed for each to make an informed decision.

11. Questions and comments from the PAT:

- a. The PAT requested that the lines of communication be open between the Principal and the PAT in between PAT meetings so the PAT is kept informed.
- b. Mrs. Howard stated her belief that the PAT wasn't being shown what the PAT had asked for.
- c. The PAT decided on “Stately” as the building shape, and wanted to see “Stately facing Alabama” and “Stately facing Scott”, and a cost analysis for each along with the pros and cons.

What to Expect next PAT meeting:

1. The Architects will present two site schemes as stated in item 11.c. The PAT will vote. The Design Team will proceed using the selected scheme.

ACTION ITEMS:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 11-01 | Architectural design team will develop revised site plan with front facing Scott Street |
| 11-02 | Architectural design team will develop revised site plan with front facing Alabama |

NEXT PAT MEETING: The next PAT meeting will be held on Thursday, September 4, 2014 at 5:30pm.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Amanda Goodie

HISD – Program Manager

3200 Center Street

Houston, TX 77007

Phone: 713-962-2452

Email: agoodie@houstonisd.org