
Date
09.

By

-
- B. Chandra explained how the architecture of the school has changed over time. She also explained other factors to be mindful of such as the seismic upgrades to the building and the landmark review process.
 - C. The CPC asked the following clarifying questions:
 - i. Can we add categories? Programs, partnerships, and sustainability we brought up as alternate categories.
 - ii. Who decided that JHS was going to become a comprehensive high school?
 - 1) Portland Public Schools
 - iii. Will the CTE programming be the same?
 - 2) It will be up to the community to decide CTE uses.
 - D. CPC members divided into 3 groups to discuss and prioritize criteria.
 - E. Each group provided a list ranking the importance of each criteria:
 - i. Group 1 (Jenn) – Culture (1), Disruption & Time (2-tie), Cost (3)
 - ii. Group 2 (Steve) – Culture (1), Disruption (2), Time (3), Cost (4)
 - iii. Group 3 (Mancala) – Disruption (1), Time & Culture (2-tie), Cost (3)
 - F. As a team, the CPC synthesized their rankings into a few key points:
 - i. Group 1:
 - 1) CPC members were curious how sustainability factors into each of these design criteria.
 - 2) There was concern about maintaining the Middle College program during construction. This could be a key disruption. PCC Cascade Campus could have a program for dual enrollment to help with this.
 - 3) Jenn expressed that JHS is a community hub for alumni who don't even have kids attending the school. This makes it different from other schools in Portland and shows that Culture and Heritage needs to be prioritized.
 - 4) Michael noted that we discussed disruption in the short term but cannot be certain of the long-term impacts of this project within the community.
 - 5) Since it was difficult to understand the complexities of how each factor influences one another, Emily reorganized the factors into a Venndiagram with Culture and Heritage as the center.
 - ii. Group 2:
 - 1) This group felt that most of the heritage lay in retaining the existing building.
 - 2) Steve asked if there was a scenario where paying for portables and temporary structures would be taking away some of the budget from student programs in the new school.
 - iii. Group 3:
 - 1) Mancala shared her concern about how long the students will need to remain in the existing school. CPC members noted that remaining in the old building has its own health and safety risks which are disruptive to current students.
 - 2) There is a feeling that this project is being built for a different audience than the one currently using the space. The team should be considering the disruption to current students and communities during this process.
- S.6 (.1 E: Td ()K)

- 1) There will be efforts to maintain or relocate all of the services currently used by JHS students, staff, and community members during construction.
- iii. How do we quantify the social impact or benefit of each scenario?
- iv. Can the CPC get a formal tour of the building?
 - i. Yes, the project team will be organizing tours of JHS and other Portland high schools.
- v. Is it possible to create a new building with elements from the old building?
- C. The CPC divided into 3 groups and worked to rank the level of disruption and representation of culture and heritage for each scheme.
- D. The CPC shared the following takeaways:
 - i. Group 1:
 - 1) Many members of the CPC are concerned that a full demolition of the building will sever the historic culture and memories of the place. They compared it to root shock meaning that placing the existing community in a new space will have unpredictable outcomes.
 - 2) Michael expressed concern about unequal representation from elders versus students in the design process.
 - 3) Overall, there is concern that eliminating the old building will erase the community who built the JHS legacy. Jenn noted that the elders will still understand the existing building even if it changes on the inside.
 - 4) Jenn shared a story about how parents continue to bring their children to the JHS youth football program, despite the disorganization, because the parents are so passionate about their experiences as Demos and want the same experience for their kids.
 - 5) Jenn noted that the student body will continue to grow but is unsure whether a new building would continue to be a community hub for alumni who have left the area or no longer have kids at JHS.
 - 6) Group 1 left the following notes on their scenario board with additional comments:
 - a) The best-case scenario is to retain and fully replace the materials in the existing building.
 - b) They would like to know more about how the program numbers are determined. Ex: How many therapeutic spaces will there be?
 - c) What is the triage plan for a system change? The plan must involve current students, future students, staff and elders.
 - d) Can the CPC get a full tour of the existing building?
 - e) What parts of the building are empty/underutilized?
 - f) Are there ways for a new building to reflect the historic building?
 - g) Will the replacement of the existing building be a symbol of erasure and past urban renewal efforts?
 - ii. Group 2:
 - 1) This group did not prioritize a scheme.
 - 2) The group felt that the current relationship of the structures and fields with Killingsworth and Alberta made sense in relation to noise and connections with the neighborhood.
 - 3) This group felt that a lot of the disruption was temporary and that long term cultural preservation was the main priority.
 - 4) They wondered what the preservation would look like. Is it saving



H. Jeanie introduced CPG~~4~~ and some discussion points for CPC members to consider over the n