

**MEETING NOTES**

Date : 6/13/2011 Project : Portland Community College Cascade  
Campus Master Plan and Programming

Author : Nick Hodges Job No. : 0912

Re : **Strategic Workgroup Meeting Thirteen**

Present :

**PCC**

Spencer Corbin Lawson  
Deb Crawford  
Penny Thompson  
Alyson Lighthart  
Scot Huff  
Linda Reisser  
Heidi Dombek  
John Garner  
Kendi Esary  
Julie Davenport  
Abe Proctor  
Donna Reed  
Gary Eaton

Michael Adams  
Larry Clausen  
Chelsea Ellertson

**PCC Bond Staff**

Rebecca Ocken  
Gina Whitehall-Baziuk  
Grant Bennett

**Consultant Team**

Will Dann, THA  
Carol Mayer Reed, MR  
Nick Hodges THA

**Notes**

- 13.1 Will gave an introduction reminding the group of the process to date and where we were at the end of the last SWG meeting. He noted the goals of this meeting are to winnow the options for the design team to develop over the summer with more detail and specificity. In the fall, THA will report back with new information and detail about the character, opportunities, programmatic implications and costs of the various schemes with a goal of selecting a final scheme by the end of the year.
- 13.2 Will reminded the group of the 12 options and their recommendation to eliminate six schemes at the previous meeting. Those six schemes recommended to eliminate were: B1, B3, C1, C2, D1 and E2.
- 13.3 At the previous BAC meeting, that committee went through the same exercise. This group recommended elimination of A1, B1, B2, C1, C2 and D1.
- 13.4 Both groups were unanimous in recommending that Options B1, C1, C2 and D1 be eliminated.
- 13.5 After this exercise, the design team and the Bond Office went through a technical review process looking in more detail at the 8 Options still being considered. Through this process, it was recommended to eliminate two more options: A4 because it has a fatal flaw with loading and service to the Student Center and the architectural implications of connecting to SSB; B2 because it isolates the NAB, was eliminated by SWG and was the sixth choice of the BAC. The

NOTE: Attention Attendees! Please review these notes carefully as they will form the basis of future work on this project. If you feel that anything is incorrect or incomplete, please call the author at 503-227-1254.

resulting six schemes are A1, A2, A3, B3, E1 and E2. These six schemes represent the first three options of both committees.

- 13.6 Will noted that of these six schemes, the design team feels that Options A2 and A3 rise to the top and made a proposal to eliminate two schemes: A1 because the only difference between it and A2 is the location of the NAB; E2 because of the implications of bringing service and loading into the center of campus and the architectural implications of connecting to the existing SSB.
- 13.7 Of the three different service and loading scenarios, schemes that locate the Student Center behind the Paragon block have the best service and loading possibilities because it moves this activity out of the center of campus; provides quick in and out vehicle maneuvering and creates opportunities to share this service drive with the neighboring buildings on Killingsworth. Schemes that put the Student Center back in the current location create some of the same challenges that currently exist by bringing vehicles onto the campus and forcing vehicles to maneuver through the neighborhood. Schemes that place the Student Center adjacent SSB bring vehicles onto Borthwick Mall and past a main pedestrian access point to the campus from the north parking lot.
- 13.8 Carol Mayer Reed led a discussion about the qualities of outdoor spaces created with the remaining four schemes by presenting a series of three-dimensional graphics. The diagrams talked about the quality of space created on campus; how people move through the campus; adjacencies; activation of the mall and Killingsworth; opportunities for outdoor plazas and green space and quality of light created by the various schemes. Some comments from this discussion were as follows:
- John and Deb both prefer the loading in scheme A3 because it moves it out of the center of campus. John also noted that all schemes should consider the desire for additional bike parking.
  - Spencer wondered whether retail along Killingsworth would be more successful in a parking garage or an academic building. Will noted that he believes they can be successful in both by right-sizing the retail and a careful understanding of what types of retail can succeed on Killingsworth. He noted that both buildings would increase foot traffic in the area.
  - Donna noted that in schemes that separate the library from the student center, the library should include a coffee shop or similar venue.
  - Spencer also questioned whether a parking garage or academic building would make a better gateway to the campus traveling east on Killingsworth.
  - Rebecca Ocken noted that the bond office is working with DAO architecture to look at opportunities to develop Kanjaya and/or Paragon and that by developing other PCC parcels on Killingsworth, sends a message that PCC wants to be an active participant in the successful redevelopment of Killingsworth.
  - Larry suggested looking at the Tuality Hills Intermodal Transit Facility as an example of mixed use parking that incorporates a variety of modes of travel support services.
  - Grant noted the potential for Option A3 to share the training yard with shuttle service.
  - John noted the need for safer crossings across Killingsworth. Will mention that for this to happen, the City needs to be on board and part of the discussion.
- 13.9 Carol also asked the group what they feel would help improve the quality of the outdoor space. Some ideas were: design spaces to encourage more outdoor activities such as National Night Out by providing adequate power, water and a variety of settings; providing a variety of shade and sunny spaces; tables; variety of seating types and configurations; outdoor program spaces; other amenities that would be found at conference or retreat centers.

- 13.10 After Carol's discussion of the four remaining schemes and the subsequent group discussion, Will asked for a vote to eliminate B3, E1 or both. The group unanimously voted to eliminate E1. The vote for B3 was split 50/50.
- 13.11 A second vote asked everyone to vote for their number one choice. All but one chose A3, with A2 being the only other first choice. The group agreed that these two schemes alone should be carried forward.
- 13.12 The next meeting is scheduled for October 3 from 2-4 but the group supported an August meeting for a preview of summer development.

**End of Notes**