NEW ACADEMIC CENTER
CORE GROUP MEETING NOTES

Summary
The purpose of the meeting was for the design team to present the progress of the Schematic Design concept to the Core Group.

1. Presentation
   a. Presentation was made by Mark Cavagnero and John Fung.
   b. The overriding goal of the project design is to leave the campus a better place.
   c. Review the elements of the original campus master plan:
      i. The Great Lawn as the organizing element (anchor)
      ii. Campus Axes oriented to view of Mt. Tam
      iii. Adjunct outdoor spaces defined by buildings
      iv. How do we bring this concept back?
   d. We want to address concerns by the community that the Great Lawn concept has been compromised by subsequent development such as the Harlan Center and the new Fine Arts Building. The goal is to re-claim the Great Lawn.
   e. Concept for the New Academic Center Building Footprint:
      i. Restore the Great Lawn/Open Space
      ii. Preserve the Heritage Trees
      iii. Restore the views of Mt. Tam
      iv. Follow the angle of College Avenue
      v. Relate to the geometry of the new buildings (Fine Arts and Math/Science)
      vi. Focus views on Fusselman Hall
      vii. Create a new adjacent courtyard, consistent to scale of the classroom building originally master planned for this site
      viii. The edges of the building shall define the open space
      ix. In summary, respect the idea that started 80 years ago
   f. Mark suggested that consideration should be given to re-planning and landscaping the main campus green space, and that there may be a community outreach for funding.
   g. Floor Plan Concepts
      i. Simplicity
      ii. Classroom wing parallels College Avenue and north edge of Library, with access from both street and campus level
      iii. Administration accessed from Campus Level
iv. Two-level atrium space (open air, but protected from rain) between classroom and administration wings
v. Faculty offices on third level (one level above campus level)
vi. Auditorium and two large classrooms in separate block, with the west edge facing the Great Lawn, and the east edge aligned with entry to the Library.

h. A small (1' = 60' scale) study model was presented to help visualize the scale, mass and relationship to the site topography of the new building concept. The model also included the buildings scheduled to be demolished, so that the sequence of existing to new could be demonstrated.

2. Questions and Comments

a. What are the functions of the auditorium? Will it be available as an alternative performance venue for the college and community?
   i. The auditorium primary function is a large lecture room, and is not intended as a performance hall. It will have the capability to function for speaking engagements, film festivals, and large board meetings. The programming process included Cheryl Carlson, who had indicated that Olney Hall rarely has a need for more than 200 seats at events/lectures.

b. Len Pullan indicated he is very pleased with the progress of the design, that it is an improvement over the original competition concept.

c. Has thought been given to the architectural style of the building?
   i. At this point, the overriding goals are for a building that is light, contemporary, the massing kept low, transparent, exposing activity to the outside world. Specific materials have not yet been determined.

d. What is the setback from College Avenue?
   i. The current thinking is 25 to 30 feet from the curb, which will allow for a generous zone of landscaping

e. Laura McCarty indicated that the College does not want to see a drop-off opportunity at the intersection of Sir Francis Drake and College Avenue.

f. Anne Peterson hopes that building materials are selected that are durable, easily maintained, and age well.

g. Was thought given to how this building will relate to the campus if/when the Library building is removed?
   i. Yes, this concept still makes sense with the existing Library, with a new building in its place, or no building at all.
h. The impacts of night lighting on the local neighborhood need to be considered.

i. The big ideas from the concept created in the design competition have been retained in this design. The original concept has been modified to respond to community comments and concerns.

j. Anne Peterson stated that it feels like the design team has listened to the comments from the community.

3. Next Steps

a. The Core Group will meet again at 11:00 am on Thursday, June 30 to review the updated design progress, and for the design team to get input from the Core Group on the structure of the July 12 community forum.

b. The Public Forum will be Tuesday, July 12, at 7:00 pm, to present the design concept to the community-at-large.

These meeting notes will be added to the official project record. Please forward comments or corrections to TLCD Architecture within one week of issue date.