Summary

The objective of the meeting was to review the outcome of the July 19 Board of Trustees presentation, and review the progress of the Schematic Design development.

PRESENTATION

John Fung projected the images that were presented by Mark Cavagnero at the July 19 BOT meeting, which included the following major objectives:

- Massing and height comparisons to existing campus buildings
- College Avenue frontage views
- View corridors to Fusselman Hall

The analysis of the BOT presentation was that it was generally well received, with the most predominant questions being about the architectural theme of the building, most specifically concerns about the frontage along College Avenue.

Laura and Len had questions about the specifics of the architectural design, which led to John moving ahead with showing newly developed images of the building:

1. Starting with the corner of SFD and College Avenue, a more defined entry sequence to the building has been developed, including a solid wall at the north end of the building which sets up the view into the campus. The sloped area of the site to the north of the building is still being developed, but the idea would be to create stepped terraces integrated with the topography and landscape.

2. The east frontage along College Avenue has been addressed by both configuration and use of materials:
   a. A recessed entrance to the building has been added near the north end of the building at the street level.
   b. The upper level overhangs the first level. Alternating overhangs provide shadowing and depth to the lower level
   c. The façade has been broken up by the use of varying planes, and the introduction of alternating horizontal slatted panels (wood or similar), that are semi-transparent. The slatted panels allow for a variety of transparency based upon the use of the space.
   d. The street level of the building would be a solid material such as board-formed concrete; the upper levels would be a lighter material such as metal.

3. The main street level entrance would occur at the south end of the building, roughly at the location of the current entrance to Olney Hall. There was discussion about whether
the elevator would be accessible when the building is closed (such as on weekends), in order to provide access to the main campus level from College Avenue. The design team will look at options to make that happen, and review with District Facilities.

4. The Auditorium has been slightly reconfigured to include an offset on the west side that would function as a secondary entrance, and would be visible to the approach from the south, along the west side of the Learning Resource Center.

5. Following Questions and Discussion:
   a. The outdoor terraces along the north side of the building would be accessible to persons with disabilities. All accessible routes will be reviewed with DSA early in the design process.
   b. Brian Wilson liked the idea of the computer labs at the street level being visible to the public, to display the building’s activity
   c. Laura suggested that the next renderings show more of the landscape development. There have been comments from the community regarding a desire to maintain as many of the street trees as possible.
   d. Sara expressed concern about keeping access to the campus level when the building is closed. Addressed in Item 3.
   e. Len would like to see some curves incorporated into the building or site. Suggested increasing the size of the courtyard light court, perhaps with a curve that sweeps into the courtyard, and provides an outdoor classroom space for the ESL Lab.
   f. A question was asked about the feel of the main courtyard. The intent is to provide an opportunity for this to support student and community events. Leigh asked if there would be direct access to the second level terrace from the courtyard.
   g. The canopy on the north side of the building will require some type of structural support that is not yet indicated. The idea would be for the structure to be light in appearance, and the canopy itself may be perforated in some manner to allow natural light.
   h. Laura asked the design team to be prepared to respond to the following comments:
      i. Can the columns from the arcade of the existing Administration building be re-used?
      ii. How are the stairs at the corner of SFD and College Avenue treated?
      iii. Community members may still bring up the parking issues. Be prepared to explain why parking cannot be added on this site.
   i. Len stated that the design team should have a response to the specific questions from the trustees regarding the visibility of the Auditorium.
j. Laura noted that the PE complex on College Avenue has been very well received by the community – it includes similar design characteristics to the NAC. Perhaps that should be pointed out to the community.

NEXT STEPS

1. The design team will present an update to the faculty at the Flex Day meeting on August 10. Floor plans should be included.

2. The design team will meet with the Core Group on August 11 in preparation for the August 16 Community Forum.

3. The design team will present the updated design to the community on August 16.

4. The District is trying to schedule the LEED kickoff/charette. Possible dates are August 8, 9, 10, or 16.

5. Leigh indicated that the geothermal feasibility study should be completed this week. This information is critical in order to meet the schedule of the Schematic Design.

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.