

NEW ACADEMIC CENTER CORE GROUP MEETING NOTES SCHEMATIC DESIGN MEETING #3

Summary

The objective of the meeting was to review the outcome of the July 12 Community Forum presentation, and discuss the content and format for the July 19 Board of Trustees presentation.

DISCUSSION

Each member of the group was given a copy of the meeting notes from the Community Forum meeting. All were in agreement that the presentation was generally well received by the community members, although there were some recurring topics of question/concern. John Fung ran through the PowerPoint presentation for the benefit of the Core Group members that were not at the Community Forum.

Following were specific areas of discussion:

1. Laura said to make sure that the highlights of the community comments are included in the presentation.
2. Comments from Anne:
 - a. Going forward there will be a general concern about the project being a modern building, without a tie to the "old style" of Kentfield. She is hearing that people want to see acknowledgement of the past architectural elements; such as arches, etc.
 - b. This building will set a precedent for future campus buildings.
 - c. A softening of the building in the renderings would be nice.
 - d. The building should be a sculpture that does not require a tree in front of it to make it work.
 - e. How does one know how to get to the Auditorium from the south parking lot? This sequence of entry is very important to address in the building and site design.
 - f. If new wells are added for the geothermal system, the location should consider the location of future buildings to avoid conflicts.
3. Comments from Len:
 - a. The building needs a sense of entrance.
 - b. The treatment of the building along the College Avenue frontage is very important.

MEETING NOTES

DATE **07/14/2011** TIME **11:00 am– 12:45 pm**

PROJECT
**College of Marin
New Academic Center**

PROJECT NUMBER
10010.00

LOCATION
**College of Marin
Swinerton Conference Room**

ISSUE DATE
07/14/2011

NOTES BY
Brian Wright

PARTICIPANTS
**Alan Butler (TLCD)
Brian Wright (TLCD)
John Fung (MCA)
Christian Wopperer (MCA)**

**Laura McCarty (COM)
Don Flowers (COM)
Leigh Sata (SMC)
Greta Siegel (COM)
Nicole Cruz (COM)
Raemon Bergstrom-Wood
(Student Trustee)**

**Anne Peterson (Community Rep)
Len Pullan (Community Rep)**

- c. Len has heard suggestions from community members that the building should relate to the landscape, and that geometric relief of the façade would be desirable.
4. Comments from Don:
 - a. Make sure at the outset of the presentation that the design elements of the building have not yet been articulated, and will be as part of the design process.
 - b. Keep in mind that buildings with simple forms (without curves, etc.) are more economical to build.
5. Comments from Leigh:
 - a. The Administration Building is the one structure that is considered historical that will be demolished as part of the NAC project. The College is required to fully document the elements of this building prior to demolition. There is an opportunity to preserve some of the historic elements of the building, and possibly integrate into the new project.
6. Comments from Laura:
 - a. In regards to the possible restoration of historic elements, perhaps these could be re-used outside of the building, such as landscape elements, etc.
 - b. The bright white building masses might be more effective if the white is toned down.
7. General Comments:
 - a. The aerial view of the building from the north was very effective, and should be incorporated into the presentation to the Board.
 - b. The most prevalent concern from the community expressed was the treatment of the building along the College Avenue.

DATE

07/14/2011

PAGE

2 of 2

NEXT STEPS

1. The Design Team will consider comments from the Community and Core Group, and continue to develop the presentation for the July 19 Board meeting. Plan for a 40 minute presentation, and a 20 minute question and answer period.
2. The Board of Trustees meeting on July 19 will be held at the Indian Valley Campus, in the new Main Building, beginning at 6:30 p.m.
3. Alan expressed concern that the completion of the geothermal feasibility study is critical for the Schematic Design to proceed. Also need the scope of work for the LEED consultant. Leigh will look into the status of the geothermal study, and send the LEED scope to TLCD.

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.