

PROJECT #	101253.03
DESCRIPTION	CML Dublin Branch
MEETING	Signature Transitional Element Advisory Committee Meeting 04
MEETING DATE	June 25, 2017
ATTENDEES	
	Vicki Newell (VN) Dublin Resident
	David A Rinaldi (DR) Dublin Resident
	David Guion (DG) Dublin Resident
	Rick Gerber (RG) Dublin Resident
	Tom Holton (TH) Dublin Resident
	Jenny Rauch (JR) City of Dublin
	Vince Papsidero (VP) City of Dublin
	Terry Foelger (TF) City of Dublin
	Alison Circle (AC) CML
	Candy Princehorn (CP) CML
	Kim Way (KW) NBBJ/ Facilitator
	Mike Suriano (MS) NBBJ
	Tony Murry (PA) NBBJ
	Tracy Perry (TP) NBBJ
	Qian Gao (QG) NBBJ

This meeting was the fourth meeting for the committee. NBBJ presented preliminary options based on the previous committee and public feedback.

1. KW introduced the purpose of the meeting. NBBJ will present some very conceptual designs ideas based on the themes previously discussed. We are not married to any of these but want to get your reaction for each.
2. TM reviewed the comments from public input meeting two weeks ago. A quick summary of reoccurring comments was provided and is as follows:
 - 2.1. An interest in stone and water being featured.
 - 2.2. Many comments focused on an element that interested all ages.
 - 2.3. Quite a few comments requested something that focuses on the near history or prehistoric historic rather than the initial settlement of Dublin.
 - 2.4. Tranquility, subtleness, peace and mindful presence was repeatedly requested.
 - 2.5. Do not want a barrier.
 - 2.6. Element should be interactive.
 - 2.7. If it's a timeline, it should be simpler and impactful.
 - 2.8. Lots of interest in mapping the school onto the plaza.
 - 2.9. Some liked technology but many thought it would be dated quickly.
 - 2.10. Some likes and some dislikes about utilizing the 'old stones' seats.
 - 2.11. Many liked the ideas of stories through time...'this is a library after all'.
 - 2.12. There was a preference for a direct reference to history, less focus on the abstract.

- 2.13. The point of view option should be more than an art project. There were a lot of comments that discourage this element from being too similar to art.
3. TM reviewed design options based on the input received at the previous committee meeting and the public session.
 - 3.1. Option 01 (with two versions A and B)
 - 3.1.1. Option 01A - This option provides a historic mapping or timeline along the wall of the ramp at the corner of High and North Street. The wall is made of wood and the ramp floor a natural paver. The wood on the wall would be made to emulate a corduroy road pattern. Embedded in the wall would be different artifacts that are important to Dublin. The adjacent planting would be made of materials that inhabited Dublin before it was settled.
 - 3.1.2. Option 01B – A derivative option with a stone wall and a rough-sawn wood paving material was also reviewed. The names of important families past, present and future would be engraved on the stones in the wall in lieu of the timeline.
 - 3.2. The following comments for option 01A and 01B were provided:
 - 3.2.1. TH - How do artifacts talk about history?
 - 3.2.1.1. TM - It could be different symbols of Dublin and what made this community what it is.
 - 3.2.2. KW - How does the wood wall resonate with the history of Dublin?
 - 3.2.3. VN - I think the stone wall is more what I think about when I think of Dublin. We have a history of them. I don't think the wood really speaks to our history, so this option doesn't work.
 - 3.2.4. RG - I agree with this.
 - 3.2.5. TH - I don't think the corduroy road happened that often in Dublin. It was used for roads in swamp areas only. I don't think it's relevant because there is not real precedent in large numbers in Dublin.
 - 3.2.6. DG - I think this is too literal. But it could be a piece that is curated and periodically changes.
 - 3.2.7. VN - I like the literalness to this one.
 - 3.2.8. AC - Does this meet the charge of the City Council
 - 3.2.9. RG - I don't think it meets the charge. It does not speak of a transition. I am glad this doesn't incorporate an actual timeline.
 - 3.2.10. KW - So what I am hearing is no wood and a preference of stone for this wall.
4. Option 02
 - 4.1. This option features a paved band on the ground that mimics the system of waterways in Dublin. There would be a node or a moment at the intersections of the different waterways that could be programmed in different features (timeline, water feature, etc) or with markers.
 - 4.2. The following comments for option 02 were provided:
 - 4.2.1. TH - I just think this tries to do too much. It tries to incorporate too much of the site.
 - 4.2.2. VP - This is my least favorite site. I think we have geology that represents this clearly, we don't need it. I prefer the [options] with a reference to the history.
 - 4.2.3. KW - Is there anything to save here? I am hearing that one has no legs with the committee.
 - 4.2.4. RG – I think so. Council is looking for something that provides a transition. This doesn't do that.
5. Option 03

- 5.1. This option provides a mapping of a historic Platt of the downtown onto the plaza. QR codes could allow visitors to leave comments on a social media site about their experiences or stories for different historic properties on the map. A narrative about downtown could be built over time using crowd sourcing.
- 5.2. The following comments on option 03 were provided:
 - 5.2.1. AC- I don't think the library wants to get rid of the green space that is in the plaza. [The option would require this.]
 - 5.2.2. KW - Is the map idea important to the committee?
 - 5.2.3. TH - As long as the map doesn't get worn and become a hazard.
 - 5.2.4. MS - Does this meet the charge on it's own?
 - 5.2.5. RG- I don't think so without a vertical element.
 - 5.2.6. DG - How do we decide who is marked on the wall or plaza map? You are excluding some by including others.
 - 5.2.7. TH - Who is going to maintain [the social media interface]?
 - 5.2.8. AC - I think [CML] is not in favor of a technology solution. It is outside of the service we provide.
6. Option 04
 - 6.1. This option provides a true mapping of the school house that once stood on this site. Fragments of the school building could emerge on new side walls that are placed in the same position. The outline of the school could be traced around the plaza to show where it once stood and even enter the library.
 - 6.2. The following comments are option 04 were provided:
 - 6.2.1. KW - This one seems to meet a lot of the requirements Rick outlined. What we are showing is very minimal but could be developed further. There was also a tree that was in the original photo that could be replanted.
 - 6.2.2. VN - You could use the desk or a sculpture of the desk to convey history. So kids could sit at one of the desks and learn. It could open.
 - 6.2.3. CP - I like this idea best.
 - 6.2.4. TH - Could it be brick instead of stone? The schoolhouse was brick.
 - 6.2.5. DR - Could it be more like a remnant? It should be less clean.
 - 6.2.6. CP - This one has appeal for different age groups.
 - 6.2.7. DG - We have done the remnant idea elsewhere in Dublin. I think it's trying too hard. It's been done here already.
 - 6.2.8. AC - Are you dismissing it entirely or as a historic, decayed element?
 - 6.2.9. DG - I think it can be done much better than here it is. I prefer a more subtle reference, like the line on the pavement. The wall is too literal.
 - 6.2.10. TH - The old school was beautiful. More detail needs to be provided here.
 - 6.2.11. KW - So does it not need to be right where it was? [In the same location as the original schoolhouse]
 - 6.2.12. VN - I appreciate the location marking the actual spot and not being moved in the plaza.
 - 6.2.13. TM - If we don't incorporate the impression of the windows, I worry we do not fulfill the charge given to us by Council. I feel like there isn't a strong enough presence.
 - 6.2.14. TH - We could add a wall at the top of the stairs that would recreate the school wall that you could literally walk through.
 - 6.2.15. KW - Could it be a ghost wall?

- 6.2.16. TH - I think it should incorporate some brick for a direct connection to the actual structure.
- 6.2.17. TH - The line [of the schoolhouse] should be a different material when it enters the building.
- 7. After the options were presented, KW lead a general discussion about the options and what the committee felt was the best proposals.
 - 7.1. KW – From our discussion, it sounds like the school house proposal has the most legs. Would the committee agree?
 - 7.2. RG - I think when the committee first spoke there were a few ideas that came forward: the outline of school, a pathway leading up to the library, with maybe a timeline and use of water.
 - 7.3. MS – We don't want there to be too little or too much. The ramp seems to be the most obvious vehicle to speak to a path and a place to make something very visual to the rest of Dublin.
 - 7.4. AC – The library would like to stay away from a water feature due to maintenance.
 - 7.5. RG - I think if we develop the school maybe that is the best option.
 - 7.6. VN- Picking the school is a very specific time in history, the desks can tell the story of before and after the school happened. Each desk could be different.
 - 7.7. RG - Timelines are present elsewhere in Dublin, maybe we should not do that here.
 - 7.8. TH - Do we need both the timeline and the school house?
 - 7.9. RG - I don't think we are talking about doing both. I think we are focused on the school.
 - 7.10. TM – We will focus on the school house and find some options for developing it further.
- 8. Next Steps
 - 8.1. TP recommended that an additional meeting be scheduled to review updated and more developed options before presenting them to the public. This meeting was set for 7/20 at 7:30am.
 - 8.2. The next public meeting is 7/25 at 5:30pm. .

Prepared by: Tracy Perry, NBBJ

The above conference memorandum represents our understanding of the discussions that took place during this meeting. If corrections or additions need to be made, please forward these in writing within five (5) days to the undersigned so that an accurate record can be maintained. These minutes will stand as submitted unless corrections or additions are communicated.