

<b>PROJECT #</b>	101253.03
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CML Dublin Branch</b>
<b>MEETING</b>	<b>Signature Transitional Element Advisory Committee Meeting 05</b>
<b>MEETING DATE</b>	July 20, 2017
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	
	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
	Pat Losinski (PL) CML
	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

This meeting was the fifth meeting for the committee. In the previous meeting, NBBJ presented design options for the signature transitional element. The committee requested modifications and an additional meeting to review the options before presenting them to the public and City Council.

1. MS reviewed the basic components of the site design again to remind the committee of the layout.
2. MS reviewed the design options
  - 2.1. The first option is 'Relic as Transition'. This option has several variations and uses a site element as a reminder of the school house that once stood on this property. Option 01a marks one of the schoolhouse walls with the site wall north of the stairs to the plaza. The windows and materials attempt to recall the details of the history building. Within the openings of the windows, frosted glass could be provided with some information about the site's history. Option 01a (alt) utilizes the same location but the wall would be constructed of steel fins outlining the wall and the wall openings. This option is a greater abstraction than 01A. The last variation, option 01b marks the southern façade of the schoolhouse wall with the element. The detailing is very similar to Option 01a. All options incorporate a change in paving in the plaza and library that indicates the location of the historic school building.
  - 2.2. The second option is 'Portal as Transition'. This option attempts to show a transition through the changing profile of a structure over the ramp. The profiles would transform from historic building outlines to a rectangle that represents the library. The design team presented this additional option after the committee discussed the importance of the ramp in the transition from historic downtown Dublin to the library.
3. KW asked the committee for their comments. Are there any options they like better? Are there any that should not be showed and deleted?
  - 3.1. DG - I like the first options better.

- 3.2. DR - I appreciate the versions of the first one that shows the building in a more direct manner.
- 3.3. TH - I like [the brick] version of the school option better. I think the way you are building the wall with the hooded window recalls it beautifully. The historic society has a brick from the original school to match. Could we use the actual brick at the line that traces the outline of the building?
- 3.4. DG - It feels like there are too many materials happening in the area. What are the other materials in the plaza?
- 3.5. TM - We can study this more as we pick an option. But there is a lot of materials happening – brushed concrete paving, the sidewalk's reddish paving bricks, stone on the building and brick on these walls.
- 3.6. DR – Does the corner of north option does not have to have glass in it? It was a door in the school and could be open.
- 3.7. AC - We need to consider safety and not provide any blind corners at the library.
- 3.8. VN - But I do think the idea of having some historic desks on the plaza in nice. Is that currently in any of the schemes?
- 3.9. MS - Not at this moment.
- 3.10. PL – Do these options work for the charge and as a transition?
- 3.11. VN - Yes and Yes.
- 3.12. RG - Yes and Yes.
- 3.13. TH - I think it does, I am not sure it works with what the public wants. From what I heard at the public meeting, they wanted technology and water.
  - 3.13.1. AC – Both technology and water are difficult for the library to maintain long term. They both pose issues with maintenance.
- 3.14. DR - I think it does also.
- 3.15. DG - I would like to propose that we present no option. I still believe this is it not necessary.
- 3.16. DR - I would not disagree, in my board review I stated that the plaza provides the transition. But this does not meet our charge by City Council.
- 3.17. DG - We have been given a charge and if we determined that it isn't necessary, we should be honest with City Council.
- 3.18. VN - I think they always have this option. We can go through this and if they don't like anything they can decide to do nothing.
- 3.19. RG - My preference is still 1B. But its City Council's call.
- 3.20. PL - We could show a softer touch and just show the outline of the school. A softer touch.
- 3.21. DR - The second option is more forced.
- 3.22. VN - It reminds me too much of other options in the City of Dublin and a sculpture at OSU. This looks like what the architect wants and not the public. I do not want to show this option.
  - 3.22.1. The committee generally agreed with deleting this option.
- 3.23. PL - What do we show the public?
- 3.24. VN - Why isn't the school desk in these schemes?
- 3.25. KW - What does the committee think of the desk?
- 3.26. DR - What if we used the stone instead of the brick for the forms the school wall to avoid another competing material?
- 3.27. VN - I would be very comfortable with this. Too many materials right now.
- 3.28. TH - I think if [the wall] was a different color with the same scale pieces and detailing it can work.
- 3.29. KW - I would like to go back to the idea of the desks.
- 3.30. DG - I think it's a cost issue. A bronze statue is a lot of money.

- 3.31. RG - I think it would go with a third option. The outline option could have bronze sculptures in the corner to compliment the outline. I don't think we should suggest the 'no intervention' option.
- 3.32. MS - We could show all the options vetted on one sheet to show the progress and then move to the ones that have been developed.
- 3.33. DR - We should show the public input provided by one slide and acknowledge it as considered.
- 3.34. PL - Was the desk an 'and' or an 'or'?
- 3.35. VP - Everything has been posted, so anyone paying attention has seen the options.
- 3.36. VN - I would not present the previous options.
- 4. After discussion, the committee directed the design team to show three options – Option 01b, and option with the school outline and an installation like the school desks and a third option with just an outline. TP let the committee know that the bronze sculptures is outside the expertise of the design team and should be a public art effort in lieu of an architectural element. None of the eliminated options are to be showed to the public.
- 5. Next Steps
  - 5.1. The next public meeting is 7/25 at 5:30pm to receive public input.

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.