1. Business School Schematic Design Update

APAAC is being asked to comment and provide guidance on the most recent renderings of the B-School façade to ensure conformance with campus design and planning principles.

- Christopher McGrath (SUCF) presented to the committee.
- Mr. McGrath discussed the precast concrete, glazing and natural stone that would be used on the exterior of the proposed building and displayed schematic design renderings from various angles.
- Committee members commented and reacted to the façade concept.
- There was concern by the committee regarding the cleaning and maintenance demands of the façade material. Mr. McGrath noted that the architect is investigating “self-cleaning” agents that can be incorporated into the precast concrete material.
- Additionally, there was much discussion on transit amenities, in particular the vestibule and its capacity to be used as a holding area for people waiting for the bus. SUCF and John Giarrusso assured the group that there will be such an area. Visibility to the buses will be provided through cut-outs and/or special windows in the vestibule.
- The bus shelter will be located at the west side of the visitor parking lot and will be part of the visitor Parking Relocation Project.
• The group was concerned that the architectural treatment on the “back end” of the building, that faces Arts & Sciences and the Podium, be treated as a major entrance with enhanced architecture. Mr. McGrath mentioned that this concern was raised at prior B-School design meetings as a priority change to the current design.

• Concerns, too, were raised about maximizing day lighting and ensuring proper acoustical treatment of spaces. Mr. McGrath assured the group that both issues were being addressed in the design.

2. Data Center Site Selection

APAAC is being asked to comment regarding the recommended site option for the relocation of the Data Center.

• Christopher McGrath (SUCF) presented to the committee with John Giarrusso providing an overview of the three sites investigated: Building 25 (the old Health Center), Service Building C (SBC), and new construction in a “greenfield” location, yet to be decided.

• Christine Haile, the University’s Chief Information Officer, stressed the importance of a new building for the machines and mechanical systems that serve the machines; and she also stressed a separate, but important goal for her operations, to one day co-locate her ITS staff.

• The SBC site was presented as the recommended location, as determined by the Data Center Relocation Project’s steering committee. Construction and renovation at the SBC site was less costly than the other locations; and it would accommodate a building addition (for the machine equipment) that would be relatively smaller and more amenable to the scale of the SBC site, as opposed to the other locations.

• The group had asked about the numbers of ITS staff that would relocate to SBC; and at the time of the meeting, it was unclear if it would be minimal staff for data center operations or some larger contingent of ancillary ITS operations.

• Some APAAC members were concerned with the relative location of the SBC to the Podium and its customers and the kind of pedestrian/travel and “quality of life” challenges it would pose for the future.
occupants of SBC. Others in the group countered that adjacent Podium space/buildings are finite and perhaps better reserved for other functions and that the other locations were not demonstratively closer to the Podium.

3. Service Building Complex Update

APAAC is being asked to comment and provide feedback regarding planned renovation and expansion of the Service Building complex project.

- Errol Millington presented a summary of concept preferences for renovation and expansion of Service Building A (SBA) and Grounds building locations.
- Both locations are being renovated and expanded as part of the multi-year capital plan so that occupants and functions can be co-located and moved from elsewhere, making selected buildings available for subsequent downstream renovations and moves.
- Specifically, for example, facilities staff housed in SBC would be moved to SBA so that the SBC building can be renovated for the future home of the Data Center. Additionally, the mechanical repair and vehicle operations shops would be moved from SBA to the Grounds area so that Five Quad ambulance service can be moved from Building 25 to SBA, thus allowing Building 25 to be fully utilized for swing space and other functions that are either temporarily or permanently moved from the Podium.
- Two options were presented to the committee; the existing SBA building location would be renovated and expanded by approximately 1,200 square feet; and the Grounds Building complex would be expanded, by yet an undetermined size, to accommodate the move of the shops.
- The only comment made was regarding the pond and how it would be affected if the Grounds Complex changes. John Giarrusso and Errol Millington noted the perimeter around the pond would be maintained and that any new construction or renovation would happen north and west of the existing building.

4. New Student Housing Project Update

APAAC was provided an informational update to the status and site planning for the proposed 500 bed residence complex.
• John Giarrusso presented a recap of the preferred site option on the southeast portion of the campus, east of the pond.
• He described changes in the design to better isolate the housing from adjacent neighbors, including further refinement on relocating Perimeter Road and an addition of an earthen berm to better shield views.
• He also noted that the University was exploring relocating the housing further north, to the Harriman Campus, but this concept was still tentative and under discussion.
• The group did not comment or object to the site planning; but offered some ideas regarding community participation and involvement in future planning efforts.

5. Campus Center Alterations-Lobby

APAAC is being asked to comment regarding refined concept plans to renovate the Campus Center lobby.

• Errol Millington presented a summary of early concept preferences for improvements of the Campus Center Lobby. John Murphy helped describe the project as well.
• He noted that the previous idea of a coffee shop on the east side of the lobby has been replaced with an information booth concept to serve student and Campus Center operations needs (as depicted below). It was explained that the elimination of the coffee shop idea was related to operational cost impacts; and that such elimination would not impact existing food service capacity in the Campus Center.

In addition to the changes to the function of the space, design changes were incorporated to address earlier APAAC comments. For example, the stair rail system has been reworked to better match other campus standards.
• John Giarrusso underscored how this project is largely intended to address important critical maintenance needs such as exterior door replacement and lighting.
There was concern about the construction taking place during the summer of 2010 and how it will impact events in the Campus Center during that time such as the summer planning conference. Errol Millington noted that other alternate site options exist for all summer activities.

6. Dutch Quad, Podium Corner Project Update
APAAC is being reminded of the next phase of the Dutch Quad corner project.
• Errol Millington and John Giarrusso presented earlier concept renderings of the intended work on the site between the Podium and Dutch Quad.

• The intention is to replace underground sanitary, storm, and irrigation lines that are suffering from deferred maintenance as well as deficient lighting, pavement, and landscaping. As discussed at earlier APAAC meetings, the intent is to restore this area to a pedestrian friendly, attractive environment, limiting automobiles and maximizing recreation and outdoor use.

• The plan would be consistent with E.D. Stone site use and planning concepts.

• John Giarrusso, however, wanted to ensure that the group was aware that almost all of the trees in the area would need to be removed and replaced, some due to the construction, but most due to their relative state of health. When done, there would be a net gain in trees and plantings, but they would not be the mature (but dying) trees currently in that location.

• Of the approximately 209 existing trees in this area 128 are suffering from Diplodia, another 41 are suffering from Chlorosis and another 6 need to be removed to access underground utilities.

• Errol Millington explained that in order to avoid an inappropriate “patchwork” look, nearly all trees would be removed and replaced with new rather than replanting sporadically between trees. The trees would be replaced with deciduous trees and not with a mixture of deciduous and evergreens that would be similar to what currently exists. One reason for this decision is to avoid the look and feel of a Christmas tree farm. Another reason is to have a canopy right from day one. Evergreens take 10 to 15 years to develop a canopy.

• It was suggested by Catherine Lawson and Susan Phillips that the trees to be removed get repurposed as either biofuel or mulch.