A. Attendees:
   a. Panel Members: Peter Vincent, Sanford Murata, Juli M. Kimura Walters, Eric Crispin, Steve Meder (absent: Kiersten Faulkner, Clark Llewelyn)
   b. Staff/Faculty: Mark Gilbert, Crystal Valliant, Kirk Yuen, Spencer Leineweber, David Hafner

B. Agenda
   a. Kanewai Loi Cultural Research Center Project
   b. Clarence T.C. Ching Athletic Facility

C. Summary
   a. Overall positivity toward and approval of the Kanewai Project Presentation with some feedback on 1) the entrance walkway & pavers and 2) the expression/readability of the design themes.
   b. General consensus that the revised scheme for the Clarence T. Ching Athletic field submitted by Mitsunaga & Associates shows a marked improvement over previous versions, but the Panel also has a number of serious concerns about this design.

D. Kanewai Project
   a. Presented by WCIT Architecture in conjunction with the UHM School of Architecture

E. Presentation
   a. Kanewai is a sanctuary for native plants and birds as well as a community space
   b. In the past 5-10 years the project has had heavy community involvement of which approx. 1/3 is members of the University Community...also includes neighbor islands and local schools.
   c. This building will provide additional space for active cultural participation, learning, and storage space for taro cultivation tools and instructional media.
   d. Project is sited on the lower campus in an area that includes a floodway.
   e. With the exception of washrooms, every use proposed is already located on the site in less permanent structures (tents/temp storage)
   f. The design utilizes traditional Hawaiian units of measurement that are based on the length of various parts of the body including anana (the distance between the fingertips of a man with arms extended).
   g. The shape of the roof, support pillars, beams, and downspout are all designed to reflect the shape of a taro stalk & leaf.
   h. For cultural reasons, the team decided to go with a long switch-back entrance pathway instead of direct stairs. One important feature of this design is the place to “call out” before entering the space.
   i. They worked with campus facilities and the Lyon Arboretum to take clippings of existing flora and propagate it off site during the building phase to ensure no native plants are lost in the process.
   j. The intent is to fund this project entirely with an HUD grant and no university funding, leading the architect to consider subtractive alternates rather than additive alternates.
k. The stack wall is to be built by volunteers as a way to preserve a cultural practice (as well as save money).
l. They propose a mural on the retaining wall in the case that this project ends up falling under the 1% art requirement.
m. Rain water will be collected on the roof via down spouts and channeled into an open trench into a collection system to water medicinal plants.

F. Areas/issues Discussed
   a. The concept of anana may be implicit to the design, but it is not clearly expressed. → maybe use doors/flooring to further express concept
   b. Is a fence required on the entry ramp? → the entry walkway is approx. 1% grade so a fence is not required. Also want to make the distinction that the walkway is not a ramp, although it will provide ADA accessibility to the site.
   c. Maybe consider adding a phase II for replacing the chain link fence along Dole street → the chain link fence is embedded in the sidewalk and that is why it was not considered in the project scope.
   d. When you have a concrete retaining wall abutting a concrete sidewalk without a planter between them, it creates a feeling of impeding urbanization. Is there some way to create a vertical green wall on the two ends of the retaining wall and leave space in the middle for a mural? Also, an inset area near the “call out” space for a mural would be a good idea. That way, even if the mural is not included in the current project, at a later date it will be intuitive to place one there.
   e. The leaf pattern of the roof does not seem to read well because the triangles are co-planar and form a solid mass of color. Is there some way to offset the leaf shapes with a shadow line (with a gutter or change in roofline) so that they “read” from a distance and/or when viewed from above on Dole Street?
   f. Will a casual observer understand the visual metaphor? → the downspouts are curved, which should add to the visual metaphor.
   g. Perhaps provide some explanation/signage that explains to the casual observer the principals of anana and the symbolism of the taro.
   h. How is the measurement system manifested in the paver system? → Perhaps the interplay between the pavers and the grade beam & interior floor space of the structure can be adjusted to express this. It may be better to have the paver pattern consistent both inside and outside the structure.

G. Follow up Items
   a. Comments for WCIT include: Kudos on design and please follow up on minor comments including: the paving against the wall issue; carrying the paving pattern inside the structure; and finding ways to display the excellent thought process for the design.
H. **T.C. Ching Athletic Facility**  
a. Revised scheme, presented by Mitsunaga & Associates

I. **Presentation**  
a. No drastic change to the site plan.  
b. First floor: rearranged areas to the right of the entrance; added elevator; made changes to the telecom, elevator, and mechanical room locations. Ticketing, administrative, and concession spaces are the same. Opposite of the entrance, there is now room for a full-height billboard or trophy case.  
c. There are 8” ramps up to the locker rooms from the field side entrances.  
d. Half of the toilets/fixtures from the downstairs bathrooms were moved to the second floor bathrooms because a study finds the upstairs restrooms will be used more. They have the ability to add more stalls if deemed necessary.  
e. New exterior elevation. By eliminating plans to build a future roof, the structure height has been brought down. As a result, costly tall columns are not required. Removed the ADA ramp on the ewo side because it is unnecessary when there is an elevator. New entry design on primary façade featuring a rainbow/warriors logo. Glass facing on the NE face of the stairwells to prevent horizontal rain from making the stairs slick.  
f. In the current design, the entryway is open, but they propose storefront type doors  
g. The second and third floors are open promenades.  
h. Colors are neutral grays and greens.  
i. Option for concrete scoring or imperial plaster exterior finishes.  
j. Palm trees to give it a more Hawaiian sense of place.  
k. The width of the sidewalk is 17 feet but with the planter, it is reduced to 5 feet  
l. They are currently working on a landscape plan that will include recycle bins in the front near the main entrance.  
m. Upper walkway was set back from the overhang by 3 feet to provide some protection from the rain.  
n. The entrance is set back from the façade 7 feet in total: 3.5 feet to first indent and an additional 3.5 feet to the doors.  
o. The glass on the stairs is a frameless glass.  
p. The stairwell façade is 8 inches thick  
q. Current design has 62 LEED points (Silver met, within grasp of Gold)

J. **Areas/issues Discussed (reorganized into themes)**  
a. **Use a single “vocabulary”**  
i. Carry the architectural vocabulary of the centerpiece to its logical end; it would be better to wrap the corners of the stairwells in the same way you have wrapped the central column.  
ii. Make the stairwell sections better integrate with the middle. Either lower the middle section or raise the height of the sides.  
iii. Emphasize the stair towers while keeping them subordinate to the central building mass (entry).  
b. **More solid, less like a façade**  
i. Both the central façade and the stairwell façades look slapped on—it would better if they were solid masses. A mere 8” thick façade for the stairwell sections is one example of this problem.
i. One way to achieve this would be by wrapping the trim all the way around both on the central column and the stairwell sections.

iii. Alternatively, they could get rid of EIFS and do the trims in concrete

c. Stairwell Facing
i. Glass versus a grilling system; glass can be hosed down, but how well will it ventilate?
ii. The angled, sloping glass on the stairwell façades has a guillotine effect – awkward and perhaps intimidating. People aren’t going to want to step under it.
iii. If grilling is done, the arch and rainbow elements could come into play in the pattern.
iv. We want something that will allow the trade winds to blow through.

v. Maybe taro leaf design could be incorporated here

d. Crosswalks
i. Remove the traditional crosswalks at the ends of the building and expand the plaza to emphasize pedestrian-friendliness of the entire plaza.

e. The arch – get rid of or not?
   i. (Eric) The center may look better as a pure cube
   ii. (Peter) Likes the rainbow and arch; maybe incorporate these on the stairwell towers as well
   iii. Looks like a rainbow from the field side. Maybe it should be lit up when there is a touchdown?
   iv. Intended to emulate shape of Founder’s Gate, which is its only tie to “sense of place”

f. Entrance (doors)
   i. Raise the height of the doors on the front entrance to give them more prominence. Doors seem small relative to the entry space.
   ii. Cantilever / curve out the ledge to make a real marquee

g. Scoring
   i. Looks inconsistent with the central non-scored column. Either score the whole thing or don’t score it at all
   ii. Scoring adds human scale
   iii. The scoring as pictured seems off; there are some missing lines

h. Internal walls/corridors
   i. Focal wall in the entrance is an improvement
   ii. On the long internal corridors, add recesses for artwork/murals to break up the long corridor (Second floor center of building and first floor toward both ends of the building)

i. Bathrooms
   i. Provide a zigzag entrance to eliminate sightlines and allow for door removal
   ii. Develop a solid recommendation on the number of toilets from experts

K. Follow up Items
a. Discussion:
   i. New design very different from past design and some improvements have been made.
   ii. Panel does not want to create hardship for design team by forcing late-stage redesign
   iii. Unanimous disappointment that no potential for a future added roof has been made, especially given the southwest orientation of the building. Seats are
facing southwest and there is extreme exposure to both sun and rain. Panel understands time and cost constraints, but is concerned about roof issue.

iv. There has been a fundamental issue from the start: the absence of a roof. This will create a problem during every event held at the facility. This is a profoundly unfortunate situation that could not be rectified within the parameters given to the Design Advisory Panel. The Panel anticipates this could compromise the facility’s basic functionality and could become an issue as a result.

b. Comments to Mitsunaga & Associates to include the following:
   i. Roof
      1. “Details of the design notwithstanding, the fundamental problem from the start has been the lack of roof. It is the Opinion of this group that the absence of a roof additive alternate/phase will be a profoundly problematic issue. This will be problematic for the function of the facility and a potential embarrassment to this campus.”

ii. Materiality
   1. If this is poured-in-place concrete, the style/manner of trimming (recessed/pushed out) should reflect the material
   2. Right now it is a bunch of elements that are not holding together
   3. Should you use EIFS with poured-in-place concrete? Why not use poured-in-place concrete for all the details?

iii. Stairwell glass
   1. Find a different solution for screening the stairwells; glass is suboptimal

iv. Lighting
   1. How will the building be lit? Sconces? What will night lighting look like?

v. Entrance
   1. Curve the marquee
   2. Increase the scale of the entry. The doors should be higher and integrated with the marquee.

vi. Landscaping
   1. Provide landscaping on the ewa side wall

vii. Concern about the sidewalk being cut down to just five feet

viii. Bathrooms
   1. Eliminate daily use doors

ix. Interior walls
   1. provide niches for murals on 1st and 2nd floors

x. Crosswalk
   1. Expand the plaza in front of the building in lieu of crosswalk demarcation

Next Steps: in the next few days, the panel will circulate a copy of the comments which will then be forwarded to Mitsunaga & Associates.