Finishes Discussion

1. TSG reviewed the last meeting items and this meeting's agenda items
2. TSG ran through the general comments from the last meeting
3. TSG walked through the current site plan, pointing out the current rectory location (and commented on the current planning review comments)
4. Walkway around the church perimeter: the committee questioned again where the sidewalks are that follow around the church perimeter
   • The walkways do not continue uninterrupted around the entirety of the church
   • Per A. Ruiz, this is an advantage: lack of distraction during services (people walking by)
5. Floor Plan – TSG briefly talked through the finishes designations as shown on the power point; Susan (TSG) will talk in more detail about this
6. TSG highlighted the revisions near the work sacristy, per the comments from the last meeting
7. The committee questioned the size of the music room: it is a bit smaller than what is used now; however, all of the functions that are used in this room now are not meant to be housed in this new room. Some of the current functions will be housed in the Parish Hall once the offices are remodeled.
8. Exposed ductwork: TSG showed examples of photos
9. Acoustic value of ducts: the committee questioned both the sound from the units and the air flow through ducts; the design team is focusing on working with the mechanical engineer to minimize this sound
10. Rendering: TSG tempered the rendering: the committee should review it for color tones mainly, and a general idea of the space
11. Ductwork: the committee still has concerns of it being exposed
12. T. Mirenda: still wants to pursue some sort of soffit to cover the ducts; TSG will need to show the committee the options that were reviewed for their feedback
13. Committee question: there is an industrial/harsh feeling of seeing the exposed ductwork if not covered by anything: the rivets and striations will show, and this is thought to not be appropriate for the space
14. Committee concern: if there are duct registers over the choir, any sound of air movement will get amplified by the choir microphones
15. Skylight was reviewed; there were no comments from the committee
16. Committee question: is the church floor shown as flat now? Per TSG, it is sloped both in the plans and in the rendering
17. Pews: The coordinating committee is reviewing different options for the pews: Segmented vs. curves: the committee feedback was that curved would be best
   • Cushion vs. no cushion: the committee feedback was that no cushion would require the least maintenance
   • Committee comments:
     o Cushions require maintenance & cost
     o Mitered pews: seemed harsh; circular pews are softer
     o Still need kneelers & book racks
     o Is cost for elliptical shaped room involved in quote? Yes, the floor plan was sent to the manufacturer for their use in quoting the costs for the pews
     o Concern for open back: things always falling through the opening
     o Acoustics of pews without cushions is still a concern for the design team
     o Replacement value of fabrics vs. having an all-wood pew: committee asked that this be weighed
     o Cleaning of seat cushions: what is the history of maintenance with other parishes?
     o All wood pews vs. carpeted aisles: this could become one trade off for the acoustics
     o Material life cycle was discussed; S. Buschweitz commented on the fabrics that are available today that could have a very long life, and could also reduce staining and maintenance
     o It boils down to about 1% of the total construction cost to upgrade to the all-wood pews; this is such a tactile thing for the congregation, it is felt that this money would be well-spent
18. Is there a value to selling the existing pews? Per A. Ruiz and T. Mirenda, it is rare to get good value for them
19. Acoustic System / distributed system: channelization of the speakers will allow for some speakers to be turned off when church is not full. This was thought to be a great idea by the committee; they will have some control over where the sound is being amplified and can avoid hot spots and echoes when the church isn’t full.

20. Location of stained glass windows: some committee members weren’t sure of the locations. It was discussed that all are in the chapel except for one panel in the main entry.

21. Exterior of building: TSG stated this is meant to be a contemporary interpretation of the mission style.
   - Entry doors: TSG has proposed clear glass: concern for maintenance Per A. Ruiz: St. Gertrude in Lombardo Church has Herculite doors, perhaps the committee could view this installation.
   - Per Armando: maybe etched glass with metal framework is another option.
   - The committee feels that this is a very important feature; committee also brought up the Los Angeles cathedral doors as an example of a contemporary installation that works well.

22. Exterior finishes:
   - Tiles: joints can be very hard to navigate with wheelchairs & walkers.
   - Tower: were there to be openings in the tower? T. Mirenda revisited.

23. Interior finishes:
   - S. Buschweitz ran through the slides for finishes and discussed the thought process behind palette.
   - Carpet / tile locations will have to be balanced with acoustical issues & maintenance.
   - Carpet: TSG is reviewing having a custom pattern that relates to the art glass.
   - Tile paving: slip coefficient is an important concern, both for the committee and the design team.
   - Woods: proposal is a cherry finish or actual cherry: brings warmth into the palette.
   - Organic, serene palette.
   - Narthex: walk-off mats will most likely be needed during the rainy season; T. Mirenda noted that permanently installed mats would be ideal.
   - Floors of churches that were visited by the committee: TSG will review with individuals that have recollection of certain aspects that were thought to be nice.
   - Committee question: what are the pews in the church right now? Per A. Ruiz, they are probably oak or maybe red oak, as this is a common California wood.

24. A. Ruiz:
   - Discussed wood types: cherry grain is wonderful & can be stained with different tones; it is a softer wood: is dented more easily than perhaps oak or ash.
   - Talked about different grain types.
   - Metals: architect & Ruiz will coordinate to have consistent metal detailing throughout the church and the liturgical items.
   - Per Msgr. Simas: the committee is leaning toward wood furnishings for the liturgical items.
   - Altar table: per A. Ruiz, this is historically the item that the community invests into being the best it can be: it is meant to be the gathering worship place for the entire community.
   - Committee question: what are the pews in the church right now? Per A. Ruiz, they are probably oak or maybe red oak, as this is a common California wood.
   - Mozambique wood and Koa wood are other options that have been used in other churches.
   - Oak would speak to the history of California.
   - Per A. Ruiz, there is a preference for altar cloths not falling all the way to the floor, as it hides the altar itself.
   - Presider chair: this is not meant to look like a ‘throne’.
   - Baptismal font: visualization will allow participation (the design team is addressing this with location and patterning on the flooring).
   - Different areas of the church:
     - Assembly
     - Altar
     - Ambo
     - Tabernacle
   - Eucharist container: the tall cylindrical option was liked.
   - Architecture of the space, the community vision and the patron saint: can all be identified within the altarpieces and the liturgical items.
• Process for review of the liturgical designs: the core committee will review A. Ruiz’s concept sketches and once a general direction is taken, it will be brought to the entire design committee for comment
• Semi-sunken baptismal font: many parishioners liked this idea, but the discussion of the safety aspects of this pointed out it might not be appropriate. Also, A. Ruiz pointed out that the congregation should be able to be involved in the baptism ceremony, and they won’t be able to see the process if the font is too low

25. The city planning department review process was discussed:
• There is a long review process for a project this large and a site this complicated; the design team is working with the planning department to address their concerns
• The schedule for the project is being pushed out longer due to the planning review

END OF REPORT