



CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS
AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 9, 2015

Council Chambers

Regular Session

6:00 PM

**7008 S. RICE AVENUE
BELLAIRE, TX 77401**

REGULAR SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

A. Call to Order – Gus E. Pappas, Councilman

Gus E. Pappas, Councilman, called the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee ("Committee") to order at 6:02 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2015. He advised that a quorum of members were present as set forth below.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dolores Avioli	Member	Present	
Christopher Butler	Member	Present	
Chris Kaitson	Member	Present	
Kristin Schuster	Member	Present	
Suzanne Shelby	Member	Present	6:12 PM
Gus E. Pappas	Council Liaison	Present	

B. Public Comments

Lynn McBee addressed the Committee on several matters including agenda development, the ordinance, and liaison responsibilities.

Council Liaison Pappas read into the record two emails, one from Frank D'Amico and one from Andrea Blitzer.

Mr. Jeff Gerber spoke to the comments he received at the State of the City event held on February 2, 2015.

Member Dolores Avioli relayed an email she received

C. Approval of Minutes

The Committee reviewed the Minutes from the January 27, 2015 Regular Meeting and asked that more detail on the discussion be added. The minutes will be approved at a future meeting.

D. Review of Ordinance Creating Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee

Council Liaison Pappas read the Ordinance which established the Ad Hoc Committee and asked the committee to pose any questions they had on any part of the Ordinance. The list of questions from the Committee would be presented to Council at a future Council meeting.

Member Chris Kaitson: The ordinance does not mention the library.

Mr. Gerber: My design contract requires PGAL to conceptualize the library. Additionally, the S. Rice esplanade and signature corner need to be considered.

Member Suzanne Shelby: Was the "campus of buildings" referring to the Council approved site plan?

Mr. Gerber: It relates to the short term and long term site plans presented to Council and the Committee.

Member Kristin Schuster: To whom are we advising?

Mr. Gerber: I see the committee as a great tool to help provide feedback which we (PGAL) will incorporate to make the product presented to Council better.

Member Avioli: the ordinance does not say to zero in on a single plan.

Mr. Gerber: As we start to look at various building locations, how we deal with entry and surroundings, are issues we see the committee providing input on.

Council Liaison Pappas: How did you see the development of an approach manifesting itself?

Mr. Gerber: We develop designs and scenarios, and the Ad Hoc Committee would help us look at the various options and provide feedback on how we could make them better.

Member Kaitson: What is meant by impact to construction?

Mr. Gerber: Construction impact, phasing, and looking at which building if any get shut down is worthy of a conversation.

Mr. Gerber reviewed possible phasing scenarios.

Council Liaison Pappas: What's meant by elements?

Mr. Gerber: Decisions should not be made in isolation; the long term scenarios should be looked at as part of the design process. Elements could include landscaping, art, etc.

Member Schuster: Can the Committee discuss the location of the "Signature Corner?"

Mr. Gerber: We (PGAL) informed the City that there were other areas that needed to have some additional thought, outside the scope of the buildings, which would help to create a future vision, whenever that vision is.

Member Butler: Is streetscape within what we should be looking at?

Mr. Gerber: My contract is related to interface to the street edge. We need to understand the whole street, not just the part in front of our building. We are not charged to design it (the street) but to understand what is possible.

Council Liaison Pappas: Are you looking for yes that's a good idea, crosswalks, size?

Mr. Gerber: Like with the other topics, we are looking to narrow the field and look at budget implications. The results would be presented to Council.

Council Liaison Pappas: What do you mean by providing definitions on elements of the Campus theme?

Mr. Gerber: How does this series of buildings continue to become a campus, that what we are looking for the Committee to help with.

Member Avioli: Is function (compatibility) one of the elements we are to look at?

Mr. Gerber: To some degree, function is an element the Committee would look at.

Member Schuster: Do campus elements limit the items we can look at?

Mr. Gerber: The budget limits the perimeters, but we need to understand how everything works together.

Mr. Gerber: It was though that the Committee would provide input on what approach to take with regards to how the building feels as it relates to looks.

Mr. Gerber: There are different "sustainability" statements "clients" want to make. A key point of the conversation is what does sustainability mean to the City of Bellaire? What are the most important types of credits we should be reviewing?

Member Butler: I don't see any mention of how the Committee deals with branding. I would like that to be a little more stated.

Mr. Gerber: I think that could be applied to item "d.".

Council Liaison Pappas: I would appreciate some "sign posting" on where the topic we discuss fit into our charge.

Member Butler: Our meetings have to be on the front page of the City's website.

Council Liaison Pappas: I will make sure that any input received will be forwarded to the Committee.

Questions the Committee has as to their charge include the following:

- Branding
- Work with other committees
- To whom do we report and advise
- Work product clarification

E. Consideration to Appoint a Spokesperson

Council Liaison Pappas: I never thought that my communication with Council would be at the exclusion of other members. Certain topics could be better articulated through another Committee member. I feel my function as a Council member and a Committee member not be blurred in any way.

Member Kaitson: Not sure why we would need to limit it to one. People travel and are out of town. I would like to see two representatives.

Member Schuster: This agenda does not reflect what the Committee wanted on it. Member Butler and I met with the City Manager, staff and Council Liaison Pappas to set this agenda. I am comfortable with selecting a spokesperson, and not officers. I would like to bring up the report we wanted to send to Council. I think we should each, individually send our thought to Council. I think we need to consider what the spokesperson should be doing, and if we would like them to present this report.

Council Liaison Pappas: I think the Committee needs to make a presentation at the February 16 workshop, including questions about the charge. There appear to be four (4) decisions to be made questions:

1. Who do you want the spokesperson to be?
2. How to address the questions the Committee has?
3. How do you want to request input?
4. What do you want to present to Council on February 16?

Member Avioli: I'm in favor of having one (1) spokesperson to gather consensus and present to Council. If they can't, then they can name an alternative.

Member Shelby: So we individually need to write a letter to present at the workshop?

Member Schuster: That is one of the suggestions I have been given.

Member Shelby: I say present the letter and then move on.

Members Butler and Schuster were nominated to be the Committee spokesperson. The Committee chose Member Kristen Schuster as its spokesperson.

Council Liaison Pappas: Do we have an idea of what we would like Council to address?

Member Avioli: When we address our concerns, do we limit them to the one plan?

Member Schuster: I think we should stick to the charge.

Member Kaitson: We may have personal beliefs, but we know what our Committee direction is.

Member Schuster: I am comfortable speaking for the Committee as long as we can tie the concerns back to our charge.

Council Member Pappas: I would like to know if we need to post a notice of possible quorum?

The Committee requested that notice be posted for the February 16 Council Workshop.

Member Kaitson: What do we mean by workshop?

Mr. Shawn Cox: It is a Council workshop to review the Facilities Project, which is a public meeting.

F. Review of Blocking Strategies per Approved site Plan

Mr. Gerber presented the Committee building blocking strategies for the new municipal buildings, outlining how they interacted with each other and the spaces around them. Mr. Gerber stated that these plans may change slightly.

Committee Members provided the following feedback on the City Hall/Courts building blocking:

Member Kaitson: Do we know how many people visit City Hall or Courts daily, is parking adequate?

Mr. Gerber: Courts meets periodically and is on a different parking "cycle" than City Hall.

Member Butler: Option "A" widens the street scape, allowing people to go faster. Parking lot causes a connection with the street to be lost.

Member Schuster: I prefer the North/South orientation of the building. I would like to see the building pushed closer to S. Rice.

Member Butler: The Council Approved Option addresses the street more than the options shown.

Member Schuster: Pushing the building closer to S. Rice, puts more green space between it and the Aquatic Center.

Member Shelby: I like the building option "A", but the parking from the other options, where the center crossing from Condit.

Member Schuster: The lots in options "A" and "B", how does that compare to the amount of parking we have?

Mr. Gerber: The parking numbers a comparable.

Member Schuster: We are adding the Court and City Hall parking in a lot that the same size as we have. The current location of the lot, keep the cars away from the Great Lawn. I don't like the ideas of having to walk through a parking lot to get to the Great Lawn.

Member Butler: IF we push the building back, do we have four (4) sides of transparency where we're not creating an alley with Loftin Park?

Mr. Gerber: Yes. The support services would be located on that side.

Member Schuster: Does a two (2) story building next to the Aquatic Center have a negative impact on sunlight?

Mr. Gerber: We have not done a shade analysis yet, but we will on whatever option we choose.

Member Butler: If I have to choose, I would rather have the Great Lawn exposed, rather than the Aquatic Center.

Member Schuster: Option "B" places the building off by itself by a parking lot. I would like an Option "D", with a North/south design.

Member Butler: The more building we can have on the street will help pedestrian friendliness.

Member Shelby: Temporary relocation costs come out of our construction budget. I know it should not be a driving factor, but phasing does need to be looked at.

Council Liaison Pappas: I like the separation of the court room in option "A" better. I also would like direct parking for Courts.

Committee Members provided the following feedback on the Civic Center building blocking:

Council Liaison Pappas: Is there a kitchen in the Civic Center?

Mr. Gerber: Yes, and we are hoping it can be utilized by the seniors, the civic center, and the future library.

Member Kaitson: The Civic center is moving to an area with less parking than before.

Mr. Gerber: The Center is moving to an area where ultimately, the most parking will be located.

Member Kaitson: Is the Civic Center's high use time weekends?

Mr. Gerber: The Civic Center, today, is used throughout the day. This location provides and opportunity to provide more activity.

Member Schuster: I still feel that it needs to be surrounded by trees, push the building up, off of Jessamine. Start out with the Civic Center building closer to the park, and the library can be build closer to Jessamine. It's likely the library will go somewhere else.

Member Shelby: We miss an opportunity not incorporating the Civic Center into the Great Lawn.

Mr. Alec Luong: The Library will, at some point, move across the street, but we should incorporate the best features of that future building into the Civic Center?

Committee Members provided the following feedback on the Police building blocking:

Member Schuster: Will noise studies be done?

Mr. Gerber: Yes. Additionally, future programing could reduce noise.

Council Liaison Pappas: The location of Civic Center/Library parking and the Police drop off areas could have an impact with the increase in traffic.

Member Butler: Head in parking will naturally slow traffic down on Jessamine.

Member Schuster: Are you moving into developing plans for the Police Building, do you have enough feedback from us.

Mr. Gerber: Yes.

G. Review of Consensus from Meeting

Mr. Gerber outlined the consensus from the meeting, highlighting the following:

- Consensus on establishing a spokesperson

- There is a need from Council to clarify elements of the Committee's charge.
- Blocking strategies are still in the evolution phase. We will incorporate the suggestions into future options.
- We will look to reevaluate the Civic Center location , relative to the Great Lawn

H. Discussion Regarding Future Meetings

Options for future meeting days would be considered and provide to the committee to see what works best. No specific date was set.

I. Adjournment

Council Liaison Pappas advised that the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2015.

Approved:



Gus E. Pappas, Council Liaison