

CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS

AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE

JUNE 29, 2015

City Hall Council Chambers

Regular Session

6:00 PM

7008 S. RICE AVE.
BELLAIRE, TX 77401



Council Liaison

Gus E. Pappas

Member

Dolores Avioli

Member

Michael Fife

Member

Todd Blitzler

Member

Chris Kaitson

Member

Suzanne Shelby

Member

Christopher Butler

Member

Kristin Schuster

Mission Statement:

The City of Bellaire is dedicated to outstanding quality service and facilities to ensure an open, progressive, and secure community.

REGULAR SESSION - 6:00 P.M.**A. Call to Order****B. Public Comments****C. Approval of Minutes**

1. Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee – Regular Session – May 5, 2015
2. Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee – Regular Session – June 18, 2015

D. Confirmation of Evaluation Factors

1. Project Objectives
2. Design Considerations

E. Review of Evaluation Factor Definitions**F. Review of New Site Plan Option D****G. Discussion of Parking Strategies****H. Review of Pros and Cons of Four Remaining Site Plan Options****I. Discussion of Site Plan Conclusions****J. Discussion of City Council Presentation****K. New Business****L. Review of Consensus from Meeting****M. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting****N. Public Comments****O. Adjournment**



CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS
AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
MAY 5, 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 6:05 p.m. on Tuesday, May 5, 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	
Gus E. Pappas	Council Liaison	Present	

B. Public Comments

Jeff Caldwell discussed his concerns with the location and design of the new Police facility. HE also asked that John Gabriel be given a chance to explain the square footage of his plan (Alternate A.)

Lynn McBee addressed her concerns with how the process is getting bogged down, and her displeasure with the minutes prepared by PGAL. She asked the Committee to consider the three or four point brought up at the Town Hall meeting.

C. Approval of Minutes

The Committee reviewed and approved the Minutes from the January 20, 2015 Regular Meeting.

The Committee reviewed and approved the Minutes from the April 24, 2015 Regular Meeting with the following comments:

- List the Public Speakers
- Add visual and light impacts to the bullets under Section C.

D. Review of Updated Project Objectives

- The Ad-Hoc committee wanted to remove qualifying descriptions ("Most Important" from Project Objectives and "Less Important but Needs Consideration" from the Design Considerations) from the "Project Objectives" and "Design Considerations" descriptions.

- The Ad-Hoc committee believes the implied meaning of “Project Objectives” and “Design Considerations” is sufficient to describe intent.
- The revised evaluation categories are as follows:
 - Design Objectives
 - Campus of buildings
 - LEED certification
 - Plan for the future library
 - Enhance the Town Center composition and existing elements
 - Improve connection of park elements
 - Maintain the character of the park
 - Preserve mature canopy trees
 - Understanding that some trees will need to be removed
 - Buildings in a park concept
 - Access to and through Town Center from all directions
 - Green corner of S. Rice and Jessamine
 - Programmatic Compatibility
 - Design Considerations
 - Efficiency of buildings
 - Share space where possible
 - Minimize staffing levels
 - Improve customer service
 - Efficient building functions
 - Improve building security
 - Multi-use of spaces
 - Adhere to Bond Referendum budget
 - Maximize the amount of green space in Town Center
 - Perimeter parking to minimize loss of green space
 - Maintain Police operability during a major flood event. (New Addition)
 - Removed from Consideration
 - Separate Police and Courts

E. Review of Site Plan Updates

Town Center Site Limitations

- Loftin Park boundaries
- Existing park improvements
 - Pool
 - Ball field
 - Tennis courts
 - Pavilion
 - Gazebo
 - Donor wall
- Existing buildings
- Water Plant
- Mature canopy trees
- Heritage trees

Review of Site Plan Updates

- Review of Original Alt A site plan configuration of Police and Courts buildings. Presented the actual space available is only 40 wide and would require extensive structural shoring and other enhancements to both the existing building and the new building to be viable. The building shape is not appropriate for efficient building configuration. Location next to water plant represents a risk to building operation.
- Presented Alt A Option 4 which is in the spirit of Original Alt A and improvement to Alt A Option 2 presented at last meeting. Option 4 flips the location of Police and Courts and places the court adjacent to the water plant. This allows the police to be able to expand in the future if necessary. Alt A Option 4 is the recommended evolution of original Alt A site plan. No additional comments from Committee.
- Presented Alt C with actual building sizes. This is the recommended evolution of original Alt C site plan. No additional comments from Committee.
- Presented Recycling Center site for both Police and Courts with 20 foot setbacks and 10 foot setbacks and associated parking options. Parking is limited on the actual recycling site but may be possible across the street on wastewater treatment plant site and/or on the existing Public Works campus. The same concerns related to sound and lights for adjacent residential properties at this location were discussed.
- Brant Gary, Director of Public Works gave a brief presentation regarding limitations regarding the parking options related to the recycling center site.
 - Recycling Center Site Infrastructure
 - The existing pipe yard/old recycling site is used for staging and storing of materials and equipment for City maintenance. Currently the site is used for material storage, heavy equipment storage, training, and lay down space.
 - A December 2014 study was presented to City Council outlining the costs to move the current uses currently located at the recycling center site elsewhere to allow for redevelopment. It was reported that an estimated cost of \$750,000 could be necessary to relocate all of the current uses to another location.
 - The existing pipe yard/ old recycle site would require a Phase 1 Environmental Analysis before any redevelopment could be done due to its use as a recycling facility for so long.
 - Across the street at the treatment plant there currently exists a large main water line along Edith Street that would need to be relocated in order to construct head in parking spaces on the site along the street.
 - A portion of the existing treatment plant site could be used for parking as shown in exhibits but there are costs to relocate existing infrastructure that needs to be considered.
 - Any of the development options being considered on the wastewater treatment plant side of Edith Street could impede future expansion of the wastewater treatment capacity of the City.
 - The existing pipe yard/ old recycling center site is one of the lowest spots in the city with an elevation of 48' at street level. The 100 year flood plain elevation at that location is 52'. The new Police Department would need to be constructed above the 500 year

- flood plain. The 500 year flood plain elevation is unknown at this time.
- The streets around the treatment plant are known to flood when heavy rains occur. The Public Works Department has established a procedure to relocate equipment and vehicles out of the area when a storm is expected.
- Brant Gary, Director of Public Works also addressed the limits of construction around the water plant located in Town Center.
 - Water Tanks and Tower Infrastructure
 - The existing masonry building adjacent to the water tanks cannot be moved as it contains critical equipment to the water system.
 - The existing fence line cannot be moved as it is currently built as tight around the site as possible that will allow for current and future maintenance activities at the site.
 - For future heavy maintenance/rehabilitation a 30'-0" buffer is required to access all parts of the water tower and tanks
 - It is recommended that new structures not be constructed any closer than 10 feet to the existing fence line to allow for routine maintenance
 - The southern access to the water plant (from Jessamine) is the only access available to the yard for certain areas of the water plant and should be maintained in any improvements.
 - Presented March 27 Site Plan. An updated version of this site plan was presented that had additional surface parking located on S. Rice to match parking count in Alt A Option 4 and Alt C in same area. No additional comments from Committee.
 - Discussed need for an acoustical study to evaluate the Police noise impact on surrounding property. This would be relevant at both the Jessamine site and recycling center site.
 - Police Chief Byron Holloway provided comments related to the Police operations with regards to noise and light impact on surrounding property and any concerns related to locating the Police Department at the recycle center site.
 - With regards to locating the Police Department on the recycling center site
 - Last year the Police received 27,000 calls for service, of which 19,000 came from west of the 610.
 - Police do not respond from the station, they respond from their service areas in the city. Relocating the Police Department to the recycle center site can be managed but would require changes in procedure and protocol. The level of police service currently provided to community may be impacted should this site be selected. Further study would be necessary to confirm impact.
 - The City should consider the possibility that the Police Department may need to expand in the future, and that expansion needs to be considered when choosing a site. The recycle site has minimal opportunity for future expansion.
 - The Police Department would need to be constructed above the 500 year flood plain and would be protected from street flooding. Any street flooding in the area would impact the accessibility of the facility during a major flood event to get supplies and personal in and out of the police station.

- With regards to noise and light at any location
 - The noise generated by the police sally port operation consists of doors closing, prisoners behavior during transfer, car hoods closing, and the testing of the police cruiser sirens at the beginning of the shifts. Many of these noises can be somewhat mitigated through design or police operation.
 - The “bumping” of the police siren can be done at a remote location once the officer is on patrol and does not need to happen in the sally port of the future police station.
 - The rear of the building would have a solid wall that would limit noise escaping out to the sally port area.
 - The back of the station is a secure area that is not intended for personnel or equipment. Since the back of the building would not be accessible to public, it would not need to be lit for security.
 - The back of the building is not going to be designed to have windows so transfer of building light should not be a concern.

Review of Creative Parking Strategies and Building Stacking Strategies

- Reviewed various creative parking and building stacking strategies that were requested from the April 24 meeting. This includes podium buildings, underground parking and three story buildings. The goal of each strategy was to reduce the amount of site that would be needed for surface parking so that additional green space would be possible.
 - a. Podium parking under the proposed City Hall/Civic Center building.
 - i. Creates approximately 40 surface parking spaces and could create approximately 27,500 SF of additional green space.
 - ii. Cost Impact is \$972,486.00 or \$25,600 per space.
 - iii. Will require an additional lobby and elevator core at grade level as well as an additional elevator serving the entire building.
 - b. Podium parking under the proposed Municipal Court building.
 - i. Creates approximately 15 surface parking spaces.
 - ii. Cost Impact is \$1,176,472.00 or \$84,000 per space.
 - iii. Will require an additional lobby and elevator core at grade level.
 - c. Underground parking under the proposed City Hall/Civic Center building
 - i. Potential for an additional 33 parking spaces under building.
 - ii. Will require an additional lobby and elevator core in the underground parking level as well as an additional elevator throughout the entire building.
 - iii. The parking ramp must be located outside of the footprint of the building due to head height clearances.
 - iv. \$2,931,726 in additional cost to project (\$88,840 per space) for the elevated structure, ramp, underground parking, additional elevator, below grade lobby and elevator core, and overall structural premium.
 - d. Underground parking under the great lawn
 - i. Potential for an additional 14 parking spaces in 6,500 S.F. of underground parking.
 - ii. Will require an additional core connecting the underground level to the Great Lawn above.

- iii. The parking ramp must be located in the middle of the Great Lawn entrance and cannot be covered for head height clearances.
- iv. \$1,171,600 in cost impacts (\$83,685 per space) for underground excavated parking, ramp, additional elevator, and stair tower buildings.
- e. Three story City Hall / Civic Center to achieve a smaller building footprint
 - i. Will require an additional lobby and elevator core in the civic center as well as an additional elevator serving the entire building.
 - ii. There is a potential for 5,000 SF of additional green space possible in this option.
 - iii. Cost impact is \$814,726.

Review of Square Footage and Cost Impact of Site Plan Options

- Reviewed the various cost impacts of the 4 site plan options presented (March 27, Alt A4 Option 4, Alt C, and the Recycling Center Site). Specific breakdowns of the required additional square footages were presented in the meeting.
 - a. March 27 Site Plan
 - i. The program SF or cost for project is not impacted by this option.
 - b. Alt A – Option 4
 - i. Will reduce by 650 SF the Civic Center / City Hall and will require an additional 4,407 SF in the municipal courts and will require temporary move costs for the police and courts as well as additional building hardening for the courts shared with police.
 - ii. Total short term estimated cost increase of \$2,128,195.
 - iii. Will require an additional 2,015 SF in the future library as well as future library relocation costs
 - iv. Total aggregate long term estimated cost increase of \$3,010,099.
 - c. Alt C
 - i. Will reduce by 650 SF the Civic Center / City Hall and will defer construction of a new courts building into the future. Will require a renovation of the existing police and courts building for the courts to remain in place.
 - ii. Will require an additional 2,015 SF in the future library as well as relocation costs. Will require an additional 4,407 SF in the future courts as well as relocation costs.
 - 1. Will require that cost of court to be escalated in for future cost increases. Assumed 5 year deferred at 5% per year impact.
 - iii. Total aggregate long term estimated cost increase of \$3,021,029.
 - d. Recycling Center Site
 - i. Will reduce by 650 SF the Civic Center / City Hall and will require an additional 4,407 SF in the municipal courts as well as additional building hardening for the courts shared with police. Will also require additional site work for the existing police site as well as increased site work for the new remote recycling center site.
 - ii. Total short term estimated cost increase of \$2,033,395. This does not include any costs associated with raising the police building above the flood plain.
 - iii. Will require an additional 2,015 SF in the future library.

- iv. Total aggregate long term estimated cost increase of \$2,665,299.
- v. At this time the level of the 500 year flood plain in this area is unknown. The future Police building will need to have its lowest level 1'-0" above this mark. Based on comments made by Brant Gary of Public Works, the current 100 year flood plain is 4' above the street level – which means at a minimum the building would be 5' above street level, if not more. Ramping in and out of the first floor to provide access to the sally port will not be possible given the size of the site without major additional cost considerations.

F. Discussion of Decision Matrix Rankings

- The final list of project objectives and considerations was revisited. Format is under consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee and will need to be finalized at the next meeting so that evaluations can be completed.
- Committee wanted the Efficiency of Buildings to cover the following considerations:
 - Share Space where Possible
 - Minimize Staffing Levels
 - Improve Customer Service
 - Efficient Building Functions
 - Improve Building Security
 - Multi-use of Spaces
- Discussion regarding not using the March 27 Option as the base line but rather score each option on its own merits.
- Discussion regarding how to score the matrix occurred with no clear consensus. Methods discussed included using number values or colors. Committee to decide method for scoring at the next meeting.

G. Discussion of City Council Presentation

H. New Business

I. Review of Consensus from Meeting

Public Comments:

Lynn McBee commented on the April 23 Minutes, staff attendance, Aspen Street residents, and the facility budget.

Cliff Morgan stated that he did not want the Police building in his back yard. He stated that noise is not the only issue, address his concerns about protests, media, and other disturbances in front of the building now. Mr. Morgan also brought up the project budget and phasing. He questioned PGAL numbers and justification for the Council approve plan.

Jeff Caldwell thanked the committee for their time and dedication.

J. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting

Next meeting to be determined.

K. Adjournment

Council Liaison Pappas advised that the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 5, 2015.

Approved:

Gus E. Pappas, Council Liaison



CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS
AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
JUNE 18, 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 6:08 p.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2015. He welcomed the two newest Committee Members, Todd Blitzler and Michael Fife, and advised that a quorum of members were present as set forth below.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dolores Avioli	Member	Present	
Todd Blitzler	Member	Present	
Christopher Butler	Member	Present	
Michael Fife	Member	Present	
Chris Kaitson	Member	Present	
Kristin Schuster	Member	Present	
Suzanne Shelby	Member	Present	
Gus E. Pappas	Council Liaison	Present	

B. Public Comments

Lydia Caldwell spoke discussing her property on Aspen and the concerns she as a property owner has with the location of the new Police Station. Mentioned property values would be negatively impacted. Ms. Caldwell emphasized her neighbor's, Mr. Morgan, question, asking if the City has looked into temporally moving into Houston PD's building on Beechnut. She spoke in favor of "Alternate Plan A."

Robert Riquelmy understands that is friction between the Council and the Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Riquelmy told the Committee to be persistent, airing complaints at the Council podium. He also suggested running for office.

Lynn McBee is disappointed in staff's understanding of their role in support of Council appointed committees. The minutes are missing chunks of information including citizen comments.

Jeff Caldwell addressed the Police Department being located on the South side of Jessamine. Mr. Caldwell spoke to Chief Holloway's comments from the previous meeting on the future of policing. Mr. Caldwell stated that the noise abatement at the Fire Station does not work. He urged the Committee to keep the Police Station on the North side of Jessamine.

C. Approval of Minutes

The Committee reviewed the Minutes from the May 5, 2015 Regular Meeting and asked that the following be amended:

- Add attendance, start time, and public comments
- Add written public comments

Member Dolores Avioli: The minutes reflect very little of the Committee's discussion. The minutes need to be provided earlier for Committee review.

Member Kristin Schuster: The minutes reflect the presentation, not the discussion.

Member Christopher Butler: Minutes do not cover public comments.

D. Confirmation of Project Objectives

Council Liaison Gus E. Pappas mentioned that this was the third meeting since the May Town Hall Meeting, and that he hopes the Committee can codify some things tonight.

Mr. Jeff Gerber stated the purpose of today is to narrow down the options. He started by asking the following questions:

1. Do we still want to evaluate all four options?
2. Do we still want to examine the other variables (raising buildings, underground parking, etc...?)

Member Todd Blitzer: The budget will not cover underground parking. Not reasonable to go down that path. No need to discuss further.

The Committee agreed that they no longer need to look at underground parking.

Mr. Gerber: Are we still talking about using podiums to park under the building?

Member Blitzer: That is still a consideration at this point.

Member Christopher Butler: We need to nail down where we want to put the buildings before we have detailed discussions.

The Committee reviewed "Alternate A – Option 4," providing the following comments:

Member Schuster: We are flipping Police and Courts.

Member Blitzer: Is this option phaseable?

Mr. Gerber: This would require Police and Courts to move during construction.

Member Blitzer: The pipes in the water facility will not allow the building to move there. What are the relocation costs?

Mr. Gerber: We put \$500,000 for Police and \$250,000 for Courts in the budget for relocation costs.

Member Blitzer: As a negative, this option does not allow for construction phasing. As a positive, you are not putting a two story building behind residences.

Member Schuster: I thought based on our last discussion that we were only looking at "Alternate A – Option 4" and "Alternate C."

Member Gerber: The Committee did not eliminate looking at the recycling center.

Member Avioli: What I'm hearing from the architects is that there is no way to bypass the flooding at Edith. Are there no ways to alleviate the problem?

Mr. Gerber: The Building Code requires us to build 1' above the 500 Year Floodplain. We know the 100 Year Floodplain is 5' above the ground, we don't know what the 500 Year is, it could be 1' or 2' above that. Protecting the building is not a problem, getting the vehicle up to the building and raising the roads are the problems.

Member Blitzer: You can't get the cars out. It's the worst flooding locations in the City.

Member Butler: It would never occur to me to put the Police and Courts in that location is doing a land use map.

Member Avioli: The space is underutilized. I question Mr. Gary's report that it would cost \$750,000 to just remove materials from the site.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To eliminate the Edith Street option from consideration.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Kristin Schuster
SECONDER:	Todd Blitzer
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To eliminate the underground parking consideration from the project.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Todd Blitzer
SECONDER:	Suzanne Shelby
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson
NAYS:	Butler

Member Butler: I won't support this motion, we don't know enough yet. I suggest we bring it back up if it's viable.

Member Blitzer: A Pro is that the Courts and Police Station is on the North Side of Jessamine versus the South side. A Con is the relocation of the Police and Courts facility during construction.

Member Schuster: A Con is that this option puts a lot of building footprint in the park. We are talking about this option with the police and courts switched.

Member Butler offered the following Pros to the Police and Courts Building not being on Jessamine;

- Less noise, visual, and light impact on the neighborhood
- Perception of safety enhancement by moving across, police farther from residents

Member Blitzer: Add aesthetic impact as a Pro.

Member Schuster: Homes are allowed to be two stories. The height of the building is not a specific impact.

Member Schuster: This option does or doesn't increase safety?

Member Butler: It increases the perception of safety by having Police in the park.

Mr. Gerber: Police has the ability to grow in both options.

Member Butler: What is the motivation to wanting to expand the Police Station?

Mr. Gerber: Policing is not necessarily driven by population; there are numerous factor in play.

Member Butler: The changes to future land use plan call for less growth.

Member Blitzer: This new station is larger than the current one. There will always be the ability to expand.

Member Schuster: If this option goes before Council they need to understand that the uses may flip-flop.

Member Avioli: If Police is two stories and Courts is one story, couldn't we expand over Courts in the future?

Mr. Gerber: Yes.

Member Blitzer: I don't think we need to worry about it.

Member Chris Kaitson: Unknowns in the future are a negative.

Mr. Gerber: We have planned for what we think the Police will need to be in the future. It's not wise not to box the building in. We need to plan for future expansion if its needed.

Council Liaison Pappas: These are just boxes at this point.

Member Blitzer: The conversation of where the Police are on the North or South side of Jessamine is a good one.

Member Butler: A Con is that Police and Courts are proximate to each other.

Member Schuster: I think their proximity to each other is an operational Pro.

Member Blitzer: I think we can solve the problem with different entrances.

Member Schuster: Can we get more contexts in the graphics with regards to the Aspen homes?

Member Butler: A Pro, is that we are leaving planning for the library, while a Con is that it will require more funding.

Member Avioli: Should we consider the library at this point?

Council Liaison Pappas: As a Pro, a reduction in the parking requirement is a pro.

Member Schuster provided the following Pro comments:

- Provides for future library (based on Committee objective)
- Pragmatic compatibility
- Uses the existing footprint, limiting impact on trees

Member Schuster: Access to the great lawn is more limited. This is a Con.

Member Avioli: We have to remember that the "green corner" will be there.

Member Schuster: Both alternative options show the City Hall/Civic Center in Northeast corner. Can we move that around?

Mr. Gerber: These are still only "boxes."

Member Butler: can the lines be drawn wiggly?

Mr. Gerber: The shapes are formed by the tree driplines. I can put a disclaimer.

The Committee reviewed "Alternate C," providing the following comments:

Mr. Gerber: In the Alternative C – long Term, the library shifts into the park and the Court moves to the other side of Jessamine.

Member Blitzer: Why not flip Police and Courts?

Mr. Gerber: This a phasing advantage?

Member Blitzer: Why don't we make Police and Courts two separate buildings? I think we need an option that puts the Courts on the South side and the future Police where the Courts is shown now.

Member Schuster: We are now not evaluating Alternative C; we are looking at another option. Do we want to do that?

Member Kaitson: I think we need to vote on whether to move the Police to the South side of Jessamine.

Member Schuster: I'm not ready to dismiss moving the Police to the South side.

Member Kaitson: I am, due to the impact on the residents.

Member Avioli: Isn't the Police and Courts together a really strong Pro?

Member Schuster: I would still consider this new option fundamentally together.

Council Liaison Pappas: Police are further to the East than they are now. If we move Police, Could we move the library adjacent to Court?

Mr. Gerber: The Police and Courts are not compatible uses.

Member Kaitson: How many plans are we showing to Council?

Member Butler: That depends on how we end tonight.

The Committee provided the following Pros and Cons to Alternative C:

Pros:

- Minimizes the amount of building in the park
- Extends phasing of the overall design
- Defers the expense of moving the Courts

Cons:

- Police impact to resident to Aspen street
- Same list as Alternate A

Member Schuster: Would you evaluate "short term" without considering "the long term" option?

Member Kaitson: Is the Court building sound enough to be left and rebuilt later?

Mr. Gerber: There are some problems with the building, and we have included some money for repairs. It all depends on how long we're talking about before its rebuilt.

Member Blitzer: Is it an option to renovate the Courts to temporarily house Police?

Mr. Gerber: You would be renovating almost the entire building. It's easier for Courts to temporarily move into Police.

Member Blitzer: The Alternative C short and long term option are really two different schemes.

Member Kaitson: Do relocation costs assume the buildings are built at the same time, or are they staged?

Mr. Gerber: The budget plans on building all you can, as fast as you can.

Member Schuster: The library is one of the most used spaces, and it is a positive to make it part of the park.

Member Kaitson: The library in the park is a huge negative. It's a quiet place, not a place for kids to play.

Member Blitzer: We should be looking at "what ifs" with regards to the library. Not funded yet. Alternative C long term is a future vision.

Member Kaitson: One of the driving issues is the need to bring the Police Department into the modern age with technology.

Member Butler: I like the original panoramic view proposed for the library. I'm struggling with the Police on the South side of Jessamine.

Member Michael Fife: It's better for Aspen resident to move the Police building.

Member Avioli: I can't get past the Police being on the South side of Jessamine.

Member Blitzer: I would be surprised if Council supported impacting Aspen. I would move Police to the North side of Jessamine.

Member Schuster: With this new option we do incur the cost of relocating and moving the pump materials, and moving the library next to the Police building.

Mr. Gerber: Are we eliminating Alternative C?

Member Butler: Can we put something together to look at?

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To add to the project objectives that the Police Station should not be located on the South side of Jessamine.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Todd Blitzer
SECONDER:	Dolores Avioli
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Shelby, Kaitson
NAYS:	Schuster

Member Schuster: I'm not in favor of this motion because it eliminates an option that with further exploration could lead to a solution. Not ready to let go of the idea to delay relocating the Court.

Member Fife: How is the Police building backing up to Aspen homes acceptable?

Member Schuster: I think there may still be design solutions to solve many of the problems.

The Committee took recess at 8:14 Pm and returned at 8:23 PM.

Mr. Gerber: Is Alternative C off the table?

Member Schuster: I thinks if we remove C, we are putting the benefit of five residents over the rest of the City.

Member Avioli: Should we leave C and flip the Courts and Police?

Member Schuster: That doesn't achieve the objectives, we would be moving Police twice.

Mr. Gerber: So keep C in the mix?

Council Liaison Pappas: Keep it in, but you heard it doesn't meet the new objective.

Mr. Gerber and PGAL presented to the Committee Options D-1 and D-2 for consideration.

Member Butler: Can you walk us through the phasing advantages of these plans over Alternative A?

Member Butler: This option improves access to the Great Lawn.

Mr. Gerber: Chief, can you talk about any concerns you may have?

Chief Byron Holloway: Not sure how we'll be getting in or out, access to the jail. Don't see that the library will cause us any problems. I would need to see it programed out more to develop a better opinion.

Member Avioli: Why would we want to jam up the library space?

Member Fife: The library next to the baseball field is odd.

Chief Holloway: We don't just police the City of Bellaire population. The area around us is growing and traffic is increasing. Policing will change in the future. The Bellaire population is only about 30% of what we take into consideration.

Mr. Gerber: Are we eliminating Option D-2?

Council Liaison Pappas: We would like to add D-1 (Alternate D) to the matrix.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To rename Alternative A-Option 4, to Alternative A and to add Alternative D into consideration.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Kristin Schuster
SECONDER:	Todd Blitzer
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

Mr. Gerber: Are we maintaining Alternative C?

Council Liaison Pappas: We should leave C.

Mr. Gerber: So we are looking at one more meeting before we go to Council. I think we need to spend the rest of tonight looking at the Pros and Cons of Alternatives C and D. Are we taking all four options to Council?

Member Schuster: I think that decision would happen at the next meeting.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To remove Alternative C from consideration.

RESULT:	MOTION WITHDRAWN BY MOVER AND SECONDER
MOVER:	Chris Kaitson
SECONDER:	Christopher Butler
AYES:	

Member Schuster: I may not be in favor of Alternative C, but it is not responsible to take it off the table yet. It needs further exploration.

Member Blitzer: It worthwhile to discuss at the next meeting.

Member Fife: Doesn't that add more confusion?

Council Liaison Pappas: Does having a design objective automatically exclude any options which don't meet all of them? I would suggest one more meeting. If each plan has to meet each objective then you going to Council with Alternative A.

Member Fife: Are you discounting Alternative D?

Council Liaison Pappas: The Committee has been at this for fourteen meeting and is ready to dismiss Alternative D after 2 minutes of discussion.

Member Blitzer: I think we should keep Alternative C in play for comparison. I think all the Alternatives are viable options.

Member Butler: I think that if it doesn't fit with the design criteria, then that option is out.

Member Blitzer: Including the Cons we've listed for an option outlines why we don't think it's viable.

Mr. Gerber: It's important for the committee to figure out how to communicate their message to Council.

The Committee provided the following Pros and Cons to Alternative D:

Pros:

- Improves accessibility and visibility to the Great Lawn from Jessamine.
- Minimal impact to Aspen residents.
- Minimizes the amount of building in the park.
- A single story building (Court) is a better buffer for the Aspen residents than a parking lot.
- Simplifies the Courts building relocation.

Cons:

- Reduces the library options in Town Center.
- Requires relocation of buildings and water plant.
- Relocation costs associated with the Police building
- Court and Police are now separate requiring an extra building

Member Blitzer: What's the possibility of the Police Building being three stories?

Mr. Gerber: There are operations that have to be on the ground floor. There are others that could be but don't have to be.

Member Fife: Why can't you put the library wherever you want to?

Member Avioli: Why are we determined to attach the Library to Police and put it in the park?

The Committee provided the following Pros and Cons to the Council Approve March 27 option:

Pros:

- Library engages the Great Lawn, programmatic compatibility Library with Civic Center
- Can be built within budget

Cons:

- Police on the South side of Jessamine
- Programmatic incapability
- Limits visibility of the Great Lawn from Jessamine
- Library adjacency to ball field

Mr. Gerber: What we want to do is answer how does this end? What do we provide to Council for them to make a decision?

E. Confirmation of Evaluation Matrix Categories

F. Discussion of Matrix Comparison Technique

G. Completion of Matrix

H. Discussion of City Council Presentation

I. New Business

J. Review of Consensus from Meeting

K. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting

The Committee chose to set the next meeting for Monday, June 29 at 6:00 PM in Council Chambers.

At the next meeting the focus will be the four site plans, review of the pros and cons, definitions, and discussion of how to present to Council.

Public Comments:

Jolene Wellington addressed the comment to adjust the plan for only 5 residents. The noise will effect more than the 5 residents on Aspen

Salim Virani stated to first do no harm in our planning. Do not look just at property values. Let's not make the Library an issue if there is no funding.

Lynn McBee is concerned with zoning and the separation of uses. Bellaire has considered itself above the zoning guidelines. These are not residential uses, city must mitigate issues. Additionally, Ms. McBee addressed the Rice Ave. corner design.

Jeff Caldwell discussed the cost savings budgetary issue combining Police and Courts. There is a long term savings.

L. Adjournment

Council Liaison Pappas advised that the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2015.

Approved:

Gus E. Pappas, Council Liaison

ALT A Option 4

PROS:

- 1) MC and PD on N. Jessamine (not south)
 - a. Reduce negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Improve the perception of safety – due to distance of PD from existing residential
- 2) MC and PD are functionally separate (with separate entrances) but share infrastructure
- 3) Leaves options for Library relocation (minimize relocation costs)
- 4) Programmatic compatibility
- 5) Minimal tree impact in Park

CONS:

- 1) Relocation costs for MC and PD
- 2) Excessive building SQFT in park
- 3) Requires future relocation costs for future LIB
- 4) Potential visibility limitations to GL from S. Jessamine
- 5) Limited option to place library close to the GL

ALT C – Short Term

PROS:

- 1) Minimizes the amount of SQFT in PARK
- 2) Saves cost of relocating PD and MC
(because you do not move MC now)
- 3) Defers the cost of building a new MC
- 4) Leaves options for Library relocation

CONS:

- 1) MC and PD on S. Jessamine
 - a. Negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Does not meet project design objective to keep PD on N. Jessamine
- 2) Short term renovation costs

ALT D

PROS:

- 1) PD on N. Jessamine (not south)
 - a. Reduce negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Improve the perception of safety – due to distance of PD from existing residential
- 2) Improves accessibility and visibility to PARK from Jessamine
- 3) Minimize SQFT of building in the Park
- 4) MC acts as buffer to PD / PARKING to Aspen St.
- 5) No MC relocation costs

CONS:

- 1) Relocation costs associated with PD
- 2) No shared infrastructure cost between MC and PD (one additional standalone building)

March 27th Site Plan

PROS:

- 1) LI proximity to GL
 - a. Meaningful sharing of space between LI and CC
 - b. No relocation costs for PD or MC

CONS:

- 1) PD on S. Jessamine
 - a. Negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Does not meet project design objective to keep PD on N. Jessamine
- 2) Does not meet programmatic compatibility
 - a. CH and MC combined (CH and CC should be combined)
 - b. LI and CC combined
- 3) Potential visibility limitations to GL from S. Jessamine
- 4) LI proximity to baseball field
- 5) Does not meet buildings in a park concept
 - a. CC buried away from the GL