



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES

**100 Civic Center Drive, Crystal Cove Conference Room (Bay 2D)
Thursday, September 19, 2019 8:30 AM**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Matthew Witte, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Karen Clark (arrived late), Mayor Diane Dixon (arrived late)

Absent: None.

III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC/ PUBLIC COMMENT

Debra Allen President of Harbor View Hills Committee Association wanted to note a problem to the Committee regarding protecting the view plain and lighting in the parking lot and around east side building windows. She noted there is a nightlight view from the neighborhood into the bay and the harbor and they would like to protect that nightlight view and asked that the Committee design in a way that does not impact the view. She asked that if the design will impact that view, they would like special notice and the opportunity to be heard on the issue.

Paul Watkins Vice Chair of Board of Library Trustees spoke to confirm that the Board of Trustees is actively engaged in overseeing the lecture hall process. He noted the Board of Trustees receives monthly updates to the Board of Trustees. He noted the Committee is subject to the Brown Act and that the minutes are available to the public.

Jim Mosher commented on the minutes for approval. He noted the minutes were uninformative. He also commented on the agenda and the order of the presentations and how the order was decided. He noted the previous meetings' minutes state there was subcommittee appointed at the last meeting and he asked whether the subcommittee would be reporting.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the items were selected randomly and she stated the subcommittee has nothing to report.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

A motion was made by Vice Chair Janet Ray, and was seconded by Matthew White, to approve the *Draft Minutes of the August 19, 2019, Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Meeting.*

The motion carried 3-0 with the following vote:

AYES: Matthew Witte, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Karen Clark, Mayor Diane Dixon

ABSTAIN: None

V. CURRENT BUSINESS

1. *Presentation by Sanders Architects, Mithun/Hodgetts & Fung*

Whitney Sanders the principal of Sanders Architect introduced himself and Katherine Hollis, Director of Interior Design and Darin Vieira Senior Associate with Mithun/Hodgetts & Fung, (Unintelligible), Associate.

Mr. Sanders spoke about the longstanding collaboration between Sanders Architects and Mithun/Hodgetts and Fung and noted they bring creative thinking to the table and economic strategy that sacrifices nothing in terms of quality. He also noted they promote the idea of gathering whereby architectural spaces create spaces for gathering through the qualities in the architecture.

Ms. Hollis noted that quality materials make all the difference in the world. She stated they place a lot of emphasis on the details of the materials.

Mr. Sanders noted their series of structures have the highest awards of the industry. He noted Mr. Hodgetts and Mr. Fung could not be present because they had to attend a wedding.

Daren Vieira commended the City for investing and focusing on advancing this project. He spoke about his previous experience and qualifications. He noted the firm operates at multiple scales and they have the ability to take small and large projects. Contextually dive into the sites and places. For example, in Nashville, they looked at the stylings of country music over time and were inspired by the adjacent river and created the stage house. He spoke about the Frost Auditorium, innovative mid-century structure. For the Newport Library Complex, is part of a collective and an identity for the City because it is the heart and core of the City's identity.

Mr. Vieira noted their vision is a strong structure with efficiency. The existing library contains traditional materials that are familiar and they would like to assemble something that speaks about Newport Beach. He spoke about the buffer zone between Avocado Boulevard and the Civic Center and how the firm would like to engage with that buffer zone. He noted they would like to create a feeling of sense in the court space or possibly to connect it with the lobby to expand the public realm. He noted they recognize the building needs civic presence particularly from the view at Avocado Boulevard.

Mr. Vieira stated they looked at the existing master plan which addresses the parking lot and the library and the court and focused on how patrons will enter the building. The analysis of the master plan was that the court wasn't connecting with the rest of the building. They have additional ideas for the master plan.

Mr. Sanders provided models and spoke about Scheme No. 1 called the "wave." He noted something was lacking from the courtyard and they thought of making the building the third side of the courtyard to bring it to life. The form of the structure would come from the energies of the ocean.

Mr. Vieira demonstrated how they would change the court and create an exterior patio and provide a new bridge location to welcome people to the court. He noted they are considering a Mezzanine level two to look over Avocado Boulevard.

Mr. Sanders showed Mr. Vieira's sketch that showed the view of the area.

The group then spoke about Scheme No. 2 which includes a "bow." He stated it provides a feeling of moving forward with elegance.

Mr. Vieira noted the form of the building is very recognizable and familiar. He stated they are occupying the site of the master plan and enhancing it with the roof structure which acts as an extension to welcome the court into the lobby. They would like to expand the court to relate to some of the existing geometries on site with the swale.

Committee Member Clark asked whether the existing bridge would be moved in this scenario.

Mr. Vieira stated it would be moved in this scenario and in the next one.

Mr. Sanders spoke regarding Scheme No. 3 which is called the “jewel” and synthesizes the first two schemes and conceived as an icon of Avocado Boulevard. The concept is a faceted jewel sitting on top of a bar that extends into the courtyard. He demonstrated the model.

Mr. Vieira noted this scheme places the lecture hall itself as the icon and provides a simple bar that references a clean, modern aesthetically pleasing space. The lobby space welcomes the bamboo court in. He noted how important it is for assembly spaces to create a presence before you walk into the lecture hall. He also noted the dramatic presence created by the swale and finally how the jewel is contrasted to the sculptural Council Chambers.

He noted these schemes promote continuity, engage the bamboo court and are adaptable to a wide range of materials. He noted it is straightforward construction and noted there is a balance of simple and complex construction so more can be placed into the lecture hall which is the most important part of the project.

Mr. Vieira clarified these are just ideas and there is no agenda about the final product until they hear from the community.

Mr. Sanders noted they purposely are not providing completed renderings because they want committee and community engagement.

Mr. Vieira noted they would go out and have formal and informal meetings with the community in order to engage and solicit responses from the community and incorporate it into the project so that the community can take ownership over the design. He demonstrated some sample models they used to receive feedback from students at Jesuit High School on a project there. He noted they also participate in the fundraising aspect of these projects.

Mr. Sanders spoke about two five-thousand and ten-thousand square foot projects of a lecture hall and house in Palm Springs that was completed for 2.5 million dollars. He used these sites to speak about the steel frames and the way they are constructed. He noted both of these projects received awards.

Ms. Hollis spoke about community and bringing people together. She noted she was a professional dancer for twenty years and has a deep physical understanding of an art space. She spoke about the importance of the audience’s feeling with regards to the space.

Mr. Sanders spoke about entry sequences regarding the various arts and the way in which this is applied to architecture.

Committee Member Witte commended the firm over their presentation. He noted this was an open discussion where they are presenting various ideas and seeking communication from the Committee. He noted the engagement aspect of their presentation was great.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked regarding sloped floor lecture halls and whether they are thinking about ADA steps and sloping.

Mr. Vieira stated each scheme presents different ideas and they have incorporated low slopes and mezzanine options as a hybrid. Another scheme presents a steep slope to bring the presenter closer to those going on stage. He noted they are all ADA compliant.

Mr. Vieira also spoke about the folding doors into the lobby and the possibility of options to watch and engage with the performance from different vantage points.

Committee Member Ray asked whether you could do the same from the jewel.

Mr. Vieira stated you can. The “jewel” has great seating with a similar layout to the one of the “wave,” with a concourse level. Ms. Hollis and Mr. Villegas talked about the entrance from the side and compared it to

Hollywood Bowl and noted additional seating could be accommodated. Mr. Villegas walked through the scheme and entering into the lecture hall. He noted you would be able to look out onto Avocado and they would like to introduce natural lighting.

Committee Member Witte asked about the seating.

Mr. Sanders spoke about the available seating and what can be accommodated. He noted all the areas that could be accommodated.

Mr. Vieira reminded the Committee this sketch is preliminary.

Committee Member Witte asked regarding the asymmetrical nature of the building.

Ms. Hollis noted they like the space is rectangular but given the fact that it is a lecture hall that makes a circular space appropriate so the speaker feels surrounded.

Mr. Sanders also noted the stage can be moved over but spoke about the beauty of asymmetrical architecture.

Committee Member Witte noted the unique feature of the scheme is the roof that makes the outdoor space inward.

Ms. Hollis spoke about the “bow” where shade can be provided and/or a cover when necessary.

Committee Member Ray asked about the glass door.

Mr. Vieira spoke about the “jewel” and the way the room can become exterior and interior and a space that can be admired from Avocado Boulevard.

Committee Member Ray asked how the “wave” scheme would complement the other waves.

Ms. Hollis stated they would use feedback and then use different approaches with the roofline.

The group spoke about the building and City Hall.

Ms. Hollis asked to take another look at the “bow.” She commented on the natural lighting.

Mr. Vieira noted all of the schemes incorporate Avocado Boulevard.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether the models and presentation materials could be left behind. She also asked whether trees would be visible from the swale.

Mr. Sanders spoke about the beautiful swale and confirmed it would include trees. He noted how thrilled they have been to work on the project.

Committee Member Witte asked how long the firms have been working together.

Mr. Sanders stated they began working academically for ten years.

2. Presentation by Bohlin Cywinski Jackson

The group presented itself and included Steve Chaitow, Erick Watson, (Unintelligible), Lena Shah, Steve Jacob, Greg Mottola.

Mr. Chaitow noted he would like for this process to be a conversation instead of a presentation. He noted they are thrilled to be back in Newport Beach. He stated he would work with Greg Mottola to head the project and noted Erick Watson would be the project manager and the City’s day-to-day contact.

He noted Lena Shah would be the project architect and also worked on the civic center and she did a great job for the civic center.

Mr. Mottola noted he works with clients and engages in a conversation to create the right project. He outlined the project comparatives and the fact that this project is about the civil sphere and private sphere supporting this goal.

He outlined some examples of a range of projects in terms of lecture hall spaces. He outlined some private sector spaces and other public sector spaces such as academic institutions and universities. He then noted they picked three options for the Committee to select from depending on the various parameters they have identified are important for example, the feeling of a unified house acoustics, and various architectural strategies. Mr. Chateau then spoke about the hall itself and the support space outside and the balance of each.

Mr. Mottola noted all four aspects have to be addressed in a spirited way and show the Committee some examples of how the firm has met those constraints in the past.

Mr. Mottola opined the second most important aspect is the pre-functioning in the indoor/outdoor gathering space. Finally, he said they wanted to speak about the word "iconic." He demonstrated an iconic project the firm worked on for Apple.

He stressed that their civic center received a prestigious award.

Mr. Mottola spoke about the elements they would use to create a high functioning space in the context of the beautiful City. He began by outlining the way patrons would arrive and the various entrances they would encounter. He noted the firm has considered way-finding and the way the space would function with the road and with parking. He noted they will be showing them three concepts that the Committee should think of as sketches because they want Committee input.

He began by preventing the "pavilion" scheme and noted the pavilion is beautiful and connected to the water. The considered how a building of that size can draw people to the courtyard. The firm looked at the existing garden wall, which they pulled back to make it more generous. Another scheme provides a walk from the plaza to the sidewalk. The other scheme draws people to the event and the plaza with a glass wall that would open and become extended to outdoor/indoor activities. He also noted a sculpted ceiling roof.

Mr. Mottola noted they have to be mindful of the size of the space and the library and have thought of a sectional concept. Their goal is to create feel of elegance with softer geometry and curving glass. He reviewed the massing of the sketch and the sculptural qualities and vertical in proportioning. He spoke about the Green Room in contrast to the blank wall of the library. This is a concept of a single space that can create anywhere from two-hundred to three-hundred seats.

Mr. Mottola then proceeded to the second concept called the "vessel" as a metaphor for what a library is. He also incorporated the relationship to water and beautiful boats with sculptural boats to them.

Ms. Shah spoke about the second concept and the way the building draws on the location and the pavilion scheme. The idea is to enter from a dock into the ship and similarly you enter in the lobby and into an enclosed body of the lecture hall. This scheme incorporates split seating configuration where the front portion of the seating is at a slight slope with great sightlines. She noted they tried to draw from existing conditions from what is already present at the library. Additionally, they incorporated the idea of immersion.

Mr. Mottola spoke about the importance of the courtyard and the vision from Avocado Boulevard. He provided an example from Tampa with the lighting system to have a wonderful nighttime presence. He stated this lighting quality could be incorporated.

Mayor Dixon asked about the lighting qualities.

Mr. Mottola spoke about the various materials that can be used to create different effects. Finally, Mr. Watson spoke about the roofing. He summarized the second concept is a split house.

Mr. Mottola stated the third scheme is called “nested shells,” to be connected to the natural world. He invited Mr. Watson to speak about the third scheme.

Mr. Watson noted they focused on the balcony to allow intimate space for larger and smaller groups and movable partition in the back. The concept is wrapped in an exuberant form that is consistent with the elements of City Council Chambers. He spoke about the natural light for certain events and the connection between outdoor and indoor.

Mr. Mottola explained they were intrigued by the balcony in the back row and making this space intimate but exuberant as an organic piece of sculpture. He spoke about the sculptural presence on the street and asked for Committee input regarding this idea. He noted the various purposes the space will be used for and told the Committee this would guide their direction. He invited Mr. Chaitow to finish the presentation.

Mr. Chaitow summarized the three reasons why they are the best firm for the project. The first reason is they have already worked on this site with their previous project. The second reason is their collaborative approach. Finally, their ability to deliver an iconic project. He then asked the Committee to come forth with questions.

Committee Member Witte noted none of the three schemes are particularly what they want to do with the project but he is attracted to the orientation towards Avocado Boulevard to bring a curiosity to the community to come inside and he noted they would not create a scheme that would bring lighting problems to the community. He stated it is encouraging the firm provided options that incorporate Avocado Boulevard without creating these problems.

Mayor Dixon asked how they see this project in relation with the Council Chambers.

Mr. Mottola noted he doesn't want this project to compete with Council Chambers and noted he wants a more elegant project. He noted there should be some connectivity but the project should not mimic the other buildings so it has its own personality.

Committee Member Clark asked for clarification about adding extra seats when needed.

Mr. Mottola noted this would be harder to do in the single sloped pavilion whereas the other schemes would provide more opportunities to change the seating. He spoke about the back wall with the gallery underneath the gallery as a way to do lose chairs or a standing remotely event. He also noted if seats are an important driver, then the other schemes can also be modified to use the lobby.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted how nice it is to have the windows available for natural light but that there should be blackout curtains, particularly for nighttime events and noted the wall blocks a lot.

The group then discussed lighting and noise reduction.

Committee Member Ray asked whether the extra chairs would be within the budget in the RFP.

Mr. Mottola stated they would bring a contractor and estimator as part of the team and they would balance the geometries, working with the contractor and using specific materials they would work with the City to hit the range of the budget.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she didn't see support areas.

Mr. Mottola confirmed these are just sketches but restrooms would be included.

Committee Member Clark and Chair Johnson-Tucker spoke about accessibility from the street to the venue.

Mr. Mottola noted they provided various locations for the service areas and if those places could be replaced, they could provide a retaining wall along a different edge.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated they are thinking of relocating parking to the drive aisle near the A/C units, and moving the bunny which would be cheaper than putting in a retaining wall.

Mr. Mottola stated there is a good pedestrian connect with the bridge and they were thinking that it could stay but they would consider whether there is a desire to bring additional pedestrians along the side.

Committee Member Clark asked Peter Tauscher from Public Works whether there could be a drop-off.

Mr. Tauscher stated there is a bus-stop.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated she likes the drop-off and that she likes the idea of a second bridge. She asked if they could keep the presentation materials.

The firm noted they would provide a drive.

Mr. Mottola thanked the Committee and provided their card.

3. *Robert A. Coffee Architects & Associates*

Chair Johnson-Tucker introduced the committee and Mayor Dixon.

Robert Coffee introduced the firm and noted he has had his firm since 1995. He introduced Reginald Wilson, Laura Converse, Terry Jacobson, and John von Szeliski.

Laura Converse noted she assists with projects from beginning to end and develops the projects and specializes in interiors.

Reginald Wilson noted he has worked with Robert for over twenty years and noted he is heavily involved with the entitlement process and early approvals required for the project. He also coordinates design elements with consultants. Finally, he is heavily involved with construction documents and construction administration.

Terry stated he has worked with Robert for over twenty-five years and is anxious to be involved in the project in the support role. He stated they collaborate on design and implementation, which is critical. He stated his experience is in places of assembly of various sizes and he is anxious to offer that expertise. He stated he also has a lot of experience with their theatrical consultant.

John S. noted he has forty-plus years of experience as a theatre architect. He stated he was in performing arts before he had a career change and taught theatre and drama. He noted this is a challenging project that is fascinating to him. He noted it is a simple lecture hall but incorporates a lot of theatre elements as well and this is a custom-designed building.

Mr. Coffee noted they have worked a lot on this site and studied it and have thought about all the various aspects. He stated the name for their project is the "Cultural Evolution of the Civic Center." He stated it is a signature building.

He noted the following site observations. He stated City Hall has a hard edge and creates a juxtaposition that translates to the south side of the library site. He stated the green is a public square that is passed by on the way to City Hall. He noted the City Hall is airy and transparent. He also noted the library on the other hand is opaque and heavy but very different from the other architecture. Finally, the existing pedestrian bi-section is also present.

He noted a signature building is timeless. His opinion is that the pavilion is a signature building in Newport Beach. His opinion is that this building is to expand the productivity of the library programs. Mr. Coffee then spoke about how the building will improve the library site. He noted how the building shape was being forced in. He stated some of the building portions will be similar to the library's and others will be transparent and a third option in the middle.

Mr. Coffee spoke about the parking lot and the view of where the library and the lecture hall are visible. He spoke about the circulation and the trouble of the bi-section of that access. He noted issues with homelessness and the courtyard. He stated if the courtyard is open, then some sort of physical barrier should be incorporated. He stated he would like to relocate the bus stop and still comply with ADA access.

After the site plan, he explained how they would comply with parking restrictions and tie together overflow parking and an upgraded entry to the library.

Mr.. von Szeliski noted this project is a lecture hall with a lot of theatre needs. He noted how the goals are to have great acoustics, seating, audience and connection.

Mr. Jacobson stated they are trying to keep the intimate one-room concept. He noted that his work with religious institutions with a feeling of community and connection pushes for seating arrangements and lowering the stage in a way that still provides visual connection. He stated he is fascinated by the idea of overflow seating and providing alternative experiences in overflow seating spaces. He noted this will enhance cultural and civil interchange and debate.

Mr.. von Szeliski stated there are many issues that will affect this project. He stated sightlines are essential. He also noted overflow seating is a challenge and so are portable risers but they would like for them to be dedicated seating like the rest of the seats but for them to be able to go away. He noted the essential thing about a lecturer is that he or she is at the center but for performance, there are many other elements involved. He stated they are leaning towards the idea of a step-floor and innovative overflow seating.

He again stressed there the location of the seating is critical and that these issues would be explored with the Committee. Mr. John S. also spoke about a center aisle. He noted the center aisle seats are the best seats. He noted they could explore the idea of removable operable seats incorporating Code requirements but he noted center aisles give rhythm to the space.

Mr. Coffee spoke about the depth of the space and that this was incorporated into planning issues.

Ms. Converse noted they included samples from projects around the world to show lighting, acoustics, materials, shapes and configurations to make the space interesting. She pointed to the sample of the perforated skin. She also pointed to a ceiling solution that makes it look like butterflies.

Mr. von Szeliski noted this is all one room tied together.

Mr. Coffee spoke about the energy demand of the building. He also spoke about materials and resources and how they can be sustainable in energy.

He introduced the first scheme, which is called "bamboo backdrop." He noted where the stage and lobby are in direct access from the drop off. He noted this is similar to the previous diagram with a ramp access. He noted this would be an extension of the current space. Mr. Coffee noted this includes the idea of the perforated screen with the angulation of the backside wall. He noted this can also be done in the third dimension.

Mr. Coffee noted the second scheme is called "riparian rhapsody," which is focused around the riparian swale and the entry way to the space. He noted some of the trees will be edited and stated the ceiling would be different than the other concept. He noted this option uses natural light to illuminate the space. He spoke about the arrival sequence and the courtyard.

Mr. Coffee noted they live in the City and the adjectives that describe Newport Beach are water, sports, accomplished, educated. They want the library building to fit in with the big picture of the civic center and the Council Chamber and they think the best word is freedom. He noted the library is the reservoir of knowledge and enlightenment.

Committee Member Witte thanked the group for taking a holistic view of the site. He noted the question of arrival is very important and the patrons who will be using this. He agreed the current parking situation is not ideal but he opined it is worth discussing.

He further commented he is intrigued by the idea of arriving by car and the idea of different permeability of the sites. He noted he is also intrigued about how this interacts with the courtyard above. He noted he liked the idea of enveloping the stage with the people and noted a specific scheme was the more practical. He asked Mr. von Szeliski which one he would defer to.

Mr. von Szeliski noted the diagonal sends energy to the library and also spoke about the size of the project and the budget.

Mr. Coffee then noted the Council Chambers are closer than twenty-feet to the line. He noted perhaps seeking a variance is worth it to accommodate all the needed seating.

Committee Member Witte asked whether they have a pragmatic architectural choice.

Mr. Coffee selected one of the two schemes which expresses the designs and the transition between the library and the stairs, the backwall and the bamboo court. He noted he would hate to have to put gates in and that there could be a reading area tied into the library. He stated ultimately, it would be the choice of the community.

Mr. von Szeliski noted acoustically the big fan shape is not the best. He stated once dimensions are incorporated, the footprint shape will be created. He stated there has to be smooth and graceful ADA access to all the spaces and this could shape the edge of the building.

Committee Member Clark asked regarding the parking spaces available.

Mr. Coffee noted about seven spaces would be impacted.

Committee Member Clark stated she liked their proposal for parking.

Mr. Coffee noted there is a juxtaposition between the two buildings which is intriguing.

The group spoke about the possibilities available for the area.

Mr. Coffee spoke about their inspiration for the biophilic design which is interesting.

Mayor Dixon asked whether it allows natural lighting during the day. She noted the Committee decided the center aisle is not good for the Committee and they would like the stepping to be incorporating because sloping will not be enough. She noted some of the needs for the various dance programs and their concerns for the stage.

The group then discussed the seating and the stage and the depth that would be available to accommodate it all.

Mayor Dixon noted there are concerns for the available parking for library patrons but ultimately, they would like enough room and theatrical capabilities.

Mr. Coffee reassured the Committee this would be the most important project in their office and that passion would be delivered given they are part of this community. He noted how easily meetings could be scheduled because of how close they are. He also stressed that Mr. Wilson basically lives at the construction site.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked that the presentation be emailed to Mr. Tauscher.

Mr. Coffee noted they created sketchbooks for each of the Committee members.

4. *Rob Wellington Quigley, FAIA*

Mary Anne Wellington introduced herself as the Project Manager. She noted only the core team was present. She noted Rob Wellington would be the Principal on the project. She stated Bob Dickens would be the Architect on the project. She stated she would be the day-to-day contact and would coordinate and manage the entire scope of work, monitor and track the budget, the schedule, and the community involvement process and the entitlement process.

She stated the three have been working for over thirty years producing civic projects of public buildings. She stated most of the projects are award winning and focused on being on time and within budget. She stated they have over one hundred awards from various institutions.

Ms. Wellington noted fundraising has been an integral part of their projects. She provided some examples of how they have been involved with various funding mechanisms. She also noted they have a long-time commitment to sustainability.

She provided the example of the San Diego Fire Coast Fire Station as a showcase of their creativity on a third-floor building with a slide. She noted this project won various awards. She noted their commitment to coming in or under budget and provided examples of projects where they came within budget. She introduced Rob.

Mr. Wellington noted he would guide the Committee through various sketches. He stated he was impressed with the landscape. He noted the building needed work on the topic of “civic identity” and stated their project would enhance this. He stated the building is somewhat anonymous and they would change that with their project.

Mayor Dixon noted the building has great functionality.

Mr. Wellington stated the area in the bamboo court should not feel like a passage and it should feel like a destination. He stated the area between the new lecture hall and the bamboo needs to be compelling and fabulous because it will have an intimacy that the grand space does not have. He imagined four design directions and are open to their direction. He stated the group likes the idea of working in a vacuum without a lot of input so they don’t have preconceptions and creatively they are able to come up with great ideas.

He stated the ideas they explored without the clients stem from the existing architecture. He noted there are two different styles of architecture that contrast one another. He opined the juxtaposition between a light, delicate architecture and the heavier architecture is something they have used in the past. He explained there is an arcade to get people from the bus stop into the building and they decided to turn it as a veil and extending the lighting architecture. He noted they wanted to expand the bamboo court and work with the proportions and use the natural slope for seating and create more space for support facilities.

Mr. Wellington provided a sketch that they included. He showed the beautiful garden views and views from the parking lot in. He noted it’s important to place the support as part of the same building. He stated there needs to be a continuation of the bamboo court into the lecture hall itself.

Committee Member Witte asked for Mr. Wellington to go back to the prior sketch and asked what he thinks about reversing the roof direction to accommodate the orientation of light. He noted mixing different types of architecture is intriguing.

Mr. Wellington noted that could work. He also noted they use great engineers and use them for specific aspects of the building rather than the whole building to create some economy.

Mayor Dixon asked regarding the penthouse examples they provided.

Mr. Wellington reviewed the three-dimensional sketch model provided to the Committee. He noted the community room of the library and the parking lot and the extended arcade. He stated a big shade tree is better than bamboo. He stated they are leaving the wall for acoustical protection and the bridge because they don't believe in sanitized corporation.

Mr. Wellington then proceeded to review the second scheme. He noted there is a paradox that the architecture would be subservient to the landscape. He provided a sketch of how it would work. He noted the potential of fundraising with water views and donors liking to have their names on the venue. He explained the idea of an amphitheater.

The group discussed the idea of an amphitheater.

Mr. Wellington then demonstrated the idea of a landscaped roof and its visibility from Avocado Boulevard. Mr. Wellington then spoke about the meaning of iconic and simplicity and spoke of his ideas regarding the parking lot.

The group then discussed some of the sketches. For example, they discussed taking out the bamboo element and providing a tree instead.

Mayor Dixon noted she would like picnic tables and look at the sunset from there.

Mr. Wellington noted they could adjust the slope on the roof to make it accessible for ADA purposes.

Committee Member Clark asked whether that would be a support space.

Mr. Wellington noted in all the schemes the entire wall by the patio would disappear and because it is an important gathering space, there would be some sound protection.

Mr. Wellington showed a model and the lecture hall at the library. He showed an area that serves as an expansion space.

Mr. Dickens compared the space to other projects. He noted the way it is designed so the front rows could be removed in order to allow the stage to expand and build a platform. He stated the whole wall opens to the courtyard and there is a coffee shop to animate the courtyard.

Committee Member Witte asked whether it is a flat-floor or section. He also noted this scheme has the reversed roof he was asking about previously.

Mr. Wellington noted it works very nicely with ADA.

The group then discussed steps and sightlines.

Mr. Wellington and Mr. Dickens then showed various examples of other notable projects. They showed a video presentation.

Committee Member Clark asked whether Ms. Wellington is based out of Palo Alto. She also asked about her experience.

Ms. Wellington discussed her background. She stated she is not an architect but is very organized and detail-oriented.

Mayor Dixon noted they are looking at building a new fire station.

Ms. Wellington noted they are light on work and could prioritize this project.

Mr. Wellington stated they do not take on too many projects each year because they keep their same employees instead of expanding the firm.

Vice Chair Ray asked regarding the Fire Station Project.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked if they could get the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Wellington noted he could send the PowerPoint tomorrow and also pictures of the models.

5. *Public Comments on Presentations*

Jim Mosher stated he has the feeling the Committee does not feel community input is important. He stated he feels the building needs to integrate with the library building and that architecture. He noted the Bohlin Cywinski Jackson presentation does not understand that and he would rule that presentation out.

He stated when the library was originally built, it would have an entrance so patrons would not have to walk through the Irvine Center to get there. He asked whether that concept will still be considered. He noted transportation modes will change between now and fifty plus years and that should be considered. He noted that in the first presentation, Mr. Hodgett was not present but he is innovative in futuristic transportation.

6. *Committee Discussion of RFP, Proposals and Four Presentations*

Committee Member Witte noted he is interested in the following three aspects: the ideas that were given, the individuals themselves, and the pragmatic aspects such as aspects. He opined all four firms are very interesting. In his mind, he was pleasantly surprised at some of the ideas that people presented at this early stage.

Committee Member Witte suggested focusing on the ideas they liked. He also suggested they can incorporate ideas they like from each to the one they ultimately select.

Mayor Dixon stated it is important to determine whether they understood what they want from the project.

Vice Chair Ray stated the Coffee group does understand what the Committee needs and they came up with the idea of changing the parking so the front doors are the first experience. She really liked the fact they payed attention to how do you enter and she liked their team. She stated the Sanders group used to be at the bottom of the pile originally but they went up.

Chair Johnson Tucker noted the Hodgetts firm went far above and beyond to present even though they were out of town. She also agreed the Coffee firm did a great job with interiors and exteriors and they were very thorough. She stated the last presenter did not show them enough variety of interiors.

Vice Chair Ray noted the last team did not go far beyond what they showed in the initial proposal.

Committee Member Clark stated they liked their experience was civic projects. She stated this is important for budget reasons and liked the quality of their work.

Vice Chair Ray stated she does not agree with the rooftop idea.

Committee Member Witte stated the purpose of today was met which was to get ideas flowing. He wrote down what the most important design criteria were: light and acoustics and he stated the Coffee firm had an expert on that, split seating which he is enamored with the idea and all of the firms could do this, the idea of indoor/outdoor space which integrates into the bamboo court, taking into account the street, flexibility and alternative seating which was mentioned by the Coffee firm, and finally, the arrival sequence and civic entry to a front door is something he had not thought of and he stated several firms addressed it and now he thinks this is one of the most important criteria.

He noted the reality is that some know more about night-time light than others. At the end of the day, it is the reality that it is important and it needs to be incorporated. He stated his impressions of the firm are different now than what they were at the beginning.

Vice Chair Ray agreed.

Mayor Dixon noted she was surprised (unintelligible) didn't realize the parking lot is such a distraction to the overall design of the structure.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted they were told about the importance.

Committee Member Witte stated they get a lot of points for noting the parking lot needs when the other three firms didn't.

Mayor Dixon stated she didn't understand his concepts as well.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted he did a beautiful expansion of the museum but it's a sloped floor lecture hall and it's completely within the building so it does not have windows or natural light; but in this case, he has stepped seating and natural light.

Vice Chair Raye stated she likes the permeability concept.

Committee Member Witte noted the group before Coffee did not have the right mindset.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated she agrees that they did not put their best effort forward.

The consensus was to take them off the board.

Committee Member Witte noted that although he knows them individually as a firm, their presentation wasn't best.

Mayor Dixon asked what the objective was regarding narrowing down the firms. She asked whether there would be a design competition between the two firms.

Committee Member Witte stated this was discussed at the last meeting and he noted he eliminated Bohlin Cywinski Jackson but any one of the other three firms would be good to work with so he would like to narrow it down to two. They could each get ten-thousand dollars to compete in two weeks.

Mayor Dixon stated the community could get involved at that point.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether the firms would be amenable to that.

Mr. Tauscher stated the firms would not appreciate extending the process and it would delay bringing the project to council. He noted we have enough information to make a recommendation.

Committee Member Witte stated if a decision can be made it should. He asked whether the Committee needs more information.

Committee Member Clark asked whether everyone can agree on two.

Committee Member Witte stated he has a different approach which is to get the best firm with the best design and if the fees are materially different, the City should tell the firm, we want to tell the firm we want to hire you but your fee has to be "x." He noted some of the firms did not have the same information and weren't as familiar with the contextual issues. He noted the firms have different design aesthetics.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked what the firms would give them if they were asked to expand on their product.

Committee Member Witte noted it would be specifics of scheme such as the rooftop theatre. For example, in Coffee's case, he asked if the Committee should ask other firms whether they have thought of parking without giving Coffee's idea away.

Committee Member Clark stated she is not ready to select one firm today. She stated that if the two finalists were Quigley and Coffee, she would look for a unique and different project. She agreed he has worked with the City and will keep on budget and on time but she isn't sure if they will get the extra design.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated she agrees and she would probably eliminate Quigley. The San Diego Library is amazing but the buildings tend to be a little heavier aesthetically which doesn't appeal to her as much as Sanders and Hodgetts.

Committee Member Clark agreed.

Committee Member Witte stated he recommended the first firm because it was a very cost-effective solution to a small community. He is also impressed with the personalities and the fact they are intellectual individuals. Additionally, the idea of three different models and three different ideas was intriguing.

There was consensus that they would be one of the firms and so would Coffee's firm.

Committee Member Witte noted the acoustical engineer being involved is above and beyond what they asked for, and the arrival concept, which is very important. He also noted it is nice they are in the community and his interest in making the façades transparent but not entirely transparent is the happy medium to make it interesting from Avocado Boulevard.

Mayor Dixon stated she defers to the wisdom of the group.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted Sanders asked if he could bring the other firm Hodgetts to work together. She also spoke of a project he worked on in Idyllwild for an auditorium for four million dollars.

Committee Member Witte noted it speaks to innovation. He noted if they ended up with those two, it is a traditional and conservative option.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether they are all leaning towards the same two.

Mayor Dixon noted Coffee knocked it out of the park with the parking issue.

Committee Member Witte stated he also did a great job with the interior.

Mayor Dixon stated she liked what RQW and would like to share some of his ideas.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted others did that as well. She stated if they all feel they should move forward with Sanders and Coffee, whether they should be asked to come back.

Committee Member Witte suggested they look at what Sanders presented versus what Coffee presented that if they hired Coffee, they would want from Sanders and vice versa and ask them to think about these issues further and come back in two weeks or submit something refined. For example, they ask Sanders more specifically about arrival sequence and parking layout and let them know they need to take another look at how people will arrive. Similarly, in Coffee, they could tell them they say different ideas in term of shapes of the building in three-dimensions, but is there any more information you want to share with us about for example, the permeability of the façade.

Mayor Dixon agrees these would be good questions.

Committee Member Clark noted Coffee did not have anything that involved anything other than a single floor.

Mr. Tauscher asked the Committee to submit questions by Monday.

Committee Member Witte noted the two firms they chose are the same regarding personalities. If they discuss other criteria, they don't know what the fees are.

Mr. Tauscher stated Sanders didn't have a direct person to speak to.

Committee Member Witte noted they should make a decision no later than two weeks.

Mayor Dixon stated two weeks is great but that should not be the driving force for the decision.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked what if the firms had questions of the Committee.

7. *Adopt Resolution Recommending Architect to City Council or Take other Action Regarding the Presentations*

A motion was made by Matthew Witte, and seconded by Committee Member Clark, to move forward and ask questions of Sanders Architects, Mithun/Hodgetts & Fung and Robert A. Coffee Architects & Associates and thank the other two firms for their time.

The motion carried 4-0 with the following vote.

AYES:	Karen Clark, Matthew Witte, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	Mayor Diane Dixon
ABSTAIN:	None

The Committee then discussed the next available day for a meeting. They decided on October first and noted if it works for Mayor Dixon, they would do morning.

VI. MATTERS WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)

No matters were proposed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson-Tucker adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker