



# CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE AGENDA

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Coast Room (Bay 2E)

Monday, February 3, 2020 - 3:00 PM

**Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Members:**

Mayor Diane B. Dixon  
Karen Clark  
Janet Ray  
Jill Johnson-Tucker  
Matthew Witte

**Staff Members:**

Peter Tauscher, Senior Civil Engineer

---

The Library Lecture Hall Design Committee meeting is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Among other things, the Brown Act requires that the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee agenda be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance of each regular meeting and that the public be allowed to comment on agenda items before the Committee and items not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee. The Chair may limit public comments to a reasonable amount of time, generally three (3) minutes per person.

The City of Newport Beach's goal is to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, we will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact Peter Tauscher, Senior Civil Engineer, at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible at (949) 644-3316 or ptauscher@newportbeachca.gov.

**NOTICE REGARDING PRESENTATIONS REQUIRING USE OF CITY EQUIPMENT**

Any presentation requiring the use of the City of Newport Beach's equipment must be submitted to the Library Services Department 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC**

*Public comments are invited on agenda and non-agenda items generally considered to be within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee. Speakers must limit comments to three (3) minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Library Lecture Hall Design Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on agenda or non-agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.*

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**1. Public Comments**

**V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. Approval of Minutes**

[Draft Minutes of the January 6, 2020 Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Meeting](#)

[Draft Minutes of the January 21, 2020 Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Meeting](#)

**VI. CURRENT BUSINESS**

1. Robert Coffee and the architectural team to the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee presentation and discussion of possible interior layouts

1. Continued discussion of project schedule, programming and concepts

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

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**



# CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES

100 Civic Center Drive, Crystal Cove Room (Bay 2D)  
Monday, January 6, 2020 3:00 PM

## **I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

## **II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Mayor Diane Dixon, Karen Clark

Absent: Matthew Witte

## **III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC/ PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Jim Mosher noted that he submitted some possible corrections to the minutes. He made some remarks regarding the architect's plans and adding an entry to the library parking lot along Avocado Avenue.

Chair Johnson-Tucker thanked Mr. Mosher for his research and mentioned that the Board of Library Trustees had discussed this matter at one time. Library Director Tim Hetherington confirmed that the City determined that it would conflict with the bus stop and the bike lane, and that it would be located too close to the stoplight.

Mr. Peter Tauscher noted there could be some problems with people crossing there.

## **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### ***1. Approval of Minutes***

A motion was made by Vice Chair Ray, and was seconded by Committee Member Clark to approve the *Draft Minutes of the October 8, 2019, Library Lecture Hall Design Committee Meeting*.

The motion carried unanimously with the following vote:

AYES: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray,  
Mayor Diane Dixon, Karen Clark

NOES: None

ABSENT: Matthew Witte

ABSTAIN: None

## **V. CURRENT BUSINESS**

### ***1. Introduction of Robert A. Coffee Architects & Associates to the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee***

Chair Johnson-Tucker pointed out that Mr. Coffee and his team would mainly determine the agenda and timing of future LLHDC meetings. She stated that Mr. Coffee knows best what his team needs and will be charged with moving the project forward keeping with the funding budgeted by the City.

Chair Johnson-Tucker then turned the discussion over to Mr. Coffee.

Mr. Coffee passed out a handout.

Mr. Coffee noted the discussion would be centered around introducing staff members, discussing the process, various other topics of discussion, and reviewing a few simple issues.

Mr. Coffee introduced the primary members of the design team. He noted the majority will be present at meetings when relevant.

Mr. Coffee first introduced Mr. Bill Rabben, Landscape Architect. He noted Mr. Rabben has worked on a number of projects in Newport Beach such as on Marina Park. Mr. Coffee stated that Mr. Rabben was selected because he is creative and is familiar with the City.

Mr. Coffee introduced Mr. John Von Szeliski, Architect. Mr. Von Szeliski was selected for his theatre and performing arts experience. Mr. Coffee opined his experience would be very appropriate for the project.

Mr. Coffee introduced Mr. Terry Jacobson who will shadow Mr. Coffee. Mr. Jacobson has shared an office with Mr. Coffee for over 20 years.

Mr. Coffee introduced Mr. Jeff Miller, Audiovisual and Acoustical Consultant from IDIBRI (a company in San Diego). He noted this composes the core design members.

Mr. Coffee then asked Mr. Tauscher how information can be distributed so he can provide a list of team members so the community can be involved.

Information is to be sent to Mr. Tauscher and Chair Johnson-Tucker.

## **2. Discuss project schedule, programming and concepts**

Mr. Coffee spoke about the big picture for the project. He noted the team will move up the design planning approval phase into the schematic design approval phase, which hinges on Irvine Company's approval of the project. They would like to meet all jurisdictional approvals before they take the project to Council. This has turned the five to the seven months.

He noted the group has mapped out some of the issues with utilities, but today's conversation will primarily be focused on the programming phase which includes discussing goals, needs, and wants. For example, goals to determine what the Committee wants to fulfill through the project.

Mr. Coffee noted that it will be an interactive process with the Committee, divided into two meetings. One meeting will revolve around the building and the second meeting will revolve around the exterior spaces. Additionally, after the programming phase, there will be the planning phase where the Committee will discuss needs versus wants.

He commented the Committee will be talking about some three-dimensional concepts. He also stated that planning sometimes evolves into design and solving design issues and that even though they will try to isolate the two, they might merge.

Mr. Coffee discussed his proposed schedule. He anticipates the planning phase will take place during January and February, and the Concept design phase will take place in February, March and early April. He discussed the community will be able to see the building concepts by April, which will be collectively designed by everyone. Mr. Coffee anticipates submitting the project for approval to The Irvine Company around May and receive approvals by the end of June. Finally, he would like to present the project to Council in July.

He noted somewhere in that schedule, two community meetings are necessary, one being around the time they take the project to The Irvine Company.

Mr. Coffee also noted the first cost estimator will be around May.

Mayor Dixon asked about the cost of the parking lot and whether the cost will be the City's responsibility.

Mr. Coffee noted that is item three but he asked if now was a good time for questions. He also stressed interaction with the community is regular during the design phase after which construction documents are not as interactive.

Mr. Coffee noted the City's milestones to submit cost estimates at seventy-five percent, ninety-five percent, and one hundred percent. He noted the time needed to submit the project through the Building Department and noted the building would potentially be open and ready by fall 2022.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the public can attend meetings at any time and that publicity is important.

Mr. Coffee discussed the need to incorporate the community's comments.

Mayor Dixon noted the positive aspects of involving the communities.

Mr. Coffee opined late March would be an adequate time to involve the community. He discussed having meetings in late March, and late May because at that time, as a Committee, they could show the public why certain decisions were made. Mr. Coffee noted the design team would like to power through the design phase for efficiency.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked what time would work best for meetings and to involve the community. She suggested to follow up with dates once people can look at their calendars.

Mr. Coffee noted the team will comply with what works best for the Committee. He suggested the last two weeks of March and last two weeks of May.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she and Mr. Tauscher will send a request for availability.

Mr. Coffee then moved on to confirmation of project scope and budget which is composed of discussing the building site, the Bamboo Courtyard, the parking lot, and the project budget versus project and construction costs. He explained in detail the different between project costs and budget.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the discussion has expanded to parking lot and the courtyard. She would like to know if the City has any money in the budget for costs not related to the construction of the building.

Mayor Dixon stated the City had not discussed the issue. She spoke of how costs will have to be divided into project costs versus costs attributed to the overall operation of the City.

The Committee discussed the eight-million-dollar budget, project costs and other miscellaneous fees and the need to discuss with the City Attorney's Office and the Foundation.

Mr. Tauscher noted the original budget did not include the parking lot; it was assumed it would be paid for by the City. He said the work could probably be done for around \$200,000.00.

Mr. Coffee noted he believed the original project would include the Bamboo Courtyard but not the parking lot. He noted it is helpful for the design team to know whether it is included in the budget or not.

Mayor Dixon asked what kind of work is needed for the Bamboo Courtyard.

Mr. Coffee stated the design team would like for the space to be better integrated and expanded into the swale to accommodate outdoor activities.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the City Attorney is drafting the Memorandum of Understanding and she stated they will discuss these issues with the City Attorney.

Mr. Coffee then directed the Committee to the handout to converse about the various spaces. First, Mr. Coffee asked whether the Committee would like to see any of the aspects of any of the other proposals or the instant proposal in this project. He asked the Committee to write down goals for the projects.

Vice Chair Ray noted she would like to see an inviting building that sits like a jewel.

Mayor Dixon would like to focus on flexibility so additional seats can be incorporated if needed. She would like to expand into the bamboo courtyard and have an overhang.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she would like to discuss overflow seating. She is also concerned with seating layout so they are flexible to have conversations with those around them. She provided an example of the SCR locally and their main stage.

John Von Szeliski asked whether they will be content with regular theatre seats, and to consider comfort, space, and interaction.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked who would be involved in the next meeting.

Mayor Dixon spoke about the difference between an elegant and a functional design.

Mayor Dixon then asked whether it is a lecture hall or a theatre.

Vice Chair Ray asked whether it would be a stationary stage or whether it will move.

Committee Member Clark noted there are different groups who use the space.

Mr. Coffee opined the individuals need to be present for the programming meetings to be successful. He asked whether they would like questionnaires to disseminate.

Mayor Dixon also asked that the plaza space be a gathering space even when there are no performances.

Mr. Coffee noted a critical question is whether access will be through the library. He stated the Bamboo Courtyard and the library will be connected and the plaza space would be between the lecture hall and the entry to the library. He noted some concerns with hidden spaces. He suggested an outdoor reading court for the library.

Committee Member Clark noted the space is public and it is used by a lot of people.

Vice Chair Ray asked about a plaza space between the library and the lecture hall.

Mr. Coffee explained half of it is covered and half is uncovered and part of it becomes part of the library and the other becomes part of the lecture hall. He noted the building will be a tight fit on the side and will be as close to the library as possible.

Vice Chair Ray noted she envisioned a courtyard and whether there is a wall.

The Committee discussed changing the courtyard to a plaza.

Mr. Coffee asked who manages operations versus maintenance.

Mr. Tauscher noted they do have staff but the City also uses contractors for maintenance.

Mr. Coffee noted he would like input regarding lighting and other features and specifications from maintenance and operations.

Mr. Tauscher stated that usually once the building is functioning, they plan how to operate it.

Mr. Coffee asked whether the building will only be used for scheduled events or whether it will be used by other interest groups such as the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Hetherington stated there is a process to use it for other purposes.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted this process will be figured out through the library.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee address questions two and three regarding the types of events that will be held at the space and items eight and nine regarding the support space and the various rooms.

Mr. Von Stelinski asked the Council to consider the individual rooms and their use such as the "Friend's Room" and the "Green Room." He stated there are rental opportunities if they create a space that is the correct size and with the correct acoustics.

Mr. Coffee suggested to use some of the space in the "Friend's Room" and whether that is a possibility.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the access to the "Friend's Room" could be improved to allow access the lecture hall, and the Committee could consider the matter without sacrificing the square footage.

Mr. Hetherington agreed noting that one of the driving values of public facilities is inclusion. He opined it is easily reconfigured.

Mayor Dixon asked the "Green Room" and/or "changing room" be considered.

Mr. Coffee stated a genderless restroom would be incorporated along with a "Green Room."

John Von Szeliski asked the Committee to consider the types of events that will be supported in order to determine the various spaces that will be incorporated into the facility.

The Committee discussed the acoustics and the required "superior acoustics" per the request for proposal. It also discussed the appropriateness of certain events being held at the center which is connected to the library.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted she would like to address the slope of the stage and visibility, and incorporating steps.

Mr. Coffee stated the design team would create some diagrams for the next meeting to discuss advantages and disadvantages of the slope, the steps and other features. He asked that the Committee ask questions and show pictures or provide examples for reference.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider operations and what kind of events will be supported so they can be functional and maintainable. He asked the Committee to consider the equipment in the various spaces and rooms including microphones, broadcasting, and other visual and audio technology.

Mr. Coffee stated that Mr. Miller would guide the Committee through what is available.

Mayor Dixon referenced the technology in the Council Chambers and the need for people to operate the equipment.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked that this topic be placed on the agenda for an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee to come up with a list of topics it would like to discuss.

Mr. Von Stelinski spoke about the one-room concept where the audience and the performers are all united with a corresponding background and backdrop that can either be changed or remains static.

Mr. Coffee asked how many seats the Committee would like with regards to fixed seating.

Chair Johnson-Tucker said 275-300 seats would provide a good range.

Mr. Coffee asked whether 30-50 additional, flexible seats are adequate.

Chair Johnson-Tucker referenced the City of San Diego hall and their stackable chairs, but pointed out that the sightlines are not good.

Committee Member Clark noted some concern with noise created by seats.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether future meetings will be held in the morning.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee focus on items two and three.

Chair Johnson-Tucker opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Mosher commented regarding the proposed schedule and the stated goals for each meeting and whether the Council will decide whether they agree with the programming or not. He also asked regarding fundraising and the Foundation's role and whether there are other groups in the City to participate. He also asked that the restrictions regarding using the space as a business center be considered.

Mr. Coffee clarified the goals for each of the proposed future meetings.

**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 5:00 p.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

---

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker





## **CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH LIBRARY LECTURE HALL DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**100 Civic Center Drive, Crystal Cove Room (Bay 2D)  
Monday, January 21, 2020 8:00 AM**

### **I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

### **II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker, Vice Chair Janet Ray, Diane Dixon (left early), Karen Clark

Absent: Matthew Witte

### **III. NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC/ PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Jim Mosher commented on a few non agenda items. He commented regarding the land use restrictions the City Council agreed to on November 19, 2019 with the Irvine Company. He summarized the following restrictions: 10,000 square foot gross area, 74,000 square foot area, a commitment to retain 172 parking spaces, and the complimentary use of the hall to patrons of the library, and the use of the lecture hall as a commercial banquet hall or conference center.

He noted the local independent newspaper, the Newport Beach Independent, conducted a poll regarding the public's desired design features, and asked the Committee to review the results.

Mr. Mosher noted the Library Board would be meeting and next Tuesday, the City Council would appoint a committee to negotiate the private/public funding agreement for the financing of the lecture hall.

Finally, he noted that at the last meeting Mr. Coffee expressed that the architectural group understands not just the goals but also the aspirations for the lecture hall. Mr. Mosher would like to clearly communicate that the aspiration to bring A-list celebrities is at odds with the aspiration to have an inclusive lecture hall and one that is compatible with a free library. He asked that there be free viewing in the Friend's Room.

Chair Johnson-Tucker thanked Mr. Mosher and asked whether the minutes were posted online.

Mr. Mosher confirmed he found the minutes online.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted future conflicts in February for Vice Chair Janet Ray and Committee Member Karen Clark. Committee Member Dixon stated she also had a conflict on February 3, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Coffee noted they would be discussing outdoor spaces at the next meeting. He would also like to talk about goals and the functions of the Bamboo Courtyard.

The Committee agreed to change the meeting to Monday, February 3, 2020 at 3 p.m.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted a conflict on February 18, 2020 for Vice Chair Ray and Committee Member Clark.

Mr. Coffee noted that was an important meeting. The Committee decided to keep meetings for the first and third Monday from one to three between now and August. The Committee decided to skip February 18, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Tauscher agreed to send an email with the calendar.

#### **IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted that the Committee did not receive the current Minutes in their packets, and thus a vote on the Minutes would be postponed until the next meeting.

#### **V. CURRENT BUSINESS**

##### ***1. Robert Coffee and the architectural team to the Library Lecture Hall Design Committee presentation and discussion of possible interior layouts***

Mr. Coffee asked John Von Szeliski and Jeff Miller to go through the list and noted they might have some specific questions.

Mr. Coffee wanted to speak regarding specific requirements people have asked for and various patrons of the Hall and their requisites. The Committee spoke of certain musical groups who requested specific technology.

Mr. Miller asked about the type of groups who would be booked.

Chair Johnson-Tucker also spoke regarding some of the specific union requirements.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether union requirements affect functional space requirements.

The Committee discussed that at times, union needs for staging might imply specific requirements.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted there are committees to try to book speakers and groups to use the hall. She spoke about the way the library books speakers.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether capacity would be expanded.

Meg Linton noted the new space doubles the potential for programming because the Friend's Room could also be used.

Committee Member Dixon spoke about the use of the flex space.

Mr. Coffee confirmed that the Committee would like the ability to use the lecture hall and the Friend's Room at the same time on occasion.

Chair Johnson-Tucker spoke about how useful it will be to be able to use both rooms and expand the capacity.

Ms. Linton spoke about the use of streaming and how beneficial it would be.

Mr. Miller again asked about the type of groups who would be booked. He noted actors and speakers and unions for example, would have different requirements which would influence the facility.

The Committee discussed competitor organizations.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked the Committee to remember this is supposed to be, foremost, a support building for the Library, and that space may not permit all the needs of a full-scale auditorium.

Ms. Linton stated presenters are happy using a conference room and don't have outrageous demands.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider the greater expectations of the lecture hall and to consider the one space that will have to be used for various uses. He asked whether the Committee owns the piano and whether a dedicated piano storage space will be needed.

Mr. Coffee stated the Committee would discuss other spaces to compare their function and what the Committee likes or dislikes from those spaces.

He began by showing the San Diego Library Lecture Hall. He showed the floor, the center and side aisles, and the number of seats.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether seats would be lost with the center aisle.

Mr. Coffee stated some seats are lost but also discussed the visibility to stage. He also discussed the number of steps to stage and further issues with visibility and stage height. He discussed the distance between the front row and the stage providing examples. He spoke about the possibility of taking the first row back and showed examples. Mr. Coffee demonstrated visibility issues and slope, and provided examples such as that at the San Diego Library.

Mr. Coffee showed another example below eye-level. He showed various examples with different numbers of rows such as five or six rows or eleven or ten rows.

Mr. Coffee then proceeded to discuss number of seats. He showed how more seats can be fitted in the back and discussed how three hundred seats are about the maximum number of seats to remain compliant with Code.

Mr. Miller discussed the site point which is the point where everybody can see. He discussed the results and consequences of moving the site point from one location to another.

Mr. Von Szeliski discussed how this point is important to consider for dance performances.

Mr. Miller noted some of the examples' site points are lower. He discussed the implications of the site point for visibility.

Committee Member Dixon asked why the site line isn't to the speaker.

The architectural team discussed the site point is the feet for dance or even playing an instrument.

Chair Johnson-Tucker did note there are events when lecturers are viewed by several hundred attendees. She asked whether the stage could drop.

Mr. Coffee spoke about the complications implicated with a stage dropping. For example, he noted backstage access is difficult.

Mr. Von Szeliski discussed depth and the implications to comfort and the sightline. He asked the Committee to consider the critical balance point.

Committee Member Dixon asked whether this would be a lecture hall or a dance hall.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether there would be enough depth in the stage for dancing.

Mr. Coffee noted the Committee would have another opportunity to discuss this and decisions did not have to be made at the moment.

Mr. Miller reemphasized why it is important to know what kind of use the space will have.

Tim Hetherton noted the proportion of dance events to lecture events are about 100 to one.

Mr. Coffee moved on to discuss seating arrangement and how to make the space feel intimate. He and Mr. Miller showed examples of various rooms such as presentational rooms where the stage is in front of all the seating. They discussed slope and sight.

Mr. Coffee noted that four concepts of seating arrangements that would be discussed.

Mr. Von Szeliski showed and explained schemes A – D of images drawn to scale of various arrangement of seating rows and the stage. He discussed the aisles and the view given the arrangement of seats. He discussed side seats, rows of seats, sidelines and depth of stage. Mr. Von Szeliski also discussed the feeling of the room and the goal of keeping the room intimate. Goal of using the full space and also be able to concentrate on the lecturer or the performer.

Mr. Coffee noted it is possible to go around double doors.

Vice Chair Ray asked how far back the seats are.

Mr. Coffee provided an image of the thrust stage, which is a semi-circle.

Mr. Miller pointed out the Harvard School of Business with 1,500 was designed to have a two-way conversation with all 1,500 people. He asked the Committee to think about the way they sell tickets and whether they will be selling general admission tickets or assigned seating.

Ms. Linton discussed the various programs and attendance for each.

Mr. Hetherton said that currently, they do a three-quarter layout with an aisle up the middle and two side aisles. He did note people will sit closer for certain events and not others.

Mr. Miller continued to discuss seating arrangements and how it affects perception. He also discussed the length of rows and how seats will be filled up depending on people's perceptions and how full certain sections of rows feel.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the areas of thirty-six felt more connected and the two wings in scheme A do not feel like they are part of everything else.

Mr. Von Szeliski asked the Committee to consider seat width and comfort. He asked the Committee to consider usual twenty-one or twenty-two-inch seats.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the seats in the city council hall feel comfortable.

Mr. Coffee also asked if cupholders and writing tables on the seats are needed.

Ms. Linton stated a lot of venues now allow people to carry drinks.

Mr. Hetherton mentioned the challenge of keeping carpets clean

Vice Chair Ray asked about writing tablets on the seats.

Mr. Coffee stated including those elements on the seats would reduce the available number of seats.

The Committee considered whether they should or should not allow drinks inside the hall.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee what they meant by "film."

Ms. Linton noted they would like to show movies once in a while. They would like the capacity to use DVD's or project presentations or films.

Chair Johnson-Tucker asked whether the film festivals could be accommodated.

Ultimately, the Committee noted they would like flexibly with technology.

Chair Johnson-Tucker spoke about whether it is possible to use the space as council chambers when a lot of people attend.

Mr. Miller noted duplicating the agenda and voting system would be difficult.

Mr. Coffee asked whether the Committee could determine whether they could choose between scheme A – D.

Vice Chair Ray eliminated scheme A because the rows are too long.

Chair Johnson-Tucker agreed with Vice Chair Ray.

Mr. Von Szeliski stated it is an intimate width and depth but it is a separate section from the main group.

The Committee discussed scheme B.

Ms. Linton stated she likes the way the stairs in scheme B flow into the aisle. She asked the Committee to consider the challenge to older patrons w long aisles.

Chair Johnson-Tucker noted the Harvard Business School example seems comfortable even if it is a large space. She noted she likes scheme C because it is more circular than schemes A and B.

Mr. Miller asked whether film festivals would fill all the seats or encompass a smaller group.

Ms. Linton spoke of the difficulty with visibility and the side seats of a thrust stage.

The architectural team noted the Committee is inclined for a lower stage and likes some elements of thrust but does not prefer a thrust stage.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee to consider lighting and interior finishes and whether they want the space to feel warm or not. He provided the Committee with renderings as examples and discussed the same.

Vice Chair Ray stated she likes the glass.

Chair Johnson-Tucker stated she would like for the space to feel brighter in the daytime.

Ms. Linton stated she likes lighting all the way around.

Mr. Coffee asked the Committee to consider illumination and the view.

Mr. Miller asked the Committee to consider reflections.

Chair Johnson-Tucker opened the floor to public comments.

Mr. Mosher discussed adding power to the seats and the way the idea was received for the City Chambers. He guessed film making seminars might be considered for the lecture hall. He noted it

is important to discuss seating arrangement horizontally. He discussed the struggle to keep natural light.

**2. Continued discussion of project schedule, programming and concepts**

None.

**VI. MATTERS WHICH MAYORS 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 10:00 a.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Jill Johnson-Tucker

Draft