

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE 2024 BOND  
COMMITTEE**

July 1, 2024, at 6:30 p.m.

**THE CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE 2024 BOND COMMITTEE** MET ON July 1, 2024, AT 6:30 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER MUNICIPAL CENTER MEETING ROOM, JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS 77040.

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. and the roll of appointed officers was taken.

Committee members present were:

Beverly Petersen	Susan Edwards
Edward Lock	Jennifer Withner
Krista Guerrero	Sean Willis
Curtis Haverty	

Staff in attendance: Robert Basford, Assistant City Manager; Isaac Recinos, Recreation and Events Manager; and Maria Thorne, Administrative Assistant.

- B. CITIZENS' COMMENTS** - Any person who desires to address the 2024 Bond Committee regarding an item on the agenda will be heard at this time. In compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, unless the subject matter of the comment is on the agenda, the City staff and Committee members are not allowed to discuss the subject. Each person is limited to five (5) minutes for comments to the Bond Committee

**Jim Pulliam - 15713 Tenbury St.** - Mr. Pulliam expressed strong opposition to spending \$8-10 million on replacing the pool, suggesting instead that the leak could be repaired for a few thousand dollars. He highlighted that he has lived in Jersey Village for over 27 years and has visited the pool only once due to it being overcrowded and having inadequate parking. He believes that most pool users are not residents of Jersey Village and emphasized the need for better parking at the pool.

Pulliam recounted a recent experience leading a tour of the White Oak Bayou Greenway trails, which span 20 miles from Clark Henry Park to Buffalo Bayou and downtown Houston. He intended to show the tour group where the trail connects to Clark Henry Park, but they were unable to access it due to the full parking lots at the pool, Post Elementary School, and on nearby streets. This forced the group to park at Jersey Village High School.

Mr. Pulliam mentioned that he had previously offered the tour to the Jersey Village City Council and city leaders and extended the same invitation during his speech. He concluded by reiterating his belief that the existing pool should not be demolished and replaced and stated his commitment to working against the bond for a new pool in the upcoming election. He thanked the council for their time and efforts.

**David Lock - 16002 Lakeview Dr.** - Mr. Lock, who has lived at 16002 Lakeview Drive for 48 years and raised three children there, questioned the need to replace the city pool. He expressed amazement that the pool has lasted 50 years despite local soil and flooding conditions and suggested that if the original construction team rebuilt it, it might last another 50 years. Mr. Lock noted that since learning about the pool's leak, he has not seen any detailed reports or leak detection tests specifying the leak's extent or location. The only report he mentioned was from a pool builder stating that the pool is beyond repair and needs replacement.

Mr. Lock questioned why the city has not followed the standard procedure of obtaining three bids for the leak detection project and making these procedures public for citizens to understand the necessity for a new pool. He criticized the Bond Committee for rushing the proposal to the City Council to get it on the ballot without sufficient citizen input and transparency.

He mentioned hearing differing opinions from citizens: some want a similar replacement pool, while the swim team desires a \$10 million two-pool solution. He questioned the justification for such a high expenditure for a facility used by a small group for limited periods each year. Mr. Lock also criticized the approach of asking the new pool builder if the pool needs replacement, likening it to asking a car salesman if one should buy a new car, implying a conflict of interest.

**Bill Edwards - 16001 Jersey Dr.** - Mr. Edwards recalled attending a town hall meeting where George from Councilman Hunsaker mentioned that, despite being 50 years old, the city's pool was in pretty good shape, implying it had been well maintained. However, Mr. Edwards noted that many people repeatedly argue that the pool needs to be replaced due to its age. He contrasted this with a recent discovery he made online: a television station in Portland, Oregon reported on the repair of an 84-year-old pool built in 1940. He questioned why Jersey Village can't do the same, implying doubt that Portland is significantly more capable in pool maintenance and repair.

**Margaret Stever- 16518 Delozier St.** - Mrs. Stever shared her experience with the local pool, noting that her children swam on the swim team and in high school. She mentioned that she had been told that the pool was too small for competitive swimming, as their times were not counted due to the pool's inadequate size. While she appreciates the current pool, especially its Z shape and facilities for diving and teaching kids to swim, she supports fixing it if possible. However, if a new pool is necessary, she believes it should be sized in such a way to meet swim team requirements. Staff explained that the current pool is sized in meters, but modern pools are typically sized in yards. Staff explained that times had to be converted between meter and yard pools, affecting consistency in swim meet results.

**Beatrice Menendez - 16217 Delozier St.** - Mrs. Menendez expressed disappointment with the lack of compromise among some committee members and their disregard for citizens' requests. She attended most committee meetings and reviewed meeting packets, initially noting an agreement to keep costs between \$6-8 million for a single pool with basic amenities and increased lanes for the swim team. However, at the last meeting, some members preferred two pools, pushing costs to the maximum without considering the tax burden. She reminded the committee of their responsibility to represent Jersey Village residents, many of whom oppose funding a new pool. Given the direction toward a new pool, she urged the committee to work together for a reasonable pool at a reasonable price.

**Joan Norland - 16106 Jersey Dr.** - Mrs. Norland, a resident of Jersey Village since 1997 with over 40 years of experience in leisure and recreation, emphasized the importance of the pool for the community, especially for children and the elderly. She noted her personal experience using the pool for aerobics and highlighted the significance of such activities for health and well-being. Mrs. Norland expressed a desire for a cost-effective solution to maintain the pool and extend its usability beyond the current three months, suggesting the Parks and Recreation staff could be trained to support this. She acknowledged the pool's benefits for all ages and urged the committee to consider the community's needs and opinions in their decisions. She appreciated the opportunity to voice her concerns and encouraged the committee to find a balanced solution.

**Jim Fields - 16413 Saint Helier** - Mr. Fields raised several concerns about the proposed expenditure of \$6-10 million on the pool, especially considering its location in a floodplain. He asked if the thought

of moving the pool to a different location to avoid flooding issues had been considered. Mr. Fields inquired about the length of the current pool, and staff confirmed that it is 25 meters long.

He requested detailed cost breakdowns for the pool project, beyond the general estimates shown in visuals, to better understand the allocation of funds. He questioned what would happen if the bond for the new pool did not pass and expressed concern over the lack of documentation of pool maintenance over the past 10 years, despite multiple requests for this information.

Mr. Fields also mentioned his preference for a pool design that includes a deep end for diving and reiterated the need for a city pool, regardless of the final decision.

**Terry O'Kelly - 16222 Tahoe** - Mrs. O'Kelly expressed concerns about the difficulty of finding lifeguards, both in Jersey Village and citywide, and opposed the idea of building two pools due to the challenges in hiring enough staff. She supports constructing a new pool if necessary but believes that proposing a single pool would have a better chance of passing with voters than two pools, based on past feedback where people felt the proposal was excessive. She emphasized the importance of meeting the community's needs without overextending. Additionally, she inquired whether multiple bids would be obtained for the project.

**Jeff Stever - 62518 Delozier** - Mr. Stever, a commercial general contractor with 40 years of experience, shared his perspective on the proposed pool costs. He mentioned that his company built large pools and clubhouses for Lenar Homes, none of which exceeded \$4 million, even with all amenities included. Although these projects were completed 8-9 years ago and inflation has since increased costs, he still finds \$6 million for a pool to be excessively high.

**Ernie Hewett - 15917 Lakeview Dr.** Mr. Hewett questioned the need for a bond when he stated that the city has about \$25 million dollars in cash.

**C. Consider approval of the minutes from the meeting held on June 25, 2024.**

Curtis made a motion for approval of the minutes, and Beverly seconded the motion.

The vote follows:

Ayes: Beverly Petersen, Edward Lock, Jennifer Withner, Krista Guerrero, Sean Willis, Curtis Haverly and Susan Edwards

Nays: None

The motion carried.

**D. Discuss and take appropriate action on potential bond items. *Robert Basford***

Robert opened the discussion by referring to last week's request for amenity prices. He noted that George had provided estimates for various amenities to help in evaluating and refining the pool concepts. Robert wanted to revisit the two Z concepts from public input and encouraged open discussion to determine a preferred route.

It was noted that the committee had not yet received formal bids but had obtained initial cost estimates from one pool design company. Councilman-Hunsaker provided several options to give a general idea of costs. It was stated that the bond amount, such as \$10 million, could be adjusted based on actual needs and that any leftover funds from the bond would be subject to specific rules about their use. Concerns were expressed about potential "loopholes" and the need that the money should be used strictly for its intended purpose was reiterated.

Robert clarified that a pool bond must be spent on pool projects only. Any excess funds would need to be applied to related aspects of the pool project itself, not diverted to other uses. He provided an example involving street bonds to illustrate that while excess funds could be reallocated to other street projects, they couldn't be used for unrelated purposes.

It was questioned whether excess funds could be used for pool maintenance. Robert was uncertain but indicated that bond usage would be clearly outlined in the proposition. Committee members reiterated concerns about the potential misuse of funds and emphasized that bond money should not be used for maintenance.

The committee members discussed their preferences for the pool concepts, with some expressing support for Concept 3 and a 10-million-dollar budget with potential changes, and others preferring Concept 4, at a 7.6 million-dollar budget, and preferably less, but also with some modifications. The discussion highlighted the need for a balanced recommendation that incorporates various amenities, such as features for toddlers, teens, and adults.

The committee chair pointed out that the committee should finalize a recommendation to present to the council. Committee members discussed the pros and cons for having two pools in detail. Some emphasized benefits like minimizing pool closures due to maintenance issues and catering to a wider range of users and others emphasized the increased staffing cost and extensive depth plan modifications needed to truly serve more wants.

In conclusion, the committee was advised to provide a recommendation for the council based on the current concepts and budget estimates. They recognized that further refinements and citizen feedback would continue to influence the final design. Committee members each expressed their preferred concept and budget recommendations; however all seemed to agree that they viewed the concept as a framework only, and would want to see changes made to the designs.

Curtis – Concept 3, 10 million  
Edward – Concept 3, 10 million  
Krista - Concept 3, 10 million  
Jennifer – Concept 3, 10 million  
Sean – Concept 3, 10 million  
Beverly – Concept 4, 7.6 million  
Susan – Concept 4, 7.6 million

Edward made a motion to propose the recommendation of Concept 3 at 10 million dollars to City Council. Curtis seconded the motion. The votes were as follows:

Ayes: Curtis, Edward, Krista, Jennifer, and Sean  
Nays: Beverly and Susan

The bond process and timeline were discussed, questioning whether George would be used for the pool design if the \$10 million bond passes. Robert confirmed that George could be an option. Concerns were expressed about the timeline, suggesting that if the bond passes in November, the design process could take around six months, possibly delaying the start of construction. Committee proposed keeping the existing pool open for another season to avoid losing use during the transition.

A suggestion was made that when presenting to the council, a design committee should be proposed. Robert agreed to this. The need to keep the current pool operational was emphasized, at least through part of the next season, and it suggested that even a partial season could be beneficial. It was mentioned that George estimated the design and construction process would take 9 to 12 months.

The question was asked if whether a small amount of funding could be allocated for the existing pool to extend its use until the new pool is built. Robert noted that the council had directed that the pool would not be operational next summer regardless of the bond's outcome, but agreed to advocate for keeping the pool open longer if feasible.

Some committee members suggested having a neutral spokesperson present to the council. The committee chairperson, Susan, agreed to present the committee's recommendation to the council, indicating she would clarify that the vote was not unanimous. Robert suggested that the recommendation could be presented by all of the committee members collectively and that Council would likely request feedback.

The committee discussed the idea of a second town hall meeting to gather more input, but some felt that previous input had been sufficient.

Committee members expressed support, appreciation and praise for the committee's work and emphasized the importance of ongoing citizen engagement for future design stages. The need to balance nostalgia with practical considerations about the pool's future was acknowledged. The value of investing in the community was pointed out as well as the need to address community concerns transparently.

Robert provided details on accessing survey feedback, noting that responses from both recent and previous surveys are available on the city's website.

**E. Select next meeting date.**

N/A

**F. ADJOURN**

There being no further business on the agenda, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Krista and was second by Sean. The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.



Maria Thorne, Administrative Assistant