TENTATIVE AGENDA
FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL
BREC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
BOARD ROOM
6201 FLORIDA BOULEVARD
BATON ROUGE, LA 70806
APRIL 21, 2011
4:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 17, 2011 AND
    THE STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING OF APRIL 16, 2011

III. REPORTS BY THE DIRECTOR
    A. FINANCIAL REPORT
    B. SYSTEM REPORTS
    C. OTHER REPORTS

IV. OLD BUSINESS
    A. TO DISCUSS ADD ALTERNATES FOR THE GOODWOOD MAIN LIBRARY – MR. KEN
       TIPTON – THE LIBRARY DESIGN COLLABORATIVE
    B. TO VOTE TO ACCEPT THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT PACKAGE FOR THE
       GOODWOOD MAIN LIBRARY - MR. KEN TIPTON – THE LIBRARY DESIGN
       COLLABORATIVE
    C. REPORT ON FINDINGS REGARDING LIBRARY COLLABORATION WITH KNOCK
       KNOCK CHILDREN’S MUSEUM – MR. DAVID FARRAR

V. COMMENTS BY THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC
THE PUBLIC IS ALLOWED TO MAKE COMMENTS RELATIVE TO AN AGENDA ITEM AT
THE DISCRETION OF THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT. ANY COMMENTS NOT
RELATED TO AN AGENDA ITEM MAY BE RECEIVED AND DISCUSSED OR DEFERRED
TO A FUTURE MEETING UNDER PROCEDURES DIRECTED BY THE LIBRARY BOARD
PRESIDENT.
Reports by the Director

A. Financial Reports

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Farrar to present his financial and system reports. Mr. Farrar gave his reports noting that the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances as of March 31, 2011 shows operating expenditures of $6,038,998.15 or 17.44% of the operating budget spent. Through the end of March, we should have spent no more than 25.0% of the operating budget. Cash collections from property taxes for 2011 remain up as we are at $955,000 and 2.86% higher than the same period last year.

B. System Reports
Mr. Farrar noted that the gate count and database usage statistics remain high. Circulation numbers throughout the system are up.

C. Other Reports

Mr. Farrar then asked Ms. Stein to give her update concentrating on the results of the 2011 CityStats report issued by the Baton Rouge Area Foundation (BRAF). The annual CityStats report contains information about the quality of life in East Baton Rouge Parish. The information is based on a collection of data about various indicators that measure quality of life. Ms. Stein said that she is awaiting hard copies of the report, but that it can be reviewed now on the BRAF website and through a link on the East Baton Rouge Parish Library’s website. Ms. Stein was happy to announce that the Library was portrayed favorably as a contributor toward a positive quality of life.

Mr. Farrar then asked Ms. Husband to give an update on maintenance projects at the Library branches. Ms. Husband noted that the replacement of the meeting room partition walls at the Bluebonnet and Jones Creek Regional Branch Libraries will be bid. Last week the staff at the City-Parish Department of Public Works and the Library Facilities Manager had a pre-construction meeting with the contractors for the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library lighting retrofit. Next the contractors will be given a notice to proceed with the work.

Mr. Farrar then reported on the four library construction projects. He said that he and his staff have held meetings with the architects to finalize the construction documents for the Goodwood Main Library. He added that they have reviewed hundreds of pages and have noted the desired changes which the architects have made. In order for the contractor to be chosen, the Library Board will be asked to approve the construction documents tonight, so that the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) can be issued.

In regard to the Fairwood Branch Library, the RFQ for a contractor was advertised from April 1, 2011 to April 15, 2011. The pre-bid conference is April 22nd and the bid submission deadline is on May 3rd.

In regard to the Rouzan Branch Library, Mr. Farrar said that he and his staff are compiling the final comments on the construction document package. These will be given to Mr. Mike Sullivan of LRK Architects in order for him to produce the revised construction documents.

Mr. Farrar noted that Statements of Qualifications for architectural services for the downtown branch library were accepted by the City-Parish Department of Public Works until 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 14, 2011. The Architectural Selection Board will hold an informational meeting today at 5:00 p.m. They will then meet on Thursday, April 28th at 5:00 p.m. to establish a short list of three firms. On Thursday, May 19th at 5:00 p.m. oral presentations will be made by the three firms followed by the selection of the firm to produce the design of the downtown branch library.

Mr. Laurence Lambert arrived for the Board meeting at 4:10 p.m.
Ms. Freeman then said she wanted to make some remarks about the Library Board strategic planning workshop that was held on April 16th. She said that the needs of our community are always changing and so the Library Board was pleased that they could provide input regarding the Library’s strategic plan. It is important that the Library’s mission continues to be carried out. She added that we talk a lot about the need for technology and the innovation it makes in our society, but the Library will always require qualified professionals to provide the services to the community. How the Library carries out its mission must always be reviewed and that was what they did at the strategic planning meeting.

Ms. Tomlinson then questioned Mr. Farrar about the fact that the oral presentations on the design of the downtown library would be made by the three firms at the same meeting as the selection of the firm to do the work. Ms. Tomlinson asked if voting on the firm to be chosen could be done at a separate meeting from the oral presentations in order to give the Architectural Selection Board time to evaluate the presentations. Mr. Farrar replied that the dates are set by Mr. Jim Frey, of the City-Parish Department of Public Works (DPW) and since a public notice of the dates has already been advertised, Mr. Farrar said he didn’t think that the dates could be changed. However, Mr. Farrar said he would speak to Mr. Frey about a change in the date for the selection vote. Mr. Gordon then said that if the date can’t be changed, perhaps they could have the May Library Board meeting which is scheduled for the same day as the oral presentations at the location of the oral presentations so that the Library Board members can attend the meeting of the Architectural Selection Board. He added that it would be very enlightening for the Library Board to witness this process.

Old Business

A. To Discuss Add Alternates for the Goodwood Main Library - Mr. Ken Tipton – The Library Design Collaborative

Mr. John Berry, a member of the public, raised his hand to speak. Ms. Payton told him that he would have the opportunity to speak on an agenda item when it is introduced. Ms. Payton then asked Mr. Gordon to act as the time keeper for public comments on the first agenda item under old business. Ms. Payton asked if there were any public comments and recognized Mr. Berry. Mr. Berry asked if Mr. Farrar could repeat the dates and subjects of the various Architectural Selection Board meetings. Mr. Farrar repeated the information. He said that Statements of Qualifications are available for review at the Main Library for the Library Board members as well as the public. He added that he has a copy of the public notice for anyone who would like to read it. Mr. Berry asked where the Statements of Qualifications would be located at the Main Library to which Mr. Farrar replied in the Library Board Room on the second floor. Those interested in reviewing the documents could speak to Mr. Farrar’s assistant for access to the Board Room.

Ms. Tomlinson asked if the dates Mr. Farrar gave could be found on a website to which Mr. Farrar replied affirmatively. He said that the public notice can be accessed on the City-Parish website.
Mr. Gordon then asked if they could attend the meeting today at 5:00 p.m. to observe the process. Mr. Farrar asked Mr. Frey to respond. Mr. Frey said that they could attend, but that it would be a very short informational meeting. Mr. Farrar added that Board members are welcome to attend the meeting which will be held on the fourth floor of the municipal building which is across the street from the governmental building.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other public comments. There being none, she asked Mr. Ken Tipton, architect with The Library Design Collaborative, to discuss the add alternates for the Goodwood Main Library. Ms. Tomlinson asked if Mr. Frey could give some background on the add alternates before Mr. Tipton speaks. Ms. Payton asked Mr. Frey if he would address this request to which he said yes. Mr. Farrar noted that Mr. Frey can address the process and then if there are any questions about the components themselves, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Steve Jackson or Mr. Dyke Nelson can respond to those. Ms. Tomlinson said she would like an explanation of what an add alternate is, what is contained in each and who decides which add alternates are placed in the project.

Mr. Frey said that as they are planning a project they may or may not have add alternates. Several reasons may necessitate that there be add alternates such as the bid environment, and so they will adjust the use of add alternates to keep the project within the budget. There may also be some items that are optional and not part of the original project scope of work, but if the money is available they can add these to the construction. Mr. Frey noted that by State bid law, they are allowed up to three add alternates on a project. Mr. Farrar then asked that if an item did not fit into the base bid, could it then be added as an alternate to which Mr. Frey said yes. Mr. Frey said that on the Goodwood Main Library project, they were slightly over the base bid, so they met with the architectural team. There was an early discussion of putting some of the essential project items in the alternates. The design team did a good job of making the project comply with the budget. This is an example of reorganizing the bid package, so they were able to include the original ancillary items. Mr. Farrar noted that the design team made sure the additional items were included in their work so that they could be added if the budget allowed.

Ms. Tomlinson then asked Mr. Frey who decides which items will be placed on an add alternate list and was it correct that based on the priority of the items in an alternate and the budget constraints possibly only the items under one alternate could be added. Mr. Frey replied that this was correct and that the project team which consists of Library staff, the architects for the project and his office make the decisions on the items for each alternate ensuring that they build a library that meets the needs of the public. Ms. Tomlinson asked if each add alternate is a package and so when an alternate is chosen for the project all of the items in the alternate must be added to which Mr. Frey said yes. He also said that the numbering of the alternates also sets the priority so that, for example, alternate #1 is the first choice to be placed in the construction work. Ms. Tomlinson then asked why the Library Board does not have an opportunity to decide on the add alternates to which Mr. Frey said that the Library Board is kept abreast on the design and the construction documents being produced. Using add alternates is frequently the process on City-Parish construction projects. As they get to the end of a project, they ask the architects to produce a final statement of probable cost, and on this project the cost was high. But after discussions, the architects were able to come in on budget and should be commended for that. Ms. Tomlinson then asked if the add alternate process is a team decision. Mr. Frey said that it is
incumbent upon them as design professionals to make these choices. Ms. Tomlinson thanked Mr. Frey for his explanation and Ms. Payton also thanked him noting that he needed to depart to be present at the 5:00 meeting.

Mr. Tipton then addressed the Library Board. He told the Board that they worked with the Library Administration, BREC and the Parish Attorney’s Office on the design and the construction documents including the three add alternates. Mr. Tipton said the Board has a document containing a budget summary and the three add alternates. Mr. Tipton said they worked with Mr. Frey on prioritizing the items. He said he would answer any questions the Board might have. Mr. Gordon asked if the add alternates were part of the project from the beginning to which Mr. Tipton said yes. Mr. Tipton noted that at this point, it appears that all three alternates can be included in the project, but at the time of the acceptance of the bids for the contractor, they will know for sure if all the alternates will be included. Mr. Tipton said that there is a contingency column on the cost summary page so that on the bid day they have flexibility. Mr. Gordon confirmed with Mr. Tipton that the Library Board approved the alternates and that the alternates list is a priority scale for including these items as the budget permits.

Mr. Bardwell said he has a document dated January 21, 2011 with six items on it. The add alternate list dated April 11, 2011 has eighteen items. He asked how they went from six to eighteen items in a few months. Mr. Tipton answered that that earlier list assumed that everything but the six items would come in on budget. The cost has changed and therefore the list has been revised. Mr. Bardwell also said that the last cost analysis he has by JVV is dated December 2009. He requested an updated cost analysis document. Mr. Tipton said they could provide an update which does track the alternates list.

Mr. Bardwell said he has a question about the rainwater harvesting. He noted that the rainwater harvesting on the north green roof is listed in Alternate #1 while the south green roof is listed in Alternate #2. Mr. Tipton said both green roofs were in the original design, but then they moved the south green roof to Alternate #2. Mr. Bardwell asked why they didn’t need a rainwater harvesting roof on the south side. Mr. Tipton said they would provide both if Alternate #2 is included along with Alternate #1. He asked if the green roof adds some insulation to which Mr. Tipton answered affirmatively along with some shade, an aesthetic value and a utilitarian ability to occupy that space.

Mr. Bardwell then asked if the green roof contributes to the Leadership in Engineering and Environmental Design (LEED) rating. Mr. Dyke Nelson, architect with Chenevert Architects and the LEED commissioning agent for the project replied that they do not look at individual items, but rather at the building and energy performance holistically to determine the LEED status. To look at the individual items incrementally is not productive in determining how the building will perform energy-wise. He said that the green roof has not been included and is not a big factor in rating the base building. Mr. Bardwell then asked if any calculations had been made regarding the cost savings of a green roof to which Mr. Nelson said no. Ms. Tomlinson then asked if the north green roof has been included in the base bid to which Mr. Nelson said yes. Mr. Tipton said the north roof will be accessible to the public and if they add a south green roof it would be on the staff side of the building. He noted that the green roofs had
been discussed in length at a Board meeting and the Board voted for the green roof. Ms. Freeman asked why the cost of the two roofs was so different in price. Mr. Gordon said the rainwater harvesting system is part of Alternate #1. Mr. Tipton added that the harvesting system collects the rainwater and stores it for irrigation purposes and the cost listed is for the system to hold the water. Mr. Gordon agreed. Then he asked what level of LEED certification the base bid for the new building would have to which Mr. Nelson replied a silver status. He said that if the add alternates are included, the building might have a gold status, but many factors are used to determine the status; not just the number of items on a list. He said that the bottom line is that it is a solid building that will meet many of the criteria used to determine LEED certification.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other questions. The Opinion of Probable Cost and Budget summary along with Add Alternates #1, #2 and #3 is appended to these minutes.

B. To Vote to Accept the Construction Document Package for the Goodwood Main Library - Mr. Ken Tipton – The Library Design Collaborative

Ms. Payton read agenda item B and asked if there were any public comments on this item which there were not. Mr. Farrar said that this has been a very long process and many of the ideas and changes that became part of the design and then construction documents came from the public. He said that Mr. Steve Jackson, Mr. Ken Tipton and Ms. Denelle Wrightson of The Library Design Collaborative have done a great job and that this new Main Library will be extraordinary and the best in the country. It’s already gotten publicity around the nation. Mr. Farrar asked that the Board members approve the construction document package. Mr. Tipton said he anticipates that the public notice for construction bids can be published before the May 19th Board meeting pending your approval today. Mr. Farrar then thanked Mayor Kip Holden and the members of the Metropolitan Council for allowing the expenditure of the money to construct this building and to the Board and the architects for their hard work.

Ms. Payton then asked for a motion. Ms. Freeman made a motion that the construction document package for the Goodwood Main Library be accepted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gordon and passed unanimously. Mr. Gordon thanked the citizens for passing the renewal of the tax millage which makes the construction of this building possible.

C. Report on Findings regarding Library Collaboration with Knock Knock Children’s Museum – Mr. David Farrar

Ms. Payton read agenda item C and asked if there were any public comments on this item. Mr. John Berry asked to speak since he could not make a comment after the item was presented. He said the public comment policy should be revised to allow comments after the presentation of the information. However, he said that the Knock Knock Children’s Museum does not have a lot to do with the Library. He said he feels that the Board of the museum is going to ask the Library for money and he does not think the Library should contribute to the museum. He added that the Library already contributes to early literacy training.
At 4:45 p.m. Mr. Farrar said that he needed to leave the Board meeting to attend the informational meeting about the architectural services RFQ for the River Center Branch Library. But he said he would make some comments and then will ask Ms. Stein to present the information that they have gathered for the Board regarding partnering and collaborating with the museum. He said they should reflect on the items that are presented and if anything else comes to mind to give that information to him and his staff to be included in the decision making process. Mr. Farrar said he thinks the next step would be for the Board and staff of the museum to send a formal letter to the Library Board outlining what they would like the Library Board to consider. They could possibly be asking for money or resource access or a combination of both. He said that he and his staff met a few times with the museum personnel, have concluded many things and learned a few things. He said everyone who is involved in education and libraries knows that children learn through play. Mr. Farrar noted that Mr. Gordon pointed out at the last Board meeting. He added that an incredible amount of brain development takes place between birth and age five. A learning-rich environment is a key factor. Children that begin behind typically remain behind. He cited a recent study, *Early Childhood Risk in Louisiana*, published in the fall of 2010 that stated that East Baton Rouge Parish was scored with a risk factor of 3 out of 4 in being ready for school which translates to a moderate-high risk. So the goal of developing and nurturing pre-literacy among our young children is a shared mission of both the Library and Knock Knock Children’s Museum (KKCM). KKCM has as its focus play-based learning exhibits which are heavily integrated with word play and literacy learning activities. There are a number of ways in which the Library and KKCM can work together to further this shared mission.

Mr. Farrar then asked Ms. Stein to list some of the highlights they have identified and to distribute the document listing the opportunities for collaboration with the museum. Ms. Payton said that the main thing to remember today is that they are not voting on any action, but just having a discussion. Mr. Gordon said that he wanted to make a comment to Mr. Farrar and to also address Mr. Berry’s concern. The Library Board directed the staff to have a conversation with the museum and the staff is responding to that request. He added that they are not voting on allocating anything and there has not been a proposal made to do anything specific. This is just researching the possibilities. Mr. Gordon added that the Board would want to reflect on whatever the staff presents today. If there is some action item to be addressed in the future it will appear on the agenda and it will be clear on how the Board would move forward.

Ms. Stein then went over the highlights of the discussions. She said they approached this topic as they do with other collaborations that they have with groups such as Head Start, the Boys and Girls Clubs, and public and private school systems. The Library already reaches out and shares resources and collaborates as they can. The most obvious and foremost way that the Library can collaborate is to provide its expertise in selecting age appropriate reading materials for each thematic exhibit. The staff would use its bibliographic expertise to create the lists of materials from which to work.

As far as sharing resources, they could share as they do with the Head Start and early Head Start Centers by purchasing new materials or deploying existing materials that would be integrated into the thematic exhibits. The collections would be specially designed for each exhibit and for all the ages using the exhibit. One additional component at the museum could be a parenting
center collection and the Knock Knock Children’s Museum was most interested in these materials as a circulating collection. A parent visiting the center could actually leave with parenting books and children’s books. That idea would require further research on how the Library could work that out. Since a museum charges an admission fee, it was important to the Library staff that these books be accessible even if the patron were not purchasing a museum ticket.

Ms. Stein said they could work with some other partners in the community and with special vendors to develop the book lists, handouts and the flyers. She noted that the Library already does the Read to Me and Zero to Three packets, so these programs could be extended to the museum.

Ms. Stein then said that the museum staff could also come to the Library to conduct programs for Library patrons and place exhibits in the Library. The museum could also provide passes for free admission to the museum itself similar to the program the Library had with the Old State Capitol. The museum personnel were also open to the idea of providing free tickets as an incentive for participation in the Summer Reading Program and the Prime Time Reading Program. Ms. Stein mentioned that the Library’s early childhood bookmobiles could also visit the museum. Ms. Stein said she would also like the staff of the museum to share their expertise on early childhood development with Library staff because that is something the Library is always working on in training and career development in Children’s Services. The museum has a portable Imagination Playground which could be used at high profile Library events such as the Summer Reading program or the grand opening of the Goodwood Main Library in the plaza area. Ms. Stein asked if the Board members had any questions and there were none. The document of Opportunities for Collaboration with Knock Knock Children’s Museum is appended to the minutes.

Comments by the Library Board of Control

Ms. Payton thanked Councilwoman Wicker and Councilman Bourgeois for attending the Library Board meeting. She asked if there were any additional comments that the Library Board members wished to make.

There were no further comments, and so with no further business, the meeting was adjourned on a motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Mr. Lambert at 4:53 p.m.

Kizzy Payton, President                                                                 David Farrar, Library Director
# Independence Park Main Library Building
## Opinion of Probable Cost and Budget Summary

### Construction Documents Phase
**Independence Park Main Library**
**Baton Rouge, LA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opinion of Cost Without a Contingency</th>
<th>Contingency (1% Before Profit)</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost with the Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building and Site</strong></td>
<td>$35,219,225</td>
<td>$996,301</td>
<td>$36,215,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including New Parking and Demolition of Existing Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plaza and Service Yard</strong></td>
<td>$1,296,591</td>
<td>$38,690</td>
<td>$1,333,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Library Portion of Shared Site Improvements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion of Probable Cost Total</strong></td>
<td>$36,516,216</td>
<td>$1,032,991</td>
<td>$37,549,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Budget</strong></td>
<td>$38,219,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,219,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-$1,702,784</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$669,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Alternate 1 Total</strong></td>
<td>$416,254</td>
<td></td>
<td>$416,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion of Probable Cost Plus Alternate No. 1 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$36,932,470</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,932,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-$1,286,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$253,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Alternate 2 Total</strong></td>
<td>$531,553</td>
<td></td>
<td>$531,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion of Probable Cost Plus Alternates No. 1 and 2 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$37,464,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,464,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-$754,977</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$278,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Alternate 3 Total</strong></td>
<td>$747,228</td>
<td></td>
<td>$747,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion of Probable Cost Plus Alternate No. 1, 2, &amp; 3 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$38,211,252</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,211,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-$7,748</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,025,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Add Alternate No. 1 includes several items that were originally part of the base construction documents. These include upgrading the paving at the main pedestrian walkway in the parking lot from grey concrete to concrete pavers which will enhance the patrons' experience and provide a distinction between the drive and walk aisles. It also includes an upgrade to the entry of the children's area with color changing lights and graphics in addition to adding an art wall at the main public, monumental stair that connects the first, second, and third floors. It will also add a water tank to the third floor roof which will provide a means to capture and store rainwater for irrigation of the north green roof. Finally, Add Alternate No. 1 will replace wall dimmers in the meeting room with a dimming system that is capable of providing preset lighting scenes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Parking Lot Walkway from grey concrete to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$61,278</td>
<td>$61,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Entry to Children's Area with Lighting and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$111,133</td>
<td>$111,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Art Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$166,500</td>
<td>$166,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Rainwater harvesting for North Green Roof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Dimming system in lieu of dimmers in Meeting Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Alternate No. 1 Subtotal = $377,411

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's General Overhead (4% of Profit)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$377,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Alternate No. 1 Subtotal = $377,411

Subtotal 1 = $392,507

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's Profit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>of Subtotal 1</td>
<td>$19,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 2 = $412,133

Construction Contingency Fee (0%)                        | 0%         | of Subtotal 1 | $0 |
Bonds                                                 | 1%         | of Subtotal 2 | $14,121 |

Add Alternate No. 1 Total = $416,254
ADD ALTERNATE NO. 2
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE
INDEPENDENCE PARK MAIN LIBRARY
BATON ROUGE, LA

LAST REVISED APRIL 11, 2011

All items of Add Alternate No. 2 were originally part of the base construction documents. It includes upgrades to multiple interior building finishes including the ceiling in the children's craft and story rooms, glass storefront entrances, wood doors, metal door frames, and the railing at the monumental stair. It also includes an upgrade to the railings at the north green roof and adding the south green roof. Finally, it adds digital signage throughout the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Children's Craft/ Story Rooms Ceiling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$22,752</td>
<td>$22,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade glazing system at interior spaces from aluminum framed entrances to all-ages entrances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$88,290</td>
<td>$88,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Veneers at Wood Doors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$47,700</td>
<td>$47,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add South Green Roof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$196,998</td>
<td>$196,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Railing at Monumental Stair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$51,675</td>
<td>$51,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Railing at North Green Roof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$19,608</td>
<td>$19,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade door frames from field-painted steel to factory-finished aluminum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$19,928</td>
<td>$19,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Digital Signage throughout Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate No. 2 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$481,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's General Overhead (4% before Profit)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$19,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate No. 2 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$481,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$501,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's Profit</td>
<td>5% of Subtotal 1</td>
<td>$25,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$526,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency Fee (0%)</td>
<td>0% of Subtotal 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>1% of Subtotal 2</td>
<td>$5,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate No. 2 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$531,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Add Alternate No. 3 develops an exterior space and adds multiple systems to the building. It develops the north courtyard into a usable reading and gathering space for the patrons by adding planting, paving, and lighting. At the building, it adds a talking signs system that will assist in wayfinding for the visually impaired, a lightning protection system, and a photovoltaic system that is anticipated to provide 3% of the building's electrical load. It also includes a digital sign component to the shared monumental sign on Goodwood Boulevard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add Alternate 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add North Courtyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Talking Signs System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Photovoltaic System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Digital Sign Display @ Monument Sign</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Lightning Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Alternate No. 3 Subtotal = $677,500

Summary

Contractor's General Overhead (4% before Profit) 4% - $677,500 $27,100
Add Alternate No. 3 Subtotal $677,500

Subtotal 1 $704,600

Contractor's Profit 5% of Subtotal 1 $35,230

Subtotal 2 $739,830

Construction Contingency Fee (0%) 0% of Subtotal 1 $0
Bonds 1% of Subtotal 2 $7,398

Add Alternate No. 3 Total = $747,228
Opportunities for Collaboration with Knock Knock Children's Museum

The goal of developing and nurturing pre-literacy among our young children is a shared admission of both the Library and Knock Knock Children's Museum (KKCM). KKCM has as its focus play-based learning exhibits which are heavily integrated with word play and literacy learning activities.

There are a number of ways in which the Library and the KKCM can work together to further this shared mission:

Provide Expertise - Library staff will select age appropriate reading materials for each thematic exhibit
- Research and select age appropriate books for each fixed theme
- Research and select age appropriate books for special rotating theme
- Research and select age appropriate books for parenting collection

Share Resources - the Library will buy a special collection of books to serve as deposit collections for children as well as parents at the Museum. Books may be enjoyed in the Museum or checked out using a self-check kiosk and returned to any Library branch.
- Deposit collection of circulating board books for ages 0-2 for each fixed theme
- Deposit collection of circulating board books for ages 2-3 for each fixed theme
- Deposit collection of circulating board books for ages 3-5 for each fixed theme
- Rotating collection of circulating books for special "visiting" exhibits
- Deposit collection of circulating books for Parents will be housed in a special, freely accessible Parent's Depot which is located within KKCM, but accessible to patrons even without a KKCM ticket

Develop Complementary Materials - the Library will provide booklists, handouts, flyers and other materials, whether created and printed locally or procured through special vendors to distribute to museum attendees
- Create printed, annotated bibliographies and quick pick booklists for each fixed theme
- Create printed, annotated bibliographies and quick pick booklists for rotating theme
- Create printed, annotated bibliographies and quick pick booklists for Parenting Collection
- Create printed, easy-to-read parenting guide which contains local information
- Provide English and Spanish Rhyming bookmarks (already created by Library)
- Provide such booklets and brochures as Read to Me (already created by Library) and Zero to Three (literature available from professional associations and institutions)
- Provide monthly newsletters for distribution to Museum attendees as well as special promotional materials such as Summer Reading Program info for distribution

Promote Both Services - each partner will use print and online media, make visits and exchange programming
- Feature the KKCM in the Library's website
- Feature all booklists and bibliographies online in the Library's website
- Distribute information and promotional pieces about the KKCM at Library branches
- Educate library staff about services and exhibits at KKCM with special in-service programs
- Host the KKCM's portable Imagination Playground at high profile events such as the Summer Reading Parties, library grand openings, major children's events at the Library
- Bookmobile makes regular monthly visits to KKCM
- Library designs story time boxes which are fully realized thematic units for each exhibit
- Visiting Library outreach staff perform thematic story times within various exhibits
- Host KKCM "teaser" programs at Library branches
- Display KKCM mini-exhibits at Library branches
- Host KKCM public design charettes at Library branches
- Include KKCM promotional incentive in children's Summer Reading sign up packet
- Include KKCM promotional material in New Baby packets (along with the free Read to your Bunny books, the "Read to Me-a Parent's Guide to Raising Readers" booklet and "Every Child Ready to Read @ Your Library" brochure, etc.)
- Circulate KKCM passes at the Library, which allows the holder free admission
- Prime Time Family Reading Time participants receive free family pass to KKCM