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
OCTOBER 17, 2013
4:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

III. REPORTS BY THE DIRECTOR

A. FINANCIAL REPORT
B. SYSTEM REPORTS
C. OTHER REPORTS
   1. GOODWOOD MAIN LIBRARY
   2. RIVER CENTER BRANCH LIBRARY
   3. NEW MARKET TAX CREDITS
   4. MAINTENANCE REPORTS

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. DISCUSSION AND DECISION REGARDING ALTERNATE SITES FOR THE SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY AND COURSE OF ACTION REGARDING THE SITE IN THE ROUZAN DEVELOPMENT
B. VOTE TO RECOMMEND TO CITY-PARISH THAT THEY TAKE ALL STEPS TO TERMINATE AND ABANDON THE COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH 2590 ASSOCIATES FOR THE SITE AT THE ROUZAN DEVELOPMENT– MR. TRAVIS WOODARD
C. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGREEMENT WITH BATON ROUGE METROPOLITAN AIRPORT FOR WIND SHEAR MONITORING DEVICE TO BE LOCATED AT THE SCOTLANDVILLE BRANCH LIBRARY SITE – MR. SPENCER WATTS

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. TO VOTE TO PROCEED WITH PURCHASE OF BUILDING AT 8560 FLORIDA BOULEVARD AT NO MORE THAN THE APPRAISED VALUE OF $1 MILLION FOR USE BY LIBRARY OUTREACH SERVICES, FOR USE AS A USED BOOK SALE CENTER AND A LIBRARY STAFF TRAINING ROOM - MR. SPENCER WATTS

VI. COMMENTS BY THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BOARD’S PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY, ALL ITEMS ON WHICH ACTION IS TO BE TAKEN ARE OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, AND COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS MAY BE RECEIVED ON OTHER TOPICS REPORTED AT SUCH TIME AS THE OPPORTUNITY IS ANNOUNCED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OR THE PERSON CONDUCTING THE MEETING.
Minutes of the Meeting of the
East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control

October 17, 2013

The regular meeting of the East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control was held in the Board Room of the BREC Administration Building at 6201 Florida Boulevard on Thursday, October 17, 2013. Mr. Travis Woodard, President of the Board called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Mr. Charles P. “Chip” Boyles, II, Ms. Tanya Freeman, and Mr. Jason Jacob. Absent from the meeting was Ms. Kizzy Payton. Also in attendance were Mr. Spencer Watts, Library Director; Ms. Patricia Husband, Assistant Library Director of Branch Services; Ms. Mary Stein, Assistant Library Director of Administration; Ms. Rhonda Pinsonat, Library Business Manager; Mr. Ronnie Pierce, Assistant Library Business Manager; Ms. Liz Zozulin, Executive Assistant to the Library Director; and Mr. Brian Thornhill, Library LAN Administrator. Mr. Mark Goodson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority and Captain Stephen Cadarette of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff’s Office also attended. Ms. Amy Wold, reporter and Mr. Travis Spradling, photographer, both with The Advocate; Mr. Frank Hillyard, and Mr. Dirk Graeser, videographers for Metro 21; and several people from the community were also present.

Mr. Woodard asked Ms. Zozulin to take the roll which she did. Mr. Woodard then asked for the approval of the minutes of the regular Library Board meeting on September 19, 2013. The minutes were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Jacob, and seconded by Ms. Freeman.

Reports by the Director

A. Financial Reports

Mr. Woodard asked Mr. Watts to make his reports. Mr. Watts then asked Ms. Pinsonat to present the financial reports. Ms. Pinsonat said that the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances as of September 30, 2013 show operating expenditures of $21,765,330.92 or 54.03% of the operating budget. Through September, the Library should have spent no more than 75% of the operating budget. Cash collections from property taxes for 2013 are up slightly, as the Library is now at $692,000 or about 2% ahead of the same ten months in 2012. Mr. Woodard then asked Ms. Pinsonat a question. He wondered since the Library had only spent about 50 to 60% of its budget for 2013 so far, would that percentage remain the same through the end of the year? Ms. Pinsonat replied no. They are getting ready to move into the new building and have been requisitioning a large number of items to be submitted to the Purchasing Department before the October 18th deadline for purchase prior to the end of 2013. Mr. Watts added that this is typical of how the budget is spent each year. Many expenditures will appear on the books at the end of the year.
A. System Reports

Mr. Watts asked Ms. Stein to present the system reports. She gave her PowerPoint presentation, *Around the Parish in 90 Seconds* which included the month of September and October.

The following were some of the highlights:

- Linda Sue Park was the author featured at the 36th Annual Author Illustrator Program on October 3rd and 4th at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library.
- On Saturday, October 19th the Pride-Chaneyville Branch Library will host the 5th Annual Community History Festival.
- Ms. Park was delightful with children and parents who enjoyed her presentations. There were many positive comments on the evaluation sheets.
- The theme of the festival is down home and homegrown, featuring horse training, horse roping, and an old-fashioned cake walk among the many activities. The focus will be on hometown heros.
- The Attic Treasures and Collectables Program was held at the Jones Creek Regional Branch Library on October 5th.
- On November 2nd the State Library of Louisiana will host the 10th Annual Louisiana Book Festival, celebrating readers, writers and their books.
- 300 items such as railroad bills and a table containing ivory were evaluated by experts.
- The EBRPL will have a booth at the event along with the bookmobile and staff. The Spring 2014 selection for the *One Book/One Community* read will be announced.

Ms. Stein noted that the Library will celebrate the soon to be demolished old Main Library. On November 16th water based paint balls will be launched on the wall of the north side of the building. Messages will also be left on the walls and floors inside the building. This activity will be held in conjunction with the Baton Rouge Walls project.

Ms. Stein also said staff training has been going on all year. In 2012 at the American Library Association (ALA) Annual Conference a staff member went to a seminar about how to be a good boss based on Disney’s training program. In 2013 the Library used this training on-line with the branch managers with very good results. Ms. Landry, the Library’s Employee and Training Development Coordinator is gathering the mandatory ethics training certificates to be submitted to Human Resources. She is also submitting the mandatory defensive driving certificates for those who drive City vehicles.

Ms. Stein then added that the Library is teaming with the Mayor’s Office on the *Healthy Choices* program. The Library will participate in the National Food Day project, and in hosting the mobile market at the Scotlandville Branch Library. The Library will also emphasize the healthy food initiative all week through displays and on-line resources.
C. Other Reports

Mr. Watts gave his report. He emphasized what an outstanding author and presenter Linda Sue Park is. He said that Ms. Pabby Arnold, Librarian IV Coordinator for Children’s Services and her staff have over the years invited great authors to participate in the Author-Illustrator program who are also good speakers who connect with the audience.

Mr. Watts then gave an update on the new Main Library construction project. He said construction is not progressing as rapidly as they had hoped. The contractor missed the punch list date of October 7, 2013. They are concerned about meeting the milestone dates. Because so many items are not completed, in lieu of a punch list, the architects are going to do a damages list. Since furniture will begin to arrive next week, the damages list will enable both the contractors and furniture vendors to monitor any damages and who is responsible. The architects also began compiling a punch list on several components that are completed.

Mr. Watts noted that they had a meeting with all the furniture vendors yesterday. Ms. Denelle Wrightson, architect with PSA Dewberry, and a principal with The Library Design Collaborative was present for this meeting. They reviewed what will happen as the furniture arrives next week and assembling of shelves begins while contractors are still working in the building. The plan that was devised is to complete the second floor first, then the first floor and finally the third. Mr. Watts said that many of the components for moving furniture into the second floor have been completed.

He added that he, the architects and the vendors are all concerned about the amount of dust and dirt in the air and carpet in the completed area on the second floor. This is due to the many activities going on throughout the building. He also noted that the first solution was to vacuum the carpets, but there is still a lot of residue. They then talked about shampooing or steam cleaning the carpet which Mr. Watts felt would be necessary.

Mr. Watts said in the last week there appeared to be a greater sense of urgency among the contractors with larger work crews. Many tasks have been expedited. The concrete pour to connect to the drive to the back was completed. Now there is a paved drive and a service yard in the back of the building. BREC was responsible for getting a significant portion of this work completed.

Mr. Watts added that there is still a lot of mud around the building. He noted that a gravel pathway leading to the building had been installed. They are still using lifts to move items and install zinc panels. Once the lifts are removed from the site, concrete can be poured for the drives and sidewalks. This will decrease the amount of dust and dirt being tracked into the building.

Mr. Watts noted that the beams have been erected for the cybercafé which now enables one to see where it will be in relation to the library entrance. Once the café is built, the plaza will be constructed which will be the finishing item for the library in 2014.
Destructive testing and analysis of the current Main Library has revealed more asbestos than originally thought. This will increase the length of time for remediation prior to demolition. Mr. Watts said that for some reason destructive testing was not done on the front of the old building. So now they have found asbestos in the aggregate panels in the interior and exterior. Fortunately, the asbestos is encapsulated and has not caused any problems. This discovery may have some impact on the schedule of providing service to patrons in the old building as moving into the new building occurs.

Mr. Watts then noted that he wished to clarify the information he provided last month in regard to library service during the transition into the new building. He said they had planned to stay in the old building as they moved the 500,000 item collection over to the new building. They had planned to reserve about 10,000 items in the front of the old building and continue to stay open. He said they will still attempt to do this, but some of the aggregate panels are in the windows in the oldest part of the building where the fiction collection is kept. So they may need to revise their plan. Mr. Watts said it will be clearer in about two weeks when they get the bids and plans for the remediation proposal.

He noted that another problem has arisen which is with the redesign of the north courtyard. Based on the architects’ plans, the contractor calculated the cost to be $200,000 which was totally unacceptable to the Library staff and to Architectural Services of DPW. The pavers were very expensive, and there was a very complex and expensive grid support, and irrigation and drainage system. The architects were given new directions, and they are working on a new plan. The contractor has been authorized to begin work on a modified infrastructure design to enclose the north courtyard. Mr. Watts said the main purpose of this courtyard is to provide a secure and safe environment which protects children and teens from wandering off or from outsiders coming into an unmonitored area. He added that they can omit the tree system and other enhancements which are not fundamental to security. He also said they found items that were double charged or items not credited in the estimate. The architects believe the cost of the courtyard with these changes will be about $60,000-$70,000 which is in line with what the Library staff had estimated.

Mr. Watts highlighted the following items regarding the new Main Library:

- The storefront at the main entrance is complete, and front doors were installed on October 16th so that the building can now be locked.
- A preliminary punch list was started by the Project Manager on October 16th.
- Bamboo ceiling tiles were installed on the first floor; star ceiling wells at columns were completed; most ceiling tiles on the second floor are complete.
- Interior doors are hung in most places and hardware is also installed.
- Lights are installed and operational in most areas of the building.
- Wall mounted monitors in the work and study areas are installed.
- Interior glass walls and windows are installed throughout the building.
- Terrazzo slab steps are in place in public stairways.
- Carpet is nearly complete on the second floor except in the reading room; started installing in Teen Services on October 16th and also in Children’s Services.
- Whisper walls which are fabric are complete in Children’s Services.
• Wall tiles in bathrooms on all floors are complete. – Some inconsistencies were noted and will appear on the punch list.

• The green terrace – The seams in the membrane in the south terrace were corrected and the media is in. The north terrace requires a correction of the light pylons to be flush with the media and pavers.

• On October 2nd a meeting with the Library’s IT staff, and the electrical and telecommunications subcontractors occurred. Phone line orders were verified, conduit connections, switch and equipment configurations were verified, and an issue with a conduit from the first floor to the third floor was resolved. Connections for racks were corrected. The Library’s IT staff is to be commended for being proactive and for having a cooperative approach to the issues.

• Wall panels were installed in the meeting room.

Mr. Watts concluded by saying that there is much that is positive with this project. The issues are being addressed. He added that everyone is working hard. He said he appreciates the work that DPW Architectural Services has been doing with the contractor and the architects to keep the project on schedule. He noted that even though some aspects of the project are behind schedule, he feels that if everyone works together, they can finish as planned.

Mr. Watts asked if the Board had any questions on the Main Library project. Ms. Freeman said she had three questions. She wondered if too much effort was being expended to keep the old Main Library open during the move to the new building. She said they want to serve patrons, but what about the ability of the staff to manage patron service and move simultaneously. Mr. Watts replied that the staff will be present regardless if the building is open or closed to patrons. He added that he believes they should do everything they can whenever they can to keep the Library open. He added that when the library is closed, and patrons expect it to be open, the consequences are negative. Mr. Watts said that at the time that they anticipate being closed, it is traditionally a time with low usage. He also pointed out that many patrons were upset when the Bluebonnet Regional and Delmont Gardens Branches were closed for the flooring projects. This sometimes hurts circulation for weeks and months after the building is reopened because patrons get out of the habit of coming to the library. Ms. Freeman said they are talking about two different things. One is repairs to a building in use and the other is a completely new building. She added that people will understand what the Library is doing. Mr. Watts said people will be thrilled, and hopefully, very understanding if the Library needs to close early. He stated that they can never try too hard to stay open, so he would like to do that. He added that there are times when it doesn’t make sense to stay opened, but he hopes they can keep Main open until the 15th-17th of December, and only be closed for two to three weeks.

Ms. Freeman then asked for a summary of what Mr. Watts was saying about the north courtyard. Mr. Watts replied that there was no security designed in the original plans. There are three doors from the building that open to the courtyard. They redesigned the courtyard to protect children and teens. They added a security gate which can be opened in case of fire or another emergency. Ms. Freeman asked if this work would be bid on to which Mr. Watts replied that it is accomplished by a change order to the contractor on the job. They also removed the fountains and ponds for safety and cost reasons.
Ms. Freeman then asked if the opening date would be delayed. Mr. Watts said the architects believe the contractor can meet the deadline. That is why they are allowing the furniture vendors to install the shelving in the building. But he said he is not completely convinced that they will meet the deadline. He feels, however, that if everyone works hard, the opening may be five to seven days later than the original date rather than thirty.

Mr. Watts then discussed the River Center Branch construction project. He said the architects reworked their cost estimate. They looked at the price of the building and for ways to save money and cut costs. They applied a great deal of value engineering into the estimate. The revised estimate was slightly under the budget. The Library staff and DPW Architectural Services did not get the revised estimate in a timely manner. Therefore, they could not study the estimate before the scheduled meeting. Mr. Watts said DPW questioned bringing in full value engineering at this early stage of the project. They should save some of the value engineering for the end of the design phase for budgetary issues that might emerge at that point. He added that the staff will review the figures for the technology and for furniture, fixtures and equipment (FF & E). He also noted that he explained to the architects that completing the new Main Library project is a priority. Therefore, the Library staff may not have the opportunity to completely review the River Center Branch cost estimates until early in January.

Mr. Watts asked if there were any questions on his reports. There being none, he said he is happy to have an expert on New Market Tax Credits (NMTC) at this meeting to explain the concept to the Library Board. He then introduced Mr. Mark Goodson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority (RDA).

Mr. Goodson distributed a flow chart to the Board outlining the structure of a project funded by New Market Tax Credits. He said the RDA in partnership with the City of Baton Rouge has formed the East Baton Rouge Community Development Entity, a CDE. This is a certification they received from the United States Treasury Department through a CDFI fund. This certificate allows them to apply for, receive and administer New Market Tax Credits.

They were successful a few years ago in obtaining a $60 million allocation. They used it in such projects as the ExxonMobil YMCA in Scotlandville, the Americana YMCA in Zachary, the Hampton Inn and Suites in downtown Baton Rouge, the expansion at Honeywell on Chippewa, the Emerge Center for the Speech and Hearing Foundation near Gardere, and IBM. They have used all the tax credits for this year, but they have applied for more credits in 2014. Mr. Goodson said the RDA is hopeful that they will obtain more credits in late spring of next year. He noted that the RDA also helps organizations find NMTC opportunities.

He noted that his presentation today is strictly for information. He will explain how NMTC works so that if the Board wishes, they may consider using these funds for the River Center Branch Library or any other project. In over 13 years $36 billion in tax credit allocation authority has been issued through this program. The program works like a subsidy providing cash infusion into the economy for real estate projects in low income areas. The ultimate benefit goes to the project developer. Mr. Goodson said that if the Library used NMTC, the benefit would go the Library.
He said major investors which are primarily large banks buy the NMTC. The cash generated from the sale is used to infuse development in low income areas. The money does not need to be paid back. There is a seven year compliance period and that capital infusion acts like a loan during that time. However, the loan is for interest only. When the seven years are ended, the loan is dissolved. Financially, the developer then has additional equity from this transaction. The developer was able to use his money to fund the project, but the money goes back to the developer after the seven year compliance period. The investor who bought the NMTC receives a 39% income tax credit over the seven year compliance period.

Mr. Goodson added that CDEs like the RDA are able to receive the credits from the federal government. The RDA determines the best projects to receive the NMTCs. They sell the credits to the investor and loan the money from that sale to the projects.

Mr. Goodson said the graphic he distributed outlines an example of a $10 million project. He asked the Board to look at the graphic with the CDE illustrated. Generally, the amount of tax credit allocation awarded to a project is equal to the total development cost. Once the CDE commits to a project and finds an investor, the investor purchases the credits and receives 39% or $3.9 million of that amount back over seven years. Because the tax credit is realized over seven years and not all at once, there is a discount that the investor pays. There is some liability that the project has to keep going for seven years, or they could lose the tax credit.

Mr. Goodson said that in the example of a $10 million project, the investor is paying $2.5 million for the $3.9 million tax credit. The tax credit income fund is called the leverage fund. The other $7.5 million for the $10 million project comes from the entity constructing the project. It is money that is already on hand through budgeting, grants or saving. So the NMTC allows a project to begin without having the total amount to complete the project in hand. The leverage fund is a private fund created by the tax credit investor and is 99.99% owned by them. This is important because they must invest their funds in a private entity in order to generate the tax credit.

Mr. Goodson then explained that the money from the leverage fund is given to the CDE who has the tax credits. The CDE then sends the NMTC to the investor. The CDE then loans the money called the Qualified Low Income Community Investment (QLICI) to the project developer which is called a Qualified Active Low Income Community Business (QALICB). The money is given to the project in the form of two loans. One loan ($7.5 million) is from the leverage loan which is the senior loan at a market interest rate or below set by a commercial lender, or in the case of the Library, lending the money back to itself. The other loan is the New Market equity loan ($2.5 million) loaned to the project at a nominal interest rate. The IRS requires that it looks like a true debt.

At the end of seven years the money the Library lent to itself is forgiven. The $2.5 million that came from the New Market Tax Credits, on which the Library paid a nominal interest rate on the interest, is forgiven. Mr. Goodson said that amount comes back to the project as equity. He summarized saying that in a $10 million project, the Library is able to source $2.5 million that is needed for a $10 million project. At the end of the project the Library gets back the $2.5 million because one does not have to repay the tax credit investor.
Mr. Goodson said he tried to make it easy to understand, but it is a complicated structure. The most important concept to remember is that it is a way to get gap financing for projects. Generally it provides about 20% of the cost of the project. He said there are some fees involved because it is like a bond transaction. The net benefit is significant especially for non-profit and government entities such as the Library because there is no tax consequence after seven years. He added that it has been used across the country to fund projects that don’t have all of the money for the project, or to provide additional funding to go a step further. Mr. Goodson said that if the Board wishes to use this option the RDA is ready to assist in any way they can. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Bardwell said he is skeptical of the program. He asked what the interest rate would be on the $2.5 million during the seven years. Mr. Goodson replied that it is set by the CDE by virtue of an agreement with the U.S. Treasury. It must be below market. He added that what they consider below market, and what they charge as an interest rate is below 1%.

Mr. Bardwell said that in the example, the Library would write a check for $7.5 million to the RDA. Mr. Goodson replied that is one way to look at it, but the Library is actually lending itself the money. But Mr. Bardwell said the RDA would control the $7.5 million and the $2.5 million. He asked how the RDA pays out the money. Mr. Goodson said there is a closing. The money is funded up front like any loan. Mr. Bardwell asked when the Library would get back the $7.5 million to which Mr. Goodson replied at the closing. So Mr. Bardwell said the Library pays the $7.5 million to the RDA which almost immediately gives that money back to the Library. He said he did not understand how this process could work. He asked how this process draws the $2.5 million from the investor. Mr. Goodson replied that the CDE provides the $10 million through the allocation of the NMTC. But Mr. Bardwell said that $7.5 million is the Library’s to start with. So he wondered why the Library must give that money to the CDE in the first place. Mr. Goodson said if the project doesn’t have the total amount needed, this is a low cost way to get the additional money and start the project immediately. Mr. Bardwell then said that the project lends the money symbolically to the CDE in order to for the CDE to merge it with the investor’s money which produces the total amount of money needed for the project. Mr. Goodson agreed saying that the $10 million must flow through the investment fund in order to generate the tax credit for the investor.

Mr. Woodard then said he could look at this a little differently. He said the Library does not have a cash flow problem today. We have money on hand to finance our project. So the $10 million project would cost us $10 million plus a little lost interest on the $10 million. Using the NMTC, Mr. Woodard asked how much it would cost the Library to fund a $10 million project. Mr. Goodson replied the total cost would be very close to $10 million, but the cost to the Library would only be about $7.5 million. Mr. Woodard then asked if after debt service, the Library could construct a $10 million building with an investment of $7.5 million. Mr. Bardwell said that it would be plus the interest paid on the $2.5 million. Mr. Goodson noted that the interest charged by RDA is well below 1%.

Mr. Woodard then asked if the Library had a project to consider for NMTC, could the RDA provide them with a detailed accounting of the fees and cash transactions so that they would
know exactly what the bottom line cost would be for the project. Mr. Goodson replied that this is required for every project and is provided by a certified accounting firm. There are just a few in the country who do this with actual certified projections to facilitate the transaction. Mr. Woodard said he is not as educated as Mr. Bardwell on this concept. But if the City-Parish Government and Finance Department were provided with information by RDA to satisfactorily show how the Library can construct a $10 million project for $7.5-$8 million, someone would then need to show him the down side to convince him not to pursue this avenue. Mr. Goodson said this is exactly how the NMTC works, but the Library Board’s reaction is not uncommon.

Ms. Freeman then said that they needed a presentation that was more visual in order to understand the concepts presented. Ms. Freeman asked if this is used for education purposes or is this for a specific project. Mr. Watts pointed out he had mentioned the possibility of using this vehicle at a prior Board meeting in July or August. He added that they would like to use this method for the qualifying project at the River Center Branch Library. It would provide the Library with extra money to upgrade all the technology for the project. With the present budget we could not buy all the technology that has been envisioned. It would also save money across the System helping conserve the Capital Outlay budget. This would then enable the Library to upgrade, for example, patron computers at some of the branches such as Delmont Gardens.

Ms. Freeman said she had two suggestions. She said they should open the possibility of using NMTC from other CDEs and that Mr. Goodson should come back to the Board with a realistic presentation based on what they are looking for. She also said that they need to open up the discussion for public comment.

Mr. Watts said he wanted to add that the City Administration is encouraging the Library to use NMTC. They feel the River Center Branch project would be a good fit for this type of funding.

Ms. Freeman said that she thought the presentation was just informational. She added that the Library Board recommends to the Metropolitan Council, so she is asking for a realistic presentation.

Mr. Watts said this presentation was informational so that the Board would have a general explanation of the New Market Tax Credits program. He added that nobody can present a specific outline for NMTC until the Library provides a proposal on what they will use the money for. Mr. Watts said he appreciated Mr. Goodson providing an explanation today. He added that the program is set up very specifically and refers back to the tax code. He understood it when it was explained to him, but he has difficulty explaining it to others as it is very complex.

Mr. Bardwell asked how the River Center Branch Library would qualify as a low income district. Mr. Goodson said the property applying for NMTC must be in a low income census tract. Mr. Bardwell asked for the boundaries of the zone for this particular Library building project. Mr. Goodson said it didn’t know the boundaries off hand, but they go by the U.S. Census data to determine whether a property qualifies. Mr. Bardwell then said many of the downtown establishments are businesses that would not be considered low income. He added that eventually it will need to be proven that the River Center Branch Library is in a low-income area.
Mr. Woodard noted that this is something governed by the program and not a decision by the RDA.

Mr. Woodard then asked Mr. Goodson what the down sides were in terms of cost or control to the Library pursuing these tax credits. Mr. Goodson said the transactions are somewhat expensive. There are attorneys involved for all parties. He said the average cost of the transactions to close which they have seen, is around $250,000. Depending on who the CDE is, they may have fees that are rated in a variety of ways. Mr. Woodard asked if there was any other CDE beside the RDA who could offer this program to the Library. Mr. Goodson said any CDE who lists East Baton Rouge Parish in its service area could provide credits. Those are the only costs incurred. Mr. Goodson said there is very little in the way of a downside. The risk is to the investor and not the project. If the project would collapse during the seven years, it would mean for example, that the Library was not doing well. The investor would lose the $2.5 million. The Library would not be considered as defaulting on a loan.

Mr. Woodard asked if any of the other Board members had questions for Mr. Goodson. There were none. Mr. Woodard thanked Mr. Goodson and asked him to remain at the meeting until the Director’s reports were completed and possible public comments would be made.

Mr. Watts asked Ms. Husband to present the maintenance report. She said that the Library Facilities Maintenance staff completed lighting preventive maintenance at the Bluebonnet Regional, Delmont Gardens, Jones Creek Regional, Scotlandville, and Zachary Branch Libraries. At the Baker Branch Library they replaced the air conditioning controller for air handler number 2, and also replaced the motor starter on fan coil number 1. The staff completed preventive maintenance on the cooling tower at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library.

Ms. Husband also noted that at the Carver Branch Library, the gutters were cleaned and preventive maintenance was performed on the air handlers. At the Central Branch and the Zachary Branch Libraries the boilers were repaired. Ms. Husband also explained that the boiler and the fence were repaired at the Eden Park Branch Library. At the Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch Library the Facilities staff repaired the electrical feeds to air handler numbers 3 and 4.

Ms. Husband said that the Pride Branch Library is ready for the Community History Day. The staff completed chiller preventive maintenance, and repaired an electrical circuit. They also connected an outlet in the courtyard that had not been connected previously.

Ms. Husband concluded her remarks by saying that the staff is working with the contractor on warranty issues.

Mr. Woodard asked if there were any public comments on the Director’s reports. There being no comments, Mr. Woodard proceeded to Old Business.
Old Business

A. Discussion and Decision Regarding Alternate Sites for the South Branch Library and Course of Action regarding the Site in the Rouzan Development

Mr. Woodard read Item A and asked Mr. Watts to begin the discussion. Mr. Watts noted that unfortunately Mr. Leo D’Aubin of the Parish Attorney’s Office could not be present for this meeting because he was in court today.

Mr. Watts told the Board that the staff at Pennington informed them that they would not be able to offer their site to the Library. The Pennington staff consulted with LSU and was told that Pennington needed to retain all of its land for future development.

Mr. Watts then said that the Board will need to look at other options. He said they had reviewed the list of sites that the staff provided in August and September, but they could revisit some of those. Mr. Watts said they could consider building a branch in a different way than they have in the past. He noted that possibly they could purchase a smaller piece of property and build a facility of more than one story. This type of construction would have some challenges with buffer zones, parking and storm water management. There would be additional challenges such as the need for elevators, and a different way of staffing.

Mr. Watts noted that another option would be to hire a realtor to look for land. He said he has spoken to several about this option. One in particular offers this service and would use a process similar to what the Library staff had done. This might be a good avenue to pursue since the realtor has access to additional databases and contacts. A realtor could also look at land that is not actively being marketed. Mr. Watts said these realtors would search for property on a fee basis which could run as high as $5,000. Under City-Parish regulations the only way they could hire a realtor is on a fee basis.

He added they could also expand the parameters of their search; not looking further east than they have already at Kenilworth, but looking further west. Mr. Watts noted that when they first began searching, there were some properties near College Drive and Perkins Road. They did not appear to be strong possibilities after he visited them in traffic. He concluded his comments saying these are the options the staff has considered. Mr. Watts asked the Board for their direction on the next course of action.

Mr. Boyles said the Library staff has a sizable amount of work with the Main Library, the River Center Branch and the day-to-day running of the Library. He wondered if the Board should hire a team that would have a local real estate background and also library knowledge to look for sites. This team could look at the demographics and the population growth. Mr. Watts replied that he didn’t think they would find a realtor with library experience, and the staff would still need to interact with a team to be sure they were looking for a site that would meet the Library’s criteria.
Mr. Watts added that if there are any properties that they have already discussed and wish to reconsider, that would be the most expeditious approach. They could also hire someone to look at other sites.

Mr. Bardwell said there is at least one firm, and maybe there is more than one, who specializes in site selection. He noted they are not realtors. But this could be a first step. This firm might even assist them on a volunteer basis. Mr. Bardwell agreed that the Library staff is overloaded. This firm does collect demographic information and trends much of which is digitized. He said he’d be glad to talk to this firm to see if they would donate their services or charge a fee. Mr. Bardwell asked Mr. Watts for his opinion on hiring a site selection specialist. Mr. Watts said they could pursue several approaches at the same time.

Ms. Freeman then said she talked about another model to provide service since space, property availability and flooding concerns seem to be issues. Mr. Watts said they had previously discussed not having a 15,000 square foot building like the Fairwood Branch Library. They could offer services through a couple of different facilities. He noted it might be possible to have a 5,000 square foot building with a core collection. But services or programs for children or adults would need to be provided elsewhere. Mr. Watts added that this approach works best in a developing community where it is understood that in the future a larger facility will replace the two smaller ones. He said it is harder to do this in an established community because the patrons feel they are not getting the full package of services like other areas.

Mr. Woodard asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Jacob said he felt that area of town is going to want a full service library. He added that this is a heavily populated area and they deserve a facility similar to Bluebonnet.

Mr. Woodard said he is going to share several thoughts about some things that are occurring externally outside the Library that the Board needs to be aware of that could affect how they serve this area. He pointed out the desire of some citizens in the southern part of the parish to form their own municipality of the City of St. George. It is unknown if this will occur, and if it were to happen, what impact it would have on some of the branches in the Library system.

Mr. Woodard then mentioned that during the last Library tax renewal election, the Library Board made a commitment to the citizens of south Baton Rouge to build a new branch library. He said the Board should fulfill that commitment and not take shortcuts. He agreed that they need to look at innovative service and delivery models. Mr. Woodard added that eight years later is not the time to slow down and regroup. He also said he appreciated the work load that the Library staff has, but this is a priority. He said they need to find an expedient and fiscally responsible way to move forward and build a branch in south Baton Rouge.

Mr. Woodard noted that the staff did a very thorough search for properties. He doesn’t believe there is any other property they can consider. There is a scarcity of sites on which to build a branch library. Mr. Woodard added that one of the sites that is attractive except for the price and the owner of that land, is still available. That site is on the east side of the Rouzan development, and fronts Perkins Road. It would be sold as an out parcel.
Mr. Woodard then said he would suggest that the Board ask the Library staff to make an offer in spite of the price and the owner. He noted that this would indicate they at least made an effort. He said they all had agreed that Perkins Road was a desirable location.

He added that if the offer is not accepted then he would agree with Mr. Watts that they should consider a multi-story building on another site. He said they would need to be aware that a multi-story structure will be more expensive to build, and that there would also be development and site issues. Mr. Woodard noted that there are several multi-story buildings in the Perkins Road area, so he did not think there would be a problem in the community. He felt they could not take their time and study it for months to come up with a perfect solution. They must move forward.

Ms. Freeman then said that when she spoke with Mr. Watts about a different model, they had discussed a storefront. She didn’t know that a multi-story building was under consideration. She said there were several models mentioned at the ALA conferences she attended. Ms. Freeman thought these would be the ones under discussion.

Ms. Freeman asked if the property on Perkins that Mr. Woodard would like them to consider is owned by Mr. Spinosa to which Mr. Woodard said yes. She also asked for the price of the property to which Mr. Woodard replied about $2.5 million.

Mr. Bardwell said he agreed with Mr. Woodard. He added that the Spinosa site was their unspoken second choice, but not at the asking price. He also said if they could get an idea of the value of the Spinosa property, this would be helpful in making an offer. He asked if DPW could conduct some due diligence to ensure the site is usable for the Library’s purposes. Mr. Bardwell noted getting this information would not cost anything and would at least be an effort to come to a decision on this site. He also said if they could purchase the property at a reasonable price that would solve their problem of finding a site.

Mr. Jacob asked what the size of the lot in question was. Mr. Watts replied 3.17 acres.

Mr. Boyles said the site has not been well vetted. He added that each of the Board members has his/her priorities. Some are concerned with traffic near the sites; others have concerns about proximity to neighborhoods, so he felt it will be very difficult to get to a true consensus of what will be the best site. Mr. Boyles said he has several issues and questions about this site such as whether it would meet the needs of the patrons in the south neighborhoods. He said he could not support making an offer on this property. Mr. Boyles noted for him moving quickly should not take precedence over choosing the best site. He added that this branch library will be there for a long time, so they should be sure the site they choose is going to be the right site. He said this neighborhood has been very patient waiting for a branch to be built, so he felt they should take a little more time to make a choice. Mr. Boyles felt that in the long run that would be best.

Mr. Bardwell then said they were in a difficult situation. However, he made a motion that the Board ask the Library staff to seek an informal evaluation by a realtor of the value of the site east of the Rouzan development in order for an offer to be made, and an evaluation of the site for its suitability for a branch library. Mr. Woodard seconded the motion. Mr. Woodard asked if there
was any further discussion by the members of the Board. The motion passed with Mr. Boyles voting against the motion; Ms. Freeman abstaining; and Mr. Bardwell, Mr. Jacob and Mr. Woodard voting for the motion.

Ms. Freeman asked when the staff would report back to the Board with this information. Mr. Woodard replied he hoped this information could be given to the Board prior to the next Board meeting. Mr. Watts said they would do their best. He said DPW might have other projects that would take precedence over this request. Mr. Watts added that they will look for an individual who can give an informal appraisal of the property in order to determine an appropriate price to offer the seller.

Mr. Woodard asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Kathy Wascom, a member of the public, said she wanted to comment about this item and the next one on the agenda regarding the Rouzan site. She said several meetings ago when Mr. D’Aubin and Mr. Spinosa attended a Board meeting they said that the agreement was ready to be signed. But that was not done because the Board needed to review and accept it. Ms. Wascom wondered why this agreement was dropped. She noted they were getting free land and design work for the Rouzan site. She added that she would like an explanation of why the Board does not want a branch library in the Rouzan development. She also said that it is serious when a neighborhood loses a library because a library is a valuable asset. Ms. Wascom wondered if there were problems about this agreement from City-Parish, or from the Rouzan developer. She said the public would like an explanation of why the site at Rouzan is no longer acceptable.

There being no other comments, Mr. Woodard moved on to Item B.

B. Vote to Recommend to City-Parish That They Take All Steps to Terminate and Abandon the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement With 2590 Associates for the Site at the Rouzan Development—Mr. Travis Woodard

Mr. Woodard read Item B, and said he made a motion on this item which was tabled at the September Board meeting. He wished to continue the discussion at this meeting. Mr. Woodard added that Ms. Wascom brought up a good point. Maybe he wasn’t clear as to some of the reasoning behind the motion. He said that since he joined the Board in the spring of 2012 the Library Board has worked with 2590 Associates on a variety of scenarios to get a guarantee that the Library would have the site they need for a branch library in the Rouzan development. Mr. Woodard noted those efforts started long before he was appointed to the Board. He added that if they need to spend that much time and effort before they even begin to build the facility how can they have any confidence that they will be able to construct the building in a way that does not put the City-Parish and Library at risk. The risks would be due to a lack of the necessary infrastructure, off sight traffic controls, and construction within the development after the library is opened. None of these issues would be under the Library’s control. It would cost the Library more to operate the system with a developer who recently has had a very bad track record. Mr. Woodard said all of these reasons would lead a rational person to conclude that far too much time and effort has been expended on this project. He noted that the project has consumed the time of several people for far too long. Mr. Woodard said in his opinion he does not think it is
the right site for the branch library, and it is not fair to the developer to hold on to that land if the Board does not intend to build there.

Mr. Woodard added at the last Board meeting Mr. Spinosa attended, he spoke about the deadlines he was going to meet. It has been a while since they have seen activity on the site. There is a new office on the property, but in terms of infrastructure, it’s been months since there has been any work done. He said in spite of the seeming attractiveness of the site, why should the residents be held hostage with the on-going negotiations between the Library and the developer. Mr. Woodard said he believes they can find a site, purchase it, build a branch and serve the residents of south Baton Rouge keeping the commitment the Board made to the citizens. He concluded by saying he wished to terminate the agreement and move on.

Mr. Woodard asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Bardwell said they need to take the motion off the table and put it on the floor. Mr. Bardwell made the motion to put it on the floor and Ms. Freeman seconded the motion. Mr. Woodard then stated the motion listed in agenda Item B. Mr. Bardwell seconded the motion.

He asked for any other discussion from the Board. Mr. Boyles said he concurred with almost all of Mr. Woodard’s comments. He noted the history of the project and that there is no indication that the developer is moving forward. He said he has a concern with terminating the CEA when they do not have an immediate second plan of action. Mr. Boyles added he did not think it was wrong to leave the CEA in place so that they could make one more effort to finalize the agreement. He did feel they should say that they would only allow another 30 days for a resolution and then move on if there is an impasse. Mr. Boyles said he has been frustrated lately with the lack of momentum and constructive discussion to resolve the issues in the CEA.

Ms. Freeman agreed with Mr. Boyles. She said they should not cancel the CEA without other options. She felt they should find someone to assist in satisfactorily completing the agreement before voting to terminate the CEA. Ms. Freeman noted that she has been on the Board for a long time. They have never attempted to build a facility like the one proposed in Rouzan. The project has caused many issues. She added that because of this CEA, some of the public have told her that the Board does not know how to build libraries. Ms. Freeman said in reality they have built several. So she would like one more effort made to resolve the issues.

Mr. Bardwell replied that he and Mr. D’Aubin have worked on the CEA intensely since February along with senior staff at DPW. They contributed ideas on how to make the details regarding the infrastructure work to protect the Library. Mr. Bardwell noted that is not the real problem however. The problem is enforcing the schedule in the CEA. The only way to enforce it is with high monetary penalties. He said that is not in the document, and he does not believe that it ever will be. That has been the problem from the beginning of the project. Mr. Bardwell said he’s tried to be faithful to the project. They have worked on this for six years because it seemed to be a good idea in the beginning. He said he was against it initially because of potential issues. The Library Board at that time voted to proceed with Rouzan. Mr. Bardwell added that he has personally reached his limit. He agreed with Mr. Woodard saying he also does not see the site as desirable. He has concerns over the next three years if the development begins to construct commercial buildings around the branch library. It will be very tedious and difficult to manage.
Mr. Bardwell also mentioned that once they are in the facility, the only area they would control is the footprint of the building. He said five years ago they were reviewing homeowner association and by-law regulations. The Library would be right in the middle of all of that.

Mr. Bardwell said he felt they needed to build a branch where they have control of the infrastructure and parking, where they own the land independently, and where access to the branch is from a main road. He also said he believes that until the Board totally severs ties with Rouzan, they will not move forward with a Plan B. They need to be rid of the safety net of having Rouzan. Mr. Bardwell said he will support the motion. They will need to have an item on the Metropolitan Council agenda stating that the Library Board wishes to abandon the Rouzan site. The site would revert back to the developer.

Ms. Freeman commented that the Board is talking about purchasing property from Mr. Spinosa while giving back to him a site which was free. She asked what will the public think. She asked what they are thinking from a public relations standpoint. Mr. Bardwell replied that he is not suggesting they buy the out parcel site of Rouzan at the asking price. He is saying that they research to see if there is a reasonable offer that can be made which will be acceptable to all. He did not think Mr. Spinosa would be agreeable to the Library’s offer. But they need to make the offer to satisfy the public and some government officials that they have done everything to somehow build at Rouzan.

Mr. Woodard addressed Ms. Freeman’s question by stating that the Rouzan site is far from a free or donated site. He said the two alternatives are mutually exclusive. He noted that regardless of whether they buy another site, they need to decide if this site meets their needs. If it does they need to pursue it, if it doesn’t they need to abandon it. Mr. Woodard said if they abandon the site, they need to find another regardless of who owns it. He added in most cases the Library purchases the land from the property owner. He also said they like to put libraries in high traffic roads in visible parts of town which is going to be expensive real estate. Mr. Woodard said in a city the size of Baton Rouge you are going to run across the same individuals in the real estate business. He said he knows that some members of the public will think that the Board is doing Mr. Spinosa a favor by abandoning Rouzan and buying another piece of land owned by him. But those that will listen to the Library Board to understand what has been going on will realize that the Board needed to take this action. Ms. Freeman said she has been in agreement with abandoning Rouzan, but not until they have another site.

Mr. Woodard then asked for comments from the public. Ms. Kathy Wascom said she does not know what land will be available. She said they found the Kenilworth site which would have been good for Kenilworth residents. She said she would like to see the actual agreement and in order to get it she would file a freedom of information request if necessary. Ms. Wascom said she doesn’t know what is wrong with the agreement. She thought that as they proceeded more concessions were being made by the developer. She said Mr. Bardwell felt they needed financial penalties in the agreement. Ms. Wascom said it would be better to state exactly what is missing in the agreement. There are so few options available and they have waited for a long time.
Ms. Gayle Smith, a member of the public, said many of the residents agree with Mr. Woodard. They have waited for six years on the Spinosa project. They need to cut their losses and move on.

There being no other comments, the question was called. Mr. Woodard asked for a vote. The motion passed with Mr. Bardwell, Mr. Jacob and Mr. Woodard voting in favor; Mr. Boyles voting against and Ms. Freemen abstaining. Mr. Woodard said the motion carried.

Ms. Freeman asked when the request to abandon the Rouzan site would appear on the Metropolitan Council agenda. Mr. Woodard replied that would be up to the Council and the Council Administrator. He added he didn’t know if the Council has to take action. But he will write a letter on behalf of the Board with their recommendation to the Council and the Mayor. Mr. Woodard said when this item is placed on the Council agenda, he will notify the Board.

C. Review and Acceptance of Agreement with Baton Rouge Metropolitan Airport for Wind Shear Monitoring Device to be Located at the Scotlandville Branch Library Site – Mr. Spencer Watts

Mr. Woodard read Item C and stated that it would be deferred. Mr. Watts informed the Board that a draft agreement has been reached as of last Friday, but a copy was not forwarded to the Library. He added that they were told that the Board would need the agreement earlier than Friday so that they could review it before the meeting in order to proceed. The Board members agreed.

New Business

A. To Vote to Proceed with Purchase of Building at 8560 Florida Boulevard at No More than the Appraised Value of $1 Million for Use by Library Outreach Services, for Use as a Used Book Sale Center and a Library Staff Training Room – Mr. Spencer Watts

Mr. Woodard read Item A and asked Mr. Watts to discuss the request to purchase the building at 8560 Florida Boulevard. Mr. Watts said in 2012 the Library Board approved $2.5 million for the purchase of a building to be used by Outreach Services, for the Recycled Reads collection and sale and as a staff training room. This request was placed in the 2013 budget request for the Library which the Metropolitan Council approved. Mr. Watts noted that he and the staff looked at many sites over this year. This one on Florida Boulevard has a good lot size, an area for the Outreach vehicles, work space, room for Recycled Reads and for a staff training space. He added that they would like to use about 10,000 square feet of space as a warehouse space for books held in reserve.

He mentioned that the facility will need some improvement which they estimate will cost between $400,000 and $500,000. They will need to install air conditioning in the rear of the building. Mr. Tim Bankston, Library Facilities Manager and DPW will inspect the facility prior
to the purchase. Mr. Alfred “Rip” Manint of the Parish Attorney’s Office is drafting the purchase agreement. Mr. Watts said the Board received an appraisal of the property in their packets.

Mr. Bardwell asked where the Outreach vehicles would be stored to which Mr. Watts replied some would be parked inside the building and others would be kept under cover. The vehicles will not be placed in the air conditioned portion of the building. Mr. Bardwell asked about when the lease on the current building used for Recycled Reads ends, to which Ms. Stein replied they are leasing on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. Boyles commented that this building was a store and will create a retail look. Mr. Watts agreed noting this is attractive for the Recycled Reads program. Mr. Boyles then made a motion to purchase the building at 8560 Florida Boulevard at no more than the appraised value of $1 million for use by Library Outreach Services, for use as a used book sale center and a Library staff training room. Mr. Bardwell seconded the motion which passed unanimously. There were no public comments.

Comments by the Library Board of Control

Mr. Woodard said that Mr. Watts has asked to make a request regarding hours of operation at Thanksgiving. Mr. Watts said he would like to close the Library at 6:00 p.m. on the day before Thanksgiving Day. He said they have looked at statistics for several years on the day before the holiday. After 6:00 p.m. the number of staff working out-numbers the patrons in the building. Mr. Watts said closing at 6:00 p.m. should not have an adverse effect on many patrons or staff. Staff who would work that evening will adjust their work schedules appropriately. There were no comments from the Board. They were in agreement with Mr. Watts on closing at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 27th.

So with no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m. on a motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Mr. Boyles.
DATE: October 12, 2013

TO: Library Board of Control

FROM: Spencer Watts
Library Director

SUBJECT: Construction Report

Goodwood Main Library

Steve Jackson, architect with Cockfield Jackson Architects reported the following on October 8, 2013 for The Library Design Collaborative on the Goodwood Main Library.

CONSTRUCTION REPORT
DATE: October 8, 2013

PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library
REPORTED BY: Stephen P. Jackson, The Library Design Collaborative

OBSERVATIONS:
1) The Monthly Owner’s Meeting was held on September 26, 2013.
2) Driveway shafts have been poured in the plaza.
3) Masonry work continues in the Service Yard.
4) Zinc panel installation continues.
5) Sun screens/ Louvers are being installed.
6) The green roofs continue to be installed.
7) Reflecting Pool #6 is being formed for the concrete pour.
8) South and west CMU walls in the Service Yard are complete. Veneer masonry continues to be installed.
9) North green roof installation has begun.
10) Lights have been installed on the north green roof.
11) South green roof growth media is complete and limestone is being installed.
12) Toilet accessories are being installed.
13) TV mounts are being installed on the walls.
14) The fur downs in Genealogy appear to be tampered.
15) Fire alarm devices are being installed.
16) Wood paneling continues to be installed in the Meeting Room.
17) Storefront frames and glazing continue to be installed.
18) Bulk glazed walls are being installed.
19) The stairs in the ceiling of Children’s are complete.
20) Doors are being hung.
21) Door hardware is being installed.
22) Frames are being installed on the second floor.
23) Ceilings are being installed on all three floors.
   1) Painting is continuing in all areas.
   2) Millwork continues to be installed.
   3) Light fixtures continue to be installed.

UPCOMING WORK:
1) The Service Yard concrete drive should be poured next week.
2) The loading dock roof should be installed next week.
3) Furniture installation shall begin on October 24th.
Looking toward the presentation area of the Meeting Room.
Looking east on the south vegetated roof.
Looking west in the two-story reading room.
Looking west toward the Computer Lab on the Second Floor..
FIELD REPORT

DATE: September 19, 2013
PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library
WEATHER CONDITIONS: Partly Cloudy - 87°
SITE CONDITIONS: Dry
WORKERS: +/- 115
REPORTED BY: Benjamin R. Bradford, The Library Design Collaborative
IN ATTENDANCE: Benjamin R. Bradford

OBSERVATIONS:

1) South CMU wall in the Service Yard is complete. Brick and white CMU being laid.
2) The south green roof installation continues.
3) White concrete grade beam at the stage outside of the Meeting Room has been poured.
4) Zinc work continues at the Meeting Room.
5) Sun screens / Louvers are being installed.
6) Rubber floors are installed on the first floor.
7) Carpet is being installed.
8) Doors are being hung.
9) Children's 'stars' are being installed.
10) VESDA detectors are being installed.
11) Genealogy furr down installation has begun
12) Storefront frames and glazing continue to be installed.
13) Painting and patch work continues on all three floors.
14) Toilet accessories are being installed.
15) Millwork and countertops are being installed.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:

1) North green roof installation should begin next week.
2) Plaza drilled shaft will begin next week.

ATTACHMENTS:

1) Three (3) pages of photographs from the site visit.

This report is not an exact record of discussions held, but a general understanding of topics discussed from the notes taken by the author. If there is an error, omission, or correction required, please contact the Architect in writing within three days of receipt of this report.
FIELD REPORT
DATE: September 26, 2013
PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library
WEATHER CONDITIONS: Clear - 86°
SITE CONDITIONS: Dry
WORKERS: +/- 135
REPORTED BY: Benjamin R. Bradford, The Library Design Collaborative

IN ATTENDANCE: Benjamin R. Bradford

OBSERVATIONS:
1) Reflecting Pool #01 is being formed for the concrete pour.
2) South and west CMU walls in the Service Yard are complete. Veneer masonry continues to be installed.
3) North green roof installation has begun.
4) Lights have been installed on the north green roof.
5) South green roof growth media is complete and limestone is being installed.
6) Wood paneling has begun in the Meeting Room.
7) Toilet accessories are being installed.
8) TV mounts are being installed on the walls.
9) Monumental stair and sprinkler pipes are being painted.
10) Carpet continues to be installed.
11) The fur downs in Genealogy appear to framed.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:
1) The green terrace (roof) plants should be installed in the next couple weeks.
2) The loading dock roof should be installed next week.
3) The drilled shafts for the Plaza seat walls should begin next week.

ATTACHMENTS:
1) Two (2) pages of photographs from the site visit.

This report is not an exact record of discussions held, but a general understanding of topics discussed from the notes taken by the author. If there is an error, omission, or correction required, please contact the Architect in writing within three days of receipt of this report.
FIELD REPORT

DATE: October 3, 2013

PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library

WEATHER CONDITIONS: Partly Cloudy - 67°

SITE CONDITIONS: Dry

WORKERS: +/- 130

REPORTED BY: Benjamin R. Bradford, The Library Design Collaborative

IN ATTENDANCE: Benjamin R. Bradford

OBSERVATIONS:

1) Drilled shafts have been poured in the plaza.
2) Masonry work continues in the Service Yard.
3) Zinc panel installation continues.
4) The green roofs continue to be installed.
5) Fire alarm devices are being installed.
6) Wood paneling continues to be installed at the Meeting Room.
7) Butt-glazed walls are being installed.
8) The stars in the ceiling of Children's are complete.
9) Doors are being hung.
10) Door hardware is being installed.
11) Floors are being installed on the second floor.
12) Ceilings are being installed on all three floors.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:

1) The Service Yard concrete slab should be poured next week.
2) Furniture installation shall begin on October 21st.

ATTACHMENTS:

1) Two (2) pages of photographs from the site visit.

This report is not an exact record of discussions held, but a general understanding of topics discussed from the notes taken by the author. If there is an error, omission, or correction required, please contact the Architect in writing within three days of receipt of this report.