

REVISED AGENDA
FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL
MAIN LIBRARY

FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

**7711 GOODWOOD BOULEVARD
BATON ROUGE, LA 70806**

MAY 15, 2014

4:00 P.M.

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 17, 2014 AND THE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION OF MAY 3, 2014
- III. REPORTS BY THE DIRECTOR
 - A. FINANCIAL REPORT
 - B. SYSTEM REPORTS
- IV. OTHER REPORTS
 - A. MAIN LIBRARY AT GOODWOOD
 - B. RIVER CENTER BRANCH LIBRARY
 - C. MAINTENANCE REPORT
- V. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. PRESENTATION OF AND DISCUSSION ON SITE SELECTION REPORT BY LEOTTA-EVERS CONSULTING, LLC. (LEO, LLC) FOR A LOCATION FOR A SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY – MR. SPENCER WATTS, MR. VICTOR LEOTTA AND MR. JOHN EVERS
 - B. TO DISCUSS AND VOTE ON THE POLICY FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE LIBRARY DIRECTOR – MR. JASON JACOB
- 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

May 15, 2014

The regular meeting of the East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control was held in the first floor Conference Room of the Main Library at Goodwood at 7711 Goodwood Boulevard on Thursday, May 15, 2014. Ms. Tanya Freeman, President of the Board called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Mr. Jason Jacob, Mr. Logan Leger, Ms. Kizzy Payton and Mr. Travis Woodard. Incoming Board Member Terrie Lundy was also present, though not in an official capacity. Mr. Leo D'Aubin of the Office of the Parish Attorney was present. 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; Kelli Bonin, Library Network Technician I; and Ms. Sonya Gordon, Library Public Relations Coordinator. Sergeant Patricia Carr of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office; Ms. Rebekah Allen, reporter with *The Advocate*; Mr. Quincy Hodges, *NOLA.com*; Mr. Frank Hillyard, videographer for Metro 21; and 3 persons from the community were also present.

Ms. Freeman asked Ms. Stein to take the roll which she did. Ms. Freeman then asked for the approval of the minutes of the regular Board meeting of April 17, 2014. Ms. Payton made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Woodard and approved unanimously. Ms. Freeman then asked for the approval of the minutes of the special Board meeting of May 3, 2014. Mr. Woodard made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Payton and approved unanimously.

III. Reports by the Director

A. Financial Reports

Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Watts to present the reports. Ms. Pinsonat made the financial report. Ms. Pinsonat said that the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances through April 30, 2014 show operating expenditures of \$10,353,878.17 or 24.14% of the operating budget. Through April, we should have spent no more than 33% of the budget.

Cash collections from Property Taxes for 2014 remain positive, as we are approximately \$1,400,000 and 3.87% ahead of the same five months in 2013.

B. System Reports

Mr. Watts asked Ms. Stein and Ms. Husband to present their reports. Ms. Stein gave the PowerPoint presentation *Around the Parish in 90 seconds* which included the months of April and May, 2014. Some of the highlights include:

- Day of Sharing with LSU class
The Library staff partnered with journalism students in LSU's C-CELL program this spring; at their final event they collected patron comments, anecdotes, and stories
- BR Room relocated
Archivist Melissa Eastin who safeguards the Library's unique collection of local history was safely and efficiently re-located to the new Main Library at Goodwood on May 3.
- Library Faces Project
In partnership with the Arts Council of Greater Baton Rouge and Digital FX, a local visual effects and production studio, library patrons became stars for a future video project
- Career Center relocated
Our Career Coach, Anne Nowak, also moved to her new office at the Main Library. We will be hiring additional staff for both collections due to their increased hours of operation.
- 3D Printing for the Public
The staff has not only begun 3D Printing demonstrations but also have started printing on demand. Detailed instructions are available at the *Makerspace Infoguide*.
- School Year Ends
Teen Librarians finished out the school year with a bang. Children's and Outreach staff also visited area schools to invite them to the Library for the summer.
- *Treehouse* Web Development Training
The new *Treehouse* video tutorial resource, which teaches such in-demand technology topics as web design, web development, coding, apps, and more, has gone online.
- Summer Reading begins soon
Children, teens, and adults are invited to sign up for Summer Reading programs. *The Source* will go to 32 pages because there are so many terrific programs to attend.

Ms. Stein also informed the Board about a number of collaborative programs such as Voter Registration, Service Learning, and the Small Business Summit as well as public programs presented in conjunction with community partners including SCORE and AARP. Ms. Stein then directed the Board to their copies of the new publication *Business Resources & Market Factbook*, which features the Library on page five and six.

IV. Other Reports

A. Main Library at Goodwood

Mr. Watts presented the Construction Report for the Main Library at Goodwood.

On May 3, the Baton Rouge Room and Career Center were moved to the Main Library at Goodwood. The Genealogy collection will not move to the new building until after the first phase of the permanent parking is complete. Permanent parking is foremost on our minds. It rained heavily last week which has slowed down progress; the contractor is churning and turning the soil to dry it out for the first large scale flat pour, which is now delayed until sometime next

week. It will look deceptive; curbs, aprons, medians, and sidewalks might be finished in early-mid July if we don't have lots of rainy weather.

There is a snag with the outdoor LED Screen: The product that the lowest bidder wants to supply does not appear to meet specifications. Staff will continue to meet with Purchasing and DPW and other experts to work this out.

The latest and hopefully last punch list consists of 48 punch list categories, consisting of such items as door locks, cameras, and tiles. The tiles in the Teen Area have arrived and are scheduled for replacement on May 16 and 17. The punch list includes correcting reverse images and placement issues with the security cameras. The Plaza should be completed in June, and granite tiles should be installed in the pools very soon. Contractors are also addressing a couple of issues with roof drains.

Staff is still working on getting a 7 ton split system AC unit for the new Computer Server Room, which will when the new Blade Servers arrive. Staff is also investigating adding glass doors with access control by the staff lounge as well as adding filters in the transom; and adding an exhaust unit in the special collections laboratory due to fumes and chemicals.

B. River Center Branch Library

Mr. Watts presented the Construction Report for the River Center Branch Library.

Staff have been meeting with the architectural team as work on design development progresses. The most recent changes include:

Moving the glass façade reduced the project by 700 feet, which not only saves on costs but also makes the reference workroom more functional; so overall it tightened up the design and enhanced functionality. The canopy at the entrance has been eliminated and several changes have been made to doors and openings throughout the building. Architects have proposed a stretch fabric with metallic thread for the purlins which will provide shade; they will provide more information concerning, fading, mildew, and durability

Mr. Watts reported that staff is taking a systematic look at the finish schedules. Flooring was discussed this past week: no VCT or 1" ceramic tiles will be allowed; instead, resilient vinyl flooring will be considered. The architects have proposed polished concrete in 2 or 3 key areas including the first floor; staff are looking at examples.

Mr. Bardwell asked the status and potential use of the large outdoor LED screen, saying that he had heard that it might be eliminated. Mr. Watts explained that the screen, will not only be used to promote the Library but will also be used in tandem with the Beacon, not in competition.

Ms. Freeman asked for public comment. Mr. John Berry asked a question concerning whether there would be time for public review and suggestions for additional changes before the final design plans would be submitted to DPW in late July. Mr. Watts explained that in this process with DPW it is not traditional to make changes after a design has completed this phase. Big

wholesale changes are not going to be made at this point. DPW controls the timing and typically the focus at this stage is on the review of key structural and engineering issues, not design.

Mr. Berry commented on the process in 2013 wherein the Library accepted public comments at the Concept Design Open House held at the LASM via conversation and post-it notes and considered this input in the design. He expressed his concern that the design had been changed since that time, saying, "What we saw that night was what we were supposed to get for \$19 million." He stated that if the design has changed, it was important for the public to get another shot at this.

Mr. Watts assured Mr. Berry that there were really no substantial changes in the overall design; he added that there is nothing wrong with having the opportunity to view and comment, though it is atypical in the design process.

The Board resumed discussion.

Mr. Woodard expressed his concern that we are Value Engineering at this stage of the design process. Mr. Watts stated that he was partially to blame for that, since he constantly stressed the need to adhere to the budget to the architects. There were some functional and aesthetic reasons for changes but undeniably, it is driven by the budget. Mr. Woodard asked for an update on the staging area. Mr. Watts replied that he will push that issue at the next meeting with the architects and with DPW.

Ms. Freeman asked who was attending the meetings with the architects. Mr. Watts assured her that he was attending and had met with the architects on a regular basis. Referring to the previous discussion about the outdoor LED screen, Ms. Freeman asked for clarification as to who the other major parties were. Mr. Watts explained that the other major parties were the people responsible for scheduling and programming the Beacon, adding that they know we will not work at cross-purposes to them.

C. Maintenance Report

Ms. Husband then presented the Maintenance Report.

The facilities staff completed preventive maintenance on the air handlers at Bluebonnet, Main, Eden Park, Jones Creek, and Pride.

Lighting preventive maintenance was completed at Baker, Delmont Gardens, Eden Park and Jones Creek; they also started lighting preventive maintenance at Bluebonnet.

At Bluebonnet, Pride, and Eden Park, the staff worked on the chillers; they also performed preventive maintenance on the cooling tower at Bluebonnet.

They changed the flow switch on the chiller at Pride.

The parking lot was repaired at Scotlandville.

V. Old Business

A. Presentation of and Discussion on Site Selection Report by Leotta-Evers Consulting, LLC. (Leo, LLC) for a Location for a South Branch Library – Mr. Spencer Watts, Mr. Victor Leotta, Mr. John Evers and Mr. Chris Ventre

Mr. Watts introduced the project, explaining that the consultant had looked at a lot of data and 9,200 parcels. Mr. Victor Leotta began the PowerPoint presentation, indicating that he would speed through the methodology portion and that there were 4 natural places for the Board to ask questions: Summary, Project Methodology, Candidate Sites, and Recommendations for Further Action. Mr. Leotta reviewed the site selection criteria, which included the desire for approximately 2 acres or more, with consideration for population growth, flood risk, proximity to complementary businesses, available transportation routes and services in the area. There was a pre-determined study area; the Library had a pretty good idea of what was available but the study allowed them to confirm and quantify using a site design model.

The consultants went from 9,200 sites to 45 sites. Then, based on what the suitability model told them, 13 sites survived, to which the library added several others for consideration. Mr. Leotta directed the Board to the top 5 sites and 1 supplemental site, which were determined using the site design model to have the highest potential for development.

The challenges are significant as to flood zone and risk; properties that appear to be under aggressive development might actually have the greatest opportunities.

Mr. Leotta reminded the Board that any particular site might have been mitigated since the time of the USGS data. He discussed general site characteristics, including visibility from the road and egress, and that they looked for land that was less wet relative to other sites.

Mr. Chris Ventre then presented highlights of details from the top sites.

Site 1320570093, at the north side of the corner of Nicholson and Ben Hur consists of a 13.2 acre site, part of a PUD. It scored 7.83 according to the model, which was a high score. A cursory site visit reveals that a pretty large area of it appears to be outside the flood zone.

Mr. Leotta added that the consultants had performed a cursory site visit on each site, calling it a windshield survey. Mr. Watts agreed that this was important, since certain factors may have changed such as clearing of the site, soil preparation, mitigation.

Site 1320570095, between Burbank and Nicholson on Lee Drive and is a PUD consisting of approximately 22 acres. It appears to have had work done on it. There are five existing curb cuts, implying multiple options for egress. There is an option to co-locate with a site of this size. It scored 7.63.

Site 1610583540, at the corner of Ben Hur and Burbank, is a 2 acre site with a score of 6. It appears to have wetlands but the windshield survey indicated that it was ready for development. It is part of a PUD.

Site 1610570009, located on the northwest side of the intersection of Ben Hur and Burbank, is a long site with a good potential to be integrated into the PUD. It scored 6.76.

Note: Site 1320570083 was not discussed in detail during the PowerPoint presentation. It is, however, included in the report. It is part of a PUD located on the northwest side of Lee, below the intersection of Lee and Burbank. It consists of 6.7 acres.

Site 1320570081, a supplemental site, is a small site located on the northwest side of the intersection of Burbank and Lee. It contains a curb cut from an old access road; parking could be situated behind the library, with a right turn off of Burbank. The challenge is that it does not appear to have had site work done on it; it is a highly visible and trafficked area. It is part of a PUD and scored 7.7.

Mr. Woodard asked Mr. Leotta about the environmental screening for environmental factors such as oil pipelines, well heads, etc. Mr. Leotta explained that they used environmental filters as a screen along with aerial views.

Mr. Leger asked about the ranges in the model score. Each criteria had a weighted value which was summed. Mr. John Evers explained that the maximum was 8.5 out of 10. The highest value, taking into account the vulnerable things as well as attractive features yielded 8.5.

Mr. Leotta provided additional information about scoring to Mr. Bardwell. The full complement of the 13 sites represented in the report have merit; there is value for more in-depth exploration of any or all of them. After screening, five sites scored high.

They ran the suitability model on 9,200 lots, however the site with the highest score is not always necessarily the best site. The site selection team works within a range. Mr. Leotta referred the Board to the methodology section of the narrative, on page five. Regarding the scores of the various sites, Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Leotta to clarify why they selected the top five sites in the report instead of just looking at the scores. Mr. Leotta gave an example of a site wherein the oil and gas data was suspect and thus they did not include the oil and gas data in the suitability model but instead, added it as a screening layer afterwards. The next step would be to see if there are any oil pipelines or gas wells currently on the property.

Mr. Leotta also commented that the top sites are not so much better than the others; the model number is not the only criteria which must be considered. He also gave examples using factors of commercial site selection, a convergence of transportation such as interstates, rail, light rail, etc, is desirable, unless it is too congested. Therefore you add judgment and experience to derive value.

Mr. Woodard agreed, stating that in his experience you use GIS data to create a raw score, then apply judgment to create a final list of candidates. Ms. Lundy asked about growth potential as a criteria for the sites.

Mr. Leotta replied that this was a good segue into the demographic data review, GIS, and site plan information. Factors studied included drive time, and demographic density. In looking at the maps, a large concentration of sites fell within that area of population density. The cooler blue sites indicated higher scores. The target zone lay in the “sweet spot” of higher scores and demographic components.

Ms. Freeman commented that this validated what we have already known. She referred to the Library’s history of seeking a proper site over the past years and asked what the Library should do as regards the flood zones. Mr. Leotta referred her to the recommendations, which suggest that the Library perform preliminary desktop analysis reviews with respect to environmental, engineering, and then begin the process of real estate negotiation. He suggested that the Library seek a qualified opinion from a consulting firm specializing in engineering and environmental review (which would incorporate information from a separate desktop wetlands survey) and then jettison any sites with “fatal flaws” before seeking an in-depth engineering analysis for each remaining site. The Library would also eliminate any site which did not have a willing land owner or eliminate any site for which the market price seems to be high above appraisal.

Mr. Berry stated that given the history with the Rouzan project, he wondered if the consultants looked at the personalities involved as developers or owners of the candidate sites. Mr. Leotta explained that they would not approach any owners without giving the Board a chance to review the information first.

Mr. Berry commented that contrary to what many thought in the past, there are a lot of college students using the Main Library and Bluebonnet, so college students might be a key demographic for this branch and usage by LSU students might be substantial. Mr. Leotta agreed this demographic age group is represented in the study. Mr. Berry asked about walkers and bikers, asking if the study took these factors into account, and observed that many people may not walk to sites in this area. Mr. Ventre explained that they considered bike and pedestrian access in the judgment part of the survey, for example, the sidewalks near Ben Hur. Mr. Woodard added that the Green Light Plan will improve and enhance pedestrian access at Nicholson and Lee. There are also plans for road projects.

Mr. Watts stated that the survey findings would be made public within the week.

Mr. Jacob asked whether the flood zone designation would disqualify a site. Mr. Leotta explained that there were mitigating steps. A wetlands review of the site would show you details, such as if there is running water and whether you are downstream.

Ms. Payton asked how a consultant would be found to perform the desktop assessment process to determine if there were “Fatal Flaws” in any sites and what the costs for such a service might be. Mr. Watts stated that we would ask Mr. Leotta for his advice and work with DPW to prepare a Professional Services Agreement. Mr. Leotta stated that costs for a Desktop Wetlands Survey generally range from \$450.00 to \$650.00 per site. The Desktop Engineering Survey is more expensive, ranging from \$750.00 to \$2,000.00 per site—so perhaps estimate \$1,500 per site.

Ms. Lundy asked if it was necessary to do all five sites. Mr. Leotta responded that the Board should consider all the sites and then decide which to pursue.

Mr. Bardwell stated that all the factors and methodology was mind boggling and asked Mr. Leotta to show why 132057093 is at the top of the list, since it is the southernmost parcel and the Board may not really want to go that far south. Mr. Leotta stated that in a vacuum, the site has merit; it is inside the prescribed area of service to the community. Now it is up to the Board to determine if there are sites to eliminate. Mr. Bardwell agreed that as he sifted through the top five sites, he saw two that looked promising. Mr. Bardwell also commented that there is value in the study as a whole; it shows the trend of development going south.

Mr. Watts stated that sometimes we wish we had purchased land 15 years ago on Perkins; 15 years from now, we might wish we had purchased land on Burbank. Ms. Freeman agreed, saying that we are building for the future, and must look at trends. This validates what we know.

Mr. Jacob commented on the large size of some of the sites, specifically Site 1320570093 being discussed by Mr. Bardwell. Mr. Watts explained that we would seek a portion. Mr. Jacobs asked if we had considered a partnership with BREC. Ms. Payton added that there were other possibilities as well.

Mr. Bardwell stated that the Board needs to give the staff direction on what to do. There was a lot to assimilate; he asked if the list could be narrowed down with the help of outside counsel to fine tune, see what is viable. He suggested that the Board and the staff go through the list and identify each person's top five. Mr. Watts agreed that it was a lot to absorb, analyze, and look at.

Mr. Leotta suggested letting the expert engineering consultants help guide the preferences and trim the list, then perform full analysis on the final candidates. Such an analysis might cost approximately \$7,000; DPW might have a list they already use. Ms. Lundy asked about the scope of work.

Mr. Leger moved that the Library engage an engineering firm to help narrow the list using a desktop engineering survey to between three to five candidates, incorporating the results from a separate desktop wetlands survey. This will be done before engaging an engineering consultant to perform a full site assessment on the preferred site(s). Ms. Payton seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**B. To Discuss and Vote on the Policy for the Evaluation of the Library Director –
Mr. Jason Jacob**

Item B was deferred on a motion by Mr. Jacob, seconded by Mr. Bardwell.

Comments by the Library Board of Control

Ms. Freeman then introduced Ms. Lundy as the newest member of the Library Board of Control.

Ms. Lundy is highly qualified, with an educational background including degrees in Computer Science from Southern University, an M.S. in Project Management from George Washington University, and a Doctorate of Management in Organizational Leadership (A.B.D.) from the University of Phoenix. Her experience includes Project Management and Program Management with IBM and as a small business owner. She will officially begin her tenure during the June Board Meeting.

Ms. Lundy stated that she was excited about being a part of this Board. She mentioned that she had also served on BRAC's Transportation Issues Council and the World Trade Center Transportation Board. She stated that she hoped to bring her experience to the Library Board, and will strive to contribute to the Board's efforts.

Ms. Freeman asked for comments by the Board members. There being none, and with no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m. on a motion by Ms. Payton, seconded by Mr. Bardwell.

Ms. Tanya Freeman, President

Mr. Spencer Watts, Library Director

DATE: May 8, 2014
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 May 6, 2014 for The Library Design Collaborative on the Goodwood Main Library.



CONSTRUCTION REPORT

DATE: May 6, 2014

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

OBSERVATIONS:

- 1) The Monthly Owner's Meeting was held on April 24, 2014.
- 2) The interior punch list work is ongoing.
- 3) The demolition of the existing library is complete. Minimal demolition of the parking area on the west side remains.
- 4) The waterproofing of the reflecting pools is completed.
- 5) The white concrete ring has been poured for the splash pad.
- 6) The splash pad plumbing lines and equipment are being installed.
- 7) Grading for the east parking area is almost complete.
- 8) The existing library cooling tower has been removed.

UPCOMING WORK:

- 1) The granite work in the Plaza reflecting pools should begin next week.
- 2) The Plaza should be completed by mid-June.
- 3) The formwork will begin later this week on the east parking area.



Looking Toward the Library's Main Entry.



Looking across the Parking Lot at the new Library.



Looking toward the Splash Pad at its plumbing lines



Looking east toward the Splash Pad.