

TENTATIVE AGENDA  
FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL  
**MAIN LIBRARY**  
**7711 GOODWOOD BOULEVARD**  
**BATON ROUGE, LA 70806**  
JUNE 18, 2009  
4:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 21, 2009 AND THE SPECIAL MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2009

III. REPORTS BY THE DIRECTOR

- A. FINANCIAL REPORT
- B. SYSTEM REPORT
- C. OTHER REPORTS

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A. REPORT ON DESIGN WORK FOR NEW MAIN LIBRARY – MR. STEVE JACKSON, AND MR. KEN TIPTON
- B. REPORT ON ROUZAN DEVELOPMENT – MR. TOMMY SPINOSA - JTS REALTY SERVICES, LLC
- C. REPORT ON NEW BRANCH FOR BURBANK AREA – MR. DAVID FARRAR
- D. ADOPTION OF PROPOSED 2010 LIBRARY BUDGET

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. LIBRARY HOLIDAY SCHEDULE FOR 2010
- B. TECHNICAL SERVICES – MS. DENISE FREYOU

VI. COMMENTS BY THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL

**ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

**THE PUBLIC IS ALLOWED TO MAKE COMMENTS RELATIVE TO AN AGENDA ITEM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT. ANY COMMENTS NOT RELATED TO AN AGENDA ITEM MAY BE RECEIVED AND DISCUSSED OR DEFERRED TO A FUTURE MEETING UNDER PROCEDURES DIRECTED BY THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT.**

Revised Minutes of the Meeting of the  
East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control

June 18, 2009

The regular meeting of the East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control was held in the Main Library Auditorium on June 18, 2009. Mr. Dan Reed, President of the Board, called the meeting to order at 4:12 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Mr. Donald Browning, Ms. Tanya Freeman, Mr. Jamie Griffin, Ms. Kizzy Payton, and Ms. Elizabeth Tomlinson. Also in attendance were Mr. David Farrar, Library Director, Ms. Patricia Husband, Assistant Library Director of Branch Services, Ms. Mary Stein, Assistant Library Director of Administration, Ms. Brenda Lovett, Library Business Manager, Ms. Rhonda Pinsonat, Assistant Library Business Manager, Mr. Ronnie Pierce, Accountant in the Library Business Office, Ms. Elizabeth Myers, Head of Computer Division, Ms. Emilie Smart, Head of Reference Services, Ms. Barbara Roos, Head of Young Adult Services, Ms. Denise Freyou, Head of Technical Services and Ms. Nikki Essex of the Parish Attorney's Office. Mr. Steve Jackson of The Library Design Collaborative, Mr. Mike Sullivan of Looney Ricks Kiss Architects, LLC, and Mr. Grant Conway of JTS Realty Services also attended as well as Ms. Sandy Davis with *The Advocate*.

Mr. Reed noted that the spelling of the name Toepfer needed to be corrected on page three of the May 21, 2009 minutes. He asked if there were any additional changes to the minutes from May 21, 2009, or June 4, 2009. Mr. Stan Bardwell noted that a sentence on page six, Item B of the May 21<sup>st</sup> minutes should be corrected to read, "Mr. Bardwell stated that the Library will have the same voting rights as other non-residential members of the association." He stated that the document had been written to restrict our fee payment to the business association, but had also eliminated the Library's voting rights. After some discussion, the document was changed to reflect that the Library would retain voting rights but would not be required to pay a fee. The correction also removed the word "founder" from the sentence.

On page nine of ten of the June 4, 2009, minutes, Mr. Bardwell stated that the last sentence of the third paragraph should be amended to include the word "not" in order that it may read, "Ms. Stein responded that, unlike the Juvenile Detention Center, the Library does not assign staff to work at the Parish prison."

Mr. Bardwell moved to approve the minutes for both meetings, as amended. Ms. Tanya Freeman seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

**Report on the New Branch for the Burbank Area**

Mr. Reed adjusted the order of items on the agenda in order to discuss the report on the new branch for the Burbank area. Mr. David Farrar presented the Board members with a history of the site, which included a copy of the plat of the land. Mr. Farrar reported that he had spoken with Dr. Aaron Bass of SJB Group, LLC regarding the possible need for another Wetlands

Delineation Request. Two weeks ago, Dr. Bass stated that there might be a need for another delineation of the proposed Burbank site, since the last report was pre-Katrina. After a review of the documents, Dr. Bass stated that the Library will not need another Wetlands Delineation. He stated that the one we have will suffice. He further stated that if the Library Board of Control decided to move forward with building on the land that the next step would be to submit a Section 404 Permit Application to the Army Corps of Engineers. The 404 permit makes clear the importance of reducing the footprint on the wetland area. Further initial steps would include a site survey, topography surveys, a boundary survey and then the site plans.

Mr. Reed asked what cost per square foot the Library was currently using on its building projections. Ms. Stein stated that the Main Library started with \$250 per square foot. Mr. Bardwell stated that he did not remember what the Library started with for Fairwood, and Ms. Stein stated that the information was on the budget page. Mr. Reed stated that we used \$275 per square foot for Fairwood. Mr. Bardwell calculated that a 10,000 square foot building would cost 2.75 million dollars. He asked if that included the furnishings. Ms. Pinsonat replied that it did not include furnishings. Mr. Reed stated that the Library would also have to mitigate the land, which would increase the cost to approximately three million dollars.

Mr. Reed mentioned work that Louisiana State University was doing with gaming and discussed whether the Library would want to consider building a digital branch that would include gaming and other electronic formats. He also asked if this type of library would affect the cost of the building.

Ms. Beth Tomlinson stated that the Library may not be able to build on the Burbank property, and she referred to statements she made at the regular Board meeting in May, in which she discussed the liability of building on the Burbank property. She also stated that she had just returned from an international conference of the Association of State Flood Plain Managers (ASFPM). Ms. Tomlinson took a few minutes to summarize the information she learned at the conference. A copy of her conference notes is attached to the minutes.

At the end of Ms. Tomlinson's review of her notes, Mr. Reed stated that he agreed with her, but that the Library should not refrain from building because of a concern about being sued, but rather because not building at that site is the right thing to do. He also commented that most of Baton Rouge is technically in the Mississippi River floodplain, and that the Board is not in a position to say if anyone will develop in this area.

Ms. Tomlinson stated that the Library can only decide that the Library will not build there. FEMA has declared this area as a Special Flood Hazard Area.

Mr. Reed stated that he thought that the elevation on Highland Road is around 19–20 feet.

Mr. John Berry, a library patron stated that he has looked at the area specifically and that this area is not in a floodplain, it is in a wetlands. According to Mr. Berry, if the Library pays so much money, the Army Corps of Engineers will consider that the Library is clear to build on the property.

Ms. Tomlinson replied that her information reflects what is happening in Washington D.C. and those changes will filter down to us.

Mr. Reed stated that if we don't have any control over the property, and if we want to make sure that the land is developed properly, maybe we should develop it properly to avoid having someone else develop it improperly. Mr. Reed then asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Bardwell suggested that the Board defer a decision and further research the matter. He would like Ms. Tomlinson to provide her information in written form to the staff so the Library can mail it out. He also asked Ms. Nikki Essex to look into the legal aspects of improper permitting. If the Corps has a permitting process, we should start with the Corps.

Ms. Tomlinson stated that the process is in legislation right now.

Mr. Bardwell replied that he wants the report from Ms. Tomlinson. He stated that the Board does not have enough information at this time. Mr. Bardwell would also like the staff to prepare a bare bones proposal for a bare bones facility. That would give the Board something concrete to discuss.

Mr. Bardwell put forth a motion to have the staff prepare a proposal for a new concept of use for this branch, to obtain the information from Ms. Tomlinson regarding floodplain development for further study, and to have Nikki Essex research the legal aspect of improper permitting.

Mr. Reed stated that people hear about libraries changing and that it would be helpful if we can state that we have thought about a library where we focused on digital technology.

Mr. Bardwell thinks that this is an opportunity for library services to be delivered through advanced technology.

Mr. Griffin stated that it would be useful to see the act of Donation of the Burbank property, the development costs, the estimates on wetlands mitigation, capital improvements, and operating costs. He also stated that he is not generally supportive of adding a new capital improvement project without addressing downtown and without looking at the capital adjustment of the budget. He also stated that he appreciates the roll forward but does not want to appear that the Library is on a spending spree. Mr. Griffin further stated that the Board needs to look at where we are developing. He noted that there is growth in north Baton Rouge and that the Board needs to make sure that the Library system develops in areas that are growing.

With regard to technology, Mr. Griffin stated that E.A. Sports does not want to be at the campus forever, and that it makes more sense to place a technology-based library between the universities, which makes downtown more attractive.

Mr. Bardwell's motion was approved unanimously.

## Reports by the Director

Mr. Farrar discussed the financial report. So far the Library has collected \$32,592,756.27. The collections are right on target. Mr. Reed asked if there were any questions; there were none.

Mr. Reed moved to system reports and Mr. Farrar asked Ms. Stein to discuss her two-day trip to Minneapolis. Ms. Stein stated that she and Ms. Andi Abraham, Head of Adult Services, attended a *Big Read* workshop in Minneapolis. The East Baton Rouge Parish Library was featured in this two-day workshop sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. Farrar noted that this workshop relates to the Library's largest program. Ms. Stein concurred and stated that she submitted the final statistics for the 2009 *Big Read* program on June 2, 2009. The final remarks included in the last paragraph from Ms. Stein's report were included in the newest Big Read booklet. Ms. Stein advised patrons to start saving their long pearl necklaces and looking for their fedoras.

In other business, Mr. Reed noted that for the first time, Shreve Memorial Library surpassed the East Baton Rouge Parish Library in database usage. Ms. Stein explained that these statistics just included the statewide databases. The East Baton Rouge Parish Library also has its own collection of databases, which our patrons also use. Ms. Stein further explained that the statistical difference only represented 150 questions, and that library staff are busy training for the new integrated library system.

Mr. Farrar reported on the progress for the Fairwood Branch Library, citing the following timeline for the architectural selection process:

- July 2, 2009: the Request for Quotations (R.F.Q.) newspaper ad will be released for the Fairwood Branch. Potential bidders will have an extra week to respond as a result of the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday.
- July 23, 2009: R.F.Q.s will be accepted at the City-Parish Department of Public Works, Engineering Division until 4:00 p.m. local time.
- July 30, 2009: Mr. Reed and Mr. Farrar will attend an informational Architectural Selection Board meeting at 4:15 p.m. in Room 415 of the Municipal Building.
- Aug 6, 2009: Final Selection Meeting at 4:15 in Room 415 of the Municipal Building.

Mr. Farrar also noted that Mr. Ralph Biron, a representative from Infor, has been working with Library staff for the past two days. He also thanked Mr. Griffin for preparing a timeline for the Library's migration to the ILS.

Mr. Reed asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none.

## **Old Business**

### **A. Report on Design Work for the New Main Library - Mr. Steve Jackson and Mr. Ken Tipton**

Mr. Jackson reported that Mr. Tipton could not attend this meeting, so he would provide the updates.

Mr. Farrar and Mr. Reed have reached an agreement with BREC on the direction the Library will pursue with Thought Square. He referenced the new diagram for handicapped parking; the new configuration will allow individuals to park in handicapped spots directly in front of the building and will allow access near the entrance of the building. The new configuration provides an opportunity to cantilever a portion of the building to provide cover for those walking to the entrance.

Mr. Jackson referenced an area delineated by brown-reddish lines indicated on the diagram that would provide a semi-covered open structure that allows people to move from the front drop-off to the cyber café and from there to the library with some cover. The architects have not designed the cover, but it will be a significant component of Thought Square.

Mr. Jackson also stated that The Library Collaborative was nearer to having the contract move forward. He is confident about the site, the parking layout, and the location of handicapped parking accessibility.

Mr. Bardwell asked Mr. Jackson where the covered drop-off would be located. Mr. Jackson indicated the area on the diagram. Mr. Reed noted that this was similar to standing under an oak tree when it starts to rain; that you don't necessarily get wet. Mr. Jackson concurred, stating that the space does not require a solid cover, but that it would allow patrons to achieve the goal of getting to the buildings fairly dry. He will have specific ideas in the future.

Mr. Reed stated that he was glad the handicapped access was done, since it was something the Library needed to address. Mr. Jackson stated that he was pleased with the handicapped area, and noted that there would still be room for an outdoor performance area. He also noted that the site would be able to retain the two large significant trees. He has also located the memorial oaks, which are a few feet from where they were initially indicated on the drawings; he will need to work on the diagrams for this area since the location of the memorial oaks will affect the building as it is now drawn.

Mr. Jackson distributed a spreadsheet with budget figures and a scope of summary. He stated that he would make a recommendation that will remove the need for the raised floor, saving 1.5 million dollars. He also spoke about many items that have been a part of the project and while the programmed area is more than 4,000 larger than the target size, he feels it meets the building program.

Mr. Jackson addressed the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) features under consideration for the building. He stated that architects try to incorporate LEED elements

in designing buildings, for example, siting and daylighting. These add nothing to the cost of the building, as they are features architects consider when designing buildings. There are also some low-cost features the Library can incorporate. Mr. Jackson stated that The Library Collaborative's goal was to achieve gold-level certification. The design team noted it will not be feasible to incorporate some design elements that were initially proposed; one of these items is the raised floor. The architects have researched the raised floor. In the process of investigating, the team learned that raised floors are designed to treat the Human Zone (the area approximately 9 feet up from the floor), with heating a factor for northern climates and cooling a consideration for southern climates. Raised floors are also used for data distribution. Since this is not a building where staff will be continually rerouting data and power, there are other ways the Library can handle adding computers. On the first floor the design can include some raceways; this is fairly easy to accomplish.

On the second floor, the design can include raceways or can utilize an increased space between the first and second floor. This area will feed air into the second floor from the first floor plenum space and will accomplish the same goal as the raised floor. Mr. Jackson stated that he felt that removal of the raised floor was a good decision.

Mr. Reed noted that he thought the cost estimates were close last time, and that none of the Board members have a problem with taking out the raised floor system. Mr. Reed stated that the 40 million dollars is the project as programmed. He asked if the 5.6 million dollars included the raised floor. Mr. Jackson stated that it did not.

Mr. Bardwell stated that he thought the number was the original proposed cost estimate including the dual skin. Mr. Jackson agreed that this was an error and the raised floor was included in the figure. Mr. Griffin asked if the figure was really 4.2 million dollars, and Mr. Jackson replied that he thought the cost was higher than \$4.2 million. Mr. Griffin requested that Mr. Jackson forward the corrected list to the Board. Mr. Jackson agreed to update the costs and forward them to the Board.

Mr. Bardwell noted that the Library's current budget supplement increases the cost of the library construction budget to 43.5 million dollars.

Mr. Reed stated that the spreadsheet also included the 2 million dollars for Thought Square, and clarified that the budget supplement does not include BREC's cost. Mr. Jackson stated that they consider the projects together when they are working on them. Mr. Jackson stated that they have narrowed the non-programmed items.

Mr. Bardwell asked for an explanation of the additional cost of the children's courtyard; Mr. Jackson replied that the courtyard was in the design but was not budgeted. Mr. Bardwell noted that the children's courtyard was in the west end, and now it has been moved to the east end. Mr. Jackson clarified that the children's courtyard on the west has been removed. Now it is the north courtyard.

Mr. Reed also stated that the north green screen is gone, but the south green screen will remain.

Ms. Stein asked for clarification regarding the additional elevator; she wanted to know which elevator this referenced. Mr. Jackson stated that this was a second elevator for the public. He stated that he felt that they have clarity on the scope. In summary, regarding the budget, Mr. Jackson stated that the original cost of 40 million dollars is now approximately 2.2 million dollars more due to unforeseen items. He stated that the civil work was under budgeted from the beginning. In addition, he stated that the budget figures contained a 12% contingency, and that they will try to whittle away the costs.

Mr. Browning asked for an explanation of the term “non-tobacco facility”; Mr. Jackson stated that this new building will be a no-smoking facility. Mr. Browning asked about the cost, and Mr. Jackson replied that there is no cost for this. He explained that architects routinely program many energy efficient features in regular buildings, but those same features get LEED points when we are applying for LEED certification.

Next, Mr. Jackson discussed the results of the workshops the Library and The Library Collaborative held with teens and children. The workshops occurred on June 9, 2009, and included teens and children from the community. He stated that the groups suggested many good ideas as well as more elaborate brainstorming, such as having a lock-in and including a roller coaster in their design.

Mr. Jackson also reviewed the series of three meetings the design team held with library staff regarding library technology. The line item cost for technology in the new building is approximately \$835,000. Some of the technology items that were discussed included security features such as access control, intrusion detection, panic alarms, and audio visual (AV) components, such as paging capabilities throughout the facility, digital signage, and AV controls.

Mr. Jackson stated that the AV work will occur in the large meeting room, the children’s and YA program rooms, and in the technology lab and other areas. There will be more bells and whistles in this new building. Mr. Jackson noted that Mr. Tom Craft is a technology specialist with PSA Dewberry, who has worked with voice/data lines, Category 5 and Category 6 cabling, fiber optics, wireless networks, transient voltage and telephone systems. There was a brief discussion about the telephone system, and whether the system would be included in the construction budget or would be provided by the Library. The construction budgets have included telephone systems in some of the previous buildings the Library has built. In this situation, the telephone system is not currently within the scope of work. Ms. Denelle Wrightson’s recommendation is to have the Library provide the telephone system and for the architects to work with Library’s staff on this portion of the project.

Ms. Elizabeth Myers stated that she was under the impression that a firm decision had not been made for voice-over IP. She stated that she would like the capability, but there are problems with it. Mr. Jackson stated that more discussion was needed regarding voice-over IP, but that it was Ms. Wrightson’s impression that the Library should provide voice-over IP capability.

Mr. Jackson also updated the Board regarding the LEED certification process. He stated that the project is registered with the U. S. Green Building Council (USGBC), and it has been registered

within the deadline for the Library to qualify under Version 2.2 of the LEED certification process.

In an update on the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement, Mr. Jackson has provided Mr. Farrar a list of topics to consider regarding the agreement. The next phase of work is the design development phase, during which Mr. Jackson hopes to provide a productive package of deliverables. Mr. Jackson hopes to return in July with items to show to the Board. He stated that the goal is to try to present the design development package information in September, but if they cannot meet the September date, to provide that information in October. He emphasized the importance of building the package correctly; that if the team does not build this next package properly, the project will have trouble.

The package will include a significant set of drawings, floor plans, elevations, furniture plans, structural plans and mechanical drawings. In addition, BREC has some items they want to see such as the service yard. The City-Parish Department of Public Works will need to be the significant reviewer of this package. Mr. Jackson outlined specifications included in it. For the LEED certification, the package will specify the use of products using recycled materials, and products from local areas. The contract also requires the architects to submit information on existing surveys, topographic information, and utility information. In addition, the team will perform an energy conservation analysis to show how the building will operate; this portion is state mandated and is required by the Department of Public Works.

Regarding the project schedule submission, Mr. Jackson stated that in the next couple of months Ms. Wrightson will be back to look at interior finishes and furnishings with the staff. Mr. Jackson will also meet with staff on exterior finishes.

Mr. Browning asked about the meeting in which the Library planned lock-ins. Ms. Stein explained that teens wanted to have a lock-in before the new library is opened. Mr. Jackson stated that he had heard some creative ideas from the team. Ms. Pabby Arnold stated that the children wanted toddler books to be shelved in an Eiffel tower.

Mr. Farrar asked Mr. Jackson to send him the updates on the new Main Library.

Ms. Tomlinson stated that she thought the Board was going to vote on which LEED items they would implement. Mr. Bardwell confirmed that the Board was going to discuss the LEED items and that justification for the LEED components would be provided. He stated that this meeting was not the last meeting at which the Board would discuss LEED components or costs.

Mr. Jackson responded that the process was an evolution. He provided the example of one LEED qualifying feature, the geothermal system and explained that, until they design the system and are able to estimate costs and return on investment, the information will not be available. The architects may design it and may remove it once they have evaluated the system.

Ms. Freeman asked for the packet to be delivered in advance so the Board could be ready to discuss the items when they meet. Mr. Jackson stated that he would deliver the packets to the Board.

Mr. Bardwell mentioned a kiosk, and Mr. Jackson stated that a person could walk up and see some of the systems at work such as the geothermal system. Mr. Reed noted that this type of educational component fits with the Library's mission. He stated that if the Library goes through the trouble of earning LEED certification, they should show the public what they have done.

Mr. Jackson concurred, citing the example of the opportunity for photovoltaics on the butterfly ceiling; that no one will see this, but the educational kiosk will make that feature evident to patrons.

Mr. Reed stated that it is necessary to review the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with BREC. He has a list of items and asked the Board members to think about the items that need to be resolved and to submit any ideas for the agreement to him or Mr. Farrar. He referenced the cyber café, and a timeline for BREC to build it, maintenance of common areas with regard to who changes light bulbs, who fills the potholes, who fixes the benches, and who takes care of landscaping. He stated that ten years from now, there may be a time when the Library will do some renovation, and also stated the need for an agreement whereby the cyber café will also be maintained.

Another issue is who will have access to the service yard, and how that access be controlled considering the number and type of individuals who may need access, including volunteers, Library staff, delivery people, and BREC staff.

Other issues included scheduling the use of the theater, the responsibility for scheduling events in the plaza, the issue of who will administer wireless access, and how wireless access would work if it fell under the Library's purview.

Ms. Freeman stated that she would like to be sure that BREC has the 2 million dollars available for their portion of the cost of Thought Square.

Mr. Jackson also mentioned insurance issues and liability. He added that BREC has asked the Library for a storage area attached to the main meeting room building, to store chairs for outside performances. There is a question about who will pay for that extra 100 square feet.

Mr. Reed requested that Board members notify him or Mr. Farrar if they think of any other issues. He stated that he does not have many concerns, but the Library needs to think about how things will be done so it is not a problem in the future.

Mr. John Berry asked if all the handicapped parking spaces would be on the left side of the building. Mr. Jackson stated that some are on the left and some are on the cyber café side of the parking lot. Mr. Berry asked if there were still 16 spaces. Mr. Jackson replied that there were more spaces, since more could be placed near the cyber café. Mr. Berry asked if people parking on the left side would have to cross the driveway, and Mr. Jackson replied they would. Mr. Berry also asked for the distance from the handicapped spaces on the library side of the parking lot to the door. Mr. Jackson stated that he did not have the measurements at this point, but that it was the shortest distance to the entrance. There being no other questions, Mr. Reed thanked Mr. Jackson for his report.

**B. Report on Rouzan Development - Mr. Tommy Spinosa JTS Realty Services, LLC**

Mr. Mike Sullivan, architect with Looney Ricks Kiss Architects, LLC, stated that his firm has been authorized by Mr. Spinosa to proceed with the design of the branch building. He stated that he has met with Library staff and is ready to proceed. He has also spent the previous 10 days on the site. The next step is to organize work sessions with the staff.

Mr. Bardwell stated that under the condition to be satisfied before act of donation is perfected, Rouzan has to submit a recording of the new subdivision map. He asked Mr. Conway if this has been done. Mr. Conway stated that this was the next step. Mr. Bardwell also discussed having a copy of the approved documents with the restrictions. Mr. Conway replied that the land will also need to be subdivided, and Mr. Sullivan stated that the amount of land would not be fixed until the library footprint was established. Mr. Bardwell replied that he thought the Board had come to that conclusion three months ago, and Mr. Sullivan confirmed that the Library needed to finish the footprint of the building, including any mechanical yards before the building can be shown on the map.

Mr. Conway stated that subdividing the land will be the last step before the act of donation.

Mr. Bardwell reminded the Board that the act of donation has not yet happened. Mr. Reed asked if there were any other questions; Mr. Sullivan responded to Mr. Berry's question about the firm for which Mr. Sullivan works.

**C. Adoption of Proposed 2010 Library Budget**

Mr. Reed opened the discussion on the 2010 budget, noting that the Board needed to adopt it. Mr. Bardwell asked about some corrections that he referenced at the budget meeting on June 4, 2009. He wanted to verify that the changes had been made and that the pages with the corrections would be submitted to the Finance Department. Ms. Pinsonat confirmed that all the requested changes had been made and that Board members had the corrected sheets. She noted that she had provided Mr. Bardwell with both the old and new copies so he could reference the old ones when he checked for the changes, but that only the new, corrected pages would be submitted to the Finance Department.

Mr. Bardwell posed one other question with regard to the bookmobile, stating that on the vehicle worksheet under the tab for vehicles, there was no mention of the proposed new bookmobile or the two proposed outreach vans. Ms. Pinsonat explained that these vehicles were not listed because the Library does not own those vehicles yet. Mr. Bardwell asked for clarification with regard to the 2010 maintenance budget, and Ms. Pinsonat responded that the vehicle sheet had nothing to do with maintenance but was just a list of the vehicles the Library currently owns. The Library purchases for this year will be listed in the vehicle portion of the 2011 budget.

Mr. Bardwell made a motion to approve the 2010 budget once item 645400 is deleted because it is no longer required. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **New Business**

### **A. Library Holiday Schedule for 2010**

Mr. Farrar requested that the Board approve the holiday schedule for 2010. Mr. Griffin moved to adopt the revised holiday schedule and Ms. Freeman seconded the motion. The Board passed the motion unanimously.

### **B. Technical Services - Ms. Denise Freyou**

Ms. Denise Freyou, Head of Technical Services, presented an overview of the Technical Services Division, including ordering items, processing them, and cataloging them. She also discussed pre-ordering popular fiction and working with book vendors. She described fund accounting, which is a method of assigning funds toward the purchase of different types and formats of materials. Each division's collection is assigned a budget to purchase materials, and the money is tracked through the fund accounting system.

Ms. Freyou then spoke about pre-processing and pre-cataloging items, a service whereby the vendor catalogs, processes, and ships the materials shelf-ready. Pre-processing shortens the time between ordering the materials and their availability to patrons. Ms. Freyou also described subscription services. Under a subscription service, the vendor purchases large numbers of best sellers, which the Library receives when the demand for them is highest. Once the demand for a certain title declines, the Library can return the excess items to the vendor.

There being no further business, Ms. Tomlinson moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Griffin and Ms. Freeman seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

---

Dan Reed, President

---

David Farrar, Library Director

### **Burbank Property Comments by Ms. Elizabeth Tomlinson - 5/21/09**

Three reasons why we should not build on the Burbank site and let the donation expire: environmental and ecological; responsible land use development and planning; and legal.

1. This land is in a floodplain (designated AE by FEMA - Special Flood Hazard Area)
  - lowest land in area
  - basically a bowl
  - excess rainwater from the area flows to this property
  - property acts as a wetland reservoir
    - stores and filters water impurities and pollutants
    - slows velocity of any flooding
    - provides habitat
    - recharges our groundwater, etc.

What happens when we build here

- development means more impervious surfaces
- also would mean bringing in fill
  - both mean the area can no longer absorb and store rainwater - can no longer serve its function as a wetland reservoir
  - will cause flooding in surrounding areas
  - will increase the velocity and volume of flooding and cause more flash flooding in surrounding areas (rainwater runs off hard surfaces more rapidly and in greater volume)
  - increase heat island effect

(From LFMA Conference) The Corps is finding that non-structural flood proofing is more cost effective than what they have been doing (non-structural flood proofing - let nature do its job)

2. Building here will promote and exacerbate sprawl - numerous negative ramifications
  - disinvestment in other areas
  - social inequities
  - dependence on car (what if you don't have one? we just talked in length about transportation problems for our underserved communities)
  - sprawl defeats efforts at providing transit options for all
  - the cost of infrastructure for sprawl is more than might gain in property taxes

Secretary Ankner (LA DOTD) - sprawl - "the most expensive cheap property"

3. Legal ramifications
  - based on Louisiana case law: if we know an area is marginal, but we build anyway and flood neighboring properties, we become liable and can be sued, as can the local gov't. who permitted it.

City of Central working on ordinance no development where fill above 1'-0" is required.  
Terrebonne Parish working on ordinance - no fill period (no development).

We need to start being smarter about our land use planning - we shouldn't wait for ordinances and regulations to show leadership in the way that we can - saying no to building where we should not build.

### **Burbank Property Comments by Ms. Elizabeth Tomlinson - 6/18/09**

Last month I talked about three very good reasons why we should not build on this delineated wetland property that is in a Special Flood Hazard Area designated by FEMA. Those 3 reasons were environmental and ecological; responsible land use development and planning; and legal. Last week I attended the ASFPM (Association of State Flood Plain Managers) International Conference.

attending: local and state governments from across US - P&Z, Public Works, water resources, conservation, economic and community development, and our GOHSEP office, but also Federal - DNR, FEMA, US Army COE, NOAA, USGS, US EPA, NFIP, DOT, USDA (natural resource conservation services), US Fish and Wildlife, DEQ, EPA.

Also - universities here and abroad, engineers, and attorneys. Global nature and integration of agencies.

Four themes throughout: LID; NAI; preserving and restoring the natural and beneficial functions of floodplains and wetlands; and legal liability of local governments permitting in marginal areas - all of these are included in the 3 reasons I mentioned last month.

Nothing in the five-six days of workshops that I took at the conference negated what I said to you last month. In fact, everything actually strengthened the arguments of why we should not build on this property. And some new things came to light - mostly in the areas of regulations.

The main thrust of what all the federal agencies were talking about (as well as state and local gov't.) was that we needed not just floodplain management, but comprehensive watershed management and that this is a multi-agency and multi-disciplinary effort.

Major General Riley, US Army Deputy Commanding General and Deputy Chief of Engineers, US Army COE told us that the Corps has a new focus and has had a major shift in the paradigm of how they think and operate. They are now going to use a Sustainable Integrated Watershed approach in their decisions of which one of the major tenets is to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial functions of our floodplains and wetlands. The Corps has rewritten their principles and standards for water resource management and this is going through legislation on the hill right now.

"It is costing us more and more energy each year to maintain the changes we have made to our environment in trying to control nature - we need to stop spending money on things that are not sustainable."

Steven Stockton, Director of Civil Works for the Corp also talked about this new direction. He talked about looking at systems, not individual projects. That this is an intergovernmental movement; that our zoning, building codes, and planning need to change; that we need stronger land use regulation over mitigation - mitigation is not the solution.

"We will pay decades from now for the decisions we make today. We need to be smarter about how and where we build our homes, businesses, and infrastructure."

Bruce Julien of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the USDA about how Recovery Act Funding is being used for watershed rehabilitation; buying easements and removing structures from the flood plain; restoring floodplains back to pre-construction state or as close as possible.

Lisa Hair from EPA HQ in DC talked about how NAI floodplain regulations are consistent with the concept of sustainable development and she talked about LEED.

- went to LEED-ND presentation yesterday - LEED ND has a prerequisite of no development in floodplains - we're building a LEED certified library on the one hand and then suggesting we build in a non-sustainable way in which we fail to even qualify to try for LEED on the other.

We heard examples from communities and states across the nation about their new watershed management programs, their new land use regulations, etc. Denver, CO has a greater population now than ever, yet because of the work they have been doing, there are fewer buildings in the floodplains.

The House Transportation Committee (that's US House) is working on a National Sustainable Watershed Planning Act right now. FEMA is working on federal regulations that declare no build areas in floodplains. Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 mandates all federal development must be LID.

Legal - Most flood losses are the result of improper and non-sustainable development - development in the wrong places. Often the cause can be farther away than you might think.

Development changes how water moves thru the environment. The more development, subsidence, fill that happens in the wrong places, the flooding events we have in places that never flooded before. The key is to let the natural and beneficial functions of our floodplains and wetlands act as they should - which means no development there.

Fatal flaw - Currently permits allow building in marginal areas with engineering and mitigation - but permits are distributed on an individual project basis - no one is looking at the cumulative impacts of each permit. That is why comprehensive watershed management is the direction we are taking. In a list of examples of projects communities can be sued for improperly permitting - No. 1 is development interfering with natural processes.

Used to be you couldn't prove causation and you couldn't successfully sue local governments. That is no longer true. Forensic hydrologists can use current technology for hydrologic, hydraulic, and geologic studies that can prove which development caused flooding.

From a paper written by Ed Thomas, an attorney who deals with this stuff all the time and who has done exhaustive studies that have revealed how the courts interpretations of local gov't. liability is changing had this to say:

"Communities should be aware that if a governing body approves a project or activity that causes damages to other properties, the affected property owners can sue the permitting authority, claiming that agency or board was negligent in its duties when it permitted the action that caused the damage. Courts regularly favor the plaintiffs in these cases." I mentioned that last month citing Louisiana case law.

This is a very complex subject and I've tried to just give the highlights so that we can be aware of what is coming down the pipe before we make a decision that can get us sued as a board, each of us sued individually, and our local government sued. But more importantly, we should not build on this Burbank property that is a wetland because it is the right thing to do. This is about looking to the future - as we are always saying we must do. We should not build here because we're afraid we might be sued. We should not build here because it is the right thing to do - the moral, and ethical thing to do.