



LIBRARY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY BOARD
FACILITIES MASTER PLAN (FMP) IMPLEMENTATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Monday June 23, 2014
Downtown Branch Meeting Room
224 Church Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

6:00 PM PUBLIC MEETING

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVE AGENDA OF JUNE 23, 2014
3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
4. OTHER BUSINESS

ACTION ITEMS (PG.3)

- a. Elect Committee Chair and Vice-Chair
- b. Discuss and accept charge of committee by Library Joint Powers Board

5. STAFF REPORTS

ACTION ITEMS (PG.4-12)

- a. Accept Director's report and provide direction including recommendations to the Library Joint Powers Board
 - i. Scope of projects
 - ii. Sequence of projects
 - iii. Financial coordination and oversight
 - iv. Coordination of construction management

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7. FMP IMPLEMENTATION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING CALENDAR

- a. The FMP Implementation Sub-Committee will consider its current meeting schedule and may revise it as necessary. Proposed schedule: Downtown Branch Library at 6 pm
 - i. Monday July 14
 - ii. Monday July 28
 - iii. Monday August 18
 - iv. Monday September 15

8. NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting is July 14 at 6:00 p.m. at the Downtown Branch Library

ADJOURN

The Library Joint Powers Authority Board FMP Implementation Subcommittee will adjourn from the regularly scheduled meeting of Monday June 23, 2014 to the next regularly scheduled public meeting on Monday July 14, 2014 at 6:00 pm in the Community Meeting Room of the Downtown Branch Library.

The Santa Cruz City-County Library System does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Out of consideration for people with chemical sensitivities, the Library requests that you attend fragrance free. The Downtown Branch Library is a fully accessible facility. If you wish to attend this public meeting, and you will require special assistance such as sign language or other special devices in order to attend and participate, please call (831) 427-7706 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the event to make arrangements for assistance. Upon request, agendas for public meetings can be provided in a format to accommodate special needs.

FYI

DATE: June 10, 2014
TO: Library Joint Powers Board
Facilities Master Plan Implementation Sub-Committee
FROM: Teresa Landers, Library Director
RE: Charge

At the June 2, 2014 LJPB meeting, the following charge was given:


1. Board Chair, David Terrazas, was to appoint a sub-committee of the Board, subject to the rules, regulations and procedures of the Brown Act. The sub-committee was to be geographically representative of the Library's service area and should include a citizen member.
2. This sub-committee is to make recommendations to the full LJPB on the following:
 - a. The scope of improvements to be included in the revenue measure
 - b. A sequence of facilities improvements over a three year time line.
 - c. How to achieve financial coordination and oversight of facilities revenue
 - d. How to coordinate construction management of the facilities projects.

Later in the meeting, Director Landers has provided additional information on each of these to begin the dialogue.

STAFF REPORT

DATE: June 10, 2014

TO: Library Joint Powers Board
Facilities Plan Implementation Sub-Committee

FROM: Teresa Landers, Library Director 

RE: Scope of Facilities Projects

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend a set of project options for approval by the Library Joint Powers Board.

SUMMARY

The amount identified for the ballot measure is \$63 million. This is adequate to meet a base level of needs identified in the Facilities Master Plan. In addition, there are requests for additional funding that should be considered. A final list of proposed projects is needed in order to move forward in the process.

BACKGROUND

At the June 2, 2014 Library Joint Powers Board, the Board authorized the formation of a Board sub-committee to address certain areas of the implementation of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). One of these is to recommend a list of specific projects that would be included in the ballot measure proposed for June 2015.

The Facilities Master Plan identified three levels of need for improvement in library facilities over the next ten years. This analysis was conducted by Group 4 Architects and Consultants and focused solely on what each branch needs.

The first level was simply maintenance since only emergencies had been dealt with for many years. The second was what it would take to bring each branch up to basic 21st Century library standards. The third level was the ideal for each branch.

The costs, presented in the plan, were adjusted for inflation at the two lower levels based on when it was expected that various maintenance issues would be addressed. The new buildings, additions and extensive remodels (Downtown) were not adjusted for inflation as there were several options for each and both the choice of project and date of construction would strongly affect the final cost. Project costs were reviewed, all or in part, by two additional independent construction estimators. Aptos costs were reduced slightly and the rest were confirmed as accurate, to the extent possible. A roof survey

was done which indicated almost all major expenditures for roofs would occur outside the 10 year window. A decision was made not to include costs for relocation of any of the branches during construction or hazardous materials abatement such as asbestos, which is known to exist at the Downtown Library.

Construction inflation was estimated at 4.5% per year (6% minus anticipated interest income on the bond of 1.5%). Given this rate of inflation, the decision was made to try to complete the projects within about 3 years of the measure passing. With this ambitious time frame, it was recognized that there will need to be some planning done before the election and that there will need to be a library staff member solely devoted to overseeing these projects even if the individual jurisdictions take major responsibility for each of their own facilities.

With these two working assumptions, Director Landers proceeded to recalculate the costs provided by the Consultant which spanned 10 years rather than 3. This meant some costs would never be incurred, or would be incurred later or earlier than what is outlined in the plan. This resulted in revised estimates for each project.

The total cost to do all the projects at the maximum level (such as new Aptos and Downtown libraries rather than remodels and/or additions) was \$92 million in construction inflated dollars. Working with a financial consultant and a pollster, it was determined that \$63 million was a realistic target for each branch to achieve what each particular facility needs. The list of options presented here represents a middle ground, taking into account that the total dollar amount of \$63 million is the most attainable.

DISCUSSION

The following table outlines the projects proposed for each branch and the estimated cost. Basic renovation is defined below with additional specifics listed where applicable

	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST (in millions)
Aptos	Addition to 11,000 sq. ft. and renovation of current interior	\$8.2
Boulder Creek	Basic Renovation- Bathrooms redone to meet ADA requirements. Possibly solar	\$1.6
Branciforte	Basic Renovation-restore meeting and/or group study room, redesigned teen space. City of SC has interest in adding solar- not included in cost estimate	\$1.6

Capitola	New 12,000 sq.ft.	\$11.4
Downtown	A gut and remodel- keep the basic shell- no change in size. Not included in this cost estimate is the cost of relocating the Downtown Library for 2 years and for the removal of remaining asbestos. A ballpark figure for these two needs is about \$2 million	\$27
Felton	New 9,300 sq ft	\$9.4
Garfield Park	Basic renovation- HVAC upgrade	\$.3
La Selva Beach	Basic renovation- improved layout to provide more defined children's and teen areas, HVAC upgrade	\$.5
Live Oak*	Basic renovation including meeting and/or group study space. Possibly solar although not included in the estimate. By end of term, furniture, carpeting and finishes will need replacement.	\$1.7
Scotts Valley*	Sound attenuation, automated materials handling. By end of term, furniture, carpeting and finishes will need replacement,. Possibly solar	\$1.0
Headquarters	By end of term, furniture, carpeting and finishes will need replacement, elevator replacement	\$.4
TOTAL		\$63.1

Basic Renovation:

- Create meeting rooms (flexible spaces) wherever possible
- Enhanced data and technology access via upgraded electrical and data wiring to (except SV and LO)
- SV- sound attenuation, possible automated materials handling including self-check in
- Marketplaces
- Replacement furniture, carpet, equipment-whatever is needed
- More effective design and placement of service desks and self-check out
- Potential for computer labs and/or makers spaces

*There is discussion about whether Live Oak and Scotts Valley, should receive additional funding for functions not identified in the Plan, such as

- The building of a community center near Shoreline Middle School and the new Live Oak Boys and Girls Club as well as the newly planned Scotts Valley Boys

and Girls Club. (Live Oak Project- estimated cost \$6 million. No estimate available for Scotts Valley)

- If the community theater does not exercise its option on the property adjacent to the current library in Scotts Valley, the Library could expand into the remaining 1/3 of the building and use this space for additional community meeting room space, makers space, audio-visual production space, larger teen area, etc. (estimated cost \$2.5 million)
- Creating a literacy center upstairs at the Live Oak Library (estimated cost \$50,000)
- Installing a “Redbox” for library books and a holds pickup locker system at the new Live Oak Boys and Girls Club or Live Oak Family Resource Center and possibly do the same at the new Scotts Valley Boys and Girls Club. (estimated cost \$200-300,000)

Should the decision be made to fund these additional projects, the funding would need to come from the other projects. There are several options which could happen individually or in combination:


- Ask Capitola to give up funding from this measure and make it up with RDA funds which were possibly going to be used for providing additional services/spaces
- Reduce the size of the Felton branch
- Reduce all the projects by 10% or 15% and hope that value engineering can make up the difference. If not, individual jurisdictions may be asked to contribute from their own funding sources. It is important to keep in mind that Downtown is already facing a shortfall from the asbestos and relocation issues and Downtown and Aptos have taken the biggest reductions already in order to reach the \$63 million.

PRELIMINARY FMP IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

	Feb-15	measure passes	Jun-15	Dec-15	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19
Aptos	Conceptual design											
Boulder Creek	Conceptual design			Plan and remodel			Plan, Contract & Construction					
Branciforte	Conceptual design	Plan and remodel										
Capitola	Conceptual design			Plan, Contract & Construction								
Downtown	Conceptual design						Plan, Contract & Construction					
Felton	Entitlements	Contract & Construction										
Garfield Park	Conceptual design				Plan and remodel							
La Selva Beach	Conceptual design	Plan and remodel										
Live Oak	Conceptual design				Plan and remodel							
Scotts Valley	Conceptual design						Plan & remodel					
Headquarters											Refurbish	

STAFF REPORT

DATE: June 12, 2014

TO: Library Joint Powers Board
Facilities Master Plan Implementation Sub-committee 

FROM: Teresa Landers, Library Director

RE: Financing and Construction Options

RECOMMENDATION: Make recommendations to the Library Joint Powers Board on how to proceed on the issues of handling the financing and construction of new and renovated library facilities.

SUMMARY

Financial and construction management issues are complex and dependent on a variety of factors. At this point there are more questions than answers and discussing them is the first step to being able to make recommendations to the full LJPB.

BACKGROUND

At its June 2, 2014 meeting, the LJPB formed a subcommittee of four members to make recommendations to the full Board on several issues. Two of the issues are how the bond proceeds will be handled and how the construction of the facilities will be managed.

This report is intended to raise the questions that need to be answered at some point, relatively soon. It is meant to stimulate discussion and, most likely, raise additional questions. Some recommendations may need to wait until decisions are made about other aspects such as how the CFD is formed. That issue is being presented to the LJPB on July 7, 2014.

DISCUSSION

Financing Options

The precise way this will work is dependent on which option is selected for CFD formation. In all the scenarios, the governing board for the CFD will be the entity that issues the bonds. A lead agency and treasurer will both need to be named. The bond proceeds are typically held by a trustee bank and expenditure requests are submitted directly to the trustee bank or via the treasurer.

There are several decisions that need to be made at the time the CFD formation occurs with respect to how the financing is handled.

1. Assuming the governing board is representative of the four jurisdictions, either electeds or administrators, who should be the:
 - Lead agency: which one of the four jurisdictions?
 - Treasurer: the chief financial officer of the above named jurisdiction?
2. Should funds be handled via the treasurer or directly with the trustee bank?

Once the money is available, how shall the oversight be handled?

1. Governing board of the CFD provides the oversight?
2. A separate board including citizens at large or electeds and/or citizens from the current LJPB?
3. Money is received by the CFD governing board and then a pre-designated amount is given to each jurisdiction to spend so that no money is actually ever held by the CFD? The issue that arises with this is should a given project come in under (or over) budget, how is that addressed?
4. What costs are taken off the top before distribution to anyone? (dependent on how construction will be managed)

Construction Options

Three ways to handle the design and construction projects are presented:

1. Each jurisdiction handles its own projects with financing either up front or via reimbursement as described above
2. The Library JPA is responsible for the construction projects.
3. A hybrid of the above with the larger projects being handled by the jurisdictions and the smaller projects by the LJPA.

	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Jurisdictions manage the projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easier to meet the 3 year timeline 2. Jurisdictions maintain control over the buildings 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lose economy of scale for purchasing from construction management to architectural services to furniture, furnishings, equipment (FF&E) 2. Will require greater coordination with the Library either through the adoption of standards or by employing one architect to handle some aspects

	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
		<p>such as pre-planning and FF&E selection</p> <p>3. Requires greater coordination with the Library and more opportunities for conflict: design vs functionality</p> <p>4. Scheduling of projects will require close coordination between jurisdictions</p>
LJPA manages the projects	<p>1. Economies of scale more achievable</p> <p>2. Greater consistency in design, signage, FF&E, etc.</p> <p>3. Costs managed from a system perspective</p> <p>4. Easier to coordinate scheduling of projects</p>	<p>1. Library will need to hire a construction manager in addition to a staff member devoted to the projects</p> <p>2. Library possibly takes on responsibility for the facilities</p>
4 large projects handled by the jurisdictions (Aptos, Felton, Capitola, Downtown) and others by the LJPA	<p>1. Smaller projects achieve greater consistency</p> <p>2. Some economies of scale</p> <p>3. More control over the larger projects by individual jurisdictions</p>	<p>1. Handling finances could be more complicated</p> <p>2. Library will need a construction manager but for less time and effort</p>

In all scenarios the Library will need to hire a full time Librarian for 3 years to coordinate with either the jurisdictions or the construction manager. This could be paid for out of the project money or the Library's operational budget.

Additional decisions include the selection of architects and subsequent construction.

There are library models for each of the options:

1. Do we want to hire one architect to do pre-planning such as community input and needs assessment?
2. Do we want one architect designing and managing all the projects, which could result in an economy of scale?
3. Do we want to group the projects such as the four small renovation projects being handled by one architect and managed differently than the others? This would be La Selva Beach, Branciforte, Boulder Creek and Garfield Park which are a mix of the City of Santa Cruz and the County. Depending on what happens with Live Oak and Scotts Valley, they could be included here as well.

4. If each jurisdiction is responsible for their own project(s), then the selection of architects could be up to each jurisdiction as long as there is some overall coordination so that long term library needs are addressed and consistency is maintained.
5. After an open process, which evaluates design capabilities, do we want to create a pool of architects from which to choose.
6. Should we move forward with master and some technical planning prior to the election? One architectural firm could be hired to engage the community in the programming, project definition and costing phase prior to the election and probably starting in Fall 2014. After the election, we could then go straight into design and have different architects on the various projects. The final decision on how much pre-planning to do should be made in concert with any public education or campaign consultants.

We will need to be careful to follow CEQA regulations regarding how much detail can and cannot be decided prior to the election and even determine if CEQA applies (it might not for an interior remodel only).

The committee will, most likely, have additional questions and interests to express. This report is intended as a beginning framework to identify the issues in need of resolution and consideration. Direction on how to proceed is requested.