

LIBRARY 21 COMMITTEE

20th Meeting

September 9, 1997

Joseph G. Sakey Lecture Hall
Main Library
449 Broadway

Members in attendance:

Nancy Woods, Co-Chair
Richard Rossi, Co-Chair
William Barry
Karen Carmean
Ed DeAngelo
John Gintell
Karen Kosko
Andre Mayer
David Szlag
Emily West
Robert Winters

Susan Flannery
Roger Boothe

Co-Chair Nancy Woods welcomed Committee members back from the August recess, also welcoming audience members and a guest advisor, John Connery.

Reviewing the evening's agenda, she announced that with Phase III essentially completed, the evening would focus on siting, stopping at 8:00 p.m. for public comments.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

The interim report draft has been circulated and comments are requested Ruth Butler (absent) will be sending in written comments.

With no corrections received, the minutes for May, June, and July are approved and will be posted for the public.

SITING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:

Bill Barry reported that the Siting Subcommittee (Bill Barry, Nancy Woods, John Gintell, David Szlag, Susan Flannery, Roger Boothe) had agreed that specialized professional assistance was necessary for evaluating the Broadway site and other possible sites. In seeking such assistance, a decision must be made between doing a Request For Proposals for individuals whom the city will ask to form professional teams to provide a site survey or doing an RFP for a team that has already been formed. After two meetings last month, Roger Boothe joined the subcommittee to bring a city professional's view of requirements for the team to be hired..

Co-Chair Rossi advised that contracting for professional services is the responsibility of the City manager. The committee should present the Manager with an interim report, either written or in a meeting, detailing what is needed, criteria, etc. With the Manager's approval, the city will then go through the public process for an RFP through the Purchasing Department. The city will put together a proposal request based on the committee's report of needs and criteria and the City Manager will award a contract after consulting with committee representatives.

Mr. Rossi said that the committee's interim report to the City Manager should cover the library program and points of agreement, but state that there was no committee agreement as to the site. It should include recommendations for the next step -- how to deal with the site issue, i.e., have a site evaluation process by a professional team. If the Manager accepts the report, a fuller decision involving City Council and public input may be required. In creating the RFP, Lisa Peterson, the city person responsible for writing the RFP, will consult with or interview committee members.

A question was raised as to the timing for putting this together. Co-Chair Woods said that Bill Barry has drafted a sample "scope of work".

If the interim report is submitted to the City Manager by the end of September, Mr. Rossi said that a response from the Manager should take about two weeks. Putting together the RFP could be completed by the end of October, with a contract award by late fall or early December. In response to how long could be expected for the consultants to do their work, Roger Boothe indicated that 3 to 4 months would be a reasonable period..

In response to an inquiry as to the City Council's role in the process, Mr. Rossi said that the Council would have to appropriate funds. In addition, after looking at the report, the Council might want to hold its own hearing,

JOHN CONNERY:

Co-Chair Woods introduced John Connery, an urban planner recommended by David Szlag, and invited him to join the committee for a discussion of site evaluation processes..

Mr. Connery described his background of 28 years in community development work in both public and private roles. He said that for both large and small scale projects the siting process is much the same. The city will want to learn the core social impact, financial impact, public impact, etc. of locating the project on each of the sites to be considered. Certain things in the RFP should be flagged -- a key city contact person available every day, a second contact level or project team to serve as a sounding board, and a billing contact.

His advice to the committee:

1. Don't build a strait jacket of siting criteria, allow for creativity, flexibility, and a fresh perspective from the consultants.
2. Criteria should be a series of filters to put each site through, a matrix for a quantifiable process understandable by both the public and the press. If some issues are more important than

others, let the consultants know the priorities.

3. Define time limits: a three to four month project will get responses from a type of firm different than those responding to a year long project.

4. Will public presentations be required? If so, spell out what you expect: -talk? -slide shows?

5. Let it be known if, in addition to paper presentations, there are to be interviews as part of the proposal selection procedure.

6. Make sure that the respondents let you know who the staff members working on the project will be.

Questions to Mr. Connery and his responses included:

Question: What skills are needed?

Response: Architectural, landscaping, city planning, urban design, public presentation

Question: What about library planning skills?

Response: Space planning skills - the ability to design space, not just libraries

(Co-chair Rossi reminded the meeting that the issue was site planning, not building design.)

Question: What if some of the sites recommended to be surveyed are controversial?

Response: There is no way to approach this except directly, putting every site through the same filter of criteria. An experienced consultant, accustomed to dealing with the public, will have the ability to deal with the NIMBY factor when it emerges.

Question: Should the matrix of siting criteria be included in the RFP, or do the consultants develop it?

Response: This is a deliverable you ask for. You outline some of the criteria for it in your request. Also, while asking the team to recommend the best site, you also should ask them to identify a fall-back site, so that if a political impasse develops you don't have to go back to square one and start again.

Co-Chair Woods, on behalf of the committee, thanked Mr. Connery for his participation. Mr. Connery wished the city the best of luck with the project.

INTERIM REPORT:

Co-Chair Woods asked committee members for their comments on the interim report.

John Gintell felt that overall the report was good, but had concerns with

the square footage numbers of 80,000 to 100,000, thinking them too small and suggesting instead a possible range of 90,000 to 110,000 to 120,000. Much discussion followed, including the following excerpts from the committee:

Why not say "Cohen report: 87,000 sq.ft.; preliminary architectural design: 93,000 sq.ft.; committee thinks up to _____ sq.ft."

It's OK to raise the low end to 90,000 sq.ft., but keep the upper end within the realm of possibility.

Inclined to give little leeway at bottom.

Why not go in at 90,000 sq. ft. but say that if a site also accommodates parking, etc. it's a plus for that site.

We don't want to limit them to 90,000 sq.ft., let them match the program as much as possible.

Also consider the parking factor, number of cars allowed for, etc.

Wouldn't want to cut back on the Cohen minimum. In view of present uncertainties and flexibilities, would say that, having examined the Cohen report and figures, would like to go into the siting process with some flexibility.

Does each site meet minimum requirements?, allow expansion?

Get out of the figure probabilities - say "This is the program. Choose a site to accommodate it."

Isn't there another number to consider? - the cost. Different sites may involve different costs.

Perhaps ask consultants to assist in evaluating costs.

(Co-chair Rossi thought that getting into costs now would be moving too quickly. The first step was agreeing on a program. The second step is analyzing sites for the program. With a sites evaluated, the City Manager and City Council will decide if the city can afford the recommended choice or if it will be necessary to choose a cheaper site. Depending on the sites, land swaps may be possible considerations.)

Co-Chair Woods asked if the committee felt it necessary to cite a square footage range or if this could be represented by the program.

Bill Barry felt that endorsing the program and then citing alternate figures would indicate inconsistency, that the consultants should be given the program report with an approximate square footage of 90,000, indicating that parking is not included.

There was a committee consensus to include a range of square footage in the interim report, with 90,000 square feet as the low end of the range.

Co-Chair Woods asked that members with additional comments on the

interim report send them in by Friday, September 19th. She will prepare a new version of the report and send it back to the members.

DRAFTING THE SITING TEAM REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Co-Chair Woods asked if it was the sense of the committee to proceed as had been discussed regarding the consultant team, with the Library 21 Committee as a referral group or advisory group to the City Manager to be called upon as needed. It was.

Co-Chair Rossi said he thought the City Manager would want the opinion of the Library 21 Committee on the consultants' draft report.

Lisa Peterson suggested that the committee should be asked as well for input into the development of and to sign off on the matrix of siting criteria.

She also suggested listing some criteria but asking the consultants for their objective, professional recommendations, making this a deliverable. The consultants should also ask for committee input into the criteria prioritization,.

In response to an inquiry as to who should speak for the committee, Co-Chair Rossi said that members should clarify their statements outside of the committee meetings, indicating when they are expressing their individual opinions and when they are conveying an agreed upon position of the committee.

Robert Winters referenced the Wisconsin Building Program as being very interesting, and indicated a need for a weighting factor among the various matrix criteria. He felt that the assigning of varied weighting values should have input from the committee and not be left to the consultants alone.

Co-Chair Woods asked if Ms. Peterson would need more input from Bill Barry to draft the scope statement covering the RFP. Ms. Peterson responded that she had received enough input on the process, but would like to talk a little more regarding the criteria. At the Co-chair's request, she will expand the scope section based on this evening's discussion for attachment to the interim report. The revised version will be mailed to members of the committee.

Co-Chair Woods asked if another siting meeting was necessary this month or if the siting work could be completed through the sub-committee. The committee agreed that another meeting was not necessary. She also asked if anything else needed to be done to complete Phase III. Nothing else was suggested..

This work being completed, Co-Chair Woods opened the meeting to public comments from the audience. Comments included:

"Are consultants going to be asked to identify a minimum number of sites or explain why more sites are not available?"

Co-Chair Rossi answered "Yes". - They will examine 4 or 5 sites.

Another person expressed concern that easy accessibility by public

transportation be one of the criteria.

To a expression of concern with cost as a criteria, Co-Chair Rossi said that the City Manager might want to have a preferability rating of the various sites before getting into a cost study.

Another person expressed interest in land swap possibilities as discussed previously by Mr. Rossi and urged that the consultants be made aware of this possibility.

There being no further comments, Co-Chair Woods declared the committee in recess until further notice. She said that she will keep everyone up-to-date via e-mail and hard copy.

(REVISED 12/12/97)