I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

A. Call to Order

The regular meeting of February 10, 2010 was called to order by Chair Kupfer at 7:08 PM.

Present: Trustees Winston Burton, Abigail Franklin, Susan Kupfer and Darryl Moore.

Absent: Carolyn Henry-Golphin.

Also present: Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services; Doug Smith, Deputy Director; Suzanne Olawski, Neighborhood Services Manager; Dennis Dang, Library Admin Manager; Alan Bern, Library Special Services Coordinator; Field Paoli – Avery Moore, AIA; Mark Schatz, AIA; Gould Evans Baum Thornley – Douglas Thornley, AIA; Harley Ellis Deveraux / Greenworks Studio – Edward Dean, AIA; Rene Cardinaux, Consultant; Steve Dewan, Project Manager, Kitchell CEM

B. Public Comments –

1. Reed Schmidt, Berkeley Public Library Foundation – Thanked the Trustees and City of Berkeley for allowing use of the library for the Eighth Annual Author’s Dinner. Several Board Members have left, have selected some new ones and they are recruiting additional Board Members. Will have a session on fund raising.

2. Jerry Long – Berkeley Public Library Foundation – Article and photos from the Author’s Dinner can be found at www.SFgate.com under Ms. Bigelow’s Social City Column.

3. Trustee Burton - 4x2 committee - Who will attend for the Foundation? To be decided at next Foundation Board meeting.

4. Trustee Burton asked for clarification that the Foundation would recruit a BOLT member for each Branch fundraising committee.

5. Trustee Moore – Author’s Dinner was great, food was excellent and authors were wonderful. Thanked Foundation for all the work to make it happen.

C. Report from library employees and unions, discussion of staff issues – none.

D. Report from Board of Library Trustees – none.

E. Approval of Agenda

R10-012 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Burton to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

II. WORKSHOP SESSION ON MEASURE FF BRANCH LIBRARY UPDATE

A. Presentation by Field Paoli Architects on the Schematic Design Phase; and Staff Report on the Process, Community Input and Next Steps.

Ms. Moore reviewed Primary Facility Improvement Goals-Bond Funding, What We’ve Heard So Far & New Design Highlights (Attachment #A.)

Facility improvement goals. New or expanded library at the existing site. Meet all current code. Consolidated, enclosed Tool Lending Library (TLL) with workspace for staff. Full accessibility. Improved lighting, ventilation, thermal comfort. Reduced energy and water consumption. A warm and welcoming design. Build green, LEED silver or better.
Process to date: Programming needs addressed by staff and library consultant Kathy Page. Concept design phase looked at options to renovate all or part of the existing building and to replace it with new. Two community meetings held with lots of great feedback that was incorporated into the project. Meetings with LPC sub-committee to discuss the options. BOLT meeting with public comments where the trustees directed the architects to focus on an all-new building. Schematic phase included an additional community meeting that was well attended and great comments that have been taken into consideration. Meetings with staff and full LPC.

New design highlights which address community comments. Importance of creating a civic presence to make the library a beacon for the neighborhood. Provide more seating. Provide more computers. Designated Teen space. Better organized an enlarged Tool Lending Library. Retain landscaped areas around building and preserve tree on Russell Street.

Proposed Site Floor Plan – Mr. Schatz presented the proposed Site/Floor Plan (Attachment #B). The proposed building will have a strong presence on the site with an entry at the corner of Russell Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way. There will be views into the multi-purpose room and children’s room from the street. A curved wall at the corner of Russell Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way will provide a dramatic welcoming to the site. One main block will house library functions (adult, teens, children’s, tool lending library and staff work area); a second block will house the multi-purpose room, storage and restrooms. The two blocks are separated by an lobby and entry zone and topped by a high roof with glass on all four sides to bring light into the inside of the building. Tall day lit central area will house the browsing collection, staff desks and self checks, popular materials and laptop computer bar

Mr. Schatz reviewed the Program Summary Chart (Attachment #C) More seating (at tables, soft lounge chairs throughout, stools in kids room, study carrels in adults, tables and chairs in the multi-purpose room and small group study room.) More public computers including laptops to be checked out. More variety of shelving.

Tool Lending Library (TLL) Will be a much larger, single enclosed space. The front area will house large tools, smaller tools will be located behind the service counter. The work room will include a large work bench for repairs, a machine room for the air pump, staff desk and storage units. A separate storage unit off the driveway will store ladders. Architects have worked with staff and Rene Cardinaux to document what is in the TLL and decide how to house all of it.

Small Group Study Room - A small group study room will be located off the teen room.

Primary Elevations – Ms. Moore reviewed primary elevations (Attachment #D.) Along Russell Street there will be a large window along children’s room, smaller windows in the corner and staff areas, a wide entry way (10-12 feet wide) with an eyebrow canopy above. There will be large sized window in the Adult reading area directly across from the one in the children’s area.) Along Martin Luther King there will be windows into multi-purpose room, driveway and parking spaces in front of TLL.

Exterior Material – Ms Moore reviewed Exterior Material Studies (Attachment #E.) Material to be used is predominantly wood. High roof area glazing will be clear on north side, possibly screened on south side. Other options include different species of wood and stone. Still looking at options but aiming for warmth, solidity and durability with a natural feel. There will be a great amount of daylight in the central area and a possibility for using stained glass on the high roof window that faces the Thai Temple.

Mr. Schatz reviewed computer simulations (Attachment #F) of the exterior and reported that they have started to work on interior simulations as well. He also provided examples of Inspirations (Attachment #G) showing examples of other projects that use similar design elements.

Landscaping – Chuck McCullough reviewed the Landscape Concept Plan (Attachment #H) includes low planting near entry area to allow for easy to maintain views into the building. Accent tree at other end of entrance access near TLL. Zen Garden outside of computer bar area. Secured Patio in Northeast corner off the adult area. Minimal space for plantings along MLK. 2 trees will stay on MLK. One tree on Russell Street stays. The oak tree on temple property will need to be evaluated. Eucalyptus trees to be removed.
Mr. Schatz provided some samples of wood siding, stone.

Schematic cost estimate of $4.2 million is within the budget but does not include rooftop solar panels. Estimate $220,000 for solar panels. Looking for ways to reduce costs. Also looking for funding options.

Multi-purpose room could be accessible after hours. Will place some sort of door to close off the multi-purpose room and restroom block from the library block.

Public Comment:

Bob Patterson – Requested access to electrical outlets for laptop computers. *Wireless data access. Electrical outlets throughout the library. Will also have loaner laptops available.*

Chia Hamilton – Will the driveway or walkways be permeable? *Driveway will be permeable if the ground underneath is not too compacted. Walkways probably will drain into the planters on either side.*

Alan Tong – Are there enough windows in the Adult Reading Room to let in daylight. *Since the wall is so close to the property line, there is a limit to the number of windows per fire code. Plan to use as many as will be allowed.*

Hale Zukas – What is life cycle of wood siding? *Haven’t explored it yet. There are many examples of stained wood exteriors in Berkeley. Will need to consider maintenance costs for re-staining.*

Alejandra Nunez – Will seating area close to windows in children’s area have little nooks for kids to sit in and read. *The intention is to have big comfy chairs where kids can sit in parent’s laps. Stools for small kids near smaller windows, easy for kids to pick up and move around.*

Charles Austin – Appreciates the exhaustive process that has occurred. Encourage trustees to approve and get on with building it. *Wish we could start construction immediately but there is a process to go through first. EIR process will likely take 6 months to a year.*

Chia Hamilton – What is the plan for the facility while it is closed for construction? *Staff is considering options. There will probably be two branches closed at a time. There is a cost issue, as Bond funds can not be used for temporary space. Library is hoping most patrons will be willing to use other branches while their branch is closed.*

Board discussion:

Trustee Franklin – Any safety concerns about the big window in the children’s area? *Architects believe the more visible the space is the safer it will be. Staff was more concerned about hidden spaces.*

Trustee Burton – The plan is very thoughtful, inclusive of people’s concerns. Community has been great about providing thoughtful input.

Trustee Moore – It’s been a great process. Like what I see. It will be a great asset to South Berkeley neighborhood.

Chair Kupfer – We have an enormous opportunity to give the community a great building.

B. Presentation by Gould Evans Baum Thornley Architects on the Schematic Design Phase; and Staff Report on the Process, Community Input and Next Steps.

Director Corbeil provided copies of Meeting Notes (Attachment #I), Audience Comments and Survey Responses (Attachment #J) from the February 3, 2010 Community Meeting.


Presentation Boards attached (Attachment #K)
Conceptual design scheme 3. Dedicated teen space, separate.

New handicap ramp to meet code.

New entry/lobby area with one-point service desk moved farther back from entry to reduce crowding. Children’s space and staff work space in 1970’s wing. No dedicated multi-purpose room. Flexible space in children’s wing can be used for a variety of programs.

1924 Wing - Treating 1924 wing as if it is a landmarked structure. Old wing will have public computer space and soft seating lounge area in one of the fireplace alcoves. Current staff office to be replaced with a dedicated teen space with lots of glass so it’s visually connected but contains noise. Adult Reading Room in the other fireplace alcove. The original plans showed sliding panel doors. Proposing to add glass sliding doors to provide a quiet reading space or a small meeting space (12-16 people.)

Samantha Haimovitch reviewed the landscape plans. Brick from old handicapped access ramp will be reused to create a seating wall. Sycamore trees at street edge to be retained while the inner sycamore trees will be replaced with smaller stature trees. Concrete paving at entrance to be replaced with special pavers. More seating nooks and information kiosk along Benvenue. Brick planter at original entrance. New signage on Ashby Avenue side. Native planting to enhance and reveal architectural features. Need to determine the health of the existing redwood trees on back side. Aggregate concrete to be replaced with permeable pavers to allow storm water to remain on site.

Mr. Thornley reported meetings with Landmark Preservation Committee (LPC) sub-committee. An informational meeting with the full LPC will be held on March 4, 2010. Three community meetings have been held. Community supportive of design and provided valuable feedback on landscaping. Will also be meeting with the immediate neighbors.

LEED Silver Goals - LEED Charette to be held later this month. LEED Silver is going to be a challenge for this building. LPC made it little more challenging as they would like to keep original single-pane windows in the 1924 wing. Architects are trying to model this in the energy model to see if is possible.

Budget – Cost estimating is underway. There are some elements that weren’t part of the original Bond measure directions. Some of these elements might become optional as we move forward. Goal is to satisfy Bond measure requirements. Hoping to have funding to do minor interventions to enhance the entry experience. Architects are working on refining the estimates. Budget is 2.9 million.

Trustee Burton – Solar Panels? Will need to generate power to get LEED points. Will look at including solar panels in the project. It’s not currently part of the energy model.

Trustee Moore – What are the plans for the fireplaces? No finalized plans yet? Possibility to include some flame or light feature.

Public Comment: Director Corbeil reported a community meeting had been held recently and many comments were received.

Board discussion:

Trustee Moore – What was the public reaction to the outside seating? People spoke to the landscape architect after Saturday community meeting and were excited about seat walls and the recycling of existing materials.

Trustee Burton – Is the lounge area for staff or public? It’s a public reading area.

Trustee Franklin – What is the difference in function for lounge area and adult reading room. They are similar in function. Lounge area will be available to all patrons. Adult reading room will be dedicated to adults.

Trustee Franklin – Heavy user of Claremont branch. Excited to hear about plans to open up entry area and possible addition of the children’s reading nook.

Chair Kupfer – Shelving reduction, what are options on future expansion of shelving?
Mr. Thornley – It’s been a very ambitious program to meet. Would need to revisit the program needs and choices. A lot of the adult books aren’t being used. When the branch is closed for renovation, staff will go through and pull books that don’t get used. Children’s collection fits in the new area.

Director Corbeil reported that when library did community surveys people asked for more seating. It’s a very busy library and people are frequently looking for a place to sit. Staff is committed to making space work really well. New book displays will make collections more visible.

Hale Zukas- Dormer/Butterfly roof has very little benefit and is not worth the cost.

Mr. Thornley – We believe it will make the area more inviting and bring in more natural light.

Trustee Franklin – Likes the reading nook off the children’s space. This branch is a different scenario than the other branches. It looks great. Landscaping looks terrific.

Seismic upgrade - Will be doing a full seismic upgrade. Currently exploring options of removing interior walls to add sheathing.

Time line - Mr. Dewan reported we expect to go to bid end of 2010 or first of 2011. Why so far in future? Still have to go through Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) for Use Permit and variance for additional space.

Next steps - Director Corbeil recommending further work on cost issues. What can we realistically accomplish within budget prior to completing design development phase.

C. Review presentation made by Harley Ellis Devereaux/GreenWorks Studio on the Conceptual Design Phase; and Staff Report on the Process, Community Input and Next Steps at February 6, 2010 Special BOLT meeting.

Draft meeting minutes and community responses from the February 6, 2010 Special Bolt Meeting on the West Branch were provided.

Chair Kupfer summarized the three schemes that were presented. Scheme A retained remnants of the original building and added new structure around it. Estimated costs are $800,000 over budget. Schemes B & C are all new construction. Scheme B is single story and fills almost all of the site. It fits program needs and budget. Scheme C has 2 stories. Literacy program would be located on second floor away from rest of library programs. Estimated costs are $200,000 over budget.

Public Comment: none.

Board discussion:

General Discussion of Current Building:

Chair Kupfer - It’s important to note that there is very little of the original building that remains. This should not be construed as a situation where we are abandoning a well-loved, ancient but gorgeous building. It has been so touched upon, destroyed and renovated that there is very little left.

The Board would like to hear more about possible re-use of historic features or a reflection of them in new design (i.e. medallion)

Discussion Regarding the West Branch as a “Gateway to the City” – University Avenue is a major thoroughfare. Board members support a new library of stature/grandeur/significance in this location. It makes sense to have a new facility that’s sustainable and meets Berkeley’s goals (Net Zero Energy as an option.) Important that the Library is not dwarfed by buildings around it – can stand out in a block with a lot of tall buildings.

Budget Concerns – Board members expressed concerns about not exceeding the budget. Trustees wish to replace current building with an all new building and give the architects time to come up with a new design that fits within our budget. Trustees want to see a building that is within the budget and answers program needs.
Director Corbeil reported we have asked to make an informational presentation to the full LPC on March 4. This will be an opportunity for library and architects to talk to them about the process so far, what direction the Board is heading and possible design schemes.

R10-012 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Franklin to build an all-new building at the West Branch Library site. Motion passed unanimously. Trustee Henry-Golphin absent.

Discussion on remaining two schemes.

Mr. Dean reported it's very typical at this point to do valued engineering exercises and identify the areas that are causing it to be over budget. It's not unusual to have 5% overage when you do your first cost estimates. We can identify where we should look for cost savings.

General Overview of Each Scheme

Entry Area - Scheme B has very little room at entry. Scheme C has more. Trustee expressed strong desire to make entry more inviting with adequate space for bike parking, strollers, etc.

Would a hybrid of schemes B and C with a saw tooth roof and mezzanine fit within the budget? Desire to bring light into the building (liked saw tooth roof for this reason.) Valued engineering would help us identify if the saw tooth roof would be less expensive than the glass second story.

Trustee Franklin – Initially liked Scheme B but after some thought likes a B-C hybrid. Scheme B is too tight, especially at the entrance area. A hybrid would be a grander presence on University Avenue. Really liked the sawtooth roof, it allows for good light. Placing the Literacy Program on a mezzanine level could make it more visually connected to the library.

Chair Kupfer – Also likes Scheme C. We need to have flexibility to have a second level. However, we don’t want to start down a road where we are already over budget at the start. Would like to go with a 2 story scheme, if within the budget. We want civic presence, outdoor space, flexibility.

Solar Photovoltaic System - Zero Net Energy may actually present cost savings, but the photovoltaic system cost are not currently included in the budget. Photovoltaic system could be purchased by bond funds but likely will not fit in the budget. Estimated cost is $140,000.00. Mr. Dean provided information for Funding Solar Photovoltaic System for the West Branch Library Project (Attachment L).

- Savings by Design could provide $10-15K, but no guarantee.
- California Solar Initiatives could provide $22K, but no guarantee.
- Demand- Response Incentive – amount unknown but not expected to be very large if at all.
- Third-Party Provider agreements (PPA) – City would lease the system and pay the PPA instead of PG&E – would use operating budget.

Director Corbeil expressed concerns about photovoltaic leasing. We have an unknown of long term energy cost concerns. We were hopeful that one or two of the projects would have included PV costs. Library staff would be responsible for applying for any grants or programs.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

R10-014 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Franklin, to approve the consent calendar as presented. Motion passed unanimously. Trustee Henry-Golphin absent.

A. Approve minutes of January 13, 2010 Regular Meeting

R10-015 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Franklin, to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2010 regular meeting of the Board of Library Trustees as presented. Motion passed unanimously. Trustee Henry-Golphin absent.

IV. INFORMATION REPORTS

A. Library Budget Update No discussion.
B. **Update on the Branch Bond Program**  No discussion.

C. **February 2010 Monthly Report from Library Director Donna Corbeil**  No discussion.

D. **Library events**  No discussion.

### I. AGENDA BUILDING

A. The next special meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 16, 2010 at the South Branch Library, 1901 Russell Street, Berkeley.
   - Library Budget (April)
   - Library Director review (March)

### II. ADJOURNMENT

R10-016  **Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Franklin, to adjourn the regular meeting of the board at 9:00 PM.** Motion passed unanimously.

**Attachments:**
- A-H  Field Paoli Presentation on South Branch
- I-K  Gould Evans Baum Thornley Presentation on Claremont Branch
- L  Harley Ellis Devereaux/Greenworks Studio Memorandum on Funding Solar Photovoltaic System for the West Branch Library Project.
PRIMARY FACILITY IMPROVEMENT GOALS - BOND FUNDING

- New larger library that compiles with current codes
- Larger enclosed Tools Lending Library
- Fully Accessible Facility
- Improved lighting, ventilation and thermal comfort
- Reduced energy and water consumption
- Warm welcoming library design
- Sustainable design to attain LEED silver certification or better

WHAT WE’VE HEARD SO FAR

- Civic Presence on Street Neighborhood Beacon
- Better Access to all space
- All required code upgrades
- More seating
- Increased Technology / Computers
- Teen Space
- Increased and Improved Lending Library
- Better organized Tool Lending Library
- Landscape around Building / Preserve Maple Tree on Russel Street

NEW DESIGN HIGHLIGHTS

- New corner entry with multipurpose room visible from street
- More spacious, organized layout
  New central browsing / self checkout
- New energy efficient building systems
- More lounge chairs, tables and carrels
  Separate noisy and quiet areas
- Wireless access and more computers
- Distinct zone for adults, teens and children
- More work space
- Larger enclosed Tool Lending Library
- Building perimeter is landscaped / Tree preserved

BERKELEY SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+36</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ stools in kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+12 on laptop cart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelving (lf)</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>+157</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Area</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
<td>+350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLL Area</td>
<td>~850</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERIOR MATERIAL STUDIES
INSPIRATIONS

WOOD & GLASS / SHADING

CURVED WOOD WALL

DAYLIT CENTRAL SPACE

VIEWS INTO AN ACTIVE LIBRARY

WOOD SIDING

BERKELEY PUBLIC LIBRARY SOUTH BRANCH
INSPIRATIONS

SUN SHADING

ANGLED ROOF FORMS

WARM WELCOMING MATERIALS

LARGE TURNED DOWN WINDOWS
Audience Participation

Q: Are the stacks integrated into the children's flex space? A: The stacks stop before entering the flex space.

Q: Is that on purpose? A: The flex space area is to accommodate an active schedule of children’s programs and will include window seating. R: The Oakland Rockridge Library has both – flex space and stacks.

Show where (on the plan) the additional SF comes from. A: The additional SF is shown in grey areas (along southern façade bump out).

I like the acoustical separation of areas.

Q: What about the roofline? A: Kick-out areas will be extended under the roof.

Q: Is there a sunset date for when funds must be spent? Are there private funding sources? A: The City has sold $10M in bonds (of $26M total), which are being sold in two phases to coincide with schedule. The Berkeley Public Library Foundation has undertaken a capital campaign to raise approximately $3M to fund furniture, fixtures and equipment for all branch projects which bond funds cannot cover.

Q: Will you take advantage of the small (140SF) space off the lobby? A: It is cost prohibitive to cover both (additional SF along southern façade and lobby space). We’ll be getting more SF with the current proposed bump out (along southern façade) than the Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan.

Q: How much more will it cost to fill in the area? A: It’s roughly $500 per SF. R: $70,000 to fill in nook? A: It will cost more than that if foundation work is required; additionally, the exterior stair is the only access to the basement, which houses the mechanical equipment.

Since the branch is losing shelving the extra space may help to add some more shelving.

Q: Why is there a 28% decrease in shelving? A: The branch must become fully ADA accessible and accommodate enlarged restroom facilities per code. Space also is needed for staff operations, which need to be physically separate from the public space to allow them to work more efficiently; additionally, space is needed to accommodate the new dedicated teen room, which will be acoustically separate from the rest of the service areas. Site constraints prohibit the facility from expanding, except for a proposed small bump out. Since the facility cannot expand, space must be carved out of existing areas. We heard from the community during this process, as well as during the facilities master planning process, that seats and tables for reading are mandatory. We can revisit this and remove seating to make more room for shelving.

Q: What about the collections? A: Branch staff currently is weeding the collections for condition, format and turnover – items that have not circulated in several years. Weeded items may be offered to other branches to include in their collections or may be offered to the Friends of the Library. The Library will continue its inter-branch delivery and Link+ services. The redesigned branch will allow for improved functional spaces, including more shelving for holds, new browsing shelving that displays and highlights collections, new media shelving, less congested lobby space, increased seating and a variety of seating type, and more computers with space around them.
Q: Why wasn’t the children’s collection reduced in proportion?  
A: We’re still looking at the branch collections; however, we know that children and their caregivers usually come to the library to browse for books, often leaving with armfuls of material while adults usually come for specific titles but may do some casual browsing. Adults generally will place holds for desired titles while children will not.

Q: Is there a large fence around the proposed back deck?  
A: There is an alarmed gate, which will be used as a secondary (emergency) exit. The property will continue to be fenced.

Q: Where are the added computers?  
A: Additional computers will be added to the adults, teens and children’s areas.

Q: Are all the children’s tables in the flex space?  
A: There also is table seating in the stack space by the children’s computers.

Q: What type of roof materials will be used?  
A: Materials have not been determined yet but the same materials will be used on both buildings (historic and addition).

Q: Can the mezzanine be used for office space?  
A: An elevator would be required. The space only can be used for either storage and/or telecom equipment.

Q: Is the basement dry?  
A: We still are exploring this.

Q: Is there a place for meetings with multimedia?  
A: It is feasible to use the children’s flex space which will have multimedia capabilities. Additionally, there is flexible meeting space planned in the adult area as well, accommodating from 16 to 20 participants for branch sponsored programs and events.

Q: Is the teen collections in the teen room?  
A: Yes.

Q: Where are the magazines for adults?  
A: Periodicals are located in the lounge area by the fireplace.

Q: What are those items on the diagonal (in Lobby Services)?  
A: They are material display units which will hold best sellers, DVDs, CDs, and new books for adults.

Q: What happens with the historic entrance nook?  
A: We’re proposing to glaze it and make it into a reading nook and reuse the existing brick to make exterior planters. We’re trying to grab as much space as possible.

Q: Can you see out of the reading nook?  
A: Yes, it will be glassed-in.

Q: Will we get more sidewalk space?  
A: No. The footprint will stay the same.

Q: Is the traffic flow going to change? Where are the bike racks?  
A: Vehicular traffic will not change. It’s proposed that the bike rack stay in the same place as it is now and the rack itself does not need to be replaced.

Q: What about the (Library) sign (corner of Ashby and Benvenue)?  
A: We have not looked at signage yet. There are signs along the street side where I park my bike.  
A: The street signs will stay.

Q: How are the pavers permeable and where does the water go? Will it run under our houses?  
A: There are holes in the pervious concrete which allow the rain water to pass through to a layer of gravel where it may be stored or permitted to percolate into the underlying soil. It’s a sustainable design and it will not run off into the neighboring properties.

Q: What happens to the seating along the front (Benvenue Ave)?  
A: The ramp will extend into the existing seating area which will need to be relocated.

Q: Is there seating proposed along Ashby Ave?  
A: Yes. Either seat pads or benches are proposed.
Q: Are the single seats (pads) 24" square?  A: Yes. They will be of natural material that will relate to the existing landscape.

Hope we get more benches on Benvenue Ave. People use the current benches a lot. A: We’re looking into comfortable benches, “soft seating,” which will encourage multiple seating but will discourage sleeping.

It would be nice to have the library more visible from Ashby Ave.

Move the landscaping to the Ashby side to allow for more seating out front (on Benvenue Ave).

I wouldn’t want to sit on the Ashby side because of the busy traffic and exhaust fumes.

People like to congregate on Benvenue Ave.

The current Information kiosk (outside the entrance) is unsightly and should be replaced. Move it to the Ashby Ave side.

The kiosk can be smaller and replaced with something more up-to-date.

Like the kiosk function –it’s very Berkeley- but want it prettier

Q: Can the City budget maintain the landscape?  A: The Library contracts for landscaping services, excluding tree maintenance. The City handles tree pruning.

Q: What percentage of the budget goes to the outside landscaping?  A: A small amount –approximately $200,000. We’ll get another cost estimate during the schematic design phase and then will reassess the exterior budget.

Q: What about the exterior lighting?  A: We’re looking at replacing the luminary and improving exterior lighting.

We love the redwoods but at least one may be diseased and will need to be removed.  A: We will have the trees’ conditions assessed and will keep the healthy redwood.

Please make sure there is proper handling of rain water from the rear of the building (western façade). There is a stream through my property when it rains as water is not being directed to the street.

Q: Will the deck be landscaped.  A: No. There is not a lot of room.

Q: The current (front) stairs are brick and slippery, especially when covered with leaves. Will you do anything about the stairs?  A: Yes. The front stairs will be replaced.

Q: Do the sycamores have to stay?  A: We’d have to give serious thought to removing mature trees.

Q: Will there be solar in the roof?  A: We’re looking into energy generation options.
Comments

• Sounds very good; nice presentation and thank you for answering all my questions
• I hope that the Foundation / private outreach to raise (hopefully) complementary or leveraged money goes well [it’s a timing thing –sensitive when to ask for the money and when the critical need is]; I’d be glad to lend any sort of hand if folks already embarked on the effort to raise money could use it
• Any hope of using volunteer labor on planting? --A huge multiple Eagle Scout community service thing –if not more trouble than it’s worth
• Thank you for your time and energy
• Bookshelves on rollers on perimeter of flex-room would inspire, function and add to the room tremendously
• Any thought on refurbishing the original front entry and having that be an entrance?
• Looks like great changes
• One concern: storytime is such a small percentage of time when the library is in use. If the flex children space could have some books, families would use that space during programming and in times w/out programs. Also, something to keep kids occupied during programs. Oakland/Rockridge is a good example of this.
• I’m a bit concerned about the 25% reduction in shelving for adults and teens. It’s important to keep the option open for a meeting room large enough to hold neighborhood discussion groups and meetings like the one we had tonight.

Surveys

1. What were three things that you heard today about the project that were most memorable?
   Roof still needs to be determined
   Outside plantings sound great and nice displays
   The idea that the “specialty” [not to the exclusion of other things, of course] of the branch will be for younger set –adult collection shrinkage makes sense

2. What three issues do you consider most important to the Claremont Branch Library?
   Continued pacific and positive relations among “stakeholders,” staff, patrons, readers, computer users, sleepers, WiFi-ers, etc
   Once construction starts, hit it hard and rapid progress
   Figure out the creek issue –why is there a bit of unevenness in perception of where / what it is?

3. What did you like most about the community meeting?
   Good audience and nice overall supportive feel of a big and somewhat disruptive and not dissuasive project

4. What did you like least about the community meeting?
   I arrived 20 minutes late

5. Is there anything you would like the project team to know that was not said at the meeting?
   Good luck
   What about having someone videotape digitally –capture the project—“construction” cam
East (Benvenue) Elevation

NEW STAFF ROOM/BAY ADDITION (SECOND)
NEW STAFF ENTRY AND BOOK DROPS
NEW ADA-COMPLIANT RAMP
NEW ENTRY STAIR
NEW DORMER AT SERVICE DESK
NEW CORNER AT SERVICE DESK TO REPLACE EXISTING
NEW CORNER AT SERVICE DESK TO REPLACE EXISTING
NEW GLASS INFILL AT EXISTING OPENING
NEW BRICK PLANTER TO REPLACE EXISTING STAIR
NEW ENTRANCE TO REPLACE EXISTING STAIR
NEW ENTRANCE TO REPLACE EXISTING STAIR
NEW GARRY AT EXITING OPENING
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Exterior Elevations

Schematic Design
Benvenue Perspective

Schematic Design
Highlights

- Technology Improvements:
  - table-top access to power at some reader tables
  - space and equipment for Library laptop lending service
- New Children's Flex Space:
  - accommodation for children's programming
  - new window seats
- Service desks:
  - efficient, ergonomic self-checkout/return and self-service reserves
- Staff work areas:
  - physically and acoustically separated from public space
  - ergonomically sound furniture and equipment
- Exterior deck at the rear yard

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14 + laptop lending</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelving (LF)</td>
<td>4027</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>-1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Floor (GSF)</td>
<td>6967</td>
<td>7307</td>
<td>+340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Summaries
PROPOSED FENCE AND GATE
EXISTING PAVING TO BE REPLACED

- Detail - Recycled brick and concrete seating nooks

ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY
EXISTING REDWOOD TREES TO REMAIN OR TO BE REMOVED (DEPENDING ON HEALTH, TO BE DETERMINED)

LOW NATIVE AND DROUGHT TOLERANT PLANTING

RAMP (UP)
EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN
PRUNE EXISTING SYCAMORES TO RESHAPE AND IMPROVE HEALTH
NEW SMALL DECORATIVE TREES, TO REPLACE EXISTING SYCAMORES TO BE REMOVED

AGGREGATE CONCRETE PAVING TO BE REMOVED, REPLACED WITH PERMEABLE PAVERS

B E N V E N U E   A V E N U E
A S H B Y   A V E N U E
SANDBLAST EXISTING CONCRETE SIDEWALK
RECYCLED BRICK AND CONCRETE SEATING NOOKS (SEE DETAIL ABOVE)
EXISTING TREE WELLS TO REMAIN AND EDGED WITH DECORATIVE BANDING
NEW SEAT WALL FROM RECYCLED BRICK AND CONCRETE
NEW SEAT WALL FROM RECYCLED BRICK AND CONCRETE
NEW SIGNAGE FROM RECYCLED BRICK AND CONCRETE, IN COLOR PLANTING AREA
EXISTING BICYCLE RACK TO BE RELOCATED
NEW DUAL-STREAM WASTE RECEPTACLE, TYP.

AGGREGATE CONCRETE PAVING TO BE REMOVED, REPLACED WITH PERMEABLE PAVERS

BIODEGRADABLE AREA WITH NATIVE PLANTINGS

NEW SMALL DECORATIVE TREES, TO REPLACE EXISTING SYCAMORES TO BE REMOVED

NEW BIKE RACK
SAWCUT AND REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE SIDEWALK. REPLACE WITH NEW DECORATIVE PAVING AT ENTRY WALK
EXISTING LAMP POST TO REMAIN, LIGHT FIXTURE TO BE REPLACED
NEW BIKE RACK

Gould Evans
Baum Thornley, Inc.
1315 Mission St.
San Francisco, CA 94103
Tel: 415.503.1411
Fax: 415.503.1471

Hornley, Inc.
Berkely Claremont Branch Library

Consent III, Item B
Attachment #K
MEMORANDUM
10 February 2010

Funding Solar Photovoltaic System for the West Branch Library Project

The Zero Net Energy design of the West Branch Library requires the installation of a solar photovoltaic system to provide the electrical power for the building’s loads. This PV system will be connected to the electrical system provided by PG&E, so that the building’s system can both draw from (when needed) and supply electricity to the PG&E grid as appropriate to the availability of solar energy at the site. By design, the net amount of electrical energy drawn from PG&E will be zero over the course of a typical year.

HED/GWS estimates that 2,000 sq. ft. of PV solar panels will be required. The installed cost of this system is estimated to be $140,000 in mid-2012 (+/- 20%), the date that bidders will likely use for their project construction bids.

The following are the options available to cover this cost:

1. **The construction budget itself.** At this point in the project, we are not ruling out that rigorous design will provide enough cushion in the budget to include this large cost item.

2. **Savings-by-Design program (PG&E).** Funds will be provided to BPL for the very low energy demand created for this building. It is expected that this amount will be on the order of $10,000.

3. **California Solar Initiative (CSI).** This initiative offers cash payment based on the size of the system and time of application (payment amount declines over time as more customers apply for the limited amount of funds). For the size of the West Berkeley Library system, the cash payment is estimated to be $22,000. (Note: this could increase with later rulings by the CPUC. When the program was initiated, the WBL system would have received $50,000.)

4. **Demand-Response Incentive.** A cash payment is given to a customer that installs equipment or control software that allows PG&E to dial back the power supplied to WBL in the event of a brown-out. A ZNE building can coast through such an event without discomfort or inconvenience to the users or staff, so this is a worthwhile incentive. The amount of this incentive is still being determined, but is not expected to be very large.

5. **Third-Party Provider Agreement.** The City of Berkeley would sign a contract with a private provider (PPA) such as Chevron Solar to install the full system. Basically, the City would be leasing the system and paying the PPA instead of PG&E for its electric bill. The advantage is that the PPA would be responsible for the system contractually and the monthly payment would be fixed—not increases in the future, which are likely with PG&E. Thus the PPA agreement would protect the Library’s operating budget by making electrical energy a fixed cost for the duration of the contract.

Note: This agreement means that the PPA would receive the CSI incentive described in #3 above. However, this payment is used to reduce the cost of the “lease” to the owner.

This option is preferred by public institutions that do not have funds to cover the initial construction cost. LACCD and Contra Costa Community College District have signed contracts with Chevron Solar for PV installations. In addition, Fresno State University, San Jose USD and Milpitas USD have also used PPA’s to fund the systems.

6. **Unknown Possibilities.** The project will start construction in late 2011/early 2012. By that time, additional incentives and subsidies may be available, including City of Berkeley (Berkeley FIRST program or targeted incentive for this project), federal incentives. Project budget increase to cover any shortfall in PV system cost not covered by project budget plus solar incentives?