Berkeley Public Library
Board of Library Trustees

Regular Meeting
May 12, 2010
6:30 p.m.

South Branch
1901 Russell Street

III Consent, Item A

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

A. Call to Order

The regular meeting of May 12, 2010 was called to order by Chair Kupfer at 6:38 PM.


Absent: none

Also present: Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services; Douglas Smith, Deputy Director; Dennis Dang, Library Admin Manager; Gisela Gonzalez, Accounting Office Specialist Supervisor; Marge Sussman, West Branch Supervising Librarian; Karen Joseph-Smith, Claremont Branch Supervising Librarian; Alan Bern, Library Special Services Coordinator; Eve Franklin, Administrative Secretary.

Rene Cardinaux, AIA, Consultant
Kitchell CEM – Steve Dewan
Harley Ellis Devereaux – Edward Dean, AIA, Project Manager; Michael Bulander, AIA
Northmore Roberts & Associates - John Roberts, ASLA
Gould Evans Baum Thornley – Douglas Thornley, AIA, Design Principal; Karen Gould, Library Furnishings Specialist, Interior Design; Robert Gould, FAIA, Principal-in-Charge; Lauren MacColl Maass, AIA, Project Manager

Public Comments

1. Vimont – Current checkout system is not doing very well. Frequently needs staff assistance to check out books. Would like to see return to barcode system with new selfcheck.

2. Gene Bernardi, SuperBOLD – Asked Board to get involved with decision regarding what kind of checkout system and what vendor the city will hire to install the system. Requested that the topic be placed on June agenda. First preference is a Barcode system with staff doing the check out. Second preference is a Barcode/Self Check system. Please do not purchase another RFID system. Spoke about history of SuperBOLD and privacy and health concerns about RFID.

3. Peter Warfield, SuperBOLD – Encouraged the Board to eliminate RFID. Expressed concerns about privacy threats, potential security and health risks of RFID. Spoke of groups (ACLU, Electronic Frontier Foundation, SuperBOLD, SNAFU and others) that oppose RFID. Claimed that previously stated repetitive stress injury claims have not been established. Urged Board to get public input on replacement of RFID.

4. Gordon Wright – Spoke against RFID. Urged Board to eliminate RFID. Doesn’t believe that most new technologies in libraries are improving quality of life in our society. Need to move in the direction to stand up against RFID. We started down a losing path, we should reverse course and do something decent.

5. Mary – Long time Berkeley resident and library patron. Encouraged Board to eliminate RFID and hire more employees to do check out.

6. Billy Karp, Berkeley Public Library Foundation – Introduced new brochure to be used in the fundraising campaign for furniture and fixtures for the Branch Improvement Project.

B. Report from library employees and unions, discussion of staff issues - None.
C. Report from Board of Library Trustees –

1. Trustee Burton reported on meetings with Senator Loni Hancock and Representative Nancy Skinner as part of CLA legislative day in the district. Both were very supportive of libraries.

D. Approval of Agenda

R10-031 Moved by Trustee Franklin, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

II. BRANCH PROJECT ARCHITECT PRESENTATIONS

A. Measure FF West Branch Library Update

Presentation by design team:

Ed Dean, AIA and Michael Bulander, AIA, of Harley Ellis Devereaux / GreenWorks Studio and John Roberts of John Northmore Roberts & Associates provided an update on the Schematic Design Phase.

Mr. Dean recapped that at the last BOLT meeting the new one-story scheme was selected to move forward on. The one-story design was less expensive than the 2-story scheme and operationally worked better. He stated he took away from the conclusion of conceptual design presentation library board request that new space have a strong civic presence as the University Avenue corridor is seen as the gateway to Berkeley. In additional to functional space the goal is to make it an exciting space. The team is following the program, additional space of 30-40% and to pursue a NZE design. Mr. Bulander discussed the architecture. He stated they wanted the space connected to the location, including the streetscape as it will be one of the major buildings on University corridor. The eyebrow (attachments 1 & 2) that frames the building has several small scale devices including the entry plaza with trellis. He reviewed the façade elements which include back-lit signage on the front. The major elements are light and air, light brought in through skylights with solar panels providing energy. A SW wind will pull up air by acting as a natural engine. Next the interior spaces / layout was reviewed (attachments 3 & 4). The entrance on the exterior will have seating, bike parking, columns and plants to help it feel welcoming. The entry, right inside the doors (between the set of sliding doors) will have a bulletin board and be a place for public announcements. The service desk is visible from the entrance, SW side is adult reading area and stacks with living room feel seating at windows. Children’s area is toward the rear looking at the garden / tree with a reading nook within the larger space. The multi-purpose room has sliding doors on each side so it can be used as an extension of the reading room at times. The teen area is internal adjacent to the service desk. No exterior wall, will have skylight. There is a defined literacy program area and on the SE side of the building are the main staff and work area and offices.

Next, John Roberts the landscape architect for the project reviewed the garden area and landscape plans (attachment 5). He is still working on the plan details. There are windows (children’s area and multi-purpose area) from which the garden can be viewed, as well as from the main public spaces. He discussed the exterior spaces and ability to enter and see outside, and from University Avenue and much of the main spaces the tree / garden in rear is visible. Mr. Bulander added that pedestrians on the street can see through to the rear.

Continuing with the design review, Mr. Bulander stated there is a small mezzanine for mechanical equipment that is on the 2nd floor (over the bathroom area shown on the layout). The roof has solar panels that will create hot water for the radiant flooring system that is planned (attachment 6).

Mr. Dean reviewed the NZE planning efforts. Building performance analysis are underway to test various models related to day lighting, to ensure lighting meets library standards for foot candles. Chart (attachment 7) represents lighting required at various times of the year, added to model skylights and windows to provide light but fog and seasons are a factor. He stated he is satisfied that will be able to meet needs. Another concept is related to natural air flow (attachment 8), the air will come in from the rear of the building and the negative energy pulls air through a chimney out of the building at the front façade side. Studied shape of the ceiling but it doesn’t seem to affect the air flow. Air flow will happen automatically via windows located high up, these will control the flow and we will have the ability to warm the air as it enters if necessary. In addition, there will be manually operable windows in spaces such as children’s and staff areas. Will vent the building at
night during hot days and can run cool water through the floor as well if needed to cool the space. Plug load is also another important concept in NZE design. All new equipment that is very energy efficient is planned. We will want to get community and building occupants involved so they are aware of the draws on energy. Studies have found can set the foundation for NZE but actual achievement dependent on how the building is actually used.

Q&A:

Trustee Kupfer – What is the height of the front of the building? What is the interior height at the front of the building? Mr. Bulander – Exterior height is about 34 feet, the height matches roof edge of hotel next door. Interior height will depend on how ceiling is shaped, likely about 20 feet.

Trustee Kupfer - What is planned for exterior materials? Mr. Bulander – Concrete planters, benches and steps. Possibly use fiber cement board panels to tie look together. Large window is glazing. Upper windows will have transparent (could be back-lit and have signage attached to it) and opaque sections. Mr. Dean – It’s possible to illuminate building façade with solar powered battery operated lights.

Public Comments:

1. Attendee – What’s planned for drains and gutters? Spoke of seeing gutter/drain systems at an Earth Day event that reduce debris clogging gutters. Will contact library with gutter/drain system information. Mr. Roberts responded, the basic system is to drain water from roof to perimeter “rain garden” planters which will filter water before it runs into the drainage system.

2. Attendee – Not sure I understand what “Zero Net Energy Design” means. Edward Dean – Zero Net Energy is averaged over a full year. On sunny days the meter will run backwards due to power supplied by the photo voltaic systems. On cold or rainy days the meter will run forward from use of heat pump to heat the slab and lighting. Over the period of a full year the energy usage will balance out at zero. PUC is talking about the next step, which is if you give the utility more power than you use, the utility has to pay you. That’s not law yet, but it may become law.

3. Attendee – Does Zero Net Energy include energy required to build? Mr. Dean – If you are a real purist you calculate the embedded energy in the building. We are approaching it strictly from the use of the building once it is built.

4. Chair Kupfer – Can you talk about the green design of the building. Mr. Dean - The new building is required to meet at least LEED Silver. With the energy performance we’re going to get, we may achieve LEED Platinum. Includes Water conservation, recycling, low VOC content.

5. Attendee – Where is the increase in space? Edward Dean – Staff areas, multipurpose room (700 SF) and literacy program (900 SF) which now uses the program room, additional bathrooms required by current code.

6. Attendee – What was the source of the program / space requirements? Who determined check out desk location? Ed Dean responded, a Library Programming Consultant and staff determined needs. Circulation Desk was ultimately located where it is on the layout to give good site lines to all public areas, such as adult, children and teen areas.

7. Attendee – Where is Reference Desk? Edward Dean – Reference and Circulation are located in shared centralized space. Marge Sussman, branch head for West added that the branch currently operates with one service desk that has multiple staff stations for reference and checkout.

Board Comments/ Discussion:

1. Trustee Franklin – Thoughtful, well considered design. Great civic presence. Likes the idea of having an educational goal showing meters, etc.

2. Trustee Burton – Reported he attended the earlier community meeting on the project held at the branch. Very pleased with outcome, grand presence as shown in street view.
3. Trustee Henry-Golphin – Great presence. Gateway feeling to the city of Berkeley is represented in design. Sounds like even on dreary days it will be bright. Very well thought out.

4. Trustee Moore – Love the layout and design. Love the height of front façade. Excellent gateway project for University avenue. Excited about it.

5. Chair Kupfer – We made a lot of progress from earlier schemes. Thank you for working with us. Appreciate interior height and windows bringing in light; what the board was looking for in design.

Director Corbeil reported project will move into Design Development Phase next. Next steps include completion of process by the Planning Department, which has issued a contract for an EIR. A local firm has started on it and it will probably take a total of 5-6 months to complete. Also, we will need to go to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Structural Alteration Permit to demolish existing building and ZAB for a use permit to construct a new building. Staff will continue to work with the architects on design and refining the details. The board will be updated in a few months.

BREAK: 5 minutes

B. Measure FF Claremont Branch Library Update

Presentation by the design team:


Doug Thornley lead the team in a discussion and presentation to update the board on the Design Development Phase including layout, lighting, furniture, floor and wall coverings, landscaping and public art.

Mr. Thornley reviewed briefly the design progress to date. The previously proposed south wall bump out has been eliminated and is replaced by expansions to the infill corners of the addition and the knuckle area build out. Further refinement to make staff areas more efficient and adding additional public space has been the focus, the result is an added reading alcove for small children. This new picture book area (the knuckle) is at the corner between the lobby and new wing with the entrance facing the children’s area (attachment 9). In the children’s space, about half-way is the computer seating and room for a few seats. At the rear of the children’s area, what is currently the program space will be additional children’s seating. This space will have a folding wall / panel to retain the ability to block it off for programs. We may lose a little stack space where this is located to create storage closet for the folding panel. More advanced plans (attachment 10) show the reflective ceiling plans with lighting and treatments. Have identified 3 areas to have special acoustical treatment in ceiling and wood slat treatment over this, these are the teen, service desk and children's flex-space, this will help mediate the noise. Skylights are planned in the teen area and children's area to introduce natural light. Will not be able to increase dramatically the natural light but will increase lighting dramatically with good lighting throughout to meet library lighting (foot candle) standards. Pendants are used to identify special areas, 5 large pendants are planned for down the center of the historic wing with ambient lighting to augment this at the stacks and perimeter so much more user friendly than now where no lights. Different pendants are planned for over the service desk area to mark this as a special area. Continuing to develop elevations (attachment 11), keeping much of the current exterior as is, similar colors with addition of cool roof and new handicapped accessible ramp that is glass, to make it more transparent and welcoming. Entrance façade as planned to have 14’ dormer window so library feels more transparent and to bring in natural northern light. Mr. Thornley continued with a review of the exterior elevations, seating is still included, the bricks from the wall will be reused in landscaping. Elevations around branch (attachment 12) show the areas of in-fill / expansions. Another feature is a new bay window at the rear of the children’s flex-space with a bench or seating for adult and child.

Trustee Burton asked how the flex-space will be used. Mr. Thornley responded it is primarily intended for use by children’s staff for programs, they have created teen room and adult reading room with doors that can be closed and used as small meeting places. The flex-space will have an art sink, and storage for chairs and tables so children can sit on floor. Also, limited shelving in this area so access is not cut off when a program is held.
Mr. Thornley returned to discussing the entry area, this will have an exterior glass canopy for protected entrance and will be fretted glass for easier maintenance; will also integrate new signage that directional and functional. A new dormer will be dark bronze color to tie the entry elements together. Details of the built-ins underway (attachment 13) - looking at a circular shape service desk with good sight lines to both wings and visible from the outside; beginning of some ideas to create active space that is inviting to the community. One desk planned, will integrate features that have now and want to keep such as chair for patron so can sit and talk to staff. Goal to keep entry open and not clogged as it feels like now. The team is beginning to look at furnishings, with wood for the adult side that is contemporary and fitting for the design and something more playful for the children’s side.

Karen Gould presented the material board (attachment 14) and discussed the interiors. In the adult area, they have lobbied for carpet so it would feel cozy and comfy like a living room. Plan to use carpet tiles. At the entry / lobby will be cork with a set-in walk off mat. The back-of-house areas will have marmoleum; restrooms will use a simple tile on walls and floor with a dark grout on the floor. In the adult area, material board shows range of colors considering but not finalized. The teen and adult area glass wall shows figures / images that can be seen through with some privacy, the colors are still being worked out. At the fireplaces considering some stenciling to bring some color back. In children’s want it to be fun and whimsical, the board shows some vibrant colors and fabrics under consideration. Wood slats for ceiling, mentioned earlier, are shown, these will have acoustical backing. The teen area tables are elliptical in shape “comma” and on wheels. We are looking at durable chairs for teens; and for children’s area looking at furniture and other pieces that can be climbed on by children.

Trustee Franklin asked about the carpet color which seems dark. Mrs. Gould responded that it will hide spills and dirt. The arched ceiling in the adult area is a light color to the rail with a darker color below but the space will feel light.

Ms Maass made a presentation on the landscaping plans (attachment 15 & 16). The goal is to provide as much useable exterior space as possible. Proposing re-use of the brick from the current ramp / wall to create seating in a wave shaped wall in front of the new ramp and other seats in landscaped areas around the building. A new information kiosk to replace the current one is under development. Proposing improved exterior lighting on the Benvenue side of the building as awfully dark now and want a better street presence. The design will enhance both the historic wing and more contemporary addition. The team is proposing a new planter at the old entrance to replace the historic entry stairs. Working to create sustainable design in the outdoor areas as well as inside, the outdoor design supports the LEED Silver goal. An example is the filtration planter systems along Ashby, since this was not considered a desirable place to sit by the community. Also, recommend adding eco-pavers to the entry area to create a sense of a special place when approaching the building. The project landscape architect has met with Dan Gallagher from the COB regarding the redwood trees in the rear at the property line. Though they are not diseased they both agreed in recommending replacement now for several reasons, they will eventually grow too large for the space, they can undermine the foundation as well as a concern about the height they might reach. The double trunk is susceptible to dry-rot and can negatively impact the trees health. The team is also working closely with the neighbors to replace these trees with mature trees (12’ to 15’) of a species that they will be happy with. The rest of the landscape pallet is mostly low maintenance natives. The team is working with Bay Friendly design guidelines and with the COB requirements to re-use materials.

Mr. Thornley summed up the process and where the project is: the team has met with the landmarks preservation commission (LPC) subcommittee members assigned to the project and shared ideas and took comments. He is happy to report they were pleased with the direction of the plans and supportive. The team will continue to meet with the staff and listen to the client so that the library will function well. The team held their fourth community meeting (since the last update to BOLT) and received good comments and attendance. The architects submitted to the city a use permit application on APRIL 13. They are working on their LEED certification checklist meeting with Stopwaste.org and KEMA, both very helpful organizations; it has been a good process. Mr. Thornley stated he is beginning to look at public art opportunities for the project, and is proposing a glass artist create an in-fill glass piece at the original entry in the historic wing that is transparent so light will come through it and that is integrated into the building design. Additionally, he reported that
GEBT has completed their cost estimate for the phase and compared it to the estimate prepared by Kitchell and is happy to report the project is on budget, with all of the components covered, including sustainability, added space and seismic included.

Q&A

Board Comments / Discussion:

1. Trustee Franklin:
   - How big is the new picture book alcove compared to the current space? Mr. Thornley – It’s smaller, about 132 square feet. The current space is about 225 square feet.
   - What are the plans were for the fireplaces? Mr. Thornley – We looked at different alternatives. Didn’t like the electric alternative that had a fake flame. Most likely will put a gas fire element in and cover front with glass panel, intent to activate.
   - What would a library patron be most excited about the improved library, in your opinion what would be the biggest improvements? Mr. Thornley – This may depend on your age or interests but, dedicated Teen room, presence on the street with entry area being completely redone, adult reading area (house away from home), improved service deck, creation of picture book alcove, and lighting levels improved so feel so much better.

Public Comment:

1. Attendee, who identified self as a parent of a young child, expressed concerns about smaller picture book space. Kids like to be near the picture books. It’s a very busy area now.

Trustee Kupfer asked the branch head to speak about the children’s programming. Karen Joseph-Smith, Branch Supervising Librarian, described children’s programs that take place on Wednesday afternoons and Saturday mornings. Children’s programs are usually held in the rear space of the children’s wing. She described staff lead class visits during the school day and 6-7 times a year larger special programming such as puppet shows.

Director Corbeil acknowledged this is a difficult project in it had a small expansion and the design team has had a hard mission to fit programming needs within the constraints of the site. We’re using the current building with a small increase in space with multiple goals, included required improvements.

Trustee Franklin agreed with the comment that it’s especially crowded on Saturday mornings I the children’s areas.

Mr. Thornley and Mr. Gould clarified there are several spaces for children to sit, the picture book alcove, a centralized seating / table area in the middle of the children’s book stacks and seating in the flex space. Doug Thornley reported they are looking at expanding the picture book alcove by taking a few feet of space from the lobby area. Picture books will be adjacent to picture book alcove.

2. Attendee – Will there be space for parking strollers in the lobby area? Mr. Thornley - Not much. As desirable as it was to create stroller parking, it was difficult to fit it in with all the programming needs.

3. Attendee - Asked for clarification of number of seats before and after. Mr. Thornley – There is increased seating in all areas.

4. Attendee - Expressed concerns about reduced shelving space. Trustee Kupfer – There have been many discussions and decisions made regarding shelving.

5. Attendee - Expressed concern that computer space takes away from shelving space. Director Corbeil referenced chart that summarized changes in the packet, board from the community meeting. Mr. Thornley – We learned from discussions with staff that lots of the collection is not being used. Library staff will be removing unused items. Many patrons use the “Holds” program that can bring books from other branches.

7. Attendee - Can see the importance of space for children’s programming, concern about reduction of space Mr. Gould. I think there is a misunderstanding. The area added is a bonus. There are several places for children to gather. The areas for children are distributed. It should reduce congestion.

8. Trustee Franklin - Are there picture books other than in the picture book alcove? Mr. Thornley. Picture books will be adjacent to the picture book alcove.

9. Attendee - Expressed concern about how many teens would use the teen space. Doesn’t see many teens using the library when he has visited. Director Corbeil – There is a part time teen librarian who has said the older teens don’t stay long because there isn’t room for them. Ms. Joseph-Smith – Many younger teens currently use both teen and younger children’s area.

10. Attendee – Expressed concerns about loss of shelving space, felt was a de-emphasis on books. Lobby space looks large. Expressed concerns about shared reference and circulation space, lack of privacy.

11. Trustee Moore reminded attendees that there have been multiple community meetings where members of the community had the opportunity to see the plans, ask questions and provide feedback that helped to shape the design. Chair Kupfer added that there have been numerous conversations in the past about shelving and what was going to happen in the future and why we had to do this. The problem is that we’re in an existing building that has limited expansion opportunities. Mr. Thornley – My understanding from staff is that there is a lot of the collections that isn’t be used and can be moved elsewhere. No one is being denied access to books. You might not be able to get a book immediately but the “Holds” program can get it for you.

12. Trustee Moore – What happened to the bump-outs that were planned for the south wall? Mr. Thornley-We decided it would be better to consolidate staff space and make it more efficient and place the addition elsewhere (picture book alcove.) Director Corbeil – The focus was on the public space in the revision. The Master Facility Plan estimated a small square foot increase and that the architects have added more than originally planned.

13. Written Comment
   a. Children’s reading area being considered is smaller than the current one. It is already too small.
   b. Fewer books/video in children’s area is tragic and alarming.
   c. Presentations were very clear and thorough.
   d. Packages were not clearly available at meeting to all. I was not aware of prior meetings for reviewing the plans until I saw the flyer for this meeting (5/12/10.)
   e. Safety concerns – Square footage needs to be known to community with a display at the branch.

Chair Kupfer thanked the design team for their efforts.

Director Corbeil reviewed next steps: In Design Development phase now, there are a few more things we need to do, then move on to construction documents. Staff will continue to work with the team on details. Will come back to Board with details about the budget and schedule as we get closer to construction which is anticipated for the first quarter of 2011.

III. PRESENTATIONS

A. Quarterly Branch Renovation Program Update by Steve Dewan, Kitchell CEM

Steve Dewan provided a progress report on work done since last update in January 2010 (attachment # 17.)

Trustee Moore – What are the permit fees to the City so far? Mr. Dewan - We anticipated 3.5% of the bid day estimate. Building permit fees have come in higher (4.8 of bid day estimate.) Building permit fees won’t be paid until we reach end of construction document phase and will be broken into two parts, fees related to the plan check and fees related to inspectors.

Trustee Moore – Will public art have to be reviewed and approved by the Civic Arts Commission? Director Corbeil – Yes. We working closely with the Arts Commission on a process and how to move that forward. There’s usually a review panel and interested Board members may take part.
Chair Kupfer acknowledged Director Corbeil’s and library staff’s work with the Landmarks Preservation Commission including many late night meetings and requested Board support at future meetings.

The Board thanked Steve Dewan for clear monthly reports.

Chair Kupfer suggested sending a letter to City’s Planning Commission in support of the proposed amendment to revise ordinance related to variances for Library Branch projects.

B. Proposed Bond / Measure FF FY2011 Mid-Biennial Budget Update

Dennis Dang provided a FY11 mid-biennial budget update (attachment #18.)

Discussion regarding the 2nd bond sale scheduled for July. City decides when to conduct the sale. They are looking at it strategically, looking for the best fees and rates. The money will be needed in construction phase. Bond sales proceeds are deposited in a library account and earn interest.

Trustee Burton – When do we have the conversation regarding local vendors and local hires? Chair Kupfer – We should talk about it in concert with the Labor Compliance Program. Director Corbeil to get more direction on this from the City Manager’s Office.

Discussion regarding bookmobile. Director Corbeil responded to trustee questions and comments: Firms usually don’t lease bookmobiles. Bookmobiles are generally custom-made to fulfill a specific library’s needs. The library has explored other options, including lease. Many libraries buy very large RV style bookmobiles, we don’t think they would work well in Berkeley. There is a possibility of selling bookmobile after branch improvement project is completed. Trustees expressed a strong interest in purchasing a vehicle. There was a discussion of the type of fuel options, diesel is the norm, but will explore if can convert it to bio-diesel after purchase. This item will be added to a future agenda.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

R10-032 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to approve the consent calendar as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

A. Approve minutes of April 14, 2010 Regular Meeting

R10-033 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2010 regular meeting of the Board of Library Trustees as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Resolution of Gratitude to Jane Scantlebury

R10-034 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to adopt a resolution expressing gratitude to Jane Scantlebury, who served as a Librarian for the Berkeley Public Library from September 1984 to April 2010. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Collection Development Policy

Chair Kupfer expressed some concerns about the selection criteria being so thoroughly detailed that it might be hard to implement them but deferred to staff expertise in this area.

R10-035 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to adopt a resolution approving the Collection Development Policy for the Berkeley Public Library. Motion passed unanimously.

V. INFORMATION REPORTS

A. Update on the Branch Bond Program No discussion.

B. April 2010 Monthly Report from Library Director Donna Corbeil No discussion.

C. Library events: No discussion.
D. FY2010 Third Quarter Budget Review No discussion.
E. Audit Suggestions for Fiscal Year 2011 No discussion.

VI. AGENDA BUILDING

A. The next meeting will be a Special Meeting held at 6:30 PM on Tuesday, May 25, 2010 at the Northbrae Community Church, 941 The Alameda, Berkeley.
   • May 25 Special Meeting
     1. Proposed FY2011 Berkeley Public Library Mid-Biennial Budget
     2. Recommendation to the City Council on the FY2011 Library Tax Rate
     3. Measure FF North Branch Library Update
   • Future agendas:
     1. Local vendors / local hires for Branch Improvement Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

R10-036 Moved by Trustee Moore, seconded by Trustee Henry-Golphin, to adjourn the regular meeting of the board at 9:20 PM. Motion passed unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

Attachments:
1-8 Harley Ellis Devereaux/Greenworks Studio - West Branch Presentation Boards
9-16 Gould Evans Baum Thornley – Claremont Branch Presentation Boards
17 Kitchell CEM - Quarterly Branch Renovation Program Update
18 Proposed Bond / Measure FF FY2011 Mid-Biennial Budget Update
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## Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>+12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelving (LF)</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (GSF)</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>+3,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Multipurpose room can accommodate an additional 10 seats at tables and 5 seats at laptop stations when used as a Reading Room.*

---

**Program Summary**

Harley Ellis Devereaux
ZERO NET ENERGY DESIGN

DESIGN STRATEGIES AND FEATURES
1. Daylighting
2. Natural Ventilation and Air Movement
3. Radiant Heating
4. Night Vent and Radiant Cooling (for extreme warm days)
5. Reduced Plug Load

NATURAL VENTILATION: SLOPED CEILING STUDY

NATURAL VENTILATION: HIGH CEILING STUDY

DAYLIGHTING: SEP 21, 12NOON - CLEAR SKY (LEFT) AND OVERCAST SKY (RIGHT)

DAYLIGHTING: PERCENT OF HOURS ABOVE 30 FC (LEFT) AND ABOVE 300 FC (RIGHT)

HARLEY ELLIS DEVEREAUX
SCHEMATIC DESIGN

THE WEST BRANCH LIBRARY

SECTION A-A

SECTION B-B

SECTION C-C

HARLEY ELLIS DEVEREAUX
Exterior Elevations

Design Development
III Consent, Item A
Claremont Branch
Attachment 15

FLOW-THROUGH PLANTERS
1. wild ginger
2. pacific coast firs
3. coral bells
4. dwarf plumage

CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANTINGS
1. California fuchsia
2. California red buckwheat
3. California hairgrass
4. Bursa poppa
5. Monardella
6. Snowberry
7. White sage
8. California red grass
9. California creeping fescue
10. California desert bluebells
11. Manzanita spp.

SHOWY PLANTING AREAS
1. lady banks rose
2. Natal plum
3. California wood rose
4. Western columbine
5. Golden currant
6. Blue-eyed grass
7. California wild grape
8. Oregon grape
9. Berkeley seige grass
10. Yellow-eyed grass
11. Starip's tur.

TREES
1. Carolina ironwood
2. Cassia fistula
3. Fremont parsley
4. Northern red oak
5. Columnar maple

PROPOSED PLANTS
1. oregan grape
2. berkeley seige grass
3. yellow-eyed grass
4. starip's tur.
5. california mes.

Conceptual Plant Palette
Design Development
Attachment 16

Detail: Recycled brick and concrete seating nooks
Agenda

- General Program Update
  - Progress Since 01/13/10, Milestones
  - What’s Next?
- Schedule Update
- Budget & Cost Control Update
- Branch Updates
General Program Update – Progress Since 01/13/10

**PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

- Final Programming document published by Page + Moris
- Draft of signage standards issued
- Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) standards issued by Page + Moris
- Information Technology standards drafted by SFMI

**DESIGN PROGRESS - MILESTONES**

- Process:
  - Conceptual Design
  - Schematic Design
  - Design Development
  - Construction Documents
- 3 projects In Design Development phase (North, Claremont & South)
- 1 project In Schematic Design phase (West)
- Input solicited at community & BOLT meetings, branch staff meetings, and Landmarks Preservation Commission
- Based on programming developed by Page + Moris
**General Program Update – Progress Since 01/13/10**

**PERMIT PROCESS - MILESTONES**

- Complete conceptual and schematic design phases
- Planning Permits
  - Use Permit - Reviewed by City Staff, Action by Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
  - Structural Alteration Permit - Reviewed by City Staff, Action by Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), Action by ZAB
- Development of design through Construction Documents
- Building Permits

- Use Permit Applications submitted for 2 projects (North & Claremont) – Pending with City Planning
- Use Permit Application (demo only) submitted for South – No action taken or “passed” at 05/06/10 LPC meeting with no comments or conditions
- Use Permit Applications still to be submitted for 2 projects (South, West)

- Structural Alteration Permit Application submitted for North – Presented to LPC 03/04/10, 04/01/10 - Preliminary approval received 05/06/10

---

May 12, 2010

**General Program Update – What's Next?**

- Continuation of design process – “fine tuning”
- FF&E design development
- Environmental Impact Report process – South & West
- Planning permit reviews, hearings & action
- Landmarks Preservation Commission review – Structural Alteration Permit (West) & subcommittees (North & Claremont)

---

May 12, 2010
### BOLT Progress Report

**Branch Library Improvement Project**

**Master Schedule Updates**

- Since 01/13/10 report, detailed project schedules further developed for each branch.

- Updates to project schedules include:
  - Actual design progress to date
  - Added detail - meetings, estimates & presentations
  - Clarifications & detail added to City permit process
  - No CEQA process at North & Claremont
  - EIR Duration at South and West reduced from 12 months to 9 months

---

**Berkeley Public Library Updated Master Schedule**

**August 27, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional North</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional South</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional West</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>01/13/10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Master Schedule - Updates

- Working with City Planning to confirm projected durations for permit reviews

- Overall, program schedule still on track for completion in 2nd quarter of 2013

- City Planning beginning Zoning Ordinance Amendment process at 05/12/10 Planning Commission meeting

- Proposed amendment specifically for Library projects - to eliminate variances of Use Permit applications

- Impacts to schedule to be assessed soon
Master Schedule – Projected Closures

• North Branch
  • Anticipated closure – 1st Quarter 2011 to 1st Quarter 2012 – No change since 01/13/10 report
  • Anticipated construction duration – 1 year
• Claremont Branch
  • Anticipated Closure – 1st Quarter 2011 to 1st Quarter 2012 – No change since 01/13/10 report
  • Anticipated construction duration – 9 months

Budget & Cost Control

• As of 04/30/10 – $964,013 of the $26M Bond Fund Expended – 3.7%
  • Current expenses – Design activity, consultants & reports
  • Reduction to program and project contingencies:
    • Allocated to certain contract contingencies
    • City permit fee estimates higher than projected
    • Unanticipated expenses (for example, bookmobile)
Branch Updates – NORTH Design

- Schematic Design phase complete
- Community meeting – December 1, 2009
- Schematic Design presentation to BOLT – January 13, 2010
- Currently in Design Development phase
- Community meeting – February 24, 2010
- Design Development presentation to BOLT – May 25, 2010
Branch Updates – NORTH Design

- Recent revisions to Josephine Street facade based on Landmarks Preservation Commission and community input

May 12, 2010

Branch Updates – NORTH CEQA / Permits

- Building Designated as City Landmark – Structural Alteration Permit and Use Permit required
- Preliminary approval of Structural Alteration Permit by LPC on 05/06/10
- Submittal of Use Permit application on 03/31/10
- Notice of Exemption from CEQA likely – City to make final determination

May 12, 2010
Branch Updates – NORTH Upcoming

- Ruling on Use Permit application by City of Berkeley (Zoning Adjustments Board)
- Construction Document phase
- Landmarks Preservation Commission subcommittee meetings
- LEED planning

Branch Updates – SOUTH Design

- Schematic Design Phase complete
- Community meeting – January 27, 2010
- Schematic Design presentation to BOLT – February 10, 2010
- Currently in Design Development phase
- Community meeting – April 13, 2010
- Design Development presentation to BOLT – June 9, 2010
Branch Updates – SOUTH Design

Branch Updates – SOUTH – CEQA / Permits

- Building not designated as City Landmark, but 40+ years old – Structural Alteration Permit not required, but Use Permit (demo referral) required
- Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) informational presentation made on 01/07/10
- Use Permit (demo referral) presented to LPC on 05/06/10 – No action taken or “passed” with no comments or conditions
- Use Permit (construction) application to be submitted soon
- DCE preparing Environmental Impact Report (EIR) focused on historical issue

May 12, 2010
Branch Updates – SOUTH Upcoming

- Draft Environmental Impact Report development & public hearings
- Construction Document phase
- LEED planning

Branch Updates – WEST Design

- Conceptual Design Phase Complete
- 1st Community Meeting – December 3, 2009
- 2nd Community Meeting - January 27, 2010
- Concept Design Presentation to BOLT – February 6, February 10 & March 10, 2010
- Direction to proceed with new construction, one story
- Currently in Schematic Design Phase
- Community Meeting – April 22, 2010
- Schematic Design Presentation to BOLT – May 12, 2010
Branch Updates – WEST Design

• Building designated as “Structure of Merit” - Structural Alteration Permit and Use Permit required

• Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) informational presentation made on 03/04/10

• Structural Alteration Permit application to be submitted soon – Will be reviewed by LPC

• Design Review Committee (DRC) oversight possible

• Proposed pending to prepare Environmental Impact Report (EIR) focused on historical issue
Branch Updates – WEST Upcoming

• Design Development Phase
• Draft EIR development and hearings
• LEED planning
• Further Net Zero Energy (NZE) testing and analysis

May 12, 2010

Branch Updates – CLAREMONT Design

• Schematic Design phase complete
• Community meeting – February 3, 2010
• Schematic Design presentation to BOLT – February 10, 2010

• Currently in Design Development phase
• Community meeting – March 31, 2010
• Design Development presentation to BOLT – May 12, 2010

May 12, 2010
Branch Updates – CLAREMONT Design

- Building not designated as City Landmark, but 40+ years old - Structural Alteration Permit not required unless demolition requested.
- Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) informational presentation made on 04/01/10
- Submittal of Use Permit application on 04/01/10
- Notice of Exemption from CEQA likely – City to make final determination
Branch Updates – CLAREMONT Upcoming

- Construction Document phase
- Use Permit application ruling by City of Berkeley
- LEED Planning
- Landmarks Preservation Commission subcommittee meetings (voluntary)

May 12, 2010

QUESTIONS?

May 12, 2010
Bond Measure FF
Program Budget

Board of Library Trustees – May 12, 2010

Where We Are

Fiscal Years 2009/2010

• First Bond Sale in May 2009: $9,964,575 (net of fees)
• FY09 Expenses: $9,277 (Professional Services)

• FY10 Beginning Fund Balance: $9,955,299
• FY10 3Q Expenses: $772,731 (primarily Architectural and Pro. Services)
• FY10 3Q Encumbrances: $3,370,977

FY2011

• Projected Beginning Fund Balance: $8,095,413
• Final Bond Sale in July 2010: $15,943,320 estimated (net of fees & docs)
• Projected Expenses: $10,296,948
Bond Measure FF Allocations consist of 5 major components:

- North Branch: 22%
- Claremont Branch: 17%
- South Branch: 24%
- West Branch: 27%
- Program-wide: 10%

Branch Projects Budget

$23,520,685

- Contingency
- Soft Costs
- Hard Costs

North: $5.00
South: $6.00
West: $7.00
Claremont: $2.00
Branch Projects’ Costs

Hard Costs:  
- Construction  
- Change Order Requests  
- Change Order Contingencies  
- Public Art  
- Miscellaneous

Soft Costs:  
- Architect and Engineering Services  
- Building Permits  
- Hazmat Abatement  
- Specialty Consultants  
- Utility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>4,282,000</td>
<td>4,282,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>1,175,470</td>
<td>95,767</td>
<td>1,271,237</td>
<td>Architect’s Contingency FY11=$68K; Permits/Inspct=$51K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>(95,767)</td>
<td>104,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5,657,470</td>
<td>5,657,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>4,844,500</td>
<td>4,844,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>1,285,020</td>
<td>120,502</td>
<td>1,405,522</td>
<td>Architect’s Contingency FY11=$79K; Permits/Inspct=$58K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>(120,502)</td>
<td>79,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6,329,520</td>
<td>6,329,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>5,518,500</td>
<td>5,518,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>1,420,955</td>
<td>151,451</td>
<td>1,572,406</td>
<td>Architect’s Contract=$59K; LEED=$50K; Survey=$30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>151,451</td>
<td>48,549</td>
<td>includes +$65K needed for Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>7,139,455</td>
<td>7,139,455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>3,268,500</td>
<td>3,268,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>925,740</td>
<td>95,856</td>
<td>1,021,596</td>
<td>Cntrt=$58K; Permits=$39K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>(95,856)</td>
<td>104,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>4,394,240</td>
<td>4,394,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program-wide Budget
$2,479,315

Shared expenditures: $1,855,632 is allocated; $623,683 is contingency.

Program-wide Costs

Soft Costs:
- Project Management
- Consultants and Legal Administration (e.g., Bond Sales Fees)
- Moving & Storage
- Miscellaneous (e.g., TLL, PR, Cntgncy)

Upcoming Activities
- RFP for Moving and Storage Services (Program-wide)
- Engagement of a Public Art Program Specialist (Branch Project)
- Instituting a Labor Compliance Program (Program-wide)
- Request CC Authorization for Contract Contingencies at North & South (Branch Project)
- Possible Acquisition of a Bookmobile (Program-wide)
Program Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soft Costs</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>(3,010)</td>
<td>996,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>484,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Miscellaneous</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>118,962</td>
<td>273,962</td>
<td>Authorized for Kitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>739,315</td>
<td>(115,632)</td>
<td>623,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Program</td>
<td>2,479,315</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2,479,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program-wide Contingency

$623,683

Must Cover These Costs:

**Non-controllable**
- Contract Scope Modifications
- Labor Compliance Program
- Full Moving and Storage Expenses
- Escalation: Economic Conditions
- Delays: Escalation and Consultants

**Controllable**
- Bookmobile Purchase
- Bookmobile Operational Costs
Purchasing a Bookmobile Allows

- Delivery of limited library services into neighborhoods
- Responds to patron demand
- Allows multiple service points and greater penetration into community
- Lower costs than opening temporary satellite branches
- Provides Library mobile public visibility
- May allow closing of up to three branch closures at a time reducing overall Program costs
- Funded by Measure FF bond monies

But What Happens to the Program-wide Contingency?

- Contingency, $483,683, 78%
- Bookmobile Operational Cost, $20,000, 3%
- Bookmobile Purchase, $120,000, 19%
Can We Do This With $26M?

- Program-wide Budget = $2.5M
- Branch Projects Budget = $23.5M
- Program Duration = estimated 51 Months JAN09-MAR13
- Elapsed Time = 17 months
- Possible Additional Expenses = Bookmobile, Contract Scope Modifications, Labor Compliance Program, Procedural Delays, Economic Conditions, etc.

Yes!

This projected can be successfully completed with prudent management of the time and the resources generously provided by the citizens of Berkeley