CITY OF PACIFICA
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 12, 2017
6:30 – 8:00 P.M.

Sharp Park Library
104 Hilton Way, Pacifica

Call to Order

1. **Approval of June 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

2. **Oral Communications**
   This portion of the agenda is available to the public to address the Committee on any issue within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on the agenda.

3. **Project Schedule**
   Long-term project schedule, Planning Commission and City Council Dates.

4. **Library Site Analysis – Committee Worksheet Report Out**
   Narrow Down Potential Sites

Open Study Session

5. **Discuss Remaining Potential Sites**

Close Study Session, Re-Open Regular LAC Meeting

6. **Library Site Analysis – Committee Site Recommendations**

7. **Community Outreach Update**

8. **Planned outreach activities and LAC participation**

9. **Discussion of website and public communications**

10. **Committee and staff communications**

Adjourn

THE CITY OF PACIFICA WILL PROVIDE SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED CITIZENS UPON AT LEAST 24 HOUR ADVANCE NOTICE TO THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE (738-7301). IF YOU NEED SIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE OR WRITTEN MATERIAL PRINTED IN A LARGER FONT OR TAPED, ADVANCED NOTICE IS NECESSARY. ALL MEETING ROOMS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO THE DISABLED.

MINUTES
June 14, 2017

CITY OF PACIFICA
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PACIFICA SANCHEZ LIBRARY
1111 TERRA NOVA BOULEVARD

COMMITTEE PRESENT:	Cindy Abbott (CA); Caroline Barba (CB); Jerry Crow (JC); Barbara Eikenberry (BE); David Leal (DL); Kathy Long (KL); Vanessa Powers (VP); Eric Ruchames (ER);
CITY COUNCIL LIAISONS PRESENT:	Deirdre Martin (DMa), Sue Vaterlaus (SV);
COMMITTEE ABSENT:	Laverne Villalobos (LV); Kellie Samson (KS); Rosie Tejada (RT);
CITY STAFF PRESENT:	Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister (TW); City Manager Keith Breskin (KB); Asst. Planner Robert Smith (RS); Exec. Asst. Sarah Coffey (SC);
CONSULTANT TEAM:	Dawn Merkes Group 4 Architects (DM); Andrea Gifford (AG); Dorsa Jalalian (DJ);
SMCL STAFF:	Paula Teixeira (PT).

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Abbott called the meeting to order at 6:42PM.

2. APPROVAL OF January 11, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

ER moves to consider minutes under item 7 or 8; CB seconds; minutes will be reviewed under item 8.

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

No public comment made.

4. UPDATE ON JUNE 12 CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION REGARDING 2212 BEACH BLVD. LIBRARY SITE UPDATE

TW confirmed that the City Council considered removing the Beach Boulevard site from consideration. After public comments, the Council decided to retain the site for consideration.

5. PROVIDE FEEDBACK TO STAFF REGARDING LIBRARY PROJECT OPTIONS

AG gave an overview of the community outreach activities conducted so far. The IBL School event held during the school day registered a large number of responses. The open house and workshop which followed in the evening was attended by 40 people both through the open house and at the evening workshop. The Farmer's Market had 60 participants, and the Senior Lunch generated around 18 responses. The online survey is now active on the City website.

SC the online survey is scheduled to be active soon.

CA confirmed two additional points will be included within the agenda for members of the public to be able to make comments.

CA asked if the City Hall Listens contact list is the same as Connect with Pacifica. SC responded affirmatively and clarified that Connect With Pacifica tends to have a broader contact list and number of respondents.

TW confirmed the survey is the same tool used as after the election.

AG Kops and Kids event this Saturday and the 4th July at Frontierland Park are the upcoming outreach events.

CA how was the presentation given at the Senior Lunch? Was new information presented because feedback from this event suggested participants left with a greater understanding of the issues with the Sharp Park site, particularly accessibility and this was new information to a long time Pacifican.

AG the presentation boards were the same, the event began with a brief introduction, and the seniors came over to the boards after their meals. One difference may have been the smaller group size which gave the opportunity for people to speak with Group 4 and staff and having the time to understand the detail of the presentation boards.

CB the Kops and Kids event is on Saturday, the 17th June.

AG That's correct, the day is correct but the date in our presentation is incorrect. If members would like to attend and contribute to the consultation event they are welcome and this item will be discussed later in the agenda.

TW There is a large amount of in-depth information on the City website. Common questions are being raised at the community events, and it could be useful for the City to produce a list of FAQ's with links for people to read more information.

CA anything that makes it easier for people to access information would be positive.

ER the Library Foundation has an FAQ section which may be helpful.

AG some of the promising responses from outreach include:

Goals and Outreach: Three additional sites have been added to the process as a result of community outreach input: Ingrid B Lacy Library, school district site, self storage on Crespi Drive. These sites have not been added to the boards. A lot of feedback about partnering with school districts has been raised. The results of the surveys have raised some interesting information:

Spaces and Activities: The results are skewed towards responses from the IBL Middle School due to the number of responses from middle schoolers received at this event and this is likely to evolve through the outreach with more respondents from different events. Considering the IBL responses, the top spaces requested were Books, Movies and Music; Youth Programs and Technology Hub and Outdoor spaces.

TW results from the library users would be an interesting result to gather.

AG the library maybe able to set up a survey which is registered by IP address to ensure the questionnaire responses can be listed as being from a particular library.

AG the top activities listed from the consultation include Community Events, Entertainment and Programs, Gaming and Computers. The community is definitely interested in technology.

The Sanchez location and catchment are the main benefits of this library. Retaining this library is important specifically for the garden, views, environment, and building. Issues with the size and collection size, traffic and parking, and hours were all raised.

ER couldn't the City provide access to libraries if they were moved?

AG seniors feedback was that they are satisfied with the proximity of library.

CA senior services could give breakdown of where seniors come from.

PT seniors at the senior lunch get there by driving, transit and walking from the senior accommodation opposite the community center.

AG Sharp Park has issues of access, size and building constraints.

DL interviewing library employees for their views could be an important source of information.

DMa at the community open house there seemed to be a lot fewer than 40 people in attendance.

DM between 18-22 people responded during the intercept survey to capture parents and teachers. The total number of responses ranged to 40 people, over the course of the event but for the workshop there were less people.

DMa there were no more than 10 community members at the workshop outside of committee members and staff.

DM the attendance was very low. The Farmer's Market for comparison had 60 people, which is encouraging given the challenging windy conditions on the day.

Sometimes with controversial projects, you could expect the attendance to be higher. It does vary, that's why we try to complement the responses with the intercept kiosks and go out to different sections of the community.

DMa Thank you for your efforts, we did do a lot of outreach.

KL when interacting with people, many responses are along the lines "been there, done that'.

CB a couple of years ago participation was a lot better, maybe people are waiting for the next step in the project.

ER there is probably a fatigue factor, but the important feedback is the ideas that are generated rather than the number of people. One participant suggested two libraries, both of bigger size with more facilities and a parcel tax to pay for it. There is some validity to the acknowledgement of how the City pays for libraries. Part of it is the numbers but another part of it is ideas. We are still catching up to changing interaction at the meetings.

SV interesting comparisons can be made to the retail sector where people don't interact in person anymore and conduct most of their activities online.

DM as a comparison, Millbrae is constructing a new community center and their attendance was 20-30 people at a recent community event. 200 people responded to the online survey.

AG what we have been hearing is the community appreciates the feedback and ability to meet face to face.

JC attending the community workshop I thought at least 30 people were present and they seemed engaged in the subject.

DM community members at the Farmer's Market were engaged in the re-opening of options for sites.

AG community responses suggest people are pleased that all options are being looked at.

CA pushing out FAQ's and being where people are is the best opportunity to get input from people who don't usually interact in the process. Hopefully we can engage in more events and add to the consultation calendar.

DM there may be an opportunity to present to the Council at the July meeting. Working with the library to determine the updated library needs assessment, could be completed in the first part of July.

SV I think a presentation to Council is important.

DL Council meeting is a good way to distribute information to people who watch the meetings at home.

DMa there is an opportunity for the LAC to present the results.

Ellen Ron people congregate at sports events and church services which would be a good intercept point. Relay for Life is another event.

6. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL LIBRARY SITES

DM the LAC has given feedback on the available sites and assessment criteria. Some criteria are more important than others. Group 4 is in the process of analyzing some sites; it is clear some sites can be eliminated.

The criteria which have been identified for assessing the sites are pre-requisites for site selection and include: *Functional and Sustainable*; *Accessible* – for example if the sites are only accessible from one direction along highway 1, this makes them inappropriate for accessibility; *Capacity* – so the site has the ability to be able to accommodate the required parking and building size. There is a servicing issue in relation to cost when a building is less than 20,000 square feet and required to be constructed over two stories.

CA site visit at the Mitchell Park library was a good example of a library that works well over two levels.

DM *Availability* – this consideration is likely to fall to the City Council for decision making. Where the existing use may have to be superseded and how that use is displaced, for example by eminent domain, which is not a desirable approach; *Synergy / Connectivity* – this criteria is important and came up in many discussions during outreach; for example, locating a library near schools, shopping and/or parks could create synergy; considering placement with schools could be good as long as the library is not so embedded into the school as to hinder public access; *Cost* – buying private sites would be prohibitive. Construction escalation is running at around 6-8%. As part of costs, consider development, infrastructure, entitlement, construction and relocation costs; *Economic Impact* – the library has the ability to be a catalyst for economic activity, bringing a large number of people to the surrounding area; *Environment* – particularly in relations to a site proximity to the ocean.

CA environment would include sea level rise. DM responded affirmatively.

CA likes the idea of breaking out costs into different categories. It is important for all the sites to be retained within the evaluation at this stage to allow community members to view and comment on individual sites.

DM sites can be retained, and it would be beneficial for the analysis to separate out sites into a hierarchy, this would allow a more focused approach for site review and data gathering.

CA thinks the response from Monday's City Council meeting was that the community wanted to be allowed to view all possible development sites.

ER it is important to arrange sites in some form of preference to allow some sites to rise and some sites to be identified as having specific constraints.

DM the intention tonight was to allow a partial analysis of the sites.

ER in relation to longevity, is there a specific lifespan for the building design?

DM most public buildings are planned for a 50 year life span. Lower cost buildings may last only 30 years. Carnegie buildings as an example were planned for a 50 year lifespan, however these buildings were designed to such a high standard that they have been able to be repurposed a number of times, extending the 50 year life span.

AG Sanchez is 36 years old, Sharp Park is over 50 years old.

DM Sanchez is in good shape for its age and not too difficult to retrofit.

CA how would members be able to evaluate cost?

DM for cost, this will be established by Group 4 to feed into the members' review.

CB would the City Hall site be able to accommodate a two-story building incorporating City offices?

DM City offices would be an extra option for the City Hall site.

DL Sharp Park needs updated construction costs on the hand out.

ER what is the City Hall site?

DM the site excludes the Little Brown Church and the remaining 'L' shape is what is being looked at.

CA how do we expeditiously complete this task?

AG it may be preferable to allow members to have time to consider the framework and review the site in detail between now and the next meeting.

DM the top three sections on the evaluation are the most important at this stage in the review. The sites could be ranked down the list and some sites might be discounted outright for specific reasons.

CA invited public comment.

Margaret Goodale: will this review be available to the public?

CA yes at the next meeting at the Sharp Park Library on July 12th.

Stan Zeavin: the length of the building at 50 years life span does not make sense.

DM the expected life of a new library building was a question for the process, although what is being planned is for the building to be constructed to meet a 50 year life span.

Ellen Ron: defining some sites – public agency – should be identified by name.

CA the business names and/or addresses of certain sites have not been included while contact is made with them to establish if they would be comfortable being partner sites.

Ellen Ron: how would you use school sites as partners?

DM based on existing site and partnering we would consider specific evaluation.

ER in some instances the background for site selection is not defined.

Justin Kumar: how are you measuring goals through the process and how they are operationally being recorded?

CA we are working from the City Council's goals setting out the LAC's tasks.

Justin: how will you measure if this process is being successful?

CA we will be discussing the sites at the next meeting.

ER how will we complete the ranking task?

AG the forms can be emailed if you would prefer electronic copies of the evaluation.

CB we are ranking the sites on the sheet.

DM as long as you can give some indication of site preference, and if clarification is required, please let Group 4 know.

In the packets are planning standards and comparisons. The data for library users should be available at the next meeting.

AG these numbers are very preliminary.

DL other information for walk-in counts may be skewed due to the open days. So when both libraries are available, which library is an individual's preference? This should hopefully provide a like for like comparison.

AG will follow up with San Mateo County to see if this information is available.

Stan: as you may know sea level rise is a concern and I would like a dialogue about specific site criteria. There may be some information that some members may or may not know. There are important issues on each site. When can we have a dialogue about this?

CA turning up to the outreach events is one way to engage. The LAC may also be able to arrange a study session so the public can engage with LAC members in a more open format.

7. PLANNED OUTEACH ACTIVITES AND LAC PARTICIPATION

AG if you have availability for upcoming outreach events, please confirm attendance on the doodle poll.

DM these events are a great opportunity to gain experience of the community response, comments and questions.

8. DISCUSSION OF WEBSITE AND PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

TW we had agreed to maintain the website item on the agenda so we could discuss and provide updates where required through the process.

9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMUNICIATION

No additional information to update

CA lets revert back to the May 10th meeting minutes.

KL moved to approve the minutes, BE seconded, all approved.

DMa there is a sea level rise discussion at the Little Brown Church on Friday. How would a study session for this group work?

CA that's something we can leave to staff to arrange.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Smith,
Assistant Planner

APPROVED:

_____
Cindy Abbott
Library Advisory Committee Chair