

## **MINUTES**

September 14, 2017

### **CITY OF PACIFICA LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE PACIFICA SHARP PARK LIBRARY 104 HILTON WAY, PACIFICA**

**COMMITTEE PRESENT:** Cindy Abbott (CA);  
Eric Ruchames (ER);  
Caroline Barba (CB);  
David Leal (DL);  
Jerry Crow (JC);  
Kathy Long (KL);  
Tom Clifford (TC)

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISONS  
PRESENT:** Deirdre Martin (DMa);

**COMMITTEE ABSENT:** Vanessa Powers (VP);  
Laverne Villalobos (LV);  
Kellie Samson (KS);  
Barbara Eikenberry (BE);  
Rosie Tejada (RT);  
Sue Vaterlaus (SV)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister (TW);  
City Manager Keith Breskin (KB);  
Assistant Planner Robert Smith (RS);  
Exec. Asst. Sarah Coffey (SC);

**CONSULTANT TEAM:** Dawn Merkes, Group 4 Architects (DM);  
Dorsa Jalalian (DJ);

**SMCL STAFF:** Julie Finklang (JF).  
Anne-Marie Despain (AD)

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cindy Abbott called the meeting to order at 6:32PM and introduced the new Planning Commission liaison Tom Clifford.

#### **1. APPROVAL OF August 9, 2017 MEETING MINUTES**

CA during the oral communication at the LAC meeting of August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017, it was noted that the Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center has their 501C status, where in fact the application is still being processed.

ER gave a motion to approve the minutes with the noted change, KL seconded, all other members voted in favor with TC abstaining.

## **2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Celeste Chernicky identified under item 3 of the agenda that public comment should come prior to the final site selection.

Mary Ann Nihart in previous City Council direction we didn't do a good enough job of laying out what the City wanted or needed and hopefully this process can go forward as is. I want members to be aware once a tax is identified relative to sites then it changes the way people think about sites. This is a good opportunity for members to identify sites without external influence.

## **3. SITE ANALYSIS**

CA last month's analysis of individual sites is contained in the meeting minutes.

DM summarized where the LAC left the site analysis at the last meeting. At the end of the last meeting there were 7 sites remaining. Two sites at the end of the last meeting were not dropped but we discussed and consider these two sites to be compromised due to the site size and limitation of parking or circulation. The capacity constraint is therefore limited by parking. Neither site can therefore provide sufficient square footage to meet community need. A number of innovative solutions were explored to try to expand the degree of parking including incorporating part of the neighboring street, building parking out under the street and moving utilities, but no relocation options provided effective solutions.

CA we can provide comments from individual members about the sites but for this site what you are saying is the parking lot site on Francisco Blvd. is restrictive because of an inability to provide parking.

DM elevators for vehicles could be an option for parking stalls but the cost and practicality is not appropriate.

CA Eureka Square is privately owned by the bank and the building is too small.

DM the bank is contained on a small parcel within the larger site, but this small site is too small to provide parking along with the square footage required for the library. We have communicated with the real estate agent about this building and the shopping center more broadly but no response has been received about available space for a library the size that is conceived.

KL the conversation last month clarified the Eureka Square sites were too constrained.

ER it is important to keep records of why sites are being removed so there is a record for anyone not at the meetings.

DM the main evaluation criteria are contained in the back of this meeting's presentation package and a summary will be provided in a final report to show the details of the site evaluations.

CA no opposition from members for removing these sites has been expressed so removing them is appropriate.

DM sites in the north side of town have been narrowed to 5 sites, the Oceana High School still has an unknown in terms of its availability. Sites in the south of town were evaluated and removed at the previous meeting.

Evaluation criteria was presented for comment at the public consultation events, agreed and applied by the LAC.

3-4 systems strategies have been previously discussed which include different square footage and parking numbers. We have tried to identify costs in an order of magnitude. For Oceana High School for example is not clear what the land cost would be, therefore it has been left as a question. Entitlements at sites which have a public facility General Plan and Zoning designation are likely to have lower costs for permitting than other sites with inconsistent General Plan and zoning considerations.

CA is there a timeframe for the CEQA document expiring for Palmetto and Montecito?

TW if this site were to come forward the existing CEQA analysis could be used with minor additions and updates.

TC can you describe what the costs would be in terms of Sharp Park library site and City Hall site in terms of demolition of the buildings and how that has been factored in?

DM demolition is not an excessive cost but the relocation of the facility may be higher cost and is factored into the analysis. City Hall rehousing during construction work would also be factored in, as would the associated cost of relocating and rehousing the Corp Yard.

TC have costs for building at the Sharp Park site included the temporary relocation of the library during construction?

AD in Half Moon Bay the City is leasing a space during construction, Atherton has a mobile space. There are a range of options depending on cost and available opportunities.

DM we are trying to identify costs relative to individual sites. Parking at the Corp Yard for example would require entirely underground parking whereas the Oceana High School site can provide entirely surface parking. For comparison surface parking is roughly \$20,000 per space, where structure parking would be roughly \$50,000 per space and under-building parking \$100 – \$125,000 per space.

Sharp Park is the only site where structure parking might be able to work. The Sharp Park site allows the building to be constructed without the need for mechanical ventilation to the parking area because it is open on two sides.

ER can you define the difference between structure and under-building parking?

DM excavation and mechanical ventilation is required for the under-building parking, which is not required for partially underground or structure parking as in the Sharp Park case.

The mandate for the Council is not necessarily an evaluation of the cost for development, and if further detail was required for the City Council a more detailed cost analysis can be provided.

CB on the Sharp Park site there would be two levels of parking?

DM responded affirmatively.

CA City Hall, parking has been split for the library only?

DM when including City Hall replacement in the design, parking requirements for City Hall is included in the design of the under-building parking.

CA would you include parking for the visitors to the area?

DM we are only required to provide parking related directly to the library, parking provision is not required for visitors to the wider area.

1a - City Hall Option 1

Axonometric design and the associated figures are not final but allow comparisons between sites. City Hall includes temporary City Hall relocation. Differentials are highlighted at the bottom of the slides.

CA can you go through all the site scenarios and then LAC members can discuss?

DM 1b – City Hall Option 2

gets relocated, but we are presently unsure where City Hall would be replaced to, but are identifying that need.

2 – Palmetto and Montecito

some surface parking can be provided and some under building parking with the pro's and con's included on the slides.

3 – Sharp Park

the existing building is currently at the same level as a proposed library, with 2 separate parking levels below. Construction cost is saved in the structure parking rather than under building parking.

4 – Corp Yard

site fits underbuilding parking nicely and level access can be provided to the site.

5 – Oceana High School

surface parking cost is attraction but we haven't been able to contact the High School yet.

TW the appointment of a new superintendent is very recent.

DM we will follow up with the school.

6 – Sanchez

Renovation, updates and strategies for an addition may be appropriate. Figures on site are general for information.

CB is that existing parking lot shown on the diagram currently at the school?

DM just a placeholder to express the potential for parking.

CA Sharp Park library has historically been discounted because of the easement on the site, which we have now been told is floating and has therefore improved the buildability of the site.

DM previous analysis has identified this site as buildable.

TW previously the easement was shown as fixed, but now it has been established as a floating easement.

JF as I understand the easement previously restricted the ability to build under-building parking.

DM not necessarily. Further explanation of the site design can be provided based on the new information.

CA we don't have to come up with one site.

TW so many policy considerations over all of the sites, it is appropriate for the committee to present several sites as recommended by the LAC.

ER need clarification on the process and outcome for this evening's meeting.

TW we are at a point that the LAC can clarify that there are appropriate sites to take to the City Council.

DM preference can be expressed based on the criteria or benefits for specific reasons.

DMa between 6 and 7 options would be a study session format for City Council.

ER grouping the sites into more or less complex. We can't evaluate the City Hall site for relocation, but the sites can be separated easily into groups of more or less viable.

DMa Council's goals for City Hall and the Corp Yard may be affected by these evaluations.

DM some sites have potential as stand-alone library sites, but other sites offer potential for other improvements and accommodations.

CA any other comments or preferences from members?

DL opportunity cost is an important consideration relative to the broader impacts of the library. What is the life expectancy of the other City infrastructure like the City Hall or Corp Yard? If the City can save money by accommodating these facilities that could be useful.

KL sites 2 and 3 are more straightforward as just library sites. The more complex the process, the greater the timeline for implementation. Other City infrastructure could be useful but we have minimal information to be able to determine the impacts at present. Oceana High School does not have enough information for decision making at present.

CB City Hall site is in the tsunami zone and Sharp Park site is not.

JF clarified the tsunami zoning designation.

DMA encourage committee to provide the Council exactly what the LAC wants with a more defined perspective on the sites.

TC the priority site of all sites is the existing Sharp Park site. This maintains the vision of an anchor for the streetscape and encourages movement around this section of the street. The site isn't within the tsunami zone. Can this building be bigger than 30,000 sq. ft. as there is a lot of potential in the Sharp Park site and there are not many drawbacks?

CA Anne-Marie, as the library representative do you have any thoughts?

AD I am unsure of the Corp Yard location.

CA at the junction of Oceana and Milagra.

AD I don't have any significant comments at this time.

JF I agree with AD

CA agree the list is long. As we have not currently connected with Oceana High School, and while the site has some synergy with the school, it doesn't have connections to the wider community and therefore doesn't meet the broader goals for the library. Corp Yard is similar and has a stark environment, does not benefit from the massing of other sites, what is wanted from a site and I would be in favor of removing these two sites.

City Hall is in need of upgrading and it is an interesting concept to think about. Especially its location relative to Palmetto.

I'm not sure if the Oceana High School and Corp Yard should be dropped.

ER two sites here have the benefit of tying in with economic development priorities. There is a great need for the City Hall and Corp Yard to be updated or replaced and this has been raised previously but never moved forward successfully. The Civic Center concept is encouraging but creating it would be challenging.

It would overcomplicate the process and go beyond the LAC purview. Could be fabulous but previously not moved forward. Narrowing the sites to what would work makes the most sense and the LAC can focus more on relevant sites. For the Planning Commission and public meeting, how far can we make decisions to focus input?

TW Planning Commission will be expected to provide input on land use considerations and the focus of the next community meeting will be more insight on the service model.

DM system options and site options are currently the focus but depending on what LAC is focused on at this meeting, it can be reflected in the upcoming community outreach.

TC agree that the library should not be coupled with the City Hall or Corp Yard sites. It's a big decision for the community.

KL sites 2 and 3 are straightforward and focused on a library alone.

CA any information required from staff at this time?

KB if Corp Yard was a vacant site, would that change the LAC thinking?

KL the Corp Yard site has many challenges, particularly traffic and access and there is not broader benefits at that site.

DL accessibility is challenging to the north and there is minimal economic benefit to the Corp Yard site. Investment in Palmetto has broader benefit.

CA any other considerations on these sites from the public?

TW In your pack are letters from the Library Foundation and the Ocean Discovery Center expressing interest in the Palmetto Montecito site. Council has not given direction that this site shouldn't be considered as a library site alone.

CA Ocean Discovery Center were at the previous meeting and expressed their interest.

Mary Ann Nihart Oceana High School has tennis as one of the few team sports at Oceana.

DM the tennis courts would be relocated on the site.

Mary Ann Nihart City Hall is one of few historic buildings in the City. Issues for the economic benefit of the City Hall site are correct. Corp Yard could benefit from a rerouting of the Milagra-Coast Highway on/off ramp but this would be unlikely to change the economic limitations of the site.

The closing of Sanchez and deciding how to deal with duplication of collection is critical. Parking in sites 2 and 3 would get flooding from a tsunami. Issues for residents parking around the library site at Sharp Park would create a difficult sell for the community. I have experience of people parking on my residential property. Resident parking issues may be resolved by closing Hilton Way and not having access from Palmetto.

The Montecito site is above sea level so the environmental concerns are not necessarily justified.

Mark Stechbart I think it should be Palmetto Montecito, and Sharp Park. The Sanchez site is a stretch. City Hall is forcing the library into a residential neighborhood and there is no community

appetite for a better facility for bureaucrats subsequently pushing the Bond measure beyond the community's appetite.

The Corp Yard is remote and relocation would be challenging and expensive. Oceana High School there is no motivation to engage from the school and the tennis courts are currently a benefit to the school. Sanchez is not central and therefore 2-3 alternate sites are important to present.

Ellen Ron is the sketch of Sharp Park building the same as the structural analysis?

DM no, it is based on the 30,000 sq ft footprint. The site analysis on the community board is a 36,000 sq. ft. library.

ER what is most important is having a site that people will vote for and largely it comes down to money. The City would lose money from not selling Sanchez and that is an important consideration as we will retain two sites. I agree that extra buildings would increase the cost. As long as the cost is as low as possible then there is a better chance of getting the vote passed.

Ruben Romero as a father of two small children, a library which is located central to where most of Pacifica families are located is important. I feel Sanchez may offer more to families. That should be part of the consideration. Belmont does a good job of using their library as a tourist attraction.

Carl Schwab the City would not be allowed to build within the tsunami zone.

TW would have to research the specific planning policy for building within a tsunami zone.

Carl Schwab that would eliminate the Palmetto/Montecito site immediately.

TW that relates to the City's own Coastal Land Use Plan. What you are referencing I believe is a statement in a previous California Coastal Commission letter, which was specific to a particular project and not related to this City or the Coastal Zone more broadly.

Celeste Chernicky tying the library project in with the renovation of the City Hall or the Corp Yard is complex. These sites and the Oceana High School site which would make the process more challenging. Does this committee consider systems strategies and the need for a library in the south? Sites 2, 3 and 6 would be on my final list.

CA more public comments will be allowed under the systems strategy discussion. At this point we can't bring questions back to the committee.

The committee has not heard at this point if Sanchez should come off the list. The committee was charged with presenting options which reflect community feedback.

TW the Council's direction in March was to consider the dual service model.

CA committee member Crow has just joined us, and I would like to give him the opportunity to comment.



JC the City Hall site has been discussed previously and the Historic Society are aware of the deterioration of the building. Understanding there are sizable costs in bringing this building into good order, and as a designated site, there are policy provisions that the structure can be removed or demolished if the financial evaluation for refurbishment presents the likely costs as infeasible.

CA anymore comments to respond to the site assessment?

ER would it be appropriate at this time to suggest a motion?

CA I would like to return to the City Hall site as there is a broader need to address City infrastructure concerns and this would meet some of the same opportunities as sites 2 and 3.

KL if you leave City Hall and group sites 2 and 3 as preferred options with the City Hall listed as not a preferred option.

ER we have reduced the sites to 2 and 3 and the next step would be to consider service options and to consider how a large library should be proposed on a site. I would move to recommend that sites 1 and 4 should be placed in a second tier pending discussion on direction. Sites 2 and 3 speak to the provisions currently in place and City Hall moves away from the City's goals. The Committee should work to refine the choices with the other sites in the second tier.

CA there are no time constraints to get to one site today. We were challenged by City Council to be creative and respond to community responses. There have been conversations about the area surrounding City Hall.

TC we should attempt to keep this process clear and move away from a recommendation of City Hall as a preferred site. The Council as part of their decision making will review all the reports and analysis produced through this process to appreciate how these recommended sites have been evaluated and removed and the Council do have the opportunity to add sites back into consideration.

CA Sanchez site is remote, therefore it's identified as a smaller branch site as it can't meet the need for a larger library.

DM we have done a lot of analysis in terms of the Sanchez site.

TC I would like to make a motion that: the committee maintain sites 2 and 3 as preferred sites and retain site 6 as a smaller branch site.

ER I second the motion.

Committee members: CAROLINE BARBA; DAVID LEAL; JERRY CROW; KATHY LONG; voted in agreement.

Committee member: CINDY ABBOT voted to oppose the motion.

ER the intention of sites falling to a second tier is not that they are removed from the process but that more focus can be dedicated to certain sites.

DM for the community meeting it would allow more detailed comments to be presented with two preferred sites which can be brought back to the LAC.

#### **4. LIBRARY SYSTEMS STRATEGIES**

DM some of the slides in this part of the presentation have been shown before. The green section of the table is cities which have new libraries with comparable sizes in other parts of San Mateo County. Comparable site ranges give a best practical comparison of 0.7 to 0.9 square feet per resident. Pacifica capacity based on attendance and circulation is significantly lower. Foster City figures for circulation are significantly higher than Pacifica and this is a reasonable comparison, as Foster City has a comparable number of residents (32,390). Circulation figures for comparison between Sharp Park and Sanchez have been requested.

JF the collection is equally distributed between both sites but there is significant duplication between libraries. Sharp Park has higher programming due to the large community room, but book club at Sanchez is popular. The room at Sharp Park encourages programming.

DMA the majority of the programming at Sharp Park is directed towards family and teen groups, whereas the impact of the book club at Sanchez skews the numbers which are actually lower at Sanchez.

DM There is a 60% to 40% split on most activities. Information for the month of August show 7557 patron counts at Sharp Park and 5713 patron counts at Sanchez. Sharp Park on most days has the higher attendance. There are anomalies in the figures, the eclipse for example, which had between 200-250 attendants.

JF musical story time on Friday mornings at Sanchez draws 100 people.

DM to get a good cross section, more results would be required.

DL thank you for the data, it tells us a lot.

DM The building size for the range we previously identified between 0.7 and 0.9 sq ft per resident would result in a range of 29,000 sq ft to 37,000 sq ft of total floor area. When you look at Sanchez and the call for ADA compliance and deferred maintenance, it creates difficulties for functionality, so as a smaller branch library, community room and program space, the floorspace would be rounded to 4,000 sq ft.

Operational cost for the two libraries is important. The JPA are given 60 hours, equally split between the two branches. Is it sensible to continue with the 50/50 split of time between the two libraries. The redundancies created with two libraries is compromised due to the collection split. When hours changed in the past, it led to reductions for Sharp Park hours and subsequent attendance reductions. Sanchez had minimal circulation reductions.

JF it is difficult to speculate on the reasons for the differing numbers of patrons. I would suggest the people using Sharp Park are more likely to use other libraries and the Sanchez patrons are more adept at adjusting to changing times.

AD Sharp Park had more hours, so the reduction was more significant.

DM there are currently four system strategies. Phasing is more appropriately removed, and four strategies are too much so Strategy 4 (phased approach to grow Sanchez to 12,000 square feet) should be removed from consideration. Proposing to remove Strategy 4 is based on feedback from the last meeting.

CA can you explain the difference between strategy 3 and 4?

DM no phasing, in Strategy 1 is still an option, Strategy 2 would keep the Sanchez library to allow smaller range for the second library. Strategy 3 looks at renovation with an addition at Sanchez. Considering the 26,000 sq ft library at Belmont as a best comparison, the addition of the meeting room space would result in an addition of 2,000 to make 28,000 sq ft as a minimum. There are options to explore different ranges so there can be a comparison for size, strategy, numbers and financial analysis.

ER Strategy 4 should be removed. In the campaign there was minimal discussion of Sanchez expansion. The strategy two to retain Sanchez with creative ways to provide the service, with maintenance and upgrade with everything else devoted to the new library. People understand that one site at Sanchez is not appropriate.

DL would keeping Sanchez with upgrades to the existing building also require additions to the building to keep the existing level of service areas?

DM updating merchandising, which would make books more accessible can encourage greater circulation and stock movement. The Woodside library is a good example of how best management practices can support more circulation.

DL It would be appropriate to set two strategies, preference would be for Strategy 1 and 3. Adding space with a community room would be more appropriate. To clarify Strategy 3 was phased.

DM phasing is used a lot in master plans but the committee commented at the last meeting that the community wouldn't necessarily appreciate any phased approach.

TC I support Strategy 2 and 3, and Strategy 4 can be removed due to trust issues. I like Strategy 3 more than Strategy 2. If the strategy is presented properly, people in the area of Sanchez are more likely to vote positively.

KL the question in Strategy 2 and Strategy 3 is the hours, which brings us back to the limit of 60 hours per week. I have an issue with more hours and the cost to residents. Building a new large library which is only open for 30 hours makes no sense. The challenge is to establish how to keep Sanchez and determine programming - specialized to children/seniors potentially with the community room being used separately. Determining how this can be done without eliminating multiple hours at the new facility would be key. Previously the library has had extra hours, paid for by the City. I would struggle to support a new large library with only 30 hours opening per week.

CA does this assume the JPA is the only source of funding for hours? Public-private partnerships could be an opportunity to support additional services and hours at Sanchez. The challenge of the LAC is to find models to find alternative service options at Sanchez.

ER can staff offer alternative ideas?

KB what staff can do for the committee is research alternative options to come back to the Committee for the next meeting.

CA information for the next meeting would be beneficial.

AD there are two tiers for cities where there is an agreement to supplement hours from city funds. Any other hours are paid for by cities entirely. Operation is tied to some libraries closing parts of the libraries to reduce costs. Self-service models can reduce costs. Expanding service is tied to hours. Policy discussion would be required.

ER we are the largest city and therefore the second branch may be justified. If we can propose a new library, retain Sanchez and add to Sanchez that would be the best outcome for the community.

Ellen Ron no need to have hours the same at each library. I am in favor of Strategy 2 due to money. In terms of a Sanchez expansion, would that reduce the size of the main library? Reducing Sanchez story hours is an challenge, but some story hours could be moved to Sharp Park. I would suggest people would follow this program if the location were to change. It would be good to understand how people from Sanchez use the service. How to remain profitable relative to cost.

CA do we need more information and what are the alternative strategies for services in terms of collections, services and offers?

ER possible to get additional cost for Sanchez, maybe a cost per sq ft.

DM new construction with the addition of parking would be about \$1,000 per square foot. Extending Sanchez would be in the range of \$4 million, dependent on the community room and that's including everything, with a construction cost of between \$500-600 per sq. ft.

TC what if covered outdoor space were an option?

DM this would be a significantly smaller cost.

TC weather at Sanchez is much better than Sharp Park and a covered outdoor space would keep costs down.

DMA it's a large site.

CA can this decision be deferred to the next meeting?

DM community response on a large range of square footages may be misleading to the community. This is the last round before a recommendation.

TC would like to remove Strategy 4.

DM if not ready to remove Strategy 4 then maybe not include for the community meeting.

## **5. PLANNED OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND LAC PARTICIPATION**

TW the presentation to the Planning Commission on Monday September 19<sup>th</sup> will update them on the process. The City will have a booth and library boards at the Fog Fest. The City Council presentation date is still floating due to the community meeting and the new City Manager appointment.

DM will send out a doodle poll for the LAC participation for the open house.

CA for Fog Fest the LAC is allowed to listen to feedback and conversations about the library and at the Planning Commission can listen to what is being discussed regarding land use considerations at the selected sites.

TW presentation to the Planning Commission will be covered by Staff.

CA any other Consultation opportunities?

ER the next meeting is October 11<sup>th</sup>.

JF at Sanchez.

## **6. DISCUSSION OF WEBSITE AND PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

TW struggled with the FAQ's due to the current position of the site selection we find ourselves in. The document is focused on public input in the process and how people could get involved.

CA where it is available?

TW it will be available at the Fog Fest and the City website. It will also be used to close out the next community survey in addition to an outcome statement.

CA boards will be at the Fog Fest and will communicate the process which has been taking place the last year.

TW because the committee is still considering details the FAQ's have been difficult to produce.

DM a summary of the round one response will be part of the next community outreach and will include the information and analysis.

TW in the later stages it would be easier to add specific questions to the FAQ's.

CA these FAQ's represent a good starting point.

KL when people find out I'm on the LAC these are the specific questions they ask.

JF the main question we get is when the building work will start for the new library.

CA any other communications or staff communications.

TW Rosie Tejada submitted resignation with the school board.

SC Rosie Tejada noted as vice chair.

TW media reports on proposition 218 are being reviewed by the City Attorney as we have requested confirmation that the recent decision does not alter the need for a super majority on a voter enacted initiative.

ER would like to thank Interim City Manager Keith Breskin for his support, effort and attendance to help move this project forward.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Smith,  
Assistant Planner

APPROVED:



---

Cindy Abbott  
Library Advisory Committee Chair