

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY  
Joint Finance and Community Services Committee Meeting  
March 6, 2012  
Trustees Room                      Louis Stokes Wing  
1:30 P.M.

Present:        Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Seifullah, Mr. Werner, Mr. Parker

Absent:        Ms. Butts, Mr. Hairston

Ms. Rodriguez called the joint meeting of the Finance and Community Services Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

Facilities Assessment Presentation

Kenneth Damm, Director of Quality Control, Westlake Reed Leskosky (WRL), gave a presentation of the facilities assessment WRL completed for 25 library branches.

Mr. Damm introduced Nancy Nozick and Kris Haycock of Westlake Reed Leskosky, who were responsible for assessing the building envelopes and building systems. Contributing consultant partners to the facilities assessment included Design LAB Architects, responsible for assessing library programming and floor plans; Knight & Stolar, responsible for site and landscape architecture; Studio Graphique, responsible for analyzing graphics, wayfinding and signage; and Ozanne Construction for providing opinion of probable cost estimates.

Director Thomas stated that the facilities assessment was completed on branches owned by Cleveland Public Library. Therefore, Garden Valley and Broadway were excluded from the process. The Rice branch was not included as it was recently built.

Mr. Damm stated that the goals of the facilities assessment were: (A) To provide an objective analysis of the physical needs of 25 branches and categorize them into priorities including site, architectural, mechanical/plumbing, electrical, signage/wayfinding, and library planning; (B) Site-by-site process that included: review existing plans and prints; meeting with facility manager and discuss concerns; observe conditions and document with notes and photographs; record in formal report format; meet with Ozanne Construction for their opinion of probable cost; enter information into data base together with planning observations; (C) Establish priorities into the following priority system categories: Priority 1 – Critical Conditions that include life safety, accessibility or critical structural concerns; Priority 2 – Serious Concerns that include building envelope conditions, energy consumption issues or failing systems requiring high maintenance; Priority 3 – Moderate Conditions that include moderate building envelope conditions, recommended repairs or old but functioning systems; Priority 4 – Minor Concerns that include minor repairs or replacement of worn finishes.

Mr. Damm gave background on the Opinion of Probable Cost as provided by Ozanne Construction and provided an Executive Summary. He stated that the library branches are well maintained and operated and offer a clean, comfortable resource for the community. The most notable deficiencies are lack of handicapped accessibility and old mechanical systems. System wide cost by priority were: Priority 1 - Critical \$2,442,791; Priority 2 - Serious \$3,097,069; Priority 3 - Moderate \$8,591,227; and Priority 4 – Minor \$867,944. The total estimate of system wide upgrades was \$14,999,031. Cost estimates can be more accurate as projects and their scope are better defined.

Ms. Nozick stated that the facilities assessment provided the following common site finding needs: ADA compliant entry ramps and parking spaces; pavement repair. Common architectural findings were: building envelope concerns such as leaking roofs, flashing or copings, corroded entrance systems and masonry truck pointing; accessibility issues such as non-accessible restrooms, check-out counter and staff work areas and lounges; finishes consisted of worn carpets, stained ceiling tiles and paint.

Mr. Haycock stated that common mechanical findings included: mechanical equipment such as boilers, air handlers were at or over their median service life; Controls in each library can benefit from advanced controls, control strategies, proper zoning; Outside Air Ventilation controls, variable frequency drives, and Director Digital Control to improve energy efficiencies; and water treatment for the many branches that lack proper treatment of water reducing service life. Common electrical findings included: most libraries could benefit from lighting upgrades with newer technology and design that will result in energy savings; improved lighting controls that would avoid breaker switching for lights and daylighting and occupancy control opportunities; and power distribution with new panels required for increased computers, routing of conduits as floor access is not always available. Common plumbing findings included: ADA deficiencies in many restrooms that require renovations as well as replacement of fixtures to reduce water consumption.

Mr. Haycock reviewed a graph of electrical and natural gas energy usage per branch from information provided by library utility bills. This tool can assist with defining potential savings goals.

Ms. Nozick reviewed the sorting data base that included total cost summaries and priority categories.

In response to a query from Director Thomas relative to the heating concerns at South, Ms. Nozick stated that 67 line items were identified at South totaling over \$1.4 million with significant costs in mechanical systems, architectural, plumbing, electrical and signage.

Mr. Haycock stated that South is a historic building with mechanical systems that are extremely old and recommends that that they be completely removed and replaced.

Ms. Nozick stated that asbestos abatement was not included in the facilities assessment.

Carrie Krenicky, Chief Financial Officer, stated that the Capital Projects Fund is currently at \$18 million with \$8 million in this year's budget to complete Tech Central and Phase Two. \$10 million will be carried forward next year. \$3 million will be transferred in 2013 into the Capital Fund with \$6 million set aside for facility needs.

Finally, Mr. Damm recommended the following next steps with a goal of developing a Master Plan outlining the desired reinvestment opportunities with a timeline: (1) meet with library leadership; (2) determine project priorities and phasing for reinvestment; (3) cost vs. value comparison; (4) operational decisions; (5) decide how and where the money will be spent; and (6) what schedule is funding available.

After lengthy discussion, Director Thomas stated that the development of a master plan that includes recommendations of possible renovation, closure or new construction is in the best interest to the library. The master plan should take into consideration demographics and information on how other libraries service their communities.

Mr. Werner stated that when a master plan is developed, stakeholders should be afforded the opportunity to suggest criteria to evaluate need to develop recommendations.

Mr. Corrigan stated that the levy should be considered as plans continue regarding the branches and the facilities assessment recommendations.

Ms. Rodriguez agreed that a master plan is necessary to move forward and requested Westlake Reed Leskosky to report their executive summary along with immediate concerns to the full board at the next regular board meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez adjourned the joint meeting of the Finance and Community Services Committee at 2:53 p.m.