

TENTATIVE AGENDA
FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL
BREC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
BOARD ROOM
6201 FLORIDA BOULEVARD
BATON ROUGE, LA 70806
APRIL 19, 2012
4:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 15, 2012

III. REPORTS BY THE CO-DIRECTORS

- A. FINANCIAL REPORT
- B. SYSTEM REPORTS
- C. OTHER REPORTS

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A. UPDATE ON STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH WASHER, HILL, LIPSCOMB AND CABANISS TO PROVIDE ARCHITECTURAL AND DESIGN WORK FOR THE RIVER CENTER BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT - MR. JIM FREY, SPECIAL PROJECTS ARCHITECT, CITY-PARISH DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
- B. UPDATE ON STATUS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT TO ADMINISTER CONSTRUCTION OF THE ROUZAN BRANCH LIBRARY – MR. MIKE SULLIVAN, ARCHITECT WITH LOONEY RICKS KISS, LLC
- C. REPORT ON FINES FOR DELINQUENT MATERIALS, PERCENTAGE OF PATRONS INVOLVED, PROCESS FOR COLLECTION OF FINES, RATE OF SUCCESS, AND ROLE OF THE PARISH ATTORNEY – MS. PATRICIA HUSBAND AND MS. MARY STEIN
- D. UPDATE ON DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT PROCESS – AD HOC COMMITTEE

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. RESOLVED, THE PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY OF THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL IS AMENDED IN THE FOLLOWING PARTICULARS: 1.) PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY AFTER SYSTEM REPORTS, 2.) ADDITIONAL STATEMENT AT THE BOTTOM OF THE AGENDA CLARIFYING PUBLIC COMMENT, 3.) WHEN QUESTIONS ARE ASKED BY BOARD MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, THE ANSWER IS NOT PART OF THE THREE MINUTE LIMIT ON COMMENTS – MR. JASON JACOB

VI. COMMENTS BY THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

THE PUBLIC IS ALLOWED TO MAKE COMMENTS RELATIVE TO AN AGENDA ITEM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT. ANY COMMENTS NOT RELATED TO AN AGENDA ITEM MAY BE RECEIVED AND DISCUSSED OR DEFERRED TO A FUTURE MEETING UNDER PROCEDURES DIRECTED BY THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT.

Revised Minutes of the Meeting of the
East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control

April 19, 2012

The regular meeting of the East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control was held in the Board Room of the BREC Administration Building at 6201 Florida Boulevard on April 19, 2012. Ms. Kizzy Payton, President of the Board called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Ms. Tanya Freeman; Mr. Derek Gordon; Mr. Jason Jacob; and Ms. Beth Tomlinson. Also in attendance were Ms. Patricia Husband, Assistant Library Director of Branch Services and Co-Director; Ms. Mary Stein, Assistant Library Director of Administration and Co-Director; Ms. Rhonda Pinsonat, Library Business Manager; Mr. Ronnie Pierce, Assistant Library Business Manager; Ms. Liz Zozulin, Executive Assistant to the Library Director; Mr. Brian Thornhill, Library LAN Administrator; and Captain Blair Nicholson of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office. Ms. Christine Nichols, Vice Chairwoman of the Board of the Downtown Development District; Mr. Rip Manint of the Parish Attorney's Office; Mr. Jim Frey, Special Projects Architect with the City-Parish Department of Public Works (DPW); Mr. Russell Washer and Mr. Rex Cabaniss, both architects with Washer, Hill, Lipscomb, Cabaniss Architects; and Mr. Mike Sullivan, architect with Looney, Ricks, Kiss/LRK, LLC were also present. Mr. Faimon A. Roberts, III, reporter with *The Advocate*; and Mr. Frank Hillyard, videographer with Metro 21 also attended along with several people from the community.

Ms. Payton asked for the approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Library Board on March 15, 2012. The minutes were unanimously approved on a motion by Ms. Freeman seconded by Mr. Jacob with one correction.

Reports by the Co-Directors

A. Financial Reports

Ms. Payton asked Ms. Pinsonat to present the financial reports. Ms. Pinsonat said that the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances as of March 31, 2012 show operating expenditures of \$5,913,179.82 or 17.65% of the operating budget. Through March the Library should have spent no more than 25.00% of the 2012 operating budget. As promised last month the final expenditure statement for 2011 was included as part of March's report. Ms. Pinsonat said she was pleased to report that total expenditures were \$47,012,836.81 or \$6.8 million less than was budgeted due to the careful stewardship of the public's tax dollars. Cash collections from property taxes for 2012 remained positive as the Library was \$1.1 million and 3.25% ahead of the same period last year.

Mr. Gordon arrived at 4:08 p.m.

Mr. Bardwell asked Ms. Pinsonat about some figures on the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Encumbrances. He asked why under Employee Benefits were the retirement fund contributions and the group health insurance figures for the 2012 budget so much higher than the figures under the column of 2011 Actual. Ms. Pinsonat replied that the Library added a large number of staff positions under the 2012 budget and the retirement contribution rate is almost 30%. She added that it is the same scenario under the health insurance and for every vacant position the Library must still budget for those potential positions.

Mr. Bardwell then asked about the Workers' Compensation actual figures for 2011 as compared to the budgeted figures for 2012 noting that the budgeted amount is lower than last year's actual amount. Ms. Pinsonat answered that the figure is provided by the City-Parish Finance Department.

Mr. Bardwell also asked about Inventoried Assets-Library Materials (Fines) under Supplies and why the same figures appear as an expense elsewhere on the report. Ms. Pinsonat said that the revenues for fines and donations are set aside as expenditures so that the budgeted and expended categories are equal.

Mr. Bardwell asked to what Communications under Contractual Services referred and why there was such a difference in the figures for 2011 and 2012. Ms. Pinsonat explained that Communications is the telecommunications services such as telephone and internet charges. The Library's e-rate reimbursement is credited there. She added that because of the e-rate reimbursement, the Library has an almost negative phone bill for most of the year. She said they must budget an amount for communications even though they know they will not spend most of it.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the figures under Janitorial and Exterminations stating that the 2012 budget is higher than the 2011 Actual. Ms. Pinsonat said that the Library bid out the janitorial services for 2012 and three firms were awarded the contracts. She said they anticipated that the cost would be higher than last year because they were not getting the service they had expected. She added that the bids came in lower than what they had paid the vendor in 2011. She said either they were overcharged by the previous company or the new vendors have underbid. Ms. Pinsonat said the Library staff is very pleased so far with the services of these three new companies. She noted that the bids were less than half of what they placed in the budget at about \$450,000 so the Library will have a large savings in that account.

B. System Reports

Ms. Payton asked Ms. Stein to present the system reports. Ms. Stein gave her PowerPoint presentation, *Around the Parish in 90 Seconds* which included the months of March and April.

The following were some of the highlights:

- Time to get Your GEEK on
- Mayor Holden geeks CommUNITY.
- Baker Branch Staff and Patrons including Baker Councilwoman Joyce Burgess geeked Dickens.
- 2012 RELIC Program-Louisiana Purchase: Impact and Legacy including Louisiana Bicentennial
- Louisiana's Family Tree under Construction at Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library Genealogy Dept.
- Scotlandville Branch Library's Clementine Hunter Collection exhibited at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library
- Building Common Ground Program with Assistance from United Way, Baton Rouge Area Foundation and Manners of the Heart
- 17,000 copies of the booklet, *Going Green in Red Stick* by Office of Recycling distributed at the Library
- Library will participate in Louisiana Earth Day festivities.
- Zachary Branch Teen Council geek it up at Relay for Life for American Cancer Society.
- Library geeks the Blues Festival.
- AARP Tax Assistance filed hundreds of returns at Main, Bluebonnet Regional and Central Branches.
- *Hunger Games* book discussed by teens with their parents.
- Louisiana Authors Row on April 28th at Jones Creek Regional Branch
- Library outreach to expectant mothers at Baby Grand in Woman's Hospital
- Coming May 1st, *Blu-rays* at the Library
- Webcam shows time lapse progress on new Goodwood Main Library construction on Library's *You Tube* site and through InfoGuides.
- Metal roof deck and stud wall framing underway at Fairwood Branch construction site

Mr. Bardwell asked about the status of the outreach vehicles. Ms. Stein replied that the Elf has had routine maintenance completed and is back in service. Unfortunately, the large bookmobile is at a local authorized dealer because the engine must be replaced. The engine is under warranty, but the local dealer does not have a replacement for it. The other authorized dealer is in Hammond where the vehicle would need to be towed at the Library's expense in order to be repaired. Ms. Stein said they are calling the local dealer every day reminding them that the Library needs the vehicle to be repaired. She said the staff is very unhappy about this situation.

However, they are using other City-Parish vehicles to conduct their outreach services. Ms. Stein noted that the Elf is being used to visit senior and retirement centers and also for outreach to children. Mr. Bardwell said he knew the Library was present at *Live after Five* and he wondered which vehicle was used to which Ms. Stein replied the Elf.

Ms. Freeman referred to Ms. Stein's statistical report on outreach services. She said the report shows how many patrons are being served, but she asked if people are notified in advance about when the bookmobile is going to be in their area and if so, how they are notified. She said this would increase the usage of this service. Ms. Stein replied that the vehicles all go to scheduled stops at institutions who expect them. Ms. Freeman then asked if other people in the area know they are going to be there so they can attend. Ms. Stein said that by law these institutions must monitor all visitors and protect children from potential predators. Therefore, outsiders cannot join in the visits by the Library. Ms. Stein added that the Library staff were required to have additional background checks before they were allowed to come to these facilities. Ms. Freeman

said at one time they discussed bringing the outreach vehicles to other locations such as BREC centers, and she wondered if this was being done. Ms. Stein said they were doing that with the large bookmobile before it broke down in December. For example, they were going to the CATS bus terminal. In order to do that type of outreach they need the large bookmobile in order for people to make use of Library services. Ms. Stein added that this summer they will again work with Glen “Big Baby” Davis on his program *Booking It with Baby*, but it is uncertain which outreach vehicle they will use. They are hoping that the large bookmobile will be repaired by then.

C. Other Reports

Ms. Payton asked Ms. Husband to give the maintenance and construction reports. Ms. Husband said that preventive maintenance for the summer has begun on all air conditioning systems including cleaning condenser barrels on water cooled machines and condenser coils on air cooled machines.

She noted that energy audits have been completed at the Baker, Central, Greenwell Springs Road Regional, and Scotlandville Branch Libraries. Adjustments are being made at the Central Branch as a result of the audit. General maintenance is also being done on the energy management system at the Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch.

Ms. Husband reported that the interior lighting replacement at the Jones Creek Regional Branch is finished. They are now installing taller parking lot light poles with LED bulbs. She added that the payback on these lights is six years. She also said that the taller poles will provide more light coverage in the parking lot, there by adding to security.

In regard to the construction projects Ms. Husband referred the Board to the construction report in their packets which contains photos and information on each project. She said the following was occurring at the Fairwood site:

1. Most of the uppermost wood glulam trusses have been installed.
2. The suspended concrete slab for the mechanical mezzanine has been poured.
3. Light gauge metal roof truss erection is almost completed and the metal roof deck is being installed.
4. The infill of dirt for the front parking lot has been completed. Layout for the concrete parking lot will begin as soon as the telephone poles are completely removed.
5. The tracks for the partition wall which will divide the meeting rooms have been installed.
6. Light gauge metal stud wall framing continues to be installed.

Ms. Husband added that she visited the site that morning and walked through parts of the building. She said it was easy to identify areas since the studs outline the various rooms.

In regard to the Goodwood Main Library, Ms. Husband reported that the following activities were occurring:

1. Insulated piping is on site.

2. Cypress trees to be removed by BREC are in the fence staging area on the west side of the BREC Theatre parking lot.
3. The pile caps and pedestals are being installed along column lines 52 and 53 in preparation for the construction crane path.
4. Structural steel sequence No. 1 has 100% of the concrete pile caps completed, and the concrete grade beams and pedestals about 70% completed.
5. The subsurface drainage system is complete from the existing 72 inch pipe to catch basin A-14.
6. Conduits are being installed from Independence Boulevard.

Ms. Husband noted that they will place a link on the Library website to a “construction terms” dictionary so that people can understand the terminology being used to describe these projects.

Old Business

A. Update on Status of Professional Services Contract with Washer, Hill, Lipscomb and Cabaniss to Provide Architectural and Design Work for the River Center Branch Library Project - Mr. Jim Frey, Special Projects Architect, City-Parish Department of Public Works

Ms. Payton read item A under Old Business. She asked Mr. Frey to give them an update to which he replied that he did not have any new information to give them because they were unable to hold a meeting with some individuals that had been proposing adding a new portion to the contract. He added that they are in a holding pattern until they can have the meeting. Ms. Freeman asked him what they were proposing. Mr. Frey said he is not one of the proponents. They would be better able to answer her question because they have more knowledge on the proposal than he. Mr. Frey suggested that possibly the architect could better answer the question. Mr. Frey did say their proposal is what his department is referring to as Exhibit B which is reimbursable expenses. Ms. Freeman asked if Mr. Frey would be representing the Library Board at this meeting. Ms. Payton said she would also like Ms. Husband and Ms. Stein as Library staff to be present at the meeting. Mr. Frey replied that he agreed, but that this would not be his decision to make. He asked that they address this request to the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW). Ms. Payton said they will do that and she thanked Mr. Frey for his comments. Ms. Payton emphasized that they need to be sure to make this request for Library staff to be included in any meetings in which discussions are occurring about the contract.

Mr. Gordon said he had a question. He said that at the last Board meeting he had asked about some additional items to be reviewed prior to finalizing the contract. He added that it is his understanding that Mr. Frey met with Mr. Cabaniss about these items. Mr. Frey said it was a meeting with Mr. Cabaniss, Mr. William Daniel, acting Director of DPW, Mr. Davis Rhorer, Director of the Downtown Development District (DDD) and him. Mr. Gordon said he thought that the Baton Rouge Area Chamber (BRAC), the Baton Rouge Area Foundation (BRAAF) and the DDD would like to have conversations with the Board about some additional features that could be considered for the River Center Branch. The architects have suggested a budget amendment. They are not asking for additional money, but are asking that the funds come from

another portion of the project. Mr. Gordon asked if Mr. Cabaniss could explain this to the Board.

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Frey if there were changes to the contract, would it increase the dollar amount of the contract. Mr. Frey replied that the Library staff was present at the initial contract discussions with the architect, the Parish Attorney and him. He also said that a copy of that contract was given to the Library. The fee was almost maxed out in that portion of the appropriation at that time with about \$3,000 remaining to be budgeted. He noted that what they are discussing today actually transpired after that meeting. Mr. Frey said the money for these additional features would have to come from a different account.

Ms. Tomlinson asked Ms. Pinsonat for a clarification. Ms. Pinsonat replied that the building would need to be smaller. Mr. Gordon said that they might be able to obtain funds from other sources for this effort. They would not be requesting additional funding from the City-Parish. He added it would be a temporary allocation until they obtained the funds from the other sources. Ms. Pinsonat replied that Mr. Frey has wording in the contract that if additional funds are identified from an outside source, the contract could be amended. Mr. Gordon said if change orders need to be made the cost of the project increases. If they can specify all the possibilities in the original contract then they would not have the additional expense involved in changing the contract.

Ms. Payton said that she recognized Mr. John Berry had his hand raised to make a comment. She said she would allow him to speak after the Board received answers to their questions.

Mr. Gordon asked Mr. Cabaniss to address the issue of additional sources of funding and involving BRAC, BRAF, and DDD in these discussions and in the visioning process for the building. He added that he believed that Mr. Cabaniss had made a proposal to Mr. Frey regarding reallocating some of the \$19 million for this project to accommodate these ideas with the strong belief that additional funding could be obtained from other sources. Mr. Cabaniss replied that they have had a number of meetings since November of 2011 to discuss how best to format this project. He said there is a bottom line amount of money approved by the Metropolitan Council for this project. He added that he and Mr. Frey discussed how the money for this project was to be allocated. They also talked about how any extra services the architect proposed would fall under the reimbursable expenses line item. Mr. Cabaniss said they submitted documents about this to Mr. William Daniel. He said they were to discuss this at a meeting this week, but unfortunately the meeting was cancelled. He noted that if that meeting had occurred they would have had a better report with more clarity to give the Library Board. Mr. Cabaniss said the architects believe that because of the unique location and programming planned for this site the best result would be obtained by engaging downtown institutions who have worked over the last thirty years to build up downtown. Mr. Cabaniss added that the expertise of BRAC, BRAF, and DDD would be invaluable to this project. These institutions would be important in outreach activities as donors are contacted. They would also be an asset in speaking about funds for the technology aspects of the project with national and international companies such as *Google* and *Apple*.

Ms. Freeman asked if any Library staff have been invited to any of the discussions. Ms. Freeman added that the staff and the community are very important. She said they don't want just one body or entity to take over the discussions. She added that they want everybody to participate and to come to the Board meetings to bring forth all the ideas. Ms. Freeman noted that they do not want the discussions to occur in private meetings behind closed doors. The Board does not want decisions being made of which they are not aware. Ms. Freeman asked for a response from Mr. Cabaniss. He replied that these meetings were not called by him, but he was requested to attend. She asked if they included Library staff to which Mr. Cabaniss said sometimes Library staff were present. Ms. Freeman asked Ms. Stein if she is usually invited, to which Ms. Stein said no. Again she emphasized that they did not want decisions being made about the downtown library without Board input. Mr. Cabaniss replied that at this point no decisions have been made.

Mr. Gordon said they are talking about discussions and not decisions. He said the Library staff should be included in the discussions. He said by talking about these other ideas, they may very well make the library even better and more responsive to the needs of the community. He added that he would like an inclusive discussion with all of the parties.

Ms. Tomlinson said that Mr. Gordon used the word inclusive and she agrees. She asked why the Library was not called first. They should have been involved even before DPW was. She added that the City-Parish is the owner of the building, but the staff and the people of the parish are the ultimate client. Ms. Tomlinson added that they have gotten off on the wrong foot. She said she agrees with Ms. Freeman and Mr. Gordon, but the Library staff should have been involved from the beginning.

Mr. Jacob agreed with the other Board members and asked why the discussions cannot occur at a Board meeting. He said that when discussions are being planned, why can't Mr. Daniel arrange for them to occur at a Board meeting? Mr. Cabaniss said he could not answer for Mr. Daniel, but that possibly Mr. Frey could reply. Mr. Jacob again said it would be good to have this discussion at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Gordon said that it appears that there are many interested parties in regard to constructing this building. He said they should have a meeting with Mr. Daniel, BRAC, BRAF and the Library staff about these ideas with the understanding that they will not exceed the amount the Metropolitan Council approved. He added that he does not want the Library staff excluded from any part of the discussions and that he wants the ideas to be presented before the contract is finalized.

Ms. Payton said the issue seems to be about the current proposed language in the contract. She said they need to have a copy of the current contract language in order to have a discussion with the interested parties. She added that if at a later date someone wishes to fund some of the technology, or pay for a wing or room in the building, the contract language will be in place to address this without touching the existing reimbursement amount. She asked Mr. Cabaniss if this was correct to which he said yes. Mr. Cabaniss said his professional opinion is that they should not follow that method. They need to have the discussions before the contract is finalized. He added that they should do what Mr. Gordon is asking before the contract goes to

the Council, so that they will not have to go back to the Council to ask for supplemental agreements later.

Mr. Cabaniss asked Mr. Frey to explain the supplemental agreements. Mr. Frey said there will probably be several supplemental agreements before the contract is finalized because this project is unique and complicated. They have the language in the contract to include these supplements. He noted that supplemental agreements are done on most projects.

Ms. Freeman asked for a clarification about the reimbursable expenses. Mr. Cabaniss said it is Exhibit B of the standard City-Parish contract in which one itemizes expenses such as travel, public meeting presentations, and presentation materials. Ms. Freeman then asked how is it that they only have \$3,000 left on what they originally proposed. Mr. Cabaniss said he was not familiar with the \$3,000 figure. Ms. Pinsonat said that the fee for the architect is almost maxed out and that there is only about \$3,000 left in the budget under the original contract without the changes to Exhibit B.

Mr. Frey referred to the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the project. They added a complexity factor of \$183,000. They factored in the technology, the programming, and the difficulty of constructing a building in a recently improved business district because they wanted the architect to address all of those problems. He noted that this was the first time in the history of the City that this was done on a project, and he feels that this project needs that consideration. He said that the figures under Exhibit B include the original amount of \$74,000 plus the complexity factor and the Fixtures, Furnishings and Equipment (F F & E). He said when they add up all these items, it almost maxes out the fee appropriation.

Mr. Gordon then said that all he is asking for is that they have a meeting with all the interested parties without spending any money. He emphasized that there are resources in the community and they should see how they can use those resources and potential dollars. Ms. Payton asked if they could have this meeting under the current contract language. Mr. Gordon replied that it is about timing, and the ability to entertain certain options will be diminished if the current contract is signed. He again emphasized in his opinion that adding to the contract later will require a change order and will add to the cost of the project.

Mr. Bardwell said he had concerns with this approach. He asked if a request for the approval of the contract had been placed on the Metropolitan Council agenda as of today to which Mr. Frey said no; that it had been removed from the agenda several weeks ago. Mr. Bardwell noted that the contract approval was supposed to be on the Council agenda in early April. He added that it was removed because these issues with the reimbursable expenses came to light. He said no dialogue with interested community groups has occurred nor have Library Board members been contacted by these groups. He added that there has been a nine month delay in approving the contract due to a variety of reasons. First there was the dispute about the drawings by Mr. Trey Trahan, architect with Trahan Associates, one of the firms who bid on the project, and now there may be another couple of months delay to have the dialog with the community groups. Mr. Bardwell said he is against this delay. He said they need to move on this contract with the architect or choose another firm. Mr. Bardwell said the contract should have been signed six months ago and they should be in the design phase of the project.

He added that the conversation with other donors is fine, but it is “pie in the sky”. They have an adequate amount of money budgeted to construct the building. He said the programming has not been created by the staff yet, but the staff are experts on technology and can do the program. This needs to be done before meeting with interested parties in the community. Mr. Bardwell then said that he did not want the architects traveling for research. The current architectural team can design the building without additional travel to study technology. They have a technology team that is supposed to be the best in their field. He noted that the Library staff go to national conferences, and know what technology is needed in the library. In regard to public meetings, they have budgeted \$25,000 for them and this is sufficient. In conclusion, he said he disagrees with Mr. Gordon on delaying the approval of the contract, and wants to move on with the project. Mr. Gordon responded that the dialogue has not occurred and it should occur with the Library present in order for them to have full information. He said he wants to hear what the community desires in this construction and does not want to waste money. Mr. Gordon added that he would like to have this conversation with the community before the next Board meeting. Mr. Gordon added that he agreed with Mr. Bardwell about the travel concerns.

Mr. Bardwell then said that the contract is ready to be placed on the Council agenda. Mr. Frey replied that it is ready in the form they had before the counter-proposal by the architect. Mr. Frey added that he had been told to put the contract on hold until the conversations with the community occur. Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Frey who told him to put the contract on hold to which Mr. Frey said Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Bardwell made a motion that the Library Board of Control requests that the City-Parish Department of Public Works place the approval of the contract for architectural services for the River Center Branch Library on the Metropolitan Council agenda as soon as possible without changing the allocations of the contract fee. Ms. Freeman seconded the motion. Ms. Payton asked if there were any further questions by the Board.

Ms. Freeman asked for an explanation of the \$300,000 fee for travel in the contract as she had not received any information on this. Mr. Cabaniss replied that this fee had been submitted to DPW as a proposal and is part of the contract negotiations. Information has not been issued to the Library Board from DPW. Ms. Freeman replied that this is why DPW wants to delay the approval of the contract to which Mr. Cabaniss said he could not speak for DPW on that. Ms. Freeman asked for the details included in the proposed \$300,000 fee. Mr. Cabaniss said that the fee includes travel, preparation for public meetings and presentation materials for the public meetings. He said they have three consultants in the northeast and much of the fee will be travel. A world-class team has been chosen and they happen to live in Boston and Washington, DC. They will need to make many trips to Baton Rouge.

Ms. Payton then said before they move forward to vote on the motion, she asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Payton then left the meeting briefly and Mr. Gordon chaired the meeting in her absence. Mr. Berry, a member of the community, said he agreed with Mr. Bardwell. He asked what the actual appropriation was for the architectural design to which Ms. Pinsonat said \$1,520,000 was the architectural fee. Mr. Berry said according to the *Business Report* today, the architectural firm is not happy with their fee. He noted that if the architect is

paid more, there will be less money for the building materials and labor. He added that Mr. Daniel has said that this library will be high-tech, but has the Library Board defined high-tech. He said it seems that the design elements have not been discussed and defined. Mr. Berry said it looks like the downtown library is more about appearance than substance. He noted that this is the reason for much of the distrust of the public regarding this project.

Mr. Gordon said that the Mayor has talked about technology and the Library and its role in technology. There have been discussions about the potential to have a restaurant or coffee house on the top of the library. He said they need to hear what other stakeholders want in the building in regard to technology. Mr. Gordon said there is no harm in having these conversations now.

Ms. Freeman said she had a question regarding the team members in the northeast. She asked Mr. Cabaniss if they considered the cost of having this firm travel when they bid on the project. Mr. Cabaniss answered affirmatively. He said he was asked by Mr. Frey to produce a figure for reimbursable expenses which was larger than DPW's figure. Mr. Gordon said that the difference in the reimbursable expenses has nothing to do with what he is requesting. Mr. Cabaniss said they are discussing ancillary items that are not appropriate to discuss today. Ms. Freeman said they have been blind-sided because they were not informed of these issues. Mr. Cabaniss replied that he did not come to this meeting prepared to discuss these issues. The meeting that Mr. Frey referenced was where some of these issues were going to be discussed. The meeting was postponed and will still occur at a later date. Mr. Gordon said that is why he is proposing at least having a discussion with the partners he has mentioned.

Mr. Bardwell asked if \$75,000 was added to the contract for travel as a reimbursable item. Ms. Pinsonat answered that \$74,000 was added to the contract for travel and meetings which is more than the contract for the new Main Library at \$65,000. Mr. Bardwell said he is very concerned that if they do not move this contract along to be approved that the whole project will collapse. The Metropolitan Council may look at this project again and with more controversy surrounding it, the likelihood increases that the Council will not approve the contract.

Mr. Bardwell then moved the question. Ms. Payton said the question has been called on the original motion. Ms. Kathy Wascom, a member of the public, asked to comment. She said that what is going on currently with the project is a contract negotiation between DPW and the architect and she does not know if the Library Board usually participates in those discussions. She added that this is a different kind of project and is similar to a project that LSU had. They did not have a vision of what the building should be and, consequently did not construct the facility for the technology they currently wish to use. Ms. Wascom added that the Library staff is knowledgeable about the technology, but it is useful to talk about it in a larger way. She said BRAC and BRAF are outstanding partners and this would be an opportunity to work with them. With no further comments, Ms. Payton then closed public comments on the topic.

Ms. Payton said the motion has been made and seconded that this item be placed on the Metropolitan Council agenda. She asked if the Board had any further comments. Ms. Tomlinson said she agrees with Ms. Wascom about the contract negotiations and that the Board is not part of that. But they are involved if the budgeted figures increase. She added that during the programming and conceptual design phase of the project, the technology should be discussed

and she wants to involve partners. Ms. Tomlinson said that Mr. Gordon wants the technology discussion to occur before the contract is approved. She feels the contract is acceptable as is. Mr. Gordon replied that it would not be a problem to have the discussions now. He said he doesn't want these potential partners to think the Board is not interested in their input. He doesn't think waiting a little longer to ask for Council approval would be detrimental to the process. He added that with the change of the Library Director there have been other significant delays in bringing this question forward.

Ms. Freeman said they can do both; ask for Council approval and have a discussion with interested partners. She hoped the meeting of interested parties could take place shortly. Mr. Gordon said he'd like the meeting to occur before the contract approval goes before the Council. Ms. Payton said that in her opinion the current contract language leaves room for them to receive the donations by interested partners. She said any parties that want to donate to the Library would be accepted by the Board. She added that the public is waiting for this project and expects the Board to proceed. She asked if there were any other Board comments on the motion. Ms. Tomlinson asked Mr. Frey when this proposal could be placed on the Council agenda to which Mr. Frey answered that whatever he submits would go to Mr. Daniel first. He also mentioned that the Rouzan contract will go to the Metropolitan Council Committee on May 2nd and to the full Council on May 9th, so that would be the earliest dates. Ms. Payton asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Gordon said that they could both ask for the approval of the contract by the Council and also approve meetings of the interested partners for the project. He added that he believes that Mr. Daniel is agreeable to having the discussions with the interested partners. Mr. Bardwell replied that he wants everyone to understand his motion, which is to ask Mr. Daniel to place the contract as it stands for the River Center Branch construction on the Council agenda. He said he does not want a conversation before the contract is placed on the agenda and he will not support a change in the motion. Mr. Gordon noted that possibly Mr. Daniel had not finished reviewing the contact to which Mr. Bardwell replied he wants Mr. Daniel to be aware of the Board's position.

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Gordon if he wished to make a substitute motion to which Mr. Gordon answered affirmatively. He moved that they vote for Mr. Bardwell's motion and add that they have a meeting with the stakeholders for this project. Ms. Tomlinson seconded Mr. Gordon's motion. Mr. Bardwell reminded them that they could not ask for the approval of the current proposal and also ask for a stakeholder meeting because the stakeholder meeting might require a change in the current contract. So Ms. Tomlinson withdrew her motion. Ms. Payton asked if there was a second on the substitute motion. There being none, Ms. Payton asked for a vote on Mr. Bardwell's motion. Ms. Payton, Ms. Tomlinson, Mr. Bardwell, Ms. Freeman and Mr. Jacob voted for Mr. Bardwell's motion. Mr. Gordon was opposed. Ms. Tomlinson said that in no way does the Board want this vote to come across as an insult to anyone.

B. Update on Status of Professional Services Contract to Administer Construction of the Rouzan Branch Library – Mr. Mike Sullivan, Architect with Looney Ricks Kiss, LLC

Ms. Payton read Item B and asked Mr. Sullivan to give his update. Ms. Payton said she will ask for public comments after Mr. Sullivan's report. Mr. Sullivan said that he and Mr. Frey have completed the contract negotiations to administer the Rouzan Branch Library and it will go to the Metropolitan Council Committee on May 2nd and to the full Council on May 9th. Mr. Bardwell asked him about the items on his monthly status report which the Board received as part of their packet for this meeting. Mr. Sullivan replied that he met with Ms. Husband and Ms. Stein to compose a list of items regarding the operation of the building and the maintenance of the grounds that needs to become part of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and the Memorandum of Understanding. This list has been submitted to Mr. Frey to be placed in a document for Mr. Tommy Spinosa. Mr. Sullivan also said that there have recently been some changes in the actual elevation of the streets which resulted in some changes in his documents with regard to how the building ties into the sewer lines.

Mr. Gordon left the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

Ms. Payton asked for public comments based on the presentation. Mr. Berry asked why the architectural firm is being allowed the maximum fee for a non-bid contract for this project. He added that this leads him to believe that the Board does not know how much it will actually cost. He noted a no-bid contract was also approved by the Board for the Trahan feasibility study on the River Center Branch Library. Mr. Berry asked what are the stipulations of the contract, the requirements of the contractor, any deliverables that the Library Board expects, and a timeline. He also wondered what the penalties would be for non-compliance of the contract. He reminded the Board that lawsuits against Mr. Spinosa's Rouzan project are still going on. He concluded that since this Rouzan project has been in multiple delay modes, two other Library construction projects have been initiated and are under construction.

Ms. Wascom said she looks forward to having a library in her neighborhood. She added that libraries adjacent to neighborhoods often thrive. She cited the Delmont Gardens Branch as an example. There were no other public comments and no other comments by the Board.

C. Report on Fines for Delinquent Materials, Percentage of Patrons Involved, Process for Collection of Fines, Rate of Success, and Role of the Parish Attorney – Ms. Patricia Husband and Ms. Mary Stein

Ms. Payton read item C and said that public comments would be allowed after the report. Ms. Stein said she gave the Board a three page report based on last year's statistics. She referred them to a pie chart that illustrated that a large amount of activity occurs between the first and tenth day of an overdue item. The longer an item is overdue the fewer people fall into that category with 70 days overdue showing the smallest segment of patrons. She said that the largest segment of patrons with overdue materials is adults who can drive to the Library or use the phone or computer to address their delinquent items.

Ms. Stein next referred to a chart that listed the types of overdue notices, when these notices are sent, the number of these notices sent and how they are sent. She summarized as follows:

1 Day Overdue	E-mail
10 Days Overdue	E-mail and Print
60 Days Overdue	Print with Cost of Items
70 Days Overdue	Parish Attorney Letter with Invoice

Ms. Stein then spoke about the number of notices sent by overdue type and the number for each patron category. Ms. Payton asked what the “system” category included to which Ms. Stein replied that this includes items on the hold shelf, items used for book talks and outreach items for pre-school and senior centers. Mrs. Stein said that the longer the period of time an item is due the fewer the patrons that fall into these longer overdue dates. She said this has been the case since she began working in circulation in 1984.

Ms. Stein said they use e-mail addresses whenever they can and encourage patrons to give their e-mail addresses for notifications from the Library. However, one of the problems is the fact that e-mail addresses change frequently. She said that when an item is sixty days overdue, they send a notice with the cost of the items that are overdue. She said if the book is returned, the charge for the book is removed from the account and all that is owed is the fine. She emphasized that the fines are a nickel a day for books and one dollar for DVDs, CDs, and videos. The threshold is \$1.00 for children’s materials, \$3.00 for adult materials, and \$5.00 for the DVDs, CDs and videos.

Ms. Stein said at 70 days the information is sent to the Parish Attorney’s Office and a very strong letter is sent to these patrons. She added at that point they get quite a bit of activity. A chart in the report summarized the results of the Parish Attorney’s actions. Within 30 days of the letter going out, the Library staff checks these accounts to see if any activity has occurred as a result of the Parish Attorney’s letter. Ms. Stein told the Board that this is only checked once because of staff time limitations. She added that just about any hardcover adult book costs \$25.00 and so even if the patrons have only kept one book, they more than likely have reached the \$25.00 threshold for which a stop is placed on the use of their library card. They cannot check out any more items until they return the materials or pay for them. This also applies to damaged materials.

Ms. Stein then said she wanted to plug *Library Elf* which has a link on the Library’s home page. By signing up for this electronic service, patrons can be reminded free of charge about due dates either before the due date, on the due date, or after the due date. This service can track the whole family with one account. Ms. Stein said they do not have many patrons that are using the service. Ms. Freeman asked if there is some way to promote this service such as a bookmark to drive the use of this service. Ms. Stein answered that they have a bookmark and people pick them up. They also have advertised in *The Source*, on the home page, on TV and on overdue notices. Ms. Freeman said they need to talk about how they can get the usage to increase.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any questions on this report. Mr. Bardwell said his original request was to see how much money the Library collected and he sees the dollar amounts at the bottom of page 1. It states that the average fines collected from delinquent borrowers per 30 day period after the Parish Attorney's letter is sent is only \$195.98. Ms. Stein reminded him that they are not doing this for the fines, but for the books being returned. That is the prime action. Mr. Bardwell asked how many books were returned to which Ms. Stein said the chart indicates that the cost of items referenced by the Parish Attorney totaled about \$500,000 resulting in about 7,000 items returned with a value of about \$160,000. Mr. Bardwell said about \$300,000 worth of items were not returned within 30 days. Ms. Stein said they cannot afford the time to track more than 30 days after the letter. It takes one staff person half of their time to do the notices to patrons. She added that they are required to track this information for the Parish Attorney. Mr. Bardwell asked what happens to the \$300,000 worth of items to which Ms. Stein replied that some of them are returned over time at possibly the 40th or 50th day or when the person comes to renew their account. They find those materials then because they want an active account to check out new items or download books. Mr. Bardwell questioned how many patrons these numbers represented to which Ms. Stein said 7,737. Mr. Bardwell asked what the cost was for the Parish Attorney to produce their letters. Ms. Stein said that is part of the Library's indirect costs. Mr. Bardwell said if we pay a small amount to collect the \$300,000 worth of materials, then it is worth it, but if we pay more than we collect, it is not worth it. Ms. Stein added that the City-Parish auditors are also involved in this process and require us to do this. She said they even talked about using an outside collection agency in the past and it's revisited periodically, but the Library is not an independent agency and is subject to certain City-Parish regulations. Ms. Stein said the goal is to get the materials back.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other Board comments. Then she asked for public comments. Mr. Berry asked if the Library teaches patrons how to use the Library software such as the databases to which Ms. Stein replied they do. She said they do formal classes, work with individuals and talk to small groups such as students or organizations in the community. In next month's *Source* they will start to list all the computer classes throughout the entire system. Mr. Berry said that by logging on to your own Library account, you can see what books you have checked out, when they are due, and how much you owe. He said he has put this to very good use. He added that if the Library taught patrons how to look up their account it might lower the number of items not returned. He said they could also do this when the bookmobile visits patrons. Ms. Stein said Mr. Berry's ideas were good and that they could show patrons how to check their accounts in conjunction with another computer class. Ms. Freeman agreed and thanked Mr. Berry for his idea. Ms. Payton asked if there were any other public comments or comments from the Board. There being none, she read the next agenda item.

D. Update Report on Director Recruitment Process – Ad Hoc Committee

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Bardwell to give an update on the library director recruitment process. Mr. Bardwell discussed the progress in attempting to amend the State statute that specifies that an applicant for the position of library director must be certified by the State Board of Library Examiners in order to be considered for the position. He said the proposed bill to allow an uncertified applicant to be hired subject to passing the exam within a year of being employed has

been assigned to a committee. The committee has not yet scheduled a hearing. Mr. Bardwell hopes to be notified when the hearing is scheduled so he can attend.

Mr. Bardwell then discussed the activities involving the search firm of Bradbury Associates/Gossage Sager Associates which the Library Board hired on March 6, 2012. Mr. Dan Bradbury and Ms. Jobeth Bradbury reviewed the required City-Parish contract and sent it back to the Library. Mr. Bardwell met with the Parish Attorney to review the contract. It is now being reviewed by the Purchasing Department.

Mr. Bardwell added that Mr. and Mrs. Bradbury will make their first visit to Baton Rouge on May 1-2, 2012. They will tour some of the facilities and talk to staff and the search committee regarding the type of person they need to recruit. He said the Bradburys sent the Board members a questionnaire to complete in order for them to have an understanding of the Board's expectations in hiring a new director. Mr. Bardwell urged the members of the Board to complete the questionnaire and return it by the middle of next week.

The third topic that Mr. Bardwell covered is the status of the request made to the City-Parish Department of Human Resources (H.R.) to increase the pay range for the director. A formal justification letter with data about comparative salaries was submitted. He said they received a response to their letter which was somewhat ambiguous. H.R. did not accept the Board's salary range, but they offered two alternate ranges which were higher than the current range and they asked the Board to submit another range. Mr. Bardwell said he thinks they will come to an agreement. He noted that the Board could request this salary range change be placed on the Metropolitan Council agenda for a vote without H.R. approval, but the Board would like the support of H.R.

Ms. Tomlinson thanked Mr. Bardwell for his work and expertise on this portion of the recruitment process. Mr. Bardwell replied that this is an area of interest and knowledge for him, so he was glad to work on these issues.

Ms. Freeman asked what salary range the Board is going to be offering since they do not have a new range yet. She added that they will soon begin to receive applications and there will be no salary guide. Ms. Payton replied that they hope to have this resolved soon so the range will be available to applicants.

Ms. Payton asked for any public comments and there were none.

New Business

A. Review of the Library Board’s Current Public Comment Policy and Discussion of Three Possible Changes; Those Being 1.) Public Comment Opportunity after System Reports, 2.) Additional Statement at the Bottom of the Agenda Clarifying Public Comment, 3.) When Questions Are Asked by Board Members of the Public, the Answer Is Not Part of the Three Minute Limit on Comments – Mr. Jason Jacob

Ms. Payton read Item A under New Business. She asked Mr. Jacob to discuss his proposed changes to the Board’s Public Comment Policy. Mr. Jacob noted that he sent the Board members some revisions to consider. The wording for the first change was as follows:

- b. The agenda for each regular meeting will also include a public comment opportunity following the system reports. This additional period of public comment is for comments/questions about any item(s) presented/discussed during the course of the system reports, but may not be duplicative of comments made earlier or concerning any item on which a vote has been taken.

Ms. Payton asked him if he meant all of the topics under Item III to which Mr. Jacob said yes that he meant all of the reports by the Co-Directors or Director in Item III of the agenda. He added there should be a period of public comment for any questions or comments the public may have on those topics reported.

Mr. Jacob then said the second change would be to add the following to the bottom of the agenda:

<p style="text-align: center;">ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC In accordance with the Board’s Public Comment Policy, all items on which action is to be taken are open for public comment, and comments and questions may be received on other topics reported at such time as the opportunity is announced by the Chair of the meeting.</p>

Mr. Jacob then told the Board members that the third change he would like to see is if a Board member asks a question of a member of the public, the response should not be part of the three-minute limit for public comment. He added that the policy he has proposed is similar to the current policy with some minor changes that loosen the policy a bit.

Ms. Payton then asked if the Board had any comments and there were none. She asked if there were any comments by the public. Mr. Berry thanked Mr. Jacob for introducing these changes for the Board to consider. He added that after the reports by the Director, the public should have the opportunity to comment and he appreciated that change. Mr. Berry then asked Ms. Payton if

the changes are voted for at this meeting, would he be able to make a comment about an item reported on by the Co-Directors to which Ms. Payton replied yes.

Ms. Wascom addressed the Board and said they need to be careful not to violate the open meetings law. She said by law an agenda must be posted before a meeting, itemizing the topics to be discussed. Therefore, she asked under this proposed policy if a library branch is mentioned in a report, does that trigger permission for the public to discuss any topic about that branch? She cautioned the Board about being too broad and violating the open meetings law. Ms. Wascom said she has dealt with this very issue in the State Legislature. The law is very tight and restrictive on certain agenda items. If the item on the agenda is very broad, the Board can be in violation because a topic could be discussed that was not posted prior to the meeting informing the public. She concluded by saying that if they wish to discuss a topic not placed on the agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting, a proposal would need to be made and voted upon by the Board in order for the topic to be discussed within the guidelines of the law.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other comments by the public. There were none, so she asked if the Board had any comments. Ms. Freeman asked if this revision of the policy had been reviewed by the Parish Attorney to which Mr. Rip Manint of the Parish Attorney's Office said yes. He added that the revised policy is acceptable. Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Manint to comment on Ms. Wascom's concern. He responded that the Board can discuss anything they wish at a meeting, but they cannot take an action if the topic has not been posted on the agenda.

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Jacob if he would like to make a motion on the item to which he replied affirmatively. He said he would like to make a motion that they approve the amended public comment policy which Mr. Bardwell seconded. Ms. Payton asked if there were any additional comments to which Ms. Tomlinson said they should add to item b "or to be made later". Ms. Freeman said they should change the words "system reports" to read "sub-reports". Mr. Jacob and Mr. Bardwell were agreeable to these changes. After further discussion, Mr. Jacob suggested that they revise item b removing the words, "but may not be duplicative of comments made earlier or concerning any item on which a vote has been taken" and change system reports to sub-reports. There was an additional discussion by the Board. Then Ms. Payton asked for a vote on the revised public comment policy with the changes to item b. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Payton then allowed Mr. Berry to make a comment about an item in the reports by the Co-Directors. Mr. Berry said that the video recording of the March Board meeting televised on Metro 21 on Saturday evenings had no audio. He said if this recording is made as a public service they need to be sure that the sound is audible. He said Ms. Gayle Smith contacted Ms. Stein, but it took a couple of weeks to get this problem corrected. Mr. Berry asked if the videographer could explain what the problem was. Ms. Payton said they received the e-mails about the sound issue. Ms. Stein noted that the problem was fixed last week.

Ms. Wascom said as President of Louisiana Earth Day, she wanted to thank the Library for its participation in Earth Day this coming Sunday. She said they are glad that the Library is a partner and she hopes to see everyone at the event.

Ms. Christine Nichols, Vice-Chairwoman of the Board of the Downtown Development District, said she is happy that so many partners like the Baton Rouge Area Foundation and the Baton Rouge Area Chamber are coming forward to offer support for the library downtown. She added that she understands the Board's decision to move ahead with the project, but she hoped that the Board would reach out to these organizations that would like to partner to let them know how appreciative we are for their interest in our Library system. She said this will help to pull our community together, so these partners should be acknowledged.

Comments by the Library Board of Control

Ms. Payton agreed and thanked Ms. Nichols for her comments. She added that she hopes they do not close the door on conversations with these potential partners. She added that the language they have in the contract will enable these discussions to occur. Ms. Payton asked Ms. Husband and Ms. Stein to request a copy of Exhibit B containing the reimbursable expenses so that when the Board is ready to talk with BRAC and BRAF they will know what course of action needs to be taken including possible fund raising opportunities.

Ms. Freeman said the vote taken today did not exclude the possibility of engaging with partners for this project. She said the Board wanted to move forward because the people downtown are looking for that new library. Ms. Freeman added that to this point they did not have much information on this portion of the contract. They want to make informed decisions.

There were no further comments, and so with no further business, the meeting was adjourned on a motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Mr. Jacob at 6:26 p.m.

Kizzy Payton, President

Patricia Husband, Co-Director

Mary Stein, Co-Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 19, 2012
TO: Library Board of Control
FROM: Patricia P. Husband
Mary H. Stein
Co-Directors
SUBJECT: Construction Report

Goodwood Main Library

Steve Jackson, architect with Cockfield Jackson Architects reported the following on March 6, 2012 for The Library Design Collaborative on the Goodwood Main Library.



CONSTRUCTION REPORT

DATE: April 10, 2012

PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library
REPORTED BY: Stephen P. Jackson, The Library Design Collaborative

OBSERVATIONS:

- 1) Pile driving is complete.
- 2) The pile caps and pedestals are being installed along column lines 52 and 53 in preparation for the construction crane path.
- 3) The staging area to the west of the BREC theatre parking lot has been fenced off.
- 4) Structural steel sequence No. 1 has 100% of the concrete pile caps complete, and the concrete grade beams and pedestals approximately 70% complete.
- 5) The subsurface drainage system is complete from the existing 72" pipe to catch basin A-14.
- 6) Conduits are being installed from Independence Boulevard.
- 7) The monthly Owner's Meeting was held March 29th.

UPCOMING WORK:

- 1) Continue the installation of the concrete work in the structural steel sequence No. 1.
- 2) Structural steel sequence No. 1 erection is scheduled to start April 16th.
- 3) Continue the installation of the subsurface drainage system.

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Two (2) pages of photographs from the site.







FIELD REPORT

DATE: April 11, 2012

PROJECT: Independence Park Main Library
WEATHER CONDITIONS: Clear - 75°
REPORTED BY: Benjamin R. Bradford, The Library Design Collaborative
IN ATTENDANCE: Benjamin R. Bradford, Vic Todd, George Griffon, and Pierce Langridge

OBSERVATIONS:

- 1) The pile caps and pedestals are being installed along column lines 52 and 53 in preparation for the construction crane path.
- 2) Structural steel sequence No. 1 appears to be 100% complete on the associated concrete foundation (pile caps, grade beams and pedestals).
- 3) Structural steel sequence No. 2 appears to be 80% complete on the associated concrete foundation (pile caps, grade beams and pedestals).
- 4) Structural steel sequence No. 3 appears to be 30% complete on the associated concrete foundation (pile caps, grade beams and pedestals).
- 5) The elevator pit slabs are complete.
- 6) The subsurface drainage system is complete from the existing 72" pipe to catch basin A-14-A.
- 7) Conduits appear to be installed from Independence Boulevard. The backfilling is approximately 90% complete.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:

- 1) Continue the installation of the concrete work in the structural steel sequence No. 2 & No. 3.
- 2) Structural steel sequence No. 1 erection is scheduled to start April 16th.
- 3) Continue the installation of the subsurface drainage system.

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Two (2) pages of photographs from the site visit.





Fairwood Branch Library

Mr. Richard Brown, architect with Bani, Carville & Brown reported the following from the job site:



Construction Report for week #32

Job Name: Fairwood Branch Library	Inspector: n/a
Date: March 13, 2012	Time: 10:30am
Weather Condition: Overcast - 70°	Contractor: Stuart & Company
Job Superintendent: Darren Thibodeaux	Report prepared by: James ("Jes") Sanders - Bani, Carville & Brown Architects

1. The site was observed to be very muddy. There have been very heavy rains in the previous week. Crews were seen to be working.
2. All of the wood truss components have arrived on site and have been "shaken out", separated and stacked. The pre-stained heavy glu-lam elements have been tightly covered to protect from the elements. The builders will begin erecting these in the next week, weather permitting.
3. Light gauge steel framing is progressing around the perimeter of the building.
4. The air conditioning chiller has arrived on site. This equipment has been placed on its pad. However, the equipment is still wrapped, and has not been connected.
5. The chiller lines have been relocated to avoid the Courtyard half-wall. These lines have been buried.
6. The footings for the rear Courtyard half wall have been excavated. The footings have not been poured yet.



March						
11	12	Today	14	15	16	17
OBSERVED	OBSERVED					
HI 77°F LO 60°F	HI 72°F LO 55°F	HI 80°F LO 64°F	HI 82°F LO 62°F	HI 84°F LO 61°F	HI 70°F LO 63°F	HI 70°F LO 64°F
Precip: 0.00in	Precip: 0.00in	Precip: 20%	Precip: 20%	Precip: 20%	Precip: 20%	Precip: 20%

Construction Report for week #33

Job Name: Fairwood Branch Library	Inspector: n/a
Date: March 20, 2012	Time: 9:30am
Weather Condition: Overcast - 75°	Contractor: Stuart & Company
Job Superintendent: Darren Thibodeaux	Report prepared by: James ("Jes") Sanders - Bani, Carville & Brown Architects

1. The site was observed to be dry and workable. Several crews were on site.
2. The suspended concrete slab for the Mechanical Mezzanine has been poured. The concrete was still wet at the thime of observation.
3. The grade beams for the Rear Courtyard half wall were in the process of being poured.
4. The following material packages were seen staged on site:
 - a. Glu-lam and glu-lam truss material.
 - b. EPIC ventilated metal roof decking.
 - c. Light gauge metal trusses.
 - d. Steel connections for glu-lams
 - e. Light gauge metal studs
5. The light gauge metal framing is progressing.
6. Many of the uppermost wood glulam trusses have been installed.
7. New off-site dirt was observed being imported and spread.



March						
18	19	Today	21	22	23	24
THURSDAY	FRIDAY					
7:00P	8:00P	11:00P Lo: 72P	8:45P Lo: 67P	10:45P Lo: 63P	11:00P Lo: 65P	8:02P Lo: 72P
Hi 84°F Lo 66°F	Hi 79°F Lo 68°F	Hi 80 Lo 60 %	Hi 80 Lo 100 %	Hi 75 Lo 30 %	Hi 80 Lo 30 %	Hi 82 Lo 0 %
0.00 (in) 0in	0.00 (in) 0in					

Construction Report for week #34

Job Name: Fairwood Branch Library	Inspector: n/a
Date: March 26, 2012	Time: 12:00 noon
Weather Condition: Clear – 80°	Contractor: Stuart & Company
Job Superintendent: Darren Thibodeaux	Report prepared by: James ("Jes") Sanders - Bani, Carville & Brown Architects

1. The site was observed to be dry and workable. Several crews were on site at the time of the visit.
2. The light gauge metal wall framing is progressing. The exterior sheathing is being installed as well.
3. The light gauge metal trusses are being installed throughout.
4. The wood trusses and beams are being installed throughout.
5. The tracks for the partition walls in the Meeting Rooms is currently being installed.
6. The remaining dirt pad for the parking lot is being laid and compacted.
7. The footings for the rear courtyard have been poured. Rebar is currently extended to tie in to the wall at a later date.
8. The steel drop-off canopy frame has been erected. The metal roof has not been installed on the canopy at this time.



March						
05	Today	27	28	29	30	31
Observed	N/A					
High	84°	84°	82°	81°	80°	79°
Low	59°	60°	61°	62°	63°	64°
Precip	0%	10%	20%	10%	10%	10%
Wind	0 mph	10 mph	10 mph	10 mph	10 mph	10 mph

No Report for Week 35

Construction Report for week #36

Job Name: Fairwood Branch Library	Inspector: n/a
Date: April 10, 2012	Time: 9:00 am
Weather Condition: Clear – 70°	Contractor: Stuart & Company
Job Superintendent: Darren Thibodeaux	Report prepared by: James ("Jes") Sanders - Bani, Carville & Brown Architects

1. The site was observed to be dry and workable. Several crews were observed on-site.
2. The existing telephone poles were observed being removed.
3. The glu-lam framing is neraly completed.
4. Light gauge metal roof truss erection is alomost completed. Metal roof deck is currently being installed.
5. The infill of dirt for the front parking lot has been completed. Layout for the concrete parking lot will begin as soon as the telephone poles are completely removed.
6. The tracks for the partition wall, which will divide the Meeting Rooms, has been installed.
7. Light gauge metal stud wall framing continues to be installed.



April						
<	>	Today	11	12	13 <	14
OBSERVED	OBSERVED					
Hi 82°F Lo 59°F	Hi 82°F Lo 59°F	Hi 82°F Lo 60°F	Hi 81°F Lo 50°F	Hi 77°F Lo 60°F	Hi 80°F Lo 64°F	Hi 82°F Lo 71°F
Precip (in) 0.0L	Precip (in) 0.0L	Precip 30 %	Precip 60 %	Precip 10 %	Precip 20 %	Precip 10 %

Rouzan Branch Library

Mr. Mike Sullivan, architect with Looney Ricks Kiss/LRK LLC reported the following:

Looney Ricks Kiss/LRK L.L.C.

5615 Corporate Blvd, Suite 100B
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808
Telephone 225 928 4905

April 10, 2012

Please note the following information to be posted for this month's status on the Rouzan Branch Library Documents:

1. The design team is currently integrating the final design comments and items of understanding between the Library and 2590 regarding items such as landscaping and maintenance access.
2. The design team is also currently coordinating civil engineering between the Rouzan Street Package and the Library Design.

Please do not hesitate to call with any additional questions or requests.

Sincerely,



Mike Sullivan, AIA



PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY

APRIL 19, 2012

PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Public comment on any item on the agenda on which a vote may be taken will be received at each of the public meetings of the Board.
 - A. The period of public comment will be immediately following the introduction of an agenda item on which a vote may be taken. The President of the Board or the person conducting the meeting has the authority to end the comment period if it is felt that the comments are not germane to the subject or contrary to good order.
 - B. The agenda for each regular meeting will also include a public comment opportunity just after the sub-reports by the Director. This additional period of public comment is for comments/questions about any item(s) presented/discussed during the course of the sub-reports by the Director.
 - C. The following language shall be added at the bottom of each agenda:

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

In accordance with the Board's Public Comment Policy, all items on which action is to be taken are open for public comment, and comments and questions may be received on other topics reported at such time as the opportunity is announced by the President of the Board or the person conducting the meeting.

2. Persons wishing to comment must be in attendance at the meeting and shall:
 - A. Speak only when recognized by the President of the Board or the person conducting the meeting.
 - B. Speak only on the agenda item that has been announced or as stated in item 1 B above.
 - C. Rise and state their name prior to any remarks on an agenda item.
 - D. Direct all comments to the Board President or the person conducting the meeting.



PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY

APRIL 19, 2012

- E. Display proper decorum and conduct at all times.
- i. There is an absolute prohibition on personal attacks on Board members or others, comments considered profane, frivolous, harassing, and repetitive or are not appropriate for comment.
 - ii. The President of the Board or person conducting the meeting has the right to exclude such comments at his discretion, prohibit further comment for any speaker who violates the rules, and, if necessary, call for the removal from the meeting of any person for misconduct or refusal to obey reasonable orders.
 - iii. If speaking on behalf of a group, provide documentation for approval by the Board President or person conducting the meeting that their presented views are those of the organization. A resolution or official minutes from the organization are acceptable forms of documentation.
 - iv. Speak only once per agenda item and limit comments to three (3) minutes or less.
 - v. If the Board chooses to ask questions of the speaker, the speaker's answers are not considered part of his three (3) minute time limitation.