

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
AUGUST 18, 2011
4:00 P.M.

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 21, 2011
- III. REPORTS BY THE DIRECTOR
 - A. FINANCIAL REPORT
 - B. SYSTEM REPORTS
 - C. OTHER REPORTS
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON WHETHER TO CHANGE THE LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL BY-LAWS REGARDING NUMBER OF MEETINGS PER YEAR FROM MONTHLY TO BI-MONTHLY OR MORE FREQUENTLY AT THE DISCRETION OF THE BOARD PRESIDENT
- V. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. CONSIDERATION FOR ALTERING PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY – MR. DONALD BROWNING
 - B. REMOVE RIVER CENTER BRANCH LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT FROM THE CURRENT CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE
 - C. CONSIDERATION OF WHETHER TO ACCEPT OR REJECT ANY OF THE ALTERNATES FOR THE GOODWOOD MAIN LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT – MR. STAN BARDWELL
- 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

August 18, 2011

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 August 18, 2011. Ms. Kizzy Payton, President of the Board, called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Mr. Donald Browning, Mr. Derek Gordon; Ms. Tanya Freeman; Mr. Laurence Lambert; and Ms. Beth Tomlinson. Also in attendance were Mr. David Farrar, Library Director; Ms. Mary Stein, Assistant Library Director of Administration; Ms. Patricia Husband, Assistant Library Director of Branch Services; Ms. Rhonda Pinsonat, Library Business Manager; Mr. Ronnie Pierce, Assistant Library Business Manager, and Ms. Liz Zozulin, Executive Assistant to the Library Director. Metropolitan Councilman Mike Walker of District 8; Metropolitan Councilman Ulysses Z. Addison of District 2; Metropolitan Councilwoman Tara Wicker of District 10; Metropolitan Councilman Rodney “Smokie” Bourgeois of District 12; Mr. Davis Rhorer, Director of the Downtown Development District; Mr. Rip Manint of the Parish Attorney’s Office; Captain Blair Nicholson, of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff’s Office were also present. Mr. Ken Tipton; Ms. Lisa Hargrave; Mr. Josh Peak; Mr. Steve Jackson; and Mr. Benjamin Bradford, architects with The Library Design Collaborative; and Mr. Rex Cabaniss, architect with Washer, Hill, Lipscomb and Cabaniss Architects were also in attendance. Mr. Greg Garland, reporter, and Mr. Arthur Lauck, photographer both with *The Advocate*; Ms. Ashley Rodrique, reporter, and Mr. Chris Sasser, videographer both with Channel 2 News, and Mr. Frank Hillyard, videographer with Metro 21 along with approximately 60 people from the community were also at the meeting.

Ms. Payton opened the meeting by asking for the approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Library Board on July 18, 2011. The minutes were unanimously approved on a motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Ms. Tomlinson.

Mr. Browning asked for a revision of the agenda. He said that under *Old Business, Item A*, he would like to suspend the Board’s Public Comment Policy for that item to give the public the time to express their feelings about the public comment policy. Ms. Payton replied that Mr. Browning could make this motion right before the agenda item is discussed. Mr. Browning added that he would also like to add under *New Business, Item D, A Discussion of the Rouzan Project*. He said he had some concerns regarding it. Ms. Payton asked if there was a second to this motion. Mr. Bardwell seconded the motion. Ms. Payton, Ms. Freeman, Mr. Bardwell, Mr. Browning, and Ms. Tomlinson voted in favor and Mr. Lambert opposed the motion. Ms. Payton said the item passed and would be added to the agenda.

Reports by the Director

A. Financial Reports

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Farrar to present his financial and system reports. Mr. Farrar gave his reports noting that the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances as of July 31, 2011 shows operating expenditures of \$14,826,563.26 or 42.94% of the operating budget. Through the end of July, the Library should have spent no more than 58.34% of the operating budget. Cash collections from property taxes for 2011 remain up as we are at \$457,000 and 1.30% higher than the same eight months in 2010. Interest earnings on investments of \$111,112.00 have been posted for the first two quarters of 2011.

C. Other Reports

Mr. Farrar said that the children's outreach van had some mechanical problems which are under warranty. It has been taken to Slidell for repairs, and as soon as it is fixed, the vehicle will be wrapped with the appropriate signage.

Mr. Farrar then gave an update on the library construction projects. He welcomed Mayor Pro Tem Mike Walker to the Board meeting. He said that a notice to proceed on the Fairwood Branch Library was issued on August 15th and construction activities have already begun. He noted that there will be some unique amenities in this branch library. Mayor Holden and Councilman Walker are available for a groundbreaking ceremony on September 7th.

In regard to the Goodwood Main Library Mr. Farrar said that on August 2nd bids from potential contractors were opened. Milton J. Womack, Inc. submitted the low bid at \$36,770,000 for the total scope of work which was under budget. The Capital Improvements Committee of the Metropolitan Council did not make a recommendation to approve the bid, but has sent it on for a vote of the full Metropolitan Council at their meeting on August 24th.

Mr. Farrar noted that he has spoken to Mr. Mike Sullivan, architect with LRK regarding the Rouzan Branch Library project and the construction documents are almost completed. The Library staff will meet with Mr. Sullivan on August 29th for a mechanical and technology review.

Mr. Derek Gordon arrived at 4:13 p.m.

Mr. Farrar then said that the Parish Attorney has completed the investigation of the architectural selection committee's process for choosing an architect to design and construct a new downtown library. The contract to hire the architect has not been presented to the Metropolitan Council. Mr. Farrar noted that further discussion of this project can occur under the agenda item of this meeting. He added that much has appeared in several media outlets in the community regarding this issue and the reports have been fairly accurate.

Mr. Farrar then asked Ms. Stein to make her presentation about children's outreach services and other programs offered by the Library. Ms. Stein said that she will give more detail in the

outreach services report in the future. She said the report shows that they have visited 1,813 preschoolers already this year. She added that she will quickly go through two slide presentations outlining a variety of programs and activities this summer.

Ms. Stein's June/July presentation highlighted some of the following activities:

- Mr. Farrar's Presentation at ALA
- Ms. Smart's Presentation at ALA about LibGuides
- Ms. Stein's Participation in The Library Instruction Round Table Discussion at ALA
- Ms. Arnold Chosen to Serve on Caldecott Committee for 2012
- Laptop Checkout at Main
- Farmer Minor and Daisy the Reading Pig
- Angela the Yarnspinner and Her Animal Friends
- Booking It with Big Baby
- Didgeridoo Down Under for Teens
- Cangelosi Dance Project at Pride-Chaneyville Branch
- Storytime at River Center Branch
- Authors ReShonda Tate Billingsley and Pat Tucker at Scotlandville Branch
- Javier Juarez at Zachary Branch

Ms. Stein's July/August presentation highlighted some of the following activities:

- *One Book One Community* Panel Discussing Mental Illness in Baton Rouge
- Mayor Holden and Big Baby Kick off *Score Big with Books*
- Big Baby Reads to Children at Delmont Garden's Branch
- Bookmobile inside Cortana Mall for Big Baby Event
- Summer Reading Parties at Each Branch
- *Playaway Views* for Checkout to Tell Stories with Audio and Video
- *TumbleBooks* - Ebooks for Kids
- Mystery Lovers Book Club at Main
- Novelist Select
- *NextReads* – Proactive Reader's Advisory Service
- Book Bundles for Teens at Bluebonnet Regional Branch
- Multi-Cultural Festival at Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch
- Sassi Strippers Quilt Display at Jones Creek Regional Branch
- Eric Herman at Pride-Chaneyville Branch

Mr. Farrar said that this is only about 75% of what the Library does to which Ms. Stein replied that the Library does approximately 4,000 programs a year. Ms. Stein then mentioned the 34th Annual Author-Illustrator Program with Jack Gantos to be held on September 29th and 30th at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library. She noted that this is the only event sponsored by the Library for which a fee is charged. Ms. Payton asked if the Patrons of the Public Library (POPL) help pay for this and other programs at the Library. Ms. Stein answered affirmatively saying that POPL funds pay for programs, incentives and gift certificates which cannot be paid for from the dedicated Library tax collection.

Ms. Freeman thanked Ms. Stein for her presentation and the way she brought the reports to life. She said that they want to make sure people understand what services are brought to the community. It's not just about bricks and mortar and the buildings. These programs help the Library fulfill its mission.

Mr. Browning then mentioned that he went to the *One Book One Community* panel discussion at the Jones Creek Regional Branch Library. He said it was so well attended that he had to park in the bank parking lot adjacent to the Library. When he entered the double meeting room, it was standing room only, so he assisted by helping to set up more chairs. He said the staff presents amazing programs and he thanked them. Ms. Stein said the staff enjoys the programs because they showcase books in the collection and also enable staff to interact with patrons. She added that they appreciate that the Library Board allows them to make these presentations. Those present applauded.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the first Outreach Services report dated July 2011. He said that his request for this report was mainly to outline the usage of the children's bookmobile and outreach vehicles. He noted that the report does not mention the bookmobile and that he cannot determine which events involved the bookmobile. He said he would like a detailed list of where the outreach vehicles went each day and in what activities they participated. He said he'd also like to see a schedule of where the vehicles anticipate visiting in the future. He added that he wants this to publicize the usage. Ms. Stein responded that they don't advertise about which daycare centers and schools they visit because the public cannot come into these facilities. Child safety regulations require a background check of all visitors. Ms. Stein did say they could provide a schedule and would do so. Ms. Freeman added that this is important because when the Library Board voted to purchase these vehicles for outreach to children, they were taking a risk. Many said that the use of bookmobiles was in decline. They have already discovered that the opposite is true in East Baton Rouge Parish. Ms. Freeman said they would also like to have the statistics in order to justify the purchase of additional vehicles in the future. Ms. Freeman also requested that Ms. Stein's reports be placed on the Library's website. Ms. Stein said she would work on providing the Board with a color-coded report of their activities.

Mr. Farrar then asked Ms. Husband to give an update on maintenance projects at the Library branches. He said when he presented the 2011 Library budget to the Metropolitan Council last year, he emphasized that maintenance of the current facilities is very important. He said that Ms. Husband and her staff ensure that the buildings are well maintained.

Ms. Husband said that even with 800 people in attendance at the Multi-Cultural Festival at Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch, the air conditioning worked well. She added that well maintained facilities enhance the positive experience patrons have when they participate in Library programs. Ms. Husband said that a lighting upgrade at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library is 95% completed. A consulting engineer met with the staff about a lighting upgrade for the Jones Creek Regional Branch Library. This project will be ready to bid soon. Partition walls have been ordered for the meeting rooms at the Bluebonnet Regional Branch and the Jones Creek Regional Branch Libraries. The City-Parish Department of Public Works (DPW) has issued a notice to proceed for this work. At the Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch Library an Energy Management System (EMS) audit is being done to ensure that all controls are

operating correctly. EMS audits are scheduled for the Baker, Central, and Scotlandville Branch Libraries. A compressor on the chiller at the Scotlandville Branch was replaced along with repairs to the chillers at the Baker, the Greenwell Springs Road Regional and the Zachary Branch Libraries.

With the Director's Reports completed, Ms. Payton said she would like to acknowledge the presence of Metropolitan Councilwoman Tara Wicker and Metropolitan Councilman Rodney "Smokie" Bourgeois at the Board meeting and thank them for attending the meeting.

Old Business

A. Discussion and Vote on Whether to Change the Library Board of Control By-Laws regarding Number of Meetings per Year from Monthly to Bi-Monthly or More Frequently at the Discretion of the Board President

Ms. Payton then read item A under *Old Business* and said that in response to all of the discussions and comments made by the public at last month's meeting, and in consideration of all the projects that the Library is pursuing, she did not feel that the Board should alter the number of meetings per year. Therefore, the Library Board will continue to hold a meeting each month. She added that in the future if circumstances change, the Board might address this topic again. Ms. Payton thanked the members of the public for their comments regarding this issue.

New Business

A. Consideration for Altering Public Comment Policy – Mr. Donald Browning

Ms. Payton said that over the last few months the Board has had many comments from the public about their comment policy and that she could understand the reactions especially in regard to presentations being made. She added that currently public comments must be made before a presentation. Ms. Payton noted that she would like to change the policy so that comments can be made after a presentation if the other Board members agree. She also said that she believes the rest of the comment policy is sufficient as it is currently written.

Ms. Payton said that Mr. Browning placed this item on the agenda and, therefore she asked him to begin the discussion. Ms. Tomlinson asked about a point of order. She said that Mr. Browning had asked earlier that the Board agree to allow public comments. Ms. Tomlinson said the current policy does allow for public comment so comments would be allowed at this time. Mr. Browning replied that he wished to waive the policy and allow the public to speak after the Board discussed the item. Mr. Browning then made a motion that the public be allowed to speak after the Library Board discussed the item. Mr. Browning added that the reason he placed this item on the agenda was because people have told him that they feel they are totally left out of the process. They must make remarks before the Board discusses the item. The agenda items as now stated do not furnish enough information. Therefore, the comments from the public are not in response to the Board's discussions and actions. Mr. Browning said he would like to change the policy so that the Board first discusses the item, then the public makes their comments and

then the Board again discusses the item and takes action if warranted. He said in this way the public feels that they are part of the decision.

Ms. Payton asked the Board if there were any objections to Mr. Browning's request to suspend the rules for this item to allow the public to speak after the board discussion. Mr. Gordon then said for clarification that is the only part of the policy that is being suspended and that a time limit is still in force to which Ms. Payton replied affirmatively adding it is only for this agenda item. Ms. Payton then asked for comments from the Board.

Ms. Tomlinson said she wanted to reiterate how the current policy came about. She said that there is nothing in the Library Board's policy that is not also in the comment policy of the Metropolitan Council and the City-Parish Planning Commission. If you go to these meetings you are expected to follow the rules and if you don't, you are escorted out. Mr. Farrar said that people have been escorted out of the Council meetings for not obeying the comment policy. She added that she proposed this policy after reviewing the policies of these two City-Parish governing bodies and the policy drafted by Ms. Nikki Essix of the Parish Attorney's office. As Ms. Essix's policy was four pages long, Ms. Tomlinson condensed the policy to one page. The Board voted to approve that one page policy.

Mr. Gordon said that their revised version was also approved by the Parish Attorney. Mr. Gordon added that a possible solution to the concerns of the public would be to write an enriched description of the agenda items which would include the presentation of the issue. The public would then be able to make an informed response. He noted they also need the rules so that the work of the Board is not impeded. He said this would amend the process and not necessarily require that the policy be amended. Ms. Freeman asked if Mr. Gordon's suggestion is a policy change. She felt it was and added that they could check with the Parish Attorney. Mr. Gordon agreed that they could ask the Parish Attorney, but he felt they could state the agenda item any way they wished. Ms. Payton replied that she did not think enriching the agenda item was a change in the policy. She added that they can let the public know if there will be a presentation which would allow public comment after the presentation.

Ms. Payton added that Mr. Bardwell has been campaigning for a while that the public be allowed to make comments after the agenda item is discussed by the Board. Mr. Bardwell said he agreed with Mr. Gordon about enriching the wording of the agenda items, and that the Board's policy is not at fault. How the Board has implemented it, is causing the issues. He noted that the public can make comments at Metropolitan Council meetings at all times except when an item is being introduced. Mr. Bardwell read the policy about comments that appears at the beginning of all Council agendas. He said it is from Title 1, Section 1.7 of the Code of Ordinances. This ordinance refers back to the State meeting law which is Title 42 about public comment. He said under Title 2 there is a very detailed process about how the agenda is put together, how items get on the agenda, and the deadlines for placing items on the agenda. He added that the agenda description must include what action the Council must take. Mr. Bardwell suggested that the Library Board modify their policy by adding that any item on the agenda should contain a detailed description of the action the Board is considering taking. He noted this detail ensures an understanding of the very specific action required.

Mr. Gordon agreed that he and Mr. Bardwell were asking for the same change to the policy. Ms. Tomlinson said she agrees with the comments that Mr. Gordon and Mr. Bardwell made. She added that the public also wants to make comments on items not on the agenda and that is not allowed at any other board or commission meeting. She asked whether that is an area that the Board would like to consider; that is, designating a specific time for any comments the public might wish to make.

Ms. Payton then opened the meeting to comments from the public. She asked that all who speak give their names and limit their comments to three minutes. Mr. John Berry asked if they would get multiple opportunities to speak at this meeting. Ms. Payton replied affirmatively since the rules had been suspended for this agenda item. Mr. Berry also asked if the public could speak again once the Board replied to the comments made. Mr. Berry then quoted from the public meetings rules. Mr. Berry said he would ask to speak again at this meeting.

Mr. Harvey Landry then spoke and said that what he had to say was not to disparage any one Board or staff member, but it is to relay the collective perspective from the community. He read the statement that appears at the bottom of every Library Board agenda. He said the Board allows items to appear under the Director's comments. By doing this, the topics that the people want to comment on are ignored. The topics that the Board chooses to place on the agenda seem to show contempt toward the public and those who wish to ask questions. He added that the public has a right to have answers to their questions in a timely manner from a public body that is appointed or elected. Mr. Landry added that an answer delayed could well be an answer denied. The Board has a fiduciary responsibility to receive and reply to questions from the public. He said the business of the Library Board does need to be conducted, but the public should not be stifled. The audience applauded Mr. Landry.

Ms. Payton asked for other comments. Ms. Colleen Crain said that she has enjoyed libraries throughout her life all around the country. She added that she is a property owner on a strict budget. Ms. Crain said she has been watching how the money from her property taxes is being spent. She added that the Board has a \$38 million construction project and a \$74 million capital improvements budget which is a lot of money. She said she was upset to learn that public comments are restricted. The public feels restricted because they cannot ask questions. She added that she hopes that she has misinterpreted the rules and that the public can ask specific questions about the construction projects since they are so costly.

Ms. Kathy Morris said she is a property owner, a tax payer and a stakeholder. She told the Board that she has always voted for the funds that the Library Board is managing. She asked why the Board would make it a policy to not answer any questions at all from the public. She added that if the Board sees the wisdom of suspending the policy for today's meeting, that they will permanently allow questions and answers. Ms. Morris noted that she looked at each Board member's community activities. She cited several non-profit organizations that Ms. Payton, Mr. Bardwell, Mr. Gordon and Ms. Tomlinson have been associated with. She asked if these organizations allowed public comments. Ms. Morris concluded by saying the public wants to be able to ask questions and get answers. The audience applauded Ms. Morris.

Mr. Mark Holmes then spoke. He said he appreciated what he was hearing today. He added that the public are not enemies of the Board. He said transparency is what protects the Library Board. He said a lack of transparency could cause a problem for the Board if an issue arises regarding something that appears unethical because sufficient discussions were not allowed. He said after reading the procedures of the Council and Board, he would like to make a motion that they have a question and answer period with all of them. Ms. Payton replied that Mr. Holmes is not a member of the Board and, therefore cannot make a motion. Mr. Holmes asked if that was in the bylaws as he looked for it and could not find it. Ms. Payton referred this request to Mr. Rip Manint of the Parish Attorney's Office. Mr. Manint replied that according to *Robert's Rules of Order* which governs the proceedings of the Library Board meetings, only a member of the Board can make a motion. Mr. Holmes said he understood, but asked how the public could get an item placed on the agenda. Mr. Manint answered that the public should speak to an individual member of the Board to ask if he/she would consider placing an item on the agenda. Mr. Holmes asked what the person could do if the Board member said no to which Mr. Manint replied he could ask another Board member. Mr. Holmes then asked what could be done if no Board member agreed to the agenda item. Mr. Manint said that would imply that the Board was not willing to address that topic at that time.

Mr. John Berry again spoke. He said that the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, the press and the right to assemble peacefully. He said this amendment applies to all government agencies including library boards. He noted that he served in Vietnam and he took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States. He said that naturalized citizens must take an oath to defend the Constitution also. He said he has been involved in Board meetings for over six years and has challenged bad decisions by the Library Board. The current public comment policy is highly limiting. Mr. Berry added that prior to the adoption of this policy, the public could speak about any topic related to the Library. He added that there was no disorder and no armed guards. He said they want their Constitutional right to free speech observed.

Ms. Ann Shaneyfelt then spoke. She thanked the Board for all that they have been doing and added that she has never had a problem contacting any Board member to give them information or to ask questions. The audience applauded Ms. Shaneyfelt.

Mr. Mike Thibodeaux, President of the Baton Rouge Tea Party, then addressed the Board stating that he would like to be the spokesperson for the Baton Rouge Tea Party. He provided a letter to Ms. Payton stating that he was designated as a spokesperson. He stated that the current comment policy is too restrictive. Mr. Thibodeaux noted that any topics presented under "Reports by the Director" are not considered agenda items and therefore, no comments could be made. He said the public should be able to talk about any topic relevant to the Library system. He added that the public should be allowed to ask questions and get responses from the Board. Mr. Thibodeaux then said that the public should be able to ask questions throughout the discussion and not just prior to the Board's action on an item. He said the three-minute limit per comment was acceptable, but that the public should be able to speak more than once regarding a topic. He added this type of process lends itself to transparency. The current restrictive policy is almost a mockery of public comment. Upon completion of his talk, Ms. Colleen Crain, a member of the Tea Party, handed each Board member a summary of the points Mr. Thibodeaux made.

Mr. Jeff Nunn then spoke and said that the Board should reinstate the original policy for public comment. He added that the Board spends a great amount of the public's money with many projects continuing for several years. He said it is incumbent upon the Board to allow the public to participate in the Board decisions. He said if the Board is making good decisions, they should not be afraid of questions from the public.

Ms. Kathy Wascom said when she began attending the Library Board meetings in 2009, there were no rules, even though the Board was supposed to follow *Robert's Rules of Order*. Then the Board adopted the same rules as the Metropolitan Council. Ms. Wascom said that the Baton Rouge Tea Party should make the same presentation to the Metropolitan Council and see if they will be willing to dialog back and forth with the public at their meetings. She added that when items are placed on the agenda, this is done before the meeting so that the public knows what topics will be discussed. She said if the Board changes this process and allows a topic to be added during the meeting, there will be no notice to the public. Ms. Wascom said the Board can place an item on the agenda with a two thirds vote of the Board members, but needs to be careful about adding items to the agenda without notice on a regular basis. She added that in the past the public tried to engage the Library staff in adversarial discussions which she thought was inappropriate. She said she asked Mr. Dan Reed, the former Board President, to follow *Robert's Rules*. Ms. Wascom said she liked Mr. Gordon's and Mr. Bardwell's suggestion to include a more comprehensive agenda so that the public would know what is going to be discussed.

Ms. René Singleton then addressed the Board. She thanked Ms. Wascom for her comments and said ditto to them.

Mr. Mark Holmes again spoke saying he was looking over *Robert's Rules*. He said if he can find in the rules that the attendees at a meeting can have a dialog with the Board, would the Board be agreeable to this? He added that he understands that some of the procedures for the Board meetings follow State law and Metropolitan Council rules. Ms. Payton replied that if Mr. Holmes found such a rule, the Board would consider that at a later date. Mr. Farrar added that any change in the policy would have to be approved by the Parish Attorney. Mr. Holmes concluded his remarks by saying that the conflict between the Mayor and the Metropolitan Council is partly the result of Council members not getting enough information in a timely manner. He said that it is about transparency and he appreciated the Board being willing to open up to the public.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other comments. Then she said she appreciated the courteous manner in which the public had made comments. She added that she noted the number of people who attended the meeting today for the first time and the fact that a lot of talking points had been shared with these new attendees about what to say to the Library Board. Ms. Payton said that a year and a half ago prior to the adoption of the public comment policy, the behavior of the public was out of order and meetings were running amuck. The public was yelling at Board and staff members. She added that it is inappropriate for the public to say anything they wish. She said they had to bring some order and decorum to the meetings. She also said that nobody on the Board stifles the public. She said that at the time the policy was adopted the national news ran stories of shootings at public meetings. She noted that it was at

that time that they engaged the assistance of the Sheriff's Department to have an armed guard because things were that out of control. She said she still stands by the need for an armed guard at the Board meetings. Ms. Payton added that she agreed with Mr. Gordon and Mr. Bardwell about the wording of the agenda items.

Ms. Freeman said that the public was heard today. She asked Mr. Farrar if Ms. Husband's maintenance report could be placed on the Library website along with Ms. Stein's report. She also asked if the construction documents could be placed on the website, too. Mr. Farrar replied that the construction documents are already on the website, but they would add more details and also include the maintenance reports.

Mr. Bardwell then said he would like to discuss the ability of the public to have a dialog with the Library Board in regard to agenda items. He said that he and Mr. Manint were discussing this topic before the meeting and it is a difficult process to implement. Mr. Bardwell gave a history of Board meeting procedures prior to Ms. Payton being elected President of the Board. He noted that the former President had served on the Board for about fifteen years, was very knowledgeable about the history of all Library activities and decisions, and was a trial attorney by profession. He was used to thinking and speaking on his feet and he became a lot more liberal with topics from the public which were not on the agenda. Mr. Bardwell added that this is not to say that Ms. Payton is not a good president; her style is just different from Mr. Dan Reed, but she is doing a good job. He then continued saying that Mr. Reed was able to differentiate in answering what was factual information to transfer as opposed to moving into policy issues that only the whole Board could address. Mr. Bardwell said this is where the split has come in the Board's ability to open the meetings up to just general questions. He said the Board President is not authorized to speak for the entire Board on some items. He noted that there are factual items that probably can be answered by the Library staff. Therefore, he said the Board could craft a statement that some items are to be answered by the Library Director and some by the Board. Mr. Bardwell added that the job of the Board President becomes difficult when questions from the public arise that are not directly related to an agenda item. He agreed that there are items for which the Board can spontaneously respond, but he did not have a solution to this concern at this meeting. Mr. Bardwell said that tonight he would like to clarify a motion about the agenda and then ask the Parish Attorney to help the Library Board resolve the issue of a dialog with the public at Board meetings.

Mr. Gordon then said that all Library Board members want to hear from the public. In regard to quoting from the U.S. Constitution, he noted that in all levels of government from local, state and national, there are avenues for getting the business of the government agency done. Mr. Gordon said for example, at this meeting there are four Council members in attendance. The Library Board is appointed by the Council which picks individuals for the Board whom they believe will make decisions regarding the Library system on the public's behalf and represent the public's interests. He said if the public is concerned about a Library Board member, they can speak to their Council member who will address the concern.

Mr. Gordon noted that in City-Parish government when there is an issue, the public speaks to the Metropolitan Council member who represents them and then the Council member takes the issue further. There are clear guidelines for this process. He said that the governing body must be in

control of its ability to get its business done. He pointed out that at this meeting they have had a discussion for forty-five minutes and that this is only on one agenda item. He said it would be impossible to get the business of the Board completed if there were no holds barred.

Mr. Gordon further stated that he agreed with Ms. Wascom who talked about the process for putting items on the agenda ahead of the meeting. He said that the items on the agenda require actions by the Board. Mr. Gordon said he felt that the Board should change the way the agenda items are stated as supported by the State statutes to give the public a much clearer understanding of what will be discussed. Then the public could respond. He noted that at Council meetings the public is asked to address the Council in order for the Council to clarify some issue prior to taking an action. He said there are also restrictions to how many times the public can be called to speak and the length of time they can speak. Mr. Gordon said all of the Board members are for a fair and reasonable public comment policy. He added that in regard to the ability to speak multiple times on a topic, he would want to be sure that all who wish to speak would have the opportunity to do so and then within a particular time limit, they could have a second opportunity to speak before the Board would take some action. He concluded by saying that this would enable the process of hearing the public's concerns and conducting the business of the Board, to be clear, transparent and reasonable. Mr. Gordon added that his statement could be a motion.

Ms. Payton said that Mr. Berry wished to speak again. Mr. Berry said he was pleased that they could discuss things with the Board and for suspending the rules just at this time. He said that he agreed with Mr. Gordon's comment that they cannot put everything on the agenda or know everything that will be discussed. But the way the process has evolved is that things that the Board has not wanted the public to comment on have been placed under the *Director's Reports*, which is not an agenda item for discussion. He added that the Rouzan project is one example. It has not been on the agenda in over a year. Mr. Berry said that the public cannot ask why after five years of planning, there is still no library in south Baton Rouge. He also said that the public has not had the opportunity to discuss the construction of a downtown library at \$19 million since last fall. Mr. Berry said it is only on the agenda today because there is a lot of controversy going on now about the architect selection, and other issues. He said the public needs to be able to ask questions about it. Many members of the public feel it is a waste of money. He asked how this would be addressed if it isn't on the agenda.

Mr. Berry added that many members of the public have contacted the Metropolitan Council about many subjects having to do with the East Baton Rouge Parish Library and they have gotten a duly noted response from only one Council member. He said he hoped the members of the Council at this meeting have heard what he said. He added that he has spoken to his Council representative and has gotten the satisfaction that he has asked for. He said he does not see any action from the Metropolitan Council toward the Library Board members. Mr. Berry said that once a person is appointed to the Library Board he is secure in that appointment for the next four years. The Board member is in control of a \$38 million budget, with over \$50 million in capital improvements and in decisions regarding the running of the Library. Mr. Berry then referred to Ms. Tomlinson's suggestion that the public be allowed to comment after the Board discusses an item. He said that this method is not an improvement over the current policy because there is no dialog between the Board and the public. The audience applauded Mr. Berry's comments.

Ms. Payton then replied by saying that the purpose of the *Director's Reports* is for him to inform the Board on his activities in the last thirty days. She noted that if there is no presentation or action to be taken or considered, there is no need to place it as an agenda item. Ms. Freeman said she remembered meetings where there was a lot of discussion because there was a decision to be made by the Board about a particular project. She said that they are a little further along on the projects and they will provide updates now on the website. Mr. Gordon said that the process does work because this item was put on the agenda because Mr. Browning was asked about this concern. Mr. Gordon said the item about the River Center Branch is on the agenda because Mr. Farrar asked that it be placed on the agenda. Mr. Gordon added that nobody can say there were no discussions about the River Center Branch. He said there were numerous meetings, and discussions, but some of the public may not have been happy with the outcome of the discussions. The Council voted for the \$19 million construction project and so the money has been allocated for this project. Until some issues involved in the architect selection are resolved, and the Council takes some action on some technology aspects, there is no action item for the Library Board. Mr. Gordon concluded that when there is some action to be taken by the Board the item will be on the agenda.

Mr. Lambert then said he would like to make a motion. He said he moved that the Library Board in the future provide a more enriched and specific statement of the agenda items posted one week before the meeting; and that the sequence for each agenda item be such that the item is introduced with any associated presentations and information given first, then the public is allowed to speak, the public comment period is then closed, then the Board discussion occurs and finally the Board votes or takes action. The motion was seconded by Ms. Freeman. Ms. Payton asked if any of the Board members had a question about what was said.

Mr. Bardwell said we are saying we have a presentation, but there may not be a presentation and he asked for a clarification of when the public will be allowed to speak. Ms. Payton answered that if there were a presentation, it would be given after the introduction of the item. Then the public could make comments and then the Board would speak. Mr. Bardwell also clarified that the other part of the motion was that the public would be given a more detailed statement of the agenda item to which Ms. Payton agreed. Mr. Gordon added that the agenda should be available to the public prior to the Board meeting. Ms. Payton agreed and that the current process for agenda notification would continue. Ms. Payton added that if there was no presentation, then the public would be given the opportunity to comment based on the statement of the agenda item and within the guidelines of the current public comment policy.

Mr. Gordon then asked Mr. Lambert if he would amend his motion to include the opportunity for the Board to ask questions or clarifications of the public after the public comment period with those answers limited by the current public comment policy. Mr. Lambert agreed that he would add that statement. Ms. Tomlinson noted that when the original public comment policy was adopted, the ability of the Board to ask questions was approved by the Board. However, Ms. Payton said that since the policy does not include this statement that they should amend the policy to include that statement. Mr. Lambert again said he would add that third aspect to the motion.

Mr. Bardwell made a substitute motion to add that they request the Parish Attorney to work with Mr. Farrar to produce a process that would permit an orderly dialog with the public in asking factual questions. Ms. Payton said she did not think this needed to be in the motion. She said that would be something that Mr. Farrar or she could discuss with the Parish Attorney. Mr. Gordon said he would like to retain Mr. Lambert's motion because what Mr. Bardwell was actually making is a recommendation that they direct Mr. Farrar to work with the Parish Attorney on a process for the dialog between the public and the Board. Mr. Bardwell withdrew his substitute motion.

Ms. Payton asked if there was any more discussion before the vote on the motion. Ms. Tomlinson said that the agenda is posted on the Library website one week before the meeting. She said the Board members and the Library staff get phone calls and e-mails from the public. She said the Board is always open to questions or comments and the public has a week to contact Board members in regard to the items on the agenda. She added that somehow it has been misconstrued what their motivation was for this policy. She noted that they never intended any disrespect toward the public, and they were asking for respect toward the Board so that they could conduct an orderly and efficient meeting.

Ms. Payton noted that Mr. Berry wanted to speak again. Mr. Berry asked that Mr. Lambert repeat the motion which he did, stating as follows:

“That the Library Board in the future provide a more enriched and specific statement of the agenda items posted one week before the meeting; and that the sequence for each agenda item be such that the item is introduced with any associated presentations and information given first, then the public is allowed to speak, the public comment period is then closed, then the Board discussion occurs with the opportunity for the Board to question the public, and finally the Board votes or takes action.”

The motion then passed unanimously.

Ms. Payton said she wanted to recognize and thank Metropolitan Councilman Ulysses Addison for coming to the Board meeting.

B. Remove River Center Branch Library Construction Project from the Current Construction Schedule

Ms. Payton read the item and said that it was requested of Mr. Farrar that this item be placed on the agenda. She said that there have been a lot of comments about this item over several years with the Board moving forward last year with a recommendation after public comment, research and a feasibility study. They looked at different types of designs, studied the budget, and the needs of the community and the City. But she noted that they are now hearing additional comments. Ms. Payton said the Board has always recognized the need for a new building downtown, but by the same token the Board does not want to proceed with a project that will tear the community apart. Ms. Payton said they need to decide the best way to proceed.

Ms. Payton then opened the meeting for public comment. Ms. Ann Shaneyfelt said that a year ago there were 100 people who signed a petition that they wanted a new library branch downtown and these people still want this branch. She said many of those people have small children, and they have jobs, and cannot attend the meetings. They thought the decision had been made and they hope this controversy does not stop this project.

Mr. Michael Desmond, an architect historian, said that he studies architecture and teaches about architecture around the world. Library construction is now one of the new and exciting building types around the world. These buildings bring together people and communities around their desire for education, improvement, discovery and growth. He added that this may be one of the most dramatic periods in the history of libraries. Mr. Desmond said it's about inclusiveness and is appearing world-wide. He noted that the East Baton Rouge Parish Library has been participating in this trend and it is one of the best parts of our community. He noted that he came to this meeting to support the construction of a new downtown library. He mentioned that his father, John Desmond, designed the River Center Branch Library, and it is inadequate. The Library's feasibility study quantified these deficiencies in a very effective way. He said Baton Rouge has the opportunity; one that the Downtown Development District and many others have worked on over the years, to pave the way for a very successful project. The downtown library project is poised to be one of the central buildings in the community. Mr. Desmond concluded his remarks by encouraging the Board to move forward with the new construction.

Ms. Payton then said the public comment policy rules are no longer suspended and the limit for comment is three minutes.

Ms. René Singleton then spoke and said she is a homeowner and a taxpayer who until recently lived on the edge of Beauregard Town on North Boulevard. She noted that she would be disappointed if they do not build a new branch library downtown. She added that it is a very emotional issue and that people on both sides are not going to change their minds. But she said the Library Board and the staff do not play with the \$38 million that they manage. They don't begin a project until the money is saved. She said she does not understand why people think that just because of this project the Board has lost its mind. When the public needed branches in other parts of the parish they were built; some of those being Bluebonnet Regional, Zachary, Central, Baker and Pride-Chaneyville. She said she has been in every branch that the Library has built and there is no reason to second guess what the staff and the experts have concluded about the downtown branch. She said they need the library that the Board promised and the voters voted on it. Ms. Singleton also noted that they have the Bluebonnet Branch and now they are fitting it with new lights. She concluded by saying that even though she lives in mid-City now, the downtown branch is still her library and she wants a new branch, too.

Mr. James Finney, a member of the public, said he believes that a beautiful library downtown would be great, but that it doesn't mean that it needs to be at the current location. He suggested that the Board look for another site because buildings get repurposed all the time. In this way they could still have library service during construction. They could build the new branch at another site along River Road with parking under the building. Mr. Finney said commercial use could also be part of the plan. Then they could find another use for the current facility.

Mrs. Gayle Smith, a member of the public, then spoke. She said that she was looking at Library reports for gate count and system circulation statistics for May, June and July of 2010 and 2011. The River Center gate count for May and June showed a steady increase, but the circulation statistics told a different story. She said comparing June and July of 2010 and 2011, the reduction in circulation was 38.7% and 40.8%. She added that system wide gate count was up slightly from May to June. However, reduction in system wide circulation dropped 3.5%. Mrs. Smith said the big deal is *OverDrive*, the electronic version of books being checked out or downloaded onto electronic devices. She added that for June to July 2010 and 2011, *OverDrive* increased 120.6%. Mrs. Smith noted that Ms. Stein spoke today about e-books for kids. Mrs. Smith said that at almost 30,000 square feet, the River Center Branch is the fourth largest branch in square footage and for the months of June and July it was last in circulation. She asked how the Library Board could justify spending their tax dollars by doubling the size of the building when remodeling would be more economical. She added that they have approved tearing down a Level 1 fire code building which is the best rating. The demolition cost could be about \$1 million dollars. She said the Board has approved the spending of \$19 million for a centerpiece for downtown. She also said that with this type of spending it would be difficult to convince taxpayers to renew the next tax proposal. The audience applauded Mrs. Smith's comments.

Ms. Meg Mahoney, Senior Vice-President of Regional Competiveness, with the Baton Rouge Area Chamber said she wished to reiterate the Chamber's position and support of the construction of a new downtown branch library. She said when people consider relocating to Baton Rouge, they frequently tour the downtown area and they ask about the library. Ms. Mahoney said a state-of-the-art 21st century library is more than just a building with books. It's an asset for our community and our region. She concluded her remarks by saying again that The Chamber supports the Board's movement to build this project.

Mr. John Schneider, a member of the public, spoke next noting that he is a resident of downtown. He said that when the proposal for the construction of a new downtown library was presented in the Mayor's 2011 budget package in November of 2010, the majority of the Metropolitan Council members did not support moving ahead with the downtown library. Since a simple majority was not gained to oppose the proposal, the budget was passed. Mr. Schneider noted that as he listened to the Council members at the meeting there were three items that they weren't clear about; these being the design of the library, the program of the library and the cost of the library. The Library Board then voted to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to hire an architect to design a building. The architectural selection was made and Washer, Hill, Lipscomb, Cabaniss Architects (WHLC) was chosen. Mr. Schneider then said that he did not think the Library Board was ready to take the contract with WHLC to the Metropolitan Council because the three questions that the Council has asked have not been answered. He added that he recommends that WHLC and Schwartz/Silver Architects work on a design concept, the programming and a projected budget over the next few weeks even before a contract is signed. He then said it would behoove the architects to do this so that the Library Board would have the information that the Council needs in order for them to approve the contract. Mr. Schneider said that unless the Board provides this information to the Metropolitan Council, they will not vote for the architectural contract. He also said that in regard to the process of the selection of the architectural firm, neither the Library Board nor the architect did anything wrong. So they should go forward and provide the Council with the information they need.

Mr. John Berry said that some of what Mr. Schneider said was true, but that it is too little, too late. He added that what Mr. Schneider suggested should have been done in 2008. The Library Board should have decided how much it would cost, and what the building would look like. He noted that in 2008 Mr. Trey Trahan of Trahan Architects did a conceptual design study under a no bid contract of just \$500 under the no bid limit. The Library Board accepted his design which looks very similar to a design coming from Europe according to the newspaper. Mr. Berry added that the Board asked Mr. Trahan about the cost and then accepted his estimate. He said that Mr. Trahan suggested that the current building be demolished and the Board also accepted that. Mr. Berry said that in the last few weeks the public has seen the problems that Mr. Trahan is having. He said the Metropolitan Council members are backing off this project and he thanked them. He also said that the Council is listening to the public and saying the public is complaining about what they will be getting with this proposal. Mr. Berry congratulated the Board for taking the project off the construction schedule.

Mr. Jeff Nunn said he opposed the downtown library construction for the last six years because it is a waste of money. He said most of those speaking have discussed the building itself and what will be occurring inside the building as incidental. He added that it should be the other way around. He noted that he spent a week in January at *Google's* headquarters doing research. He said their buildings are not exceptional, but what is special are the minds working inside. He concluded by saying he felt that the \$19 million budgeted for the building could better be spent on the intellectual capital of our parish to improve the 20% adult illiteracy rate. The audience applauded Mr. Nunn.

Mr. Davis Rhorer, Director of the Downtown Development District, said he wanted to reiterate that the Library Board went through several years of feasibility work, public meetings, and discussions about the River Center Library. He added that the Board came to the conclusion to build a new downtown library after a lot of work, and he thanked them for that. He noted that this is an extremely important project for the community. Mr. Rhorer said two people from Cleveland, here for the *Smart Growth* summit, made it a point to see the Town Square construction and the library. He said the Downtown Development District continues to support the decision to build a new river Center Branch Library.

Ms. Wascom said that she has family who live downtown and they often visit the downtown library. She said there were many meetings about this facility and the Board made a decision which should be honored. Many people put in a lot of work in attending many public hearings and Board and Council meetings, and a democratic process followed. Rules and regulations were followed. She said if what is in the newspaper is correct, that a contract for the downtown library will not be awarded to stop a project, she said it sends a message to the business community that politics is involved. She added that the business community will wonder if their efforts to do business here will become part of a political agenda or whether the integrity of the process will be honored. Ms. Wascom noted if the contract is not honored then political expediency will appear to be occurring.

Ms. Marilyn Woolf, a member of the public, said she opposed the downtown library project. The downtown library is not used, the project costs too much and the Metropolitan Council did

not agree with the Mayor's bond issue. She concluded by saying \$19 million is too much to spend.

Ms. Colleen Crain said she lives in the Garden District and the downtown library is very close to her home. It might be nice to have a new library and we all want to have a lovely downtown area, but we have to look at the funds. She added that the problem with public projects is that these projects are always going to be political because it is public money. She said it is wise to stop this project. There is a library close to the downtown branch. She said she goes to the Main Library and there is nothing far in Baton Rouge by driving or riding a bicycle. Ms. Crain concluded by saying she did not think they could afford this project at this time.

Mr. Alex Holly, a member of the public, said he does not agree with the idea of a downtown library as being a show piece for Baton Rouge. He asked some of the Metropolitan Council members where the Main Library is in New Orleans and Houston and they did not know. He added that most people would not know even though they go to these cities all the time. Mr. Holly said he used to be a Council aide and they toured cities and nobody ever mentioned the libraries. He noted that he works in the computer field and in the 21st century, libraries are not the future. He then said if we try to impress potential newcomers by showing them our Library, they are going to think we are backward. He said there is nothing wrong with the current River Center Branch Library building. He said he knows there is a lot of blight downtown because he used to work there and he visits his clients there. Mr. Holly added that if a new building is put downtown it will make the blight look worse. He concluded his remarks by saying they should stop considering the construction of a new downtown branch. . The audience applauded Mr. Holly.

Metropolitan Councilman Ulysses Z. Addison of District 2 then addressed the Library Board. He said he is at this meeting to make some comments especially in regard to what the obligation is of the Library Board and the Library staff's obligation to the general public. Councilman Addison then said they were talking about the taxpayers' fees. When people talk about playing politics, he wanted to make it clear, that last year when the Metropolitan Council debated the idea of building a new downtown branch, there were seven members who made the decision not to proceed. If there had been one more member to vote with the seven it would have been pulled out of the budget proposal. He noted again that it was not about politics. Councilman Addison added that the public has made it clear that the Library Board must justify the need for the expenditure wherever they are. The members of the Council were not satisfied with how the Library Board arrived at its decision. He added that when the public and the media say that a decision is based on politics, he said he has to disagree. Councilman Addison said it is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Council to be sure money is spent wisely no matter where the funds come from, State or federal or from the taxpayers of the parish. He then added that when people do not get what they want, they find a scapegoat. He said he voted to leave the downtown library construction proposal in the budget, but he was not comfortable with that decision and is still not comfortable today. He added that if the Library Board cannot justify the project, whether it is in downtown, at Bluebonnet or the Main Library, do not spend the taxpayers' dollars. Justify the expenditure; let the public know and be transparent. Councilman Addison noted that if the Library Board cannot justify the expenditure, he will vote against it.

He said that this is a promise and not politics. It's not what the Administration wants, but what the public wants and deserves. The audience applauded Councilman Addison.

Mr. Harvey Landry then spoke. He said that they do not need a new library downtown because they have the Carver Branch Library within fifteen minutes of walking from the current River Center Branch. He said it is within a mile away. He added what they really need is a community center and they don't want library taxes to go toward building a community center.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any more comments from the public and as there were none the public comment period ended. Ms. Payton turned the discussion over to the Board members. Mr. Lambert said he appreciated everyone expressing what was in their hearts and minds. He said this issue has been going on for several years and there are strong opinions on both sides. He added that he wanted to give the public and the Council every assurance that the Board has looked at this project diligently and deliberately. They have arrived at their numbers based on scientific study, the experts and programming results. Mr. Lambert held up a program dated October 2008 that was developed by Library consultant, Denelle Wrightson. All of the work on this project had been based on this program. He added that he did not want anyone to think that the Board had been careless or frivolous about the development of this project in terms of the size and cost. Mr. Lambert then noted that they could have done a better job of answering the questions of the Metropolitan Council. Therefore, he said he would like to make a motion to take thirty to sixty days to meet with the Council individually to discuss this and appoint Ms. Payton to be the point person or chair for this effort. He added that he would like the contract for WHLC not be sent to the Council for a vote until the Board has had the chance to speak to the Council. Ms. Payton thanked Mr. Lambert for the motion, but said before they proceeded with this motion she would like to hear the comments of the other Board members.

Ms. Freeman said she wanted to address Mr. Farrar regarding the agenda item. She asked him how the removal of this project from the current construction schedule became an agenda item. Mr. Farrar said he wanted to first congratulate Mr. Rex Cabaniss and his firm for winning the contract that they worked so hard to get. Mr. Farrar said he didn't want to overlook the professionalism associated with this firm. He added that the Metropolitan Council has in no way been political in regard to this project. They have been very informative throughout this entire process and their doors have always been open when discussions needed to take place. Mr. Farrar continued by saying that recently he was called to the office of Mr. William Daniel, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) in the Mayor's Office. Their discussion which was about placing this item on the Board agenda has been written about in the paper. So Mr. Farrar said he agrees with Councilman Addison that all politics should be set aside. In the meeting with Mr. Daniel, Mr. Farrar said he asked to place it on the agenda. Ms. Freeman replied that she knows they are an advisory Board, but she was wondering what was really behind this. Mr. Farrar answered that Mr. Daniel chose to put the private conversation that he had with him in the newspaper. He added that Mr. Daniel asked him to put it on the agenda and he did so because Mr. Daniel works for the Mayor. Mr. Farrar added that in the paper the next day, Mr. Daniel said he represented the City-Parish Department of Public Works (DPW), the one that the FBI is investigating in regard to the Architectural Selection Committee. Mr. Farrar then said this could be an opportunity to set politics aside to see if there is a clear direction for the Library Board to take with the Council on whether to proceed with this project. Mr. Farrar noted

that the motion made by Mr. Lambert is a good one and may provide the opportunity to show how this project can benefit the entire community as opposed to the incorrect notion that the people in downtown just want a new library because it would be a show piece. He added that he has never gotten that sense from people downtown. Mr. Farrar added that for those who think it is a waste of money, they are about to build a \$37 million dollar Main Library and nobody is complaining about that expenditure. So he said here is an opportunity for the community to come together and do something right with the Library since it is the premier subject matter right now. Mr. Farrar added that he is sure that Mr. Daniel is a great CAO and Director of DPW, but he has not made it clear to him if he was speaking from the Mayor's Office or from DPW.

Ms. Freeman replied that she appreciated the way Mr. Farrar handled this and for his candor with the Board. She added that she likes the motion that has been made because the downtown library is a hot topic in Baton Rouge. She said among all of the other issues in the community, the Library is the issue. She noted that they can use the time wisely to communicate with the Metropolitan Council so that their questions are answered. Then the Library Board can get feedback from the Council on what they want so that some understanding can occur because it is apparent that regardless of what the Board decides the Council has the final vote. Ms. Freeman said the Council members are here today to be sure that the road to communication is open and that the community is being served.

Mr. Gordon then said that the agenda item is about the timing of the project and not whether there should or shouldn't be a new downtown library or how much it should cost. He said that because of the questions about the selection process, more time may be needed to resolve that. Mr. Gordon said he was present for the long discussions with the Council and Councilman Addison and others asked for more information. He said they wanted the Library to come to them with a descriptive program outlining what would be in the building and how it would be different from the others. Mr. Gordon noted that they haven't responded to this request effectively. He added that the design and the construction of the building was placed under one contract and he thought that was a mistake. He noted that they need to show a design with the functions and types of technology illustrated to answer the questions of the Council. Mr. Gordon added that it is important to delay the project to answer the questions.

He then said that there was a comment made about Mr. Trey Trahan who was hired by the Board to complete a feasibility study based on Ms. Denelle Wrightson's program. He emphasized that Mr. Trahan was not hired to design a building, but to give the Board the options for the current location including renovating the building, renovating it with an expansion and building new.

Mr. Gordon noted that they looked at other sites downtown, but land acquisition downtown would have cost about \$6 million. Mr. Farrar said they looked at twenty locations. Mr. Gordon said that if they built on a different site, the current library building would need to be returned to the City. So it was determined that they should remain at the current location.

He commented that someone said people don't talk about their downtown library. But Mr. Gordon said he just visited Chicago's new downtown library. It is a centerpiece and people came from all over to see it because of the technology and the design. He also said he lived in Houston at the time they built a new downtown library and it also was a centerpiece. He also

pointed out that the Cleveland Public Library draws people to it because it is designed like a shelf of books and is considered a work of art. He said he feels that many people are drawn to a place with a downtown library.

Mr. Gordon then discussed Mr. Trahan and said he does not think that Mr. Trahan's reputation has been besmirched. He said he is a well recognized architect. Mr. Daniel and others are looking into the fact that some information that was damaging to Mr. Trahan was shared with just a few. All should have received the same information and the person that passed on the information should admit it. Mr. Gordon added that in regard to the allegation, the only similarity between the designs is the footing that is used to construct the new building. He said it is analogous to someone saying a micro-chip used to design a computer cannot be used by another designer to create a different computer. He said he does not think there is a lot of credibility to the entire issue. Mr. Gordon said the process has given the Board a winning candidate which is a very fine firm with a good track record. They are capable of doing a good job and he does not care who got the library job as long as they build an appropriate piece for downtown and the community. He added that if they could add the program design of the building into the discussion that it might need more than sixty days, but it would give the Council and the public a better idea of what they can expect in this new construction. Mr. Gordon noted that Mr. Schneider suggested that WHLC do the program design for free, but he feels that is not feasible. If they create the design, they should get paid for the work. Ms. Payton agreed they should be paid.

Ms. Payton asked how the Board could proceed in getting the work done by them given the current situation. Mr. Gordon replied that initially there was going to be two separate contracts, but then it was decided to put the design and the construction into one contract for expediency. Mr. Gordon added that if they talk to the firm, and have them do the work because it would be under \$50,000 and not require a bid. Mr. Gordon then asked Mr. Rex Cabaniss, architect with WHLC to respond. Mr. Cabaniss said he represents WHLC and Schwartz/Silver Architects. Mr. Cabaniss said he cannot speak with any finality because they are not under contract and that all he can give are opinions which are non-binding. He noted that they have begun contract negotiations with DPW and his contract would be with DPW and not with the members of the Library Board. He said he would need to speak with DPW before discussing anything with the Board. Mr. Cabaniss noted that they want to serve the Board and the entire community in working through the issues that have been raised in the press so that there is clarity. He added that he could not agree to any contractual obligations at this meeting. Mr. Gordon said with these thoughts in mind, he wanted to ask Mr. Cabaniss his opinion on doing a considerable amount of work without a guarantee of getting paid. Mr. Gordon said that is what Mr. Trahan did and they have seen where that ended up. Mr. Gordon said maybe that would be a discussion with DPW to decide to split the work including the whole underlying contracts and litigation details.

Mr. Gordon asked about Schwartz/Silver to which Mr. Cabaniss said they formed as a joint venture to propose on this project. Mr. Cabaniss said there is no provision to discuss the contract in a public forum such as this meeting and he was reticent to offer an opinion that might be considered part of contract negotiations. Mr. Farrar then added that originally there was going to be two separate contracts, but then DPW decided to make it one contract. Mr. Gordon asked if

Mr. Cabaniss has worked on a project which contains two contracts to which Mr. Cabaniss answered affirmatively, but emphasized that this project has been set up as one. He added that he needs to respect the City who has worked hard to draw up this contract. He noted that there is nobody present from DPW to discuss the contract and they really need to be involved in this discussion. Ms. Payton agreed and added that the Metropolitan Council would still have to approve the \$150,000 contract. Ms. Payton then said that they still need to meet with the Council to see what they would be agreeable with for the downtown branch.

Mr. Cabaniss said private conversations would need to occur regarding the contract negotiations between his firm and the Library Board. If an agreement in principle is reached, then DPW would need to be involved in further discussions.

Mr. Farrar then injected that Mr. Bardwell has reminded him that there were extensive conversations regarding the alternates for the Goodwood Main Library project by the Board. He said the Library Board's due diligence has been intact and the Board always does its job in regard to construction projects. Mr. Farrar added that information to the public about the downtown library has been given to the public in a detailed and factual way. Mr. Farrar said that in the future he needs to do a better job of informing the Metropolitan Council of the facts and sending information about the downtown project.

Ms. Freeman then said she wished to second the motion regarding the downtown library project. She added that for clarification, Mr. Gordon was saying delay, but not cancel. Mr. Gordon replied affirmatively that they have discovered that this project will take longer to accomplish. Ms. Payton said they are just revising the timeline. Mr. Gordon said that for clarification they should extend the timeline and address the programming piece of the project first. He said that sixty days may not be enough time for this part of the project which could actually take six months.

Mr. Lambert then asked Mr. Cabaniss what his estimate would be to do a program. Mr. Cabaniss said that in his opinion before they even pass this motion, they should consult the Parish Attorney because there are legal ramifications involving contracts for his firm and the Board. He added that anything he would say to the Board should be subject to legal advisement. Ms. Freeman then said that the way Mr. Lambert phrased the motion there is no need to get legal advice to which Mr. Lambert agreed. Mr. Cabaniss again said that since the Board is trying to get more clarity on this project, he would again respectfully say that the Board should consult the Parish Attorney. Mr. Farrar said they can defer the motion until they speak with the Parish Attorney or with DPW since they are in control of the contract.

Mr. Bardwell then asked Mr. Cabaniss to assume that they can suspend the contract or split it to just get the program completed, how long would it take to complete a program? Mr. Cabaniss replied that they would need to know what the Board wants and what services they would like the architect to perform. He noted that he is hearing that the Board would like to meet with the Council. He said that could be part of the program and he would want to hear the discussions that they were having.

Ms. Payton asked for a clarification questioning whether they were saying that they should discard the program they have and begin again. Mr. Bardwell said there is no program to which Ms. Payton replied there is one that Ms. Wrightson produced. Mr. Bardwell said the RFQ for this project specifies designing a program for the building. Mr. Gordon then said that the document that Mr. Lambert had was what the staff said they felt they needed in the building to accomplish their work and is about square footage and work areas. He added that the program they are asking about would address things such as the type of technology and how the spaces will address the needs. Mr. Gordon said they are looking for a description of how all the square footage requirements translate into a building. Mr. Cabaniss said that many times this type of program is completed by one firm and then the firm chosen to build the structure uses this program. He added that in this current project, the program was alluded to as Mr. Trahan's feasibility study and was attached to the RFQ. He noted that there was a sense that this was the anticipated size and budget, but that there was no formal recipe for their design work. Mr. Bardwell then asked what the budget was for the programming element of the RFQ. Mr. Cabaniss said the fee for the programming was not itemized in the RFQ. Mr. Bardwell thought there was an amount for the programming in the RFQ, but Mr. Cabaniss disagreed. Mr. Cabaniss then answered the question regarding the amount of time to create a program as anywhere from 60 to 120 days or longer. He noted that citizen input for a project can be part of the process. Mr. Cabaniss said if he were able to talk to the Board in detail about what they want, he would be able to give a better estimate.

Ms. Freeman said they need to first form a dialog with the Metropolitan Council because they will vote on whether to proceed with the project. They said there are some real issues that need to be addressed. Mr. Cabaniss said there would be a real difference for his firm in moving into a programming phase versus being involved in discussions with the Metropolitan Council in which they could offer some professional recommendations as they listen to the desires expressed. Mr. Cabaniss said that is a service architects provide in being a mediator between two sides in a discussion and is very common. He added that is very different than programming the building. He said from what he was hearing it seemed they should divide the two steps of talking to the Council and designing the building. He then said they need to talk to the Council before the architects begin to design the building. This would seem to be the better path for them to take.

Mr. Farrar said he senses that having a program might help the Board to speak with the Council. Mr. Cabaniss said they understood that the project would involve a building that would be very high tech and visionary. With that understanding WHLC chose to team with Schwartz/Silver because they could assist with this aspect of the design. Schwartz/Silver works on high tech buildings and therefore, they would need to be brought into the discussions. He said the program is more than a room by room description, but includes how this building can be like no other building in this town. Mr. Cabaniss said that was what they understood the RFQ to be and that's how they were selected to do this project. He added that he did not want to rush them to do a quick program. He also said they asked for a world-class building with technology that would serve the future growth of the community. He noted that they should address the political opposition separately from the original task that they were asked to do. Ms. Payton thanked him for his comments.

Mr. Bardwell said he wanted to comment. He said the concept is too abstract. The Metropolitan Council is going to reject the \$20 million contract as it stands now. He added that they need to find out what the Metropolitan Council wants from the Board. Mr. Bardwell said they should suspend the contract for thirty days to understand what the Council wants by meeting with them face to face. If the Council will not accept the \$20 million project, then they need to learn what the Council will accept. He added that either Ms. Payton alone or with other Board members needs to meet with the Council members. He made a substitute motion to suspend the contract for thirty days in order to speak to the Council. Mr. Gordon said he asked for more time because of the program request, but he could make a third motion which would be to defer this item which would give the Board thirty days and a chance to have the initial discussions with the Council.

Mr. Lambert replied that his concern is if WHLC and DPW finish their negotiations before thirty days and the contract goes to the Council who has questions, they will reject the contract. So Mr. Lambert said he does not want them to stop negotiating the contract, but just not to send it to the Council for approval. He said he's willing to give it a 30-day limit so that Ms. Payton can get the information for them to discuss next month. Mr. Gordon said he could support sixty days, but Mr. Lambert said thirty would be acceptable to him.

Ms. Tomlinson commented that Mr. Lambert's concern is that the contract not go to the Council until the Board has the opportunity to dialog with them. Mr. Lambert said that was correct. She continued to say that WHLC and DPW could possibly finish the contract negotiations within that time. She asked if they had any authority to make this request. Mr. Lambert and Ms. Payton said they could ask DPW to hold the contract for them. Ms. Payton asked Mr. Farrar if they could make the request to which he said yes. He added that the Library Board has the power to initiate the production of a program under a Professional Services Agreement for under \$50,000 which would be separate from this contract. He noted that a program is something the staff works on with the architect because staff members have the knowledge of what is needed in a library. Mr. Farrar said it would have to be under \$50,000 or they would need to get the Council's approval and that could make the process even more extended.

Ms. Freeman said that is why she is emphasizing having the dialog with the Council. Mr. Cabaniss then said that it is important that they be involved in the conversations with the Council, too. Ms. Payton said they've noted his request.

Mr. Lambert made the motion that the Library Board take the next thirty days to speak to the Council for their input regarding the River Center Branch Library construction, that the contract between WHLC and DPW not go to the Council for a vote during this time, and that the Board discuss their findings at the September Board meeting. Mr. Cabaniss said he requests that they get legal advice from the Parish Attorney. The motion passed; with Ms. Payton, Ms. Freeman, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Gordon and Ms. Tomlinson voting yes and Mr. Bardwell and Mr. Browning voting no.

C. Consideration of Whether to Accept or Reject Any of the Alternates for the Goodwood Main Library Construction Contract – Mr. Stan Bardwell

Ms. Payton read the agenda item and said that Mr. Bardwell asked that this item be placed on the agenda. Mr. Farrar said that The Library Design Collaborative architects, Mr. Ken Tipton and Mr. Steve Jackson with some of their staff members, were present and would be able to answer any questions the Board might have regarding the alternates for the Goodwood Main Library. Mr. Farrar reminded the Board that they have had a discussion about the alternates in the past, but it was good to have another discussion if there were additional questions. Mr. Farrar added that Mr. Jim Frey, of the Architectural Services Division of DPW, said that the Library Board has the authority to review the alternates and delete some from the project if the Board wishes.

Ms. Payton then opened the discussion by asking for any public comments. There being none, Ms. Payton asked Mr. Bardwell to begin the discussion. Mr. Bardwell said that he was aware that the total bid by Milton J. Womack, Inc. was lower than the cost estimate made by the architects by almost \$1 million. However, he noted that the alternates contribute about \$2 million to the project, and that the bid on Alternate # 2 is almost double what the architects projected. Mr. Bardwell asked Mr. Tipton to explain that difference noting that he did not have a breakdown on the cost of the components of each alternate. He added that the architects estimated Alternate # 2 would cost approximately \$530,000 while the contractor's bid was \$920,000. Mr. Tipton replied that he did not have a more detailed breakdown at this point. He added that the bids for Alternates # 1 and # 3 were less than the architects' estimates. Mr. Tipton noted that the totals include BREC's portion of the cost. BREC will be contributing monies against that amount. The amount that the Library will need to pay will not be the total listed on the bid tabulation sheet. Mr. Bardwell said he was glad to get the clarification.

Mr. Bardwell agreed that the bid for Alternate # 1 was less by \$56,000 and the bid for Alternate # 3 was less by \$30,000, but the bid for Alternate #2 was greater by \$400,000. Mr. Tipton then said that the base bid was less by \$2 million. Mr. Bardwell said they could save more money by reconsidering Alternate # 3 which he had objections to earlier in the year. This alternate contains the solar panels for which Mr. Bardwell had wanted data on the return on investment for them. Mr. Bardwell noted that two studies of the solar panels were given, but they did not justify the payback period. Mr. Bardwell then read seven concerns he had with the solar panels. He mentioned that DPW had installed solar panels on its renovated building in hopes of using the same type of panels on the new library. A federal grant paid for the panels and the data does not support the savings over time for the panels. He also said the product they were recommending has only been on the market for two years and only has a five-year warranty.

Mr. Bardwell then made a motion to delete Alternate # 2 entirely and Alternate # 3 entirely. He said the reason to delete # 2 is because it is double the cost estimate and # 3 is because of the solar panels. Mr. Browning seconded the motion. Mr. Gordon then asked how the solar panels relate to the LEED certification. Mr. Tipton said the solar panels are not a make or break factor for LEED certification, but could be the difference between a silver or gold certification. Ms. Tomlinson then said that some of the current Board members were not on the Board when the first discussions about the new Main Library began. One of the guiding principles was that the building itself would serve as an educational tool to serve the community. She said the solar panels add extra value to the project. Mr. Gordon asked if they could also get federal money to

pay for the panels to which Mr. Farrar replied that DPW's grant came from the economic stimulus package which is no longer being offered. Mr. Farrar said they could research other grant opportunities.

Ms. Payton asked Mr. Bardwell to reiterate what is included in Alternates # 2 and # 3. Mr. Bardwell said Alternate # 2 upgrades the doors and stairway with a nicer finish which he felt was too expensive at \$400,000 more than the cost estimate. Mr. Tipton replied that there are some substantive changes in terms of the quality that people will see and it includes some of the design features that were asked for in the project. Mr. Bardwell then said that alternate includes the south green roof. He said all of that was acceptable to him at a cost of \$500,000, but not acceptable at \$1 million. Mr. Tipton said he understood, but put in context, the base price is \$2 million less than their cost estimate. Mr. Bardwell said they are talking about taxpayer dollars and he does not want to spend more than they have to. Mr. Tipton then replied that he was just trying to put this into the context of what they were asked to deliver. Mr. Bardwell asked if they had the ability to pick and choose within each alternate to which Mr. Tipton said no.

Ms. Payton asked for a vote on the motion to delete Alternates # 2 and # 3. Mr. Gordon said he did not think they had enough information to vote. He said Alternate # 1 should be approved, but they need more information on #2 and # 3. Mr. Gordon agreed with Mr. Bardwell about the fact that the base price being lower, but Alternate # 2 being much higher is not a good rationale for accepting the alternates. He said he would abstain from voting. Ms. Payton then asked for a show of hands on the vote. Ms. Freeman, Mr. Bardwell and Mr. Browning voted for the motion; Ms. Payton, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Gordon, and Ms. Tomlinson opposed the motion. The motion failed.

Mr. Lambert then said he wanted to discuss the talking signs. He wondered how they arrived at the particular technology for the talking signs. He noted there are many technologies available and he is not comfortable with using a proprietary product. He said the price of \$120,000 is a lot of money without even going out for a bid. Mr. Tipton said there were other bids for the talking signs and they researched the vendors. Mr. Lambert added that he was not comfortable with the fact that people might have to purchase their own hardware to which Mr. Tipton replied that patrons would be given the device to use in the library. Mr. Lambert then asked how many devices they would get for \$120,000. Mr. Tipton said the price included the equipment found throughout the building which enables a visually handicapped person to know where they are through the talking devices.

Ms. Payton then said that there had been a vote taken, so she asked if there were any other questions. Ms. Freeman asked for an explanation of why the base bid was under the cost estimate and yet Alternate # 2 was so much more than the cost estimate. Mr. Tipton said that how a contractor structures his bid is not something the architect has access to. Ms. Freeman replied that they approved the project based on the architects' cost estimate and their expertise, but then when the bid is so different from the cost estimate, it leads to uncertainty. Mr. Tipton explained that the quality of an estimate is based on breaking down the estimate into as many pieces as are possible. He added that in the architect's cost estimate some features will be higher and some lower than the bid, but that overall both the estimate and the bid will be similar. So he said when one looks at the total package the price is less than the estimate, but some features

may be higher than the estimate. Mr. Steve Jackson then said that they probably did not explain the alternate process sufficiently. He said as architects they listen to what is needed and then they design that project around what they heard. Then if necessary they remove from the project the things that they can live without. He said they are not just adding extras with the add alternates, but they are giving the client what they wanted. Mr. Jackson noted that the bid process requires add alternates and typically there can be a wide range in the bid price for these alternates. He noted that sometimes the wide range is confusion by the contractor, but it can be about how the contractor is determining to do the work. He also said they ended up with the low bidder actually also having the highest bid for Alternate # 2. He said that as architects they look at the whole package and what it will take to get the job done. Mr. Jackson noted that they are presenting a project based on what was asked for during the design phase. Mr. Farrar then said that the Library staff, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Tipton, and Mr. Jim Frey of DPW have all worked together throughout this process. It has been an exhaustive process to determine what might be best in the alternatives. Mr. Farrar said that the Library Board can delete the alternates if they wish; however, these alternates provide the Library with the project that was initially discussed and agreed upon. Mr. Farrar concluded by saying that he appreciated the work of the architects.

Mr. Tipton thanked the Board and said they looked forward to the groundbreaking. Ms. Payton asked Mr. Farrar when that would occur to which he replied the Metropolitan Council will need to approve the bid, and then a contract will need to be negotiated. At that point they will set a date after consulting with the Mayor for his availability. Ms. Payton said she was eager to move forward.

D. Discussion of the Rouzan Project – Mr. Donald Browning

Ms. Payton said that Mr. Browning asked that this item be placed on the agenda. Ms. Payton asked Mr. Browning if he had any comments to make before she opened it to comments from the public. Mr. Lambert said that at the beginning of the meeting, he voted against adding this item to the agenda. He noted that State law requires a unanimous vote to add an agenda item. He also said that this is what Mr. Browning told them a few months ago when they wanted to put something on the agenda about the downtown branch. Mr. Browning said he would put it on the agenda for next month. Mr. Lambert said that would be acceptable. Ms. Payton apologized that she did not see that Mr. Lambert had voted against that motion.

Comments by the Library Board of Control

There were no further comments, and so with no further business, the meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Ms. Freeman at 7:52 p.m.

Kizzy Payton, President

David Farrar, Library Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 18, 2011

TO: Library Board of Control

FROM: David Farrar
Library Director

SUBJECT: Construction Report

Goodwood Main Library

Lisa Hargrave, architect with Tipton Associates reported for The Library Design Collaborative on the Goodwood Main Library. On Tuesday, August 2nd competitive bids were received for the new Goodwood Main Library. The approved library budget for this work totals \$38,219,000 plus a BREC contribution of between \$1 and \$2 million for their portion of the shared work. The contract time allowed for this project is 720 calendar days. Milton J. Womack, Inc. submitted the low bid totaling \$36,770,000 for the total scope of work.

It is expected to be recommended by the City-Parish Department of Public Works for approval before the Capital Improvements Committee of the Metropolitan Council at their meeting on August 17th and before the Metropolitan Council at their meeting on August 24th.

Below is a copy of the bid tabulation sheet.

NEW INDEPENDENCE PARK MAIN LIBRARY BUILDING

BID TABULATION SHEET

PROJECT NO. 11-ASC-CP-1012
 ADDENDA 4
 ESTIMATE \$37,600,000.00

BID OPENING DATE: August 2, 2011 2:00pm

K. Wilson	4	✓	41,000,000	570,000	564,000	575,000

Bidders	Lic No.	Add.	Bid Bond	Amount	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3
Aitrol, Inc. (Baton Rouge, LA)	2						
Bree Building Company, LLC (Delaware) (Metairie, LA)	49341	4	✓	37,149,000	275,000	764,000	774,000
Buquet & LeBlanc, Inc. (Baton Rouge, LA)	93	4	✓	28,500,000	500,000	1,100,000	787,000
J.F. Juge Construction Company, Inc. (Prairieville, LA)	9126						
K D Homes Builder, LLC (Metairie, LA)	44719	4	✓	31,539,000	600,000	520,000	300,000
Lemone Company, L.L.C., The (Lafayette, LA)	32600	4	✓	35,170,000	307,000	984,000	724,000
Lincoln Builders of Baton Rouge, Inc. (Ruston, LA)	48570						
Mapp Construction, LLC (Baton Rouge, LA)	26436	4	✓	34,600,000	210,000	800,000	550,000
Milton J. Womack, Inc. (Baton Rouge, LA)	790	4	✓	34,775,000	300,000	920,000	715,000
Plaza Construction Louisiana LLC (New York, NY)	53347	4	✓	36,800,000	304,000	486,000	242,000
Satterfield & Pontikes Construction Group, LLC (Kenner, LA)	45141						
Walton Construction - A Core Company, LLC (Harrison, LA)	54378	4	✓	36,528,000	311,000	1,050,000	740,000
W.G. Yates & Sons Construction Company (Philadelphia, MS)	11170	4	✓	34,340,000	305,000	250,000	720,000

Fairwood Branch Library



Construction Report #4

Job Name: Fairwood Branch Library	Inspector: n/a
Date: August 8, 2011	Time: n/a
Weather Condition: n/a	Contractor: n/a
Job Superintendent: n/a	Report prepared by: James Sanders, Bani, Carville & Brown Architects

1. The fully executed and signed contract for construction of the Fairwood Branch Library was issued on August 4th.
2. A pre-construction meeting is scheduled for August 10th at 10:00a.m. at the Main Library on Goodwood Boulevard in the Auditorium.
3. The Library staff is in the process of organizing a ground-breaking ceremony.
4. The Notice-to-Proceed with construction will likely be issued on August 15th, 2011.

Rouzan Branch Library

Looney Ricks Kiss/LRK L.L.C.

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

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

1. Construction documents are 95 percent completed with final staff comments and revisions being coordinated.
2. A mechanical and technology review meeting is scheduled with the Library staff for the week of August 22, 2011.