

MINUTES

July 12, 2017

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

COMMITTEE PRESENT: Cindy Abbott (CA);
Caroline Barba (CB);
Jerry Crow (JC);
Barbara Eikenberry (BE);
Kathy Long (KL);
Vanessa Powers (VP);
Eric Ruchames (ER);
Kellie Samson (KS);

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISONS
PRESENT:** Sue Vaterlaus (SV);

COMMITTEE ABSENT: David Leal (DL);
Laverne Villalobos (LV);
Rosie Tejada (RT);

COUNCIL LIAISONS ABSENT: Deirdre Martin (DMa);

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister (TW);
City Manager Keith Breskin (KB);
Exec. Asst. Sarah Coffey (SC);

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

SMCL STAFF: Julie Finklang (JF).

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Abbott called the meeting to order at 6:37PM.

1. APPROVAL OF June 14, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

BE moved to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2017 meeting as drafted; KL seconds.
Approval of minutes passes unanimously by all members present.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - No public comment made.

3. PROJECT SCHEDULE

TW requested a slide with an update on the Draft Schedule to show meetings scheduled with Planning Commission on 9/18 and report back to City Council on 9/25; will bring updates to Council on library needs assessment and site analysis, system options and final recommendations. The format of those meetings is still being discussed.

JF: Is a library representative needed at those meetings? TW confirmed that a library representative would be helpful. JF will not be available on those dates, but will arrange for a substitute.

DM: At the last LAC meeting, committee was given a preview of the work coming up in August – site recommendation, system strategies, best practices in library design (e.g. square footage, service stacks, etc.). August meeting of the LAC will focus on system strategies and different service options.

DM: Library project kiosk at Kops & Kids and 4th of July events generated a lot of good local interaction. Considering another intercept kiosk for local input – is Fog Fest the best option for local interaction? TW: At the City of Pacifica booth at Fog Fest in the past, local residents primarily stop by as opposed to out-of-towners. JF: Library has tentatively scheduled the Library Lookmobile at the Fog Fest at IBL School on Sunday; the Lookmobile hits the demographic we are interested in for library project feedback. CA: If the library project kiosks are placed as part of the City booth, this may achieve good feedback from local residents. TW: We will take a look at how to incorporate it with other information at the City booth. DM: The kiosk at Farmers Market on 5/24 had lower volume of visits than typical community outreach due to the windy weather. We can look at the City calendar to identify other possible opportunities. The idea of an intercept kiosk at a local market such as Oceana Market had previously been mentioned.

4. LIBRARY SITE ANALYSIS – COMMITTEE WORKSHEET REPORT OUT, NARROW DOWN POTENTIAL SITES

DM: Group 4 summarized information received by committee members on the library site evaluation worksheet. TW: Group 4 provided handout “Pacifica Libraries Opportunities – Consultants Site Analysis Notes” to accompany the discussion. DM: Would like committee to share thoughts that went into ratings of the site criteria. Group 4 has not added in cost of sites yet. Costs may include funds needed to relocate existing operations (e.g. if City Hall site is recommended for new library site). ER suggested having a discussion to identify which sites should “fall off the table” immediately, then spend more time discussing those that have more potential. DM and CA concurred.

Sites – Initial Gauge of Potential:

City Hall – potential

Beach Blvd. – potential. DM: Consider long-term maintenance: (1) cost to replenish beach, (2) maintain sea wall, (3) long-term impact of rising flood zones. Infrastructure maintenance is a bigger, City-wide discussion. Discuss ways to mitigate costs. With this site, there could be an

associated loss of revenue due to other use, e.g. another 40 hotel rooms if hotel site is expanded. Additional information on costs can be developed.

Sharp Park Library – potential, but less-favored. DM: Site may be constrained – 2 levels of parking needed for sufficient parking. Group 4 is still refining the analysis. Existing needs assessment indicated a size of 33,000 sq. ft. for a library for this community, which would be a tight fit at this site.

Parking Lot at Francisco / Salada – potential, less-favored. This is the parking lot next to the Thai restaurant. CB: Could this site include closing off the street? DM: Closing the street could be a creative strategy to increase capacity. CA: This area is not very accessible. Need to discuss traffic flows, as Francisco Blvd. has a lot of construction going on and there is concern with impact on traffic. TW: We will have more discussion and analysis of several options that are expected out of this meeting's discussion.

Corporation Yard – potential. DM: This site looks great. It may require additional funds to relocate the existing Corp Yard.

Oceana High School – potential. DM provided comments on school sites generally. City has not yet heard from school district(s) regarding interest in partnering. The school district building site in Vallemar presents a challenge for site accessibility. IBL library site is too small. CA spoke with Don Horsley, who mentioned that for building on a school site there may be a need to meet additional building requirements. DM: If the library is used as a classroom, then that triggers additional requirements that must be adhered to for state architectural standards. ER: It is premature to discuss details / requirements before talking to the school districts about interest in partnering. CA: Is it viable to take the time to explore sites further with the school district(s)? ER: would eliminate the two Pacifica School District sites, but the Oceana High School site might have potential.

Pacifica School District Office in Vallemar – eliminate.

IBL Library – eliminate.

ER: Would like to see in notes with reasons discussing why sites fell off the list to keep a record for public to see. CA: We will get into a more granular discussion of the sites in the Study Session portion of the meeting.

Public Agency – Clarendon & Francisco (Water District office) – eliminate. DM: Water District was contacted by City, but has not expressed interest.

Shopping Center / Eureka Square – eliminate. DM: City reached out to Eureka Shopping Center realtor and owner regarding availability. There are two approx. 1,000 sq. ft. spaces available in the shopping center. The shopping center will not work if not already discussing redevelopment.

US Bank building / Eureka Square – potential. DM: Staff reached out to US Bank realtor, but have not heard back yet. The bank building (approx. 19,000 sq. ft. space) might be a size on which to do a renovation to accommodate the library.

South of Gorilla BBQ – eliminate. Poor access and/or not enough space.

Public Agency on Pacific & Palmetto (Recology) – eliminate. Poor access and/or not enough space. ER pointed out that it is technically not a public agency.

Fairway Park – eliminate. DM: This is on the east side of Highway 1. Site is owned by National Park Service and Caltrans. Site has poor / limited access; can only get to it from northbound direction. KS: There is an easement for access, but vegetation may need to be taken out. JF: Would there be significant opposition due to increased traffic in the neighborhood? KS doesn't believe there would be much opposition. This is my neighborhood, and would love a library to walk to. People in the neighborhood are used to the traffic flow for the baseball fields that are there. CA: We would need additional study on traffic flows and parking in the area. ER: Would the Federal / State government be interested in use of the site for the library?

Sanchez Library – potential. SV: The location is central to its own neighborhood.

Community Center property – potential. DM: Some concern environmentally due to flood zone, potential wetlands; observations of the site indicate that it is wetter than most others. SV: Are we talking about the Community Center itself? DM: There is some space behind the Community Center, also. CB: Where is the site in relation to the EQ Basin? DM: It could be on the parking lot. We can spend more time exploring strategies if there is interest in the site.

Oddstad School – eliminate. See above discussion regarding school districts.

Terra Nova / Oddstad Blvd. (Shopping Center) – eliminate. DM: Availability of the site is in question; no contact has been made yet with the private property owners. Feels it is premature to reach out to owners. Sanchez Library site has capacity. JF: Why consider a site so close to Sanchez Library when the Sanchez site is viable?

Shopping Center on Linda Mar Blvd / Coast Highway – eliminate. DM: The County recently released a flood map that shows that the whole Linda Mar area is concerning.

Quarry – potential. ER, CB, KL all commented they would like to say “yes” to this potential site, but it is pointless due to local sentiment / opposition to Quarry development.

The “Rock” north of Sea Bowl – eliminate. Inadequate size, topography.

Adobe Shopping Center – eliminate.

Self Storage on Crespi Dr. – eliminate.

**** STUDY SESSION – LIBRARY SITE DISCUSSION ****

CA opens Study Session portion of agenda for open discussion of potential sites for the library, and invites public audience to the table. Going around the table, each committee member or attendee will discuss what thoughts went into evaluating the sites and rating against the site criteria.

5. DISCUSS REMAINING POTENTIAL SITES

ER: Where can we deliver the services we want to deliver? What are the issues? City Hall site is too small and a lot of traffic. We should talk about traffic issues, as that will politically keep coming up. Beach Blvd. – if we don't put the library there, there is a loss of economic advantage as an anchor to the main street. Sharp Park Library site is not viable, but what if we combined this site with the Recology site? Corp Yard is an intriguing possibility, but would this be politically charged due to the need to relocate the existing Corp Yard somewhere? KB recommended assuming there is another location in mind for relocating the Corp Yard in considering the Corp Yard site as a potential library site; do not rule it out due to the need to relocate the existing Corp Yard. ER asked about the sites on the south end of town, and what the thoughts were in considering those. Would that mean closing Sanchez Library? DM: System strategy options will be developed. If there are two libraries, they may not be equal in size. If one library, an alternative service model may be suggested to complement the library at one or more locations.

Ellen Ron: Traffic near Oceana High School is similar to the traffic around the Thai restaurant site; would like to see both of those sites considered. Community Center site is too far south to also keep Sanchez Library open. The Corp Yard is pretty far north for a "central" library, and there are traffic issues in that area. Fairway Park would be more of a central location if looking at a geographically central library. Sharp Park Library site may be viable if looking at a smaller footprint library, and would hate to see this site eliminated.

KL: Looked at the capacity of the sites primarily, then accessibility. Sharp Park Library site has potential if considering a smaller footprint than previously recommended. Beach Blvd. is high on the list of potential sites. The flood zone issue also affects City infrastructure and other sites. Would love to just pick up the Sanchez Library site and put it in the middle of town. Sanchez site is nice, but it is so far south. The Corp Yard is far north. Did not have a position on the Oceana High School site one way or the other.

BE: Focused on capacity and accessibility of the sites primarily. Likes Beach Blvd. Would like to talk about keeping Sanchez Library open and building new library with a smaller footprint.

KS: Looked mainly at accessibility, traffic issues and site capacity. Sharp Park is my main library; rarely visit Sanchez Library. It is hard to look at the sites without personal perspective overshadowing overall community interest, but that is what needs to be done. Feel that Beach Blvd. is a top site for a new library. There are environmental concerns for a lot of sites. Community Center is interesting site. For the Corp Yard, concerned about back up of traffic at the Manor intersection. The evaluation of sites against site criteria on the worksheet and conducting the process was helpful.

Sharon (public attendee): Liked Oceana High School site the best; asked for clarification on exactly where the site is on campus. DM clarified that it is the flat parcel by the tennis courts and design could consider undergrounding parking underneath the tennis courts. Sharon observed that the school is already there, so the area is used to traffic in the area. IBL School is nearby, and the site is centrally located.

VP: Did not want Park Pacifica sites. Consider socioeconomic. Park Pacifica tends to have residents with more money. There are fewer apartments in the area. Politically, we hear more about the Sanchez Library, but need to consider fairness to all residents. If you do not live in that area (Park Pacifica), people do not go there. Likes the Beach Blvd. site. There are enough homes and services in proximity to Beach Blvd. site. The City has a commitment to maintain the sea wall with or without a library at that site. Likes the City Hall site. City Hall could be improved and possibly incorporated into design of new library.

KB: No additional comments.

Stan Zeavin (public attendee): Gives kudos to the committee for a good job in shrinking the list of potential sites. The location at the Senior Center / Community Center creates the same problem of putting a single library in the north end of town. Pacifica is 7 – 9 miles corner to corner. Should target sites north of Fassler. Should keep Sanchez Library; you will not win an election without keeping Sanchez. Regarding the Beach Blvd. site, people do not understand what kind of money we are talking about to mitigate flood risk. Moffatt & Nichols report indicated we need sand nourishment, maintain the sea wall and keep sea level rise (SLR) under 5 feet. The sediment study included Beach Blvd as one of 7 sections evaluated in Pacifica, and indicated a need to nourish the beach a minimum of 5 – 7 times up to year 2050 with a cost estimate of \$60M for sand nourishment. The cost to put in an armored wall would be \$40M. So, the City would need \$100M - \$150M to keep the Beach Blvd. area clear of flood risk. There is 4,000 miles of coastline. The City can probably get funding for partial armoring and the first sand nourishing, but other cities along coastlines in the U.S. will be asking for funding, too. There is a huge liability to building on Beach Blvd. site; it is like playing Russian Roulette. Why would the City put a public building on that site? Strongly emphasized choosing any other location.

SV: Still favors Beach Blvd. site for the library. Attended the sea level rise (SLR) meeting that was held recently at the Little Brown Church, and learned that SLR is estimated at 3mm per year. SLR is not an issue; coastal erosion is the problem. Likes the following 5 sites: Corp Yard, Beach Blvd., Oceana High School, Quarry, Community Center (based on a 1 library model).

Margaret Goodale (public attendee): agreed with comments / cautions made by Stan Zeavin.

CA: Focused on site availability, synergy and economic impact. Beach Blvd. site provides an opportunity to build something vibrant and new along with the Palmetto Streetscape. The idea of the library at this location started with the streetscape vision. Evaluated criteria on the site evaluation worksheet based on each site on the list. Would like to see Economic Impact and Connectivity criteria weighted more. Connectivity implies the site and area are walkable and

bikeable in addition to vehicle access. The Corp Yard site does not have much economic impact potential. The area is not very walkable; it is more of a single, standalone site. Looking at SLR maps, Linda Mar area is under water; there are flooding concerns for the Community Center site. Likes the idea of spending more money to provide the City more of a City Center area; the current City buildings are in bad condition. A City Center area with buildings, public space, offices would create a good synergy. Look at traffic flows and small, one-way streets. Some sites require more study. Sites in the "Back of the Valley" don't make sense. Likes taking the space of Sanchez Library and considering a public / private partnership for a community-serving use of the site.

JC: Looked at accessibility as the number one criteria, considered average distance from home to the site and driving to the site. The location should fall within the path of normal living patterns. Avoid the penalties of long negotiations and potential price increases that private properties may require. Community Center – consider the friends of "Lake Matilda"; it is a flood zone; the last unbuilt segment is the area behind the Community Center. CA commented that the marshy land near the storage center is privately owned.

CB: Looked first at availability; Economic Impact is also important. Likes the Beach Blvd. site. Would like to see the library somewhere in the Sharp Park area. Likes the idea of building new City Hall with a floor for library services. Did not like the Sharp Park Library site until DM mentioned some possible design options. There is no point in pursuing privately owned sites.

JC commented that there was a vision for a City Hall site with an L-shaped footprint; Karl Baldwin (Pacifica's first city manager) came up with a plan for a City Hall site, but the City Council did not pursue it.

Ellen Ron clarified that the Beach Blvd. site is not actually on Beach Blvd.; it is on the corner of Palmetto and Montecito.

JF: Focused on one criteria – a site that 2/3 of the community would vote for. Give me any site, and I will make it work as a library staff member. There is no point in looking at sites at the south end of town aside from the Sanchez Library site, which is a great site. Continuing to consider sites where there is existing opposition will not work. The Sharp Park Library site already has an existing library, so that site should work.

ER: I've been involved in this process for a long time. There is a lot of resistance to change. Concerned about focusing on sites that are considered non-starters, such as the Quarry, as being a delaying tactic for the purpose of not getting anything done. Cautioned about not getting stuck in false arguments. For Beach Blvd., whether or not a library is considered on the site, the City still needs to figure out how to protect City infrastructure, businesses and residents there. People are adamant about various reasons (Sanchez Library closing, sea level rise, cost) for the library bond not getting enough votes for the super-majority needed, but they have no information to back up those claims.

Ellen Ron: If Civic Center / City Hall area is considered, City can sell Sharp Park Library and Beach Blvd. sites. Big criteria to consider: Is the site already City-owned?

Stan Zeavin: In response to ER comments – It really is about the money needed; there is not enough money to protect the coastline for everyone. Why put a public building in harm's way?

KL: Sites in the Sharp Park area make the most sense for most of the criteria and the ability to add economic impact. We should put most attention on sites with the ability to add economic impact. It is inadequate to consider sites at one end of town or the other due to inconvenience and the potential disenfranchisement of residents at the opposite end of town.

KS: It is important to inform the community about this process of evaluating / discussing potential sites, and the reason for focus on City-owned sites. Educating the public on why we settled on these sites is important in changing perceptions.

Margaret Goodale: This process has been good.

Sharon: Can you summarize the sites that are still being considered? (See Item 6 below.)

DM: Must consider parking together with the library footprint.

JF asked if we can pass a bond measure with a single library site model. CA responded that it is too early to ask that question; wait for a future conversation on how library services can be delivered during the August LAC meeting.

ER: If we are leaving US Bank and Oceana High School sites on the list, can someone reach out to judge interest from the owner / school board?

CA closed the Study Session portion of the meeting and resumed the regular session.

**** STUDY SESSION – CLOSED ****

6. LIBRARY SITE ANALYSIS – COMMITTEE SITE RECOMMENDATIONS

CA listed the sites still being considered:

**City Hall
Beach Blvd. / Montecito
Sharp Park Library
Corporation Yard
Oceana High School
US Bank in Eureka Square
Sanchez Library
Parking Lot at Francisco / Salada (added)**

(Community Center and Quarry were eliminated upon further discussion during Study Session.)

DM asked whether the committee is keeping the Community Center on the potential site list. JC: The phone company moved out of the building due to dampness. KL: As a librarian, dampness

is a concern. CA asked committee to confirm taking the Community Center off of the potential site list, and the committee confirmed.

DM asked for confirmation of taking the Quarry off of the list; committee confirmed.

KL suggested re-naming the Beach Blvd. site to Palmetto / Montecito to be more accurate to the location.

DM will summarize information from all of the site analysis evaluation worksheets received from committee and will send to SC to distribute consolidated results to the committee.

CA: Maybe not ready to list the sites in tiers; suggested waiting to consider additional analysis / options provided by Group 4.

7. COMMUNITY OUTREACH UPDATE

TW: Group 4 and staff will incorporate several slides into presentation for August meeting to show completed Library Opportunities survey data.

DM thanked the committee members who helped at the intercept kiosks at local events.

JC was impressed with the diligence of the community outreach efforts and the graphics presented on the kiosks.

8. PLANNED OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND LAC PARTICIPATION

TW: Put meetings for the Planning Commission on 9/18 at 7pm and City Council meeting on 9/25 at 7pm on your calendars for presenting an update on the library project.

CA asked how the online survey is going. TW responded that it is going well, comparable results as we are receiving at the kiosks.

DM observed that it is interesting to see the differences in priorities selected for the activities and spaces; that they do not always correspond.

9. DISCUSSION OF WEBSITE AND PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

CA noted that David Leal is not here, but he had been working on the website and there is the outstanding concern that JF brought up about the URL.

No additional public comments made.

10. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

TW: On the agenda for the next City Council meeting is an item to enter into an easement agreement with 122 Hilton Way that impacts the Sharp Park Library site. It is a floating easement, so the access may move at the City's discretion as long as the property has access.

Library Advisory Committee Minutes
July 12, 2017
Page 10 of 10

CA asked if there is an appointment to LAC coming from the Planning Commission to fill the vacancy left by Chuck Evans. TW: We are waiting for the vacancy on the Planning Commission to be filled, and will bring this request up once the Planning Commission vacancy is filled.

CA called for a motion to adjourn. JC motioned to adjourn; KL seconded. Meeting adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Coffey,
Executive Assistant

APPROVED:



Cindy Abbott
Library Advisory Committee Chair