



**CITY OF PACIFICA  
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**January 10, 2018  
6:30 – 8:00 P.M.**

**Sharp Park Library  
104 Hilton Way**

**Call to Order**

- 1. Approval of November 8, 2017 Meeting Minutes**
- 2. Oral Communications**  
This portion of the agenda is available to the public to address the Committee on any issue within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on the agenda.
- 3. Review Draft Pacifica Libraries Opportunities Summary Report**  
The Committee will review the draft report as edited by the ad hoc editing committee and direct Group 4 consultants to make final revisions to the report for presentation to the City Council on January 22<sup>nd</sup>. (*Hard copy distributed to LAC, electronic copy available to public at [cityofpacificca.org/library-project](http://cityofpacificca.org/library-project)*)
- 4. Committee and Staff Communications**
  - January 22<sup>nd</sup> City Council Meeting Reminder

**Adjourn**

THE CITY OF PACIFICA WILL PROVIDE SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED CITIZENS UPON AT LEAST 24 HOUR ADVANCE NOTICE TO THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE (738-7301). IF YOU NEED SIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE OR WRITTEN MATERIAL PRINTED IN A LARGER FONT OR TAPED, ADVANCED NOTICE IS NECESSARY. ALL MEETING ROOMS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO THE DISABLED.

## MINUTES

November 8, 2017

**CITY OF PACIFICA  
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
PACIFICA SANCHEZ LIBRARY  
1111 TERRA NOVA BLVD., PACIFICA**

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

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

**COMMITTEE ABSENT:** Vanessa Powers (VP);  
Kellie Samson (KS);  
Laverne Villalobos (LV);  
Deirdre Martin (DMa)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Kevin Woodhouse (KW);  
Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister (TW);  
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 6:35 PM.

#### **1. APPROVAL OF October 11, 2017 MEETING MINUTES**

JC moved to approve the October 11, 2017 minutes as drafted; KL seconded. DL and SV abstained, as they were not present at the October meeting. All other members voted in favor.

#### **2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None**

### **3. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS FROM CITY MANAGER KEVIN WOODHOUSE**

TW introduced recently appointed City Manager Kevin Woodhouse.

KW: is now about 4 ½ weeks into the job, and making the rounds to attend each Committee / Commission meeting to introduce himself. Thank you to your volunteer work on the Committee. Committee / Commission work is important work particularly to small cities like Pacifica. KW shared some background on his experience: has been in local government for 27 years, starting as an intern in Mountain View and working into the position of Deputy City Manager after graduating from Stanford. Then moved on to Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District as General Manager for 4 years, overseeing aspects such as programs for rangers, docents, natural resources and human resources. Has always enjoyed visiting Pacifica, and sees Pacifica as a coastal backyard. He is happy to be here. Also, wanted to recognize that Council Member Sue Vaterlaus is in attendance at the LAC meeting. SV replied that she is one of the designated Council liaisons to the Library Advisory Committee along with Council Member Deirdre Martin.

CA: Council Member Martin is not present tonight, as she had her baby on 11/5.

### **4. COMMUNITY OUTREACH UPDATE**

DM: Wrapping up on soliciting community feedback for final report with recommendations to City Council. Next outreach event will be on 11/18 at the Pacifica 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Open House at the Community Center. Will summarize work to-date on site options, system strategies and operational strategies to have available at the City table. DM summarized community outreach feedback to-date: Round 1 had about 700 participants; Round 2 had about 319 participants. There were 8 participants last week at the community meeting (Open House / Workshop). Will do an online survey following the community meeting. Round 1 survey focused on library spaces and activities. Results from Round 1 showed good cross-fertilization between spaces and activities, and complemented each other nicely; results showed that all the spaces of a 21<sup>st</sup>-century library are wanted in Pacifica. The Sanchez Library building is in relatively good shape. The Sharp Park Library building's existing condition is structurally questionable. Community feedback showed that building systems and accessibility were negatives / dislikes; community "likes" for Sharp Park mentioned location, programs and staff.

CA mentioned the dislikes about Sanchez Library regarding traffic and parking issues. These areas should be considered when adding additional services. DM agreed that the small parking lot is impacted, and there is not enough parking at times; she will clarify this comment on the slide. TW noted that traffic may refer to Sanchez not being as accessible on public transit stops.

DM summarized community feedback on site options. Sanchez Library received 134 votes supporting it for the small branch. Sharp Park Library site received the most in support (130) for the large branch site, followed by Palmetto / Montecito (114), the Corporation Yard (46) and City Hall site (32). The two-branch model received about 2/3 in support as compared to about 1/3 supporting a single-library model; this was not a surprise, as residents value Sanchez Library and don't want to see it close.

CA: Of the 8 people that attended the community meeting on 11/2, were any new?

CB: There were 3 new people, but they had been tracking the library project information.

## 5. SITE AND SYSTEM OPTIONS

DM: Showed a presentation slide summarizing the site evaluation criteria and slides to confirm site recommendations from the LAC. Site recommendations for the large branch are the same for the single-branch and 2-branch strategies. DM updated slides for 3 of the sites. DM met with the City Manager to provide information on the library project, and following that refined the model for the **Sharp Park** library site strategy for the building and parking, including access to the site. There are new images on the slide that show access points including an access point from Hilton Way. There would be 2 levels of parking. TW: The Sharp Park site is harder for people to visualize as compared to the other sites, so images were added to help visualize the Sharp Park site layout. DM: This site would make use of vertical circulation with the 2 floors of parking with an entrance into the library from the parking floors to act as a vertical lobby. ER: Is the rendering of images to scale, including the surrounding buildings? DM: Yes.

DM: There are 2 options for the **Palmetto / Montecito** site. The RFP for the Beach Blvd. hotel project oriented the library the other direction, but the library could work oriented in either direction. The advantage of option 2b is that it can be built up and over the pump house on the site, which goes down 3 levels, so this doesn't create dead space with the pump house on the site.

DM: The **City Hall site** is already zoned for public facilities use, so there is additional flexibility on the height of the building. TW: The height does need to be relatable to the surrounding neighborhood. DM: Option 3b for the City Hall site plans for above-grade parking, which is significantly less expensive than underground parking. This option plans for the library portion above the City Hall portion of the building. ER: Is there no community room? DM: There is a placeholder on the image for a community room. CA: Is there a concern with too much parking? What is the thought behind not having the library space on the ground floor? DM: The library is planned for the upper floors because the bigger floor plate for the library allows for more efficient operation.

DL: Is the Sharp Park library site zoned for public facilities use? What about the Corporation Yard? TW: Yes, both are zoned for public facilities use already.

ER: Can City Hall be located elsewhere? DM: We can provide an option 3c to show only the library at the City Hall site, with City Hall relocated. ER: There may be a political issue in tying the library together with City Hall. TC agrees. CB: Then where would City Hall be relocated?

DM: The Corporation Yard site is shown with the same model as seen before with parking below building and a 2-story library above. KL: finds it odd that easy highway access is listed under the list of Pros. It is easy to get off the highway northbound, but not as easy coming from the other direction. DM: To get back on the highway, need to cross the Manor intersection. KL: Manor intersection is horrible all the time. ER: Is Caltrans changing that to an onramp to mitigate the congestion at that intersection? TW: There is a Public Works project, but not certain of the status.

DM: For the Sanchez Library site, there is plenty of space to add a program / community room and additional parking.

DM reviewed recommended system strategies. A summary slide shows a comparison of current facilities and services, showing that Pacifica's per capita library space is on the small side in comparison to other cities in the system. The slide shows projected 2040 population for Pacifica for per capita comparisons. The recommendation for library size to serve Pacifica is within the range of 0.7 – 0.9 sq. ft. per capita, which would be 28,000 – 36,000 sq. ft. range. This range is then mapped to 2 system facility strategies: Strategy A – single branch or Strategy B – 2 branches (1 large and 1 small). The slide detailing the large branch operational scenario was revised to work for both Strategy A and Strategy B, showing a full-service, contemporary library. The small branch operational scenario encompasses the library services now at Sanchez. The multi-use program space is not at Sanchez now and would be an addition. The multi-use program space could be secured off from the other library space with glass doors. Movable shelves and tables can be used to make spaces flexible. There are many innovative ideas to leverage staffing efficiencies, self-service / materials vending, flexible building design, a 24/7 lobby, independent access. Shared use by additional partners, such as Parks, Beaches & Recreation (PB&R) could offer multi-generational programs and additional community programs at Sanchez.

CA: Are these innovative ideas being done today? JF: Not yet in San Mateo County library system. CA: Has this been discussed? JF: Cannot confirm what has yet been discussed; there are a lot of moving pieces to consider such as the JPA agreement, MOU's and there is not an existing model to reference in this system. CB: Why would we need to build an additional 4,000 sq. ft.? DM: We had talked about renovating and addition of a program room. CA: This would ensure that the community doesn't feel a bait-and-switch ending up with something less than what is at Sanchez now. TC previously mentioned possible discontent. KL & JF asked if any others were aware of other service models used outside of the SMCL system. CB mentioned that the Redwood Shores library rents space for weddings, etc. JF mentioned a small self-service branch that is unstaffed in Livermore. DM: Contra Costa County has vending machines in use. The City of Olathe, KS - client has independent access within the recreation center. DM said that Anne-Marie, Rachel and Julie understood the issue Pacifica has and they are open to looking into what can be done in an innovative way to allow for partnering and mixed use of the library space. CA: Does every city in the JPA need to approve a change to the JPA agreement? JF: Need to research the by-laws / requirements.

DM: We want to confirm that your thoughts on these operational scenarios are captured and seem appropriate for Pacifica.

CA: Is the only partner that we came up with PB&R?

DM: There could be other partners, community groups such as 4-H that could make use of independent access.

TC: The slide covered the possible facility and operational scenarios well and did a good job tying it all together. CA & KL also agree the slides are clearer now on the facility and system strategies and how they work together.

JF: Now the City Council would need to direct further exploration of innovative operational scenarios? DM: Yes, that is my understanding.

ER: The sites are numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 then Sanchez. Does that reflect the priorities for site preference? TW: The numbering is a hold-over from all sites, but may not be necessary. ER: The numbers imply a ranking. DM: We will remove the numbers from the slides.

CA opened the floor to **Public Comment:**

Ellen Ron: On the Sharp Park site images, those parking lots are separate? DM: We may be able to reconfigure Hilton Way and Hilton Lane to get extra square footage on the site, then we would be able to connect the parking lots.

Ellen Ron: Could the rest of the site be sold if we don't make Sanchez larger? Does the square footage range of 28,000 – 36,000 square feet include the community room(s)? May recommend separating out the community room square footage to address some concern with the size of the building. DM: We did that on some models. Things change and evolve quickly in the library realm. May wait to consider this when it comes time to update the building program (which is part of the conceptual design phase) in approx. 2 years. CA: In community outreach, we consistently heard that the community room is important. DM: With not breaking it out, the 30,000 sq. ft. library would include a community room. CA thinks it may be beneficial to break out the community room. KL: People will anchor on the community room. In the future, it may be a challenge. Recommend including the community room, but could later break it out. ER: Are we talking about the community space. Up to now we have had a community room – the large room at Sharp Park. KW: In the community input process, has the community space been discussed? What is the expected use of the community space? Do we have a definition? TC: The community space would be used for City Council and Planning Commission meetings. Where will we have those meetings when the current Council Chambers is gone? DM: Rental of the community room was also discussed. Walnut Creek library has community / program space, a technology room, large conference room and meeting space that are all rentable and provide revenue to the City. CA: Community has said that it is important to have a large meeting space / community room. TW: The space can be designed for flexibility of use, for example the dais can be hidden while the room is not being used for City Council or Planning Commission meetings. DM mentioned another city (Mountain View?) having a mixed-use meeting space for City Council meetings, where the dais can be hidden / closed off. KW: It was Cupertino where the dais can be closed off when the space is not being used for City Council meetings. TC: The meeting space is a selling point. JF: Currently, the City owns the library building and land, but SMCL manages the use of space. In the existing model, the community room space is free and open to all subject to availability. There is currently an unmet need for free meeting space. SV: How big is the rentable space in the Community Center now? JF: From the City website, the multi-use large room at the Community Center is 50 ft. x 50 ft., so 2,500 sq. ft. KL: Remembers the whale talk held at the large room in the Community Center; it was not big enough for the crowd that attended. Some were in the hallway, and others left due to not enough space. ER: There are also a lot of programs that the library runs all over the county, but Pacifica misses out on because our libraries do not have the space for them.

CA: Recommends that the facility strategies include square footage notations.

## **6. SUMMARY REPORT**

DM: We aim to finish a draft report with LAC recommendations to City Council by the first week of December. Suggest forming an ad-hoc editing committee to review and finalize the final report.

TW: The final report will be a bound report with a cover that Group 4 will help prepare, and will be the final phase in the work that the LAC was tasked with from the City Council direction received at the 3/27/2017 City Council meeting. The ad-hoc committee would review for edits

and provide feedback on the report document. We could hold an optional LAC meeting on January 10 for final review of the report before presenting to the City Council.

TC asked how the ad-hoc committee would fit in with the Brown Act. TW: If the members meeting are kept below a quorum, there would be no issue with a Brown Act violation. Can vote at this meeting to select who will participate in the ad-hoc committee. CA: Why not everyone? TW: If we are getting feedback from everyone electronically while drafting the report, that could be a Brown Act violation for an electronic meeting. TW: Would there be enough time to have a draft report ready for the December LAC meeting? DM: We will be refining the slides, and the information from the slides will comprise about 90% of the report. KL: believes LAC is OK with the substance of the report based on the review of slides. An ad-hoc editing committee makes sense, and then the final draft can be ready for review by the full committee at the regular January 10 LAC meeting. LAC members agreed. CA: Are we looking for 3 people for the ad-hoc committee? DL: Can we have up to 6 to keep it below a quorum? KL asked DM how many is preferred. TW: The ad-hoc meetings will likely be daytime meetings, and those participating should be comfortable with reading a draft on the fly, depending on what constraints there may be with electronic sharing of the draft document.

KL, ER, CA are interested. TC can't meet during the day.

TW: There will be no regular LAC meeting in December. The next full meeting will be Jan. 10.

CA: Can we plan for up to 1 week or 5 days to get the report to review before the January meeting?

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

TW: Nov. 18 will be the City's 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Open House event at the Community Center. Community groups will have tables at the event to promote information about their groups. The City will have a table at the event with information, and information on the library project planning will be included. City staff will work the table, as there are specific space constraints. LAC members are welcome to stop by and visit the City table. CA: Will there be a survey for community feedback? TW: We will have summary information that also shows where to find more details.

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

CA: The website is now up-to-date with presentations from each of the LAC meetings.

## **9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

TW announced the Robert Smith and his wife welcomed their first baby (a boy) on Halloween.

CB: The Pacifica Friends of the Library book sales will be on Dec. 8 – 9 and the Sharp Park Library community room. They will be setting up on Dec. 7 – any one is welcome to help set up.

JF: Next Thursday, Nov. 16 at 6pm there will be a Home For All presentation at the Sharp Park Library. This is a countywide program to develop an action plan to address housing needs. Pacifica Conflict Resolution Center will facilitate the discussion. The library will be serving Goodfellas pizza at this event.

Motion to adjourn the meeting by TC; seconded by KL.

Library Advisory Committee Minutes  
November 8, 2017  
Page 7 of 7

MEETING ADJOURNED 7:49pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Coffey  
Executive Assistant

APPROVED:

---

Cindy Abbott  
Library Advisory Committee Chair