

Library Tax Advisory Committee Regular Meeting Agenda

Mt. Shasta Library – 515 East Alma Street
Thursday, April 21, 2022; 2:30 p.m.

“Our mission is to maintain the character of our “small town” community while striking an appropriate balance between economic development and preservation of our quality of life. We help create a dynamic and vital City by providing quality, cost-effective municipal services and by forming partnerships with residents and organizations in the constant pursuit of excellence.”

Page	Item
	1. Call to Order and Roll Call
	2. Consent Agenda: Approval of Minutes: April 15, 2021 Regular Meeting
	3. Selection of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary
	4. Library Director’s Report
	5. Discussion and Possible Action: Proposed 2022/23 Budget
	6. Discussion and Possible Action: Library Expansion Project Discussion and development of action plan for moving ahead with the building addition including financial feasibility report and update on the status of the Mt. Shasta Engineering plans.
	7. Adjourn: The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2022 Availability of Public Records: All public records related to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 305 North Mt. Shasta Blvd., Mt. Shasta, CA at the same time the public records are distributed or made available to the members of the legislative body. Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the legislative body after distribution of the Agenda packet will be available for public review within a separate binder at City Hall at the same time as they are made available to the members of the legislative body. The City of Mt. Shasta does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or provision of services. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons requiring accommodations for a disability at a public meeting should notify the City Clerk or Deputy City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (530) 926-7510 in order to allow the City sufficient time to make reasonable arrangements to accommodate participation in this meeting

**MT. SHASTA LIBRARY TAX ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES SPECIAL MEETING
MT. SHASTA LIBRARY
515 East Alma Street
Thursday, April 15, 2021 Regular Meeting
The meeting was conducted via Zoom**

The purpose of the Committee is to review and make recommendations to the City Council of the City of Mt. Shasta on the expenditure, investment, or encumbrance of revenues raised from the Library Transactions and Use Tax. The Committee will also review and make recommendations to the City Council on the operations of the Library as they may relate to the expenditure of those revenues. The Committee will serve as a forum for the free exchange of information and ideas relating to Library issues.

1. Call to Order

This regular meeting was called to order by Chairman Dennis Johnson at 2:39 PM

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairman Dennis Johnson, Vice-Chairman Merle Anderson, Ray Nobriga, Ted Marconi, and Betty Kreeger

Also Present: Courtney Laverty, Executive Director, Community Staffing Solutions, LLC; Cheryl Bauer, Friends of the Library; and Evelyn Callas, Friends of the Library

3. Public Comment: There were not public comments.

4. Consent Agenda: Approval of Minutes: Merle Anderson moved to approve the minutes; Ted Marconi seconded. Minutes approved.

5. Discussion of Possible Action on the Library Expansion Plan

Committee finally received a copy of the library expansion plan. Dennis noted it was the first he has seen since October 2018. We have the permit on these plans.

Juliana noted they have the building footprint for organization of the various spaces within the building, but that wasn't included in the package. There is a copy of the renderings that were presented to the Planning Commission for Architectural Review process included in our packet. Discussing easement with the school for expansion of the parking area. She recently was told she could go out for an RFP for the landscape architect who will do the final landscape architecture of the new areas as well as a vegetation management plan for the wetland area to remove invasive species. The landscape architect was requested by the Beautification Committee to do the initial plan and installation. Beautification Committee will add it to their annual maintenance work.

CEQA Process: Juliana stated she hopes to launch the public draft of IS/MND next Wednesday on April 21st to be open for public comment until May 28th. The Native American tribe information for CEQA has been completed which went well. She hopes to have the application to the City Council for architectural design and CEQA approval minus landscaping plan end of June.

Will close out contract with Mt. Shasta Engineering by August 1st to give them an extra month for final invoices to come in.

Finishing NEPA process. Did initial discussion with Kevin DeMers at the USDA. This project would qualify for several USDA grant loan programs among other funding sources. Will make sure the project is available to use those funds if LTAC chooses. Nick Riddle will prepare a section of final report with cost estimate for different funding sources he feels would be applicable to this project primarily focusing on grants rather than bonds or loans. Courtney also has been working on sources of grant funding.

Nick will provide us with a full range of estimates for construction. One concern is the building supplies market is volatile such as lumber price increased significantly. Will make sure there is a conservative range for construction of the building based on current materials market

Cheryl asked if there is a budget for constructing this project. Juliana responded that the current budget is approximately \$3.8M, but Nick will finalize that number based on the volatile product market and give us phase construction costs as well. He will separate costs associated with interior design. Furniture, etc. will be subdivided out of that so we can see what each cost. He is finalizing that now based on materials market and will make sure the estimate is good for 1-1/2 to 2 years.

Ray asked when the final number will be available to us. Juliana said when we conclude the CEQA process just in case something else gets brought up in CEQA that we need to consider. Tentatively will have a final estimate for the City Council meeting on June 28th.

Cheryl wants to know if the city has set a budget for this project. Or is it just open to whatever Nick comes up with? Concerned about whether there are budget restrictions. Are there criteria for creating a budget?

Juliana will ask Muriel because they had a ballpark figure that this would come to but says no planned budget. Waiting for actual construction cost estimate from Nick. That will reflect what has been outlined for Courtney to do her job, offer expanded library services.

Dennis mentioned that we've always talked about a 2-tiered building plan. The first tier is what the city had no choice but to do which is building the new facility and the cost. The second is the cost of the remodeling the existing building. Are they going to provide us with that breakdown?

Juliana stated that Nick is looking at a 3-phase project. The goal is to keep the library running. First phase is the addition. Phase 2 move the operations to the new addition and work on the existing building. Phase 3 will be to combine the two.

Dennis asked where is money coming from for CEQA and landscape studies? Juliana said that would be a question for Muriel. Dennis stated LTAC hasn't allocated any money. LTAC has suggested City Council allocate money to Mt. Shasta Engineering which was \$215,000 and has been spent. Where is money coming from for the other things such as reserve fund, etc.? Juliana will ask Muriel.

Betty asked if landscaping is an added cost or is it factored in right now? Juliana said Nick is factoring that in the final cost of construction but wasn't clear if it was factored in now or if it was going to be factored into the final numbers. When asked if the shrubs, trees, etc. will be included in this figure, she said they will not, and the Landscape Architect the Beautification Committee recommends will give us a figure when the RFP is sent out. In response to the question if the landscape architect is going to make a presentation of what he/she feels should

be planted would LTAC make the decision, Juliana said it would be the Beautification Committee's decision because this is a city-owned building. But if LTAC would like to be involved in that decision that definitely could happen.

Betty remarked that Dennis and Courtney have been asking for these plans for quite some time and we received them a few days before they are going to the Planning Commission for review which is concerning. Juliana said they were presented to the Planning Commission in early 2019 Architectural Design Application, so they've already reviewed it, but that didn't answer the question of why we're just now seeing it. She deferred to Bruce, the project manager, as the one who could answer why.

Merle asked Courtney how satisfied she is with the floor plan. Courtney feels it is mostly fine but doesn't like the fact the lobby bathroom has no door and not being able to see people coming in to use it. Juliana offered to set up a meeting with Courtney and Nick to go over these issues. Any major changes would add to the cost.

Cheryl had a question about who does the cost estimate. Juliana stated that Nick is the engineer, and they normally do the cost estimates. There is an option in the contract that we can recontract with him to do the supervision and contracting bidding for the construction, or the City will have to go out to bid with an RFP to get another engineer architect to do that. Or we could do Pace Engineering depending on their availability.

Evelyn asked if the outside of the building is final. Juliana explained that because we submitted the permit before 2020 regulations went into effect, we must abide by previous building code standards. If we want to change things the building department determines we need to bring the building up to the current code which would cost more for engineering and construction.

Evelyn concerned about aesthetics. 2-1/2 years ago when we first saw design renderings LTAC, and Friends of the Library submitted written concerns to Juliana and others involved. Concerns about the interior were addressed, but the aesthetics concerns (roof lines, popups, etc.) were not addressed, and were not presented to the community for community input. She is concerned that now we must go to the public for financial support. And grantors want community input. These groups feel the building exterior, roof lines and décor do not fit our community or are attractive. So, is this the time to revisit this and get public input. Juliana said that originally that was taken out because there was no budget to do this. To do it now would mean amending the contract and budget.

Dennis disagreed stating that the plans LTAC submitted to her in spring of 2017 involved massive community input representing hundreds of hours of Friends of the Library, LTAC and many others. This process began in 2011 and for 5 years we collected input and presented it to Juliana, and she just ignored it.

Juliana disagreed and said they did consider LTAC's input, but the drawings didn't meet state code. And she had meetings with Courtney. She said if LTAC recommends it they can withdraw the permit and do additional surveying.

Evelyn suggested we publish the renderings in the newspaper and see what kind of public response we get. The only people who have seen these so far are a few people who attended meetings at the library. There has been no community input regarding these exterior renderings. What part of the 2020 building code applies to the exterior and rooflines? Juliana deferred to Nick Riddle since he is a licensed engineer, and his recommendations meets the California Building Code. Offers to share questions with Nick. Evelyn said she doesn't think it is an engineering question. It is an architectural and aesthetics question. Reminds Juliana that

originally Mt. Shasta Engineering would have an architect design the building which didn't happen. Doesn't feel the building aesthetics will help us finance an expansive library change.

Betty had concerns with the lack of communication. There needs to be more outreach when this is going to be discussed before the Planning Commission because not everyone regularly goes to the City's website to see what is being discussed. As Dennis stated a lot happened in 2017, but since then pretty much nothing except for a few Planning Commission meetings and a few meetings with Courtney regarding the interior design. Dennis and Courtney have been reaching out to Bruce saying, "please send us the plans". Now a few days before the Planning Commission meeting when they are supposed to approve the plans, we get them and are being asked to make comments on them. There is just not enough communication.

Juliana then states if we want to make a recommendation to pull back on this process that is up to the committee. She states she is not the project manager, so I cannot talk about communication on the project because she says she has had only a small portion in the CEQA area. Says she can pull back the CEQA process and wait if we want to make amendments.

Betty stated that would be up to other people. The reason for having to pull back on CEQA is because of lack of communication. To blame us for wanting to pull back if that is what the committee decides is not quite fair.

Dennis asked if Ted as a former City Manager can give us an understanding of the muddled process that is going on

Ted said he doesn't know if he can but asked Juliana if she said this project has already received design review, architectural approval from the Planning Commission.

Juliana said the Planning Commission did a preliminary review. That was just a presentation of the current draft 11/13/19. And they took input to see if they needed anything. And they took public comment and made a recommendation. [see footnote]¹ Juliana stated it was not a final; the final will come with the CEQA approval process and that will go to City Council because the city owns the building.

Dennis said he had heard nothing about a preliminary review and if they took community input, yet she didn't include what seemed to him the most obvious community input (us).

Ted said he agreed with Evelyn that the roof lines are horrendous. However, we don't have the time and money to scrap the entire thing and start over. Evelyn is right that putting a plan out to the community that doesn't have community support and isn't likely to get community support because it doesn't fit in with the community esthetics is going to make fundraising next to impossible unless the city wants to do it. He would have a hard time recommending we spend a lot of LTAC money on this design.

Merle reminded us that 2-3 years ago LTAC worked hard making recommendations for a cost-effective addition to the library, but the City Council made it clear they didn't want our opinion and were going to take control and design the project. He thinks we should not have a role in fundraising for construction if the city wants to design and build it. Let's focus LTAC fundraising on furnishing it and bringing it into operation after the city has done construction. The city should

¹ **Note:** That was the façade review and there were no public comments made at the 11/19/19 meeting. Juliana talks in the meeting about comments she got from the general public re cyclists. Nick says, "we'd be happy to bring the community into the conversation at some point". Melanie recommended ATC be brought in.

not have expectations of us and the public for building a building they designed while rejecting community input.

Evelyn: Mt. Shasta engineering did not hire an architect regarding building aesthetics. What is wrong with doing that now? Friends who have expertise in children's safety objected to the floor plan as not providing child safety, and the City Council made the adjustments. But there has been no change regarding our written disagreements to the architectural design and we weren't even invited to the City Council meeting that discussed it. It's not too late to get a design that the community can support.

Dennis: Juliana wrote the RFP and one of the conditions was to have an architect onboard. It was obvious to us that Mt. Shasta Engineering was not going to use an architect. He asks when Juliana was aware of that. Juliana reading RFP "it was for either an architectural or engineering firm for design services and environmental documentation for library expansion and renovation." Dennis said they did have an architect in their plan, right? Juliana said she would have to look it up. Both Dennis and Courtney responded they did. Courtney stated the person they were going to use moved away and wasn't replaced.

Dennis agreed with Merle that the city essentially took the project away from LTAC and said it is a city building and we're paying for it. He agrees with Evelyn that two of the largest potential donors to the project are represented by Merle (Rotary) and Evelyn (Friends) and they aren't pleased with the design. In October 2018 we said it was too large making it too expensive and we were ignored. The plan LTAC presented was a much smaller plan which would have been half the cost. The only way we can make major changes is to get City Council, approval. Ted agreed because they are the decision-making process, including the tax money. If they don't agree with LTAC's recommendations, they are free to ignore them and move forward. Our role is to represent the public seeing that the tax money the people voted on benefits the library. But the City imposes the tax, collects the tax and is responsible for the tax and the city buildings like the library.

Dennis stated one of his intentions for this meeting was funding. But we are not going to have a role in fundraising. Ted agreed and stated if there was a strategy to get the community involved or how the LTAC funds were going to be used he isn't going to propose anything to Rotary regarding fundraising. Evelyn said when Friends of the Library reaches out to the community for donations, they always include the new library. Says she finds it difficult to ask for this new library. Ted pointed out that the larger the library the more it will cost to furnish and operate it. Sees that as where the community would be involved in fundraising.

Evelyn reminded us that one of the reasons the children's area was changed was so they could be supervised from the circulation desk because otherwise it would have required another full-time staff person. Raising money for the day-to-day management is not generally appropriate for Friend's 501(3c). Its role is providing financial support for things like computers, desks, chairs, lamps, etc. and that is where they want to focus.

Ray stated he agrees with what everyone has said. There is no point to bring in an architect and incur additional costs. If there is a role for LTAC in fundraising it is looking for grants for furnishings and let the city deal with paying for the cost of construction.

Dennis agrees. Said Cheryl and Evelyn are responsible for the large library reserve fund because they did all the oversight and running the library for free before we hired Courtney. Agrees with Merle that if we decide we want to start over we've taken on the responsibility for fund raising. Our original approach was to do that because we knew the city had no money and never had any money which is why the original library in 1969 and expansion in 1989 were

headed up by the rotary, not the city. And since then when anything needed to be done Friends and Rotary paid for it. We assumed it would be the same this time, but the city decided they would take over the project so now are responsible for finding the money. Suggested we don't make a recommendation and move on to the other items. Told Juliana we would like to be kept informed about what is happening which hasn't been done in the past. If Juliana is going to put something before the Planning Commission would she let us know.

Again, Juliana deferred to Muriel who is staff liaison and Bruce who is project manager and then left the meeting.

Merle said he would like to see what kind of funding strategy the city has.

Cheryl concerned with runaway costs. Dennis said that is the City's problem because they decided to take over the project. The costs are high because they built a much larger building than requested and a lot more remodeling. He thinks the original estimate was \$3.5M. Courtney thought \$3.1M. But LTAC was looking at about half that because the community would be doing much of the job.

6. Possible Action and Budget for the Library Contract for Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Courtney mentioned when she wrote the budget, she didn't have the expenditure report from Muriel, so the numbers are place holders.

Dennis mentioned that her budget is basically what it was prior to Covid for a full operation although we don't know for sure what it will be like. Courtney agreed.

In the proposed 2021-2022 budget, SCORE is \$3,000. That is based on a previous and the expenditure report she just received has \$3,300 spent already this year. Property tax looks about the same. Heating & electric she would raise it \$500. Only used 57% this year. Cleaning has been less because not open and only cleaned twice a month. Only spent 36% of budget. Basically, this is the budget prior to Covid with a 10% increase. The contract amount stayed the same. She needs to meet with Muriel and refine some of the numbers.

Courtney would like to open July 1st with full staff, but there are some logistic issues regarding space, such as removing furniture, that need to be considered.

Ray asked for clarification about what was approved for Courtney's contract. She read contract which stated that her contract allowance should not exceed \$36,503.66 for the partial year March 1st through June 30th. Compensation for fiscal year July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022, and fiscal year July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023 shall be determined through the budgeting process. The term of the agreement shall be from March 1, 2021 – June 30, 2023, unless either wants to terminate the contract.

Contract allowance in this budget is for full staff at \$160,000 which is what it was before.

Ray asked for clarification on Capital Outlay (Building Expansion) \$10,000. Courtney explained that it is a placeholder because she doesn't know how much is going out for CEQA or expenses.

Ray what 21-22 revenue projection is. Courtney doesn't know.

Ted made motion to approve budget with the addition of an extra \$1,000 to the SCORE budget for a total budget of \$258,550. Ray seconded. Approved unanimously.

7. Budget

Muriel was not in attendance to go over budget and answer questions. Dennis noted in the Revenue Expenditure Report that if current income of \$45,000 is from January or February it is almost twice what it has been in previous years. Considering we have 4 or 5 months left the total of \$195,000 is way above what it is been before Covid. If things continue this way, this could be a record-breaking year. Expectations were lower so the budget was reduced. However, ordering online (Amazon) because every online order delivered here pays into LTAC fund. From a fiscal viewpoint we are looking good because we have few outstanding bills and have \$618,000 in bank. And Mt. Shasta Engineering has been paid.

8. Executive Director's Report:

Things are going very well. People enjoy curbside. As more evidence came out that you can't get Covid from services we have placed used book and new book carts outside. Continuing to conduct business at the door which is also going well. Circulation has increased. January there were roughly 1,500 checkouts; February 1,700; March 2,200. Courtney lets people she knows use Chromebooks outside. People can call in a print job. They are reorganizing library shelves and working with different seating scenarios in anticipation of reopening. The big challenge is making it safe to reopen following guidelines such as 6 feet distancing.

Ted asked if we participate in the Canopy Program. We do not. Canopy is a budget-driven program, and we don't have the budget. Courtney will check to see if this is viable for our library. People can get a card in a city that participates and have access here in Mt. Shasta to view movies and documentaries for free.

She updated the website, and it has more database things for students.

9. Agenda Topics for October 2021 meeting:

No agenda topics were discussed. However, Dennis announced he will not be at the next meeting as he will be on vacation. He also notified us his term expires the end of the year and he will not be asking the City Council to renew his seat on LTAC.

10. Adjourn: The next special meeting is scheduled for October 21, 2021

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 PM by Chairman Johnson.

Submitted by: Betty Kreeger, Secretary.