Meeting Report

Rob Harrington called the meeting to order at 10:36am and with motion by Rob Harrington seconded by Leland Park who joined the meeting by phone, the previous meeting minutes were approved.

- **Capital Project Ranking**
  Rob Harrington stated that he discussed the proposed forced ranking document with Board Chair Jennifer Appleby, to review the current list. Mr. Harrington’s concern was that the board would not have a confirmed ranking prior to the County requesting a final draft. Mr. Lee Keesler mentioned that the library has heard from County and that the County will most likely request the list early December 2016. Mr. Keesler wanted to ensure that the Infrastructure Committee was comfortable with the current ranking list so that the library board would have the best and most current data available to make their decision. Mr. Blair highlighted the recent changes, stating that Davidson and Independence libraries were added to the ranking. While the factors used to rank the list retained their original weight, adding two locations necessarily affected the order of the items on the list.

  Mr. Park commented that the Independence location was earmarked to move across US 74 at one point. Mr. Blair explained that the ranking list does not include the exact location of relocations. Mr. Keesler interjected that the plan was to replace Independence with 2 potential relocation sites. The service area for the location would be split in order to serve its community on either side of US 74 effectively. In response to a question from Mr. Harrington, it was noted that the square footage increase due to the dual location would be from 18,700 to 65,000.
Mr. Harrington noted that the top 3 ranked projects have remained in the same order on the proposed list, but the remainder have change. Mr. Blair confirmed this and explained the factors governing the list order.

Mr. Harrington also said that the committee is confident that the list is clear and concise, and asked what, if any concerns, staff had about the latest version of the list. Mr. Blair mentioned that University City library had dropped 2 places on the list from 5th to 7th, but that there is a considerable amount of community interest in that location. Mr. Keesler observed that library staff has done considerable research on the list and remains confident that the list is clear and consistent with the data collected. Mr. Keesler also mentioned that the data reflects that there are areas such as Scaleybark and Arrowood where there is tremendous demand for services and that these locations rank highly in the revised list. Mr. Keesler noted that while the rank order of the list is data driven, an argument could be made to move University City up the list. Mr. Park queried whether or not the list could be change once it is submitted to County? Mr. Blair responded that the list would be considered with other County projects and prioritized accordingly. Mr. Harrington stated that he appreciated the data-driven nature of the list and that, while some intuitive reordering could be done, the data presented to the Committee does not support reordering. Mr. Singleton agreed that the proposed ranking is in line with the library’s needs yet acknowledged that the University City library is currently inadequate to serve the needs of its customers.

Mr. Harrington asked if there were other locations in need of a library in future that do not appear on the list. Mr. Blair mentioned that areas in the southeastern and northwestern part of the County, as well as west of the airport should be considered in future CIP lists. Mr. Harrington observed that the committee appears confident with the makeup of the list. Mr. Keesler proposed to re-format the weighted ranking table to more clearly show the relative importance of the weighted criteria prior to the board meeting next Monday.

- **Construction Methodology for North County**
  Mark Hahn explained that, with regard to the North County Renovation project, Asset and Facility Management would consider two different construction methodology options. Design, Bid, Build (DBB) is one option while the other is to employ a Construction Management at Risk (CM@R). Mr. Hahn stated that AFM could manage the DBB process if required, as opposed to having a CM@R manage the process and receive a portion of the bid amount. Mr. Hahn noted that there are pros and cons to either, yet with regard to North County renovation, he did not anticipate the project being very complex at this time, which might support the DBB option. Mr. Blair mentioned that with the DBB process there would be cost savings involved and knowing that the budget for this project is between $4 and $5 million, it may be advisable to explore this option first. Mr. Hahn recommended hiring a professional cost estimator to assist with the estimation of the project as there are advantages to having a second recommendation or comparison. Ms. Rogers expressed that at this time she felt comfortable with the current proceedings and that she was working closely with AFM to target areas of concern. Mr. Blair mentioned that the HVAC has historically been an issue at North County Library and that these issues should be reviewed and possibly the unit relocated. Ms. Miller mentioned that conversations surrounding the HVAC are moving forward as the system is nearing the end of its lifespan.
• **North County Renovation RFQ update**
Becky Miller continued the conversation regarding the North County Library stating that both the Program Planner and Architecture/Engineer requests have been posted and the statement of qualifications are due in on November 10th. Approximately 35 responses have come in at this time and the timeline for shortlisting the bids has not changed. Mr. Harrington asked for and received clarification that the Architect/Engineer would be selected prior to the construction methodology, but this should not bear any weight with the selection of the Architect/Engineer. Jay Rhodes stated that if the decision of the construction methodology chosen was to use a CM@R, then another RFQ bid process would be required to select the CM@R, which may impact the timeline of the construction.

• **Board Advisement: Architect Selection Committee**
Mr. Harrington confirmed with Mr. Blair that the changes stipulated in the previous Infrastructure Committee meeting were incorporated in the updated version of the Architect Selection Committee documents. Mr. Blair stated that the changes were made however the document did not reflect them and that there is an updated version which he will distribute to the committee. Mr. Harrington confirmed that the Infrastructure Committee is comfortable with the recommendation to the board which authorizes Mr. Keesler to short-list the Architect/Engineer and Program Planner for the upcoming North County Library renovation. Ms. Miller clarified the process for shortlisting the firms, and Mr. Keesler asked whether the language should be changed to reflect County AFM’s role in the selection and authorization for the Architect/Engineer and Program Planner. Mr. Keesler recommended contacting the library’s lawyer about this language.

• **Morrison Update**
Ms. Miller began stating that early voting is now complete at the Morrison Regional Library and that County AFM and Barnhill had regained authority of the facility. The library’s legal representatives are reviewing the interior design portion of the contract provided by HBM with the intent to terminate that portion of the contract only. The final contract is close to its final completion and should be confirmed prior to the end of the year. The proposed reopening is still approximately fall of 2017. Mr. Keesler asked whether any value engineering was lost due to the facility being opened to the public for early voting. Ms. Miller stated that it was a nominal amount and would more than likely not be noticed in the overall project cost. Ms. Miller also stated that the transfer of budgeted funds from the North County Renovation budget has not been finalized however AFM is confident that it will not be more than the requested amount. Ms. Miller went on to say that she and Peter Wasmer with AFM reviewed the interior design proposal provided by HBM and that the library did not approve, and therefore the library would like to remove the interior design portion of the contact with the architect. The library’s legal team will review the contract and provide recommendations at which time the library and AFM may search for a replacement interior designer.

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at 11:45am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upcoming</th>
<th>November 14, 2016 12:00pm – 1:30pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Trustee Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>December 12, 2016 10:30am – 11:30am</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>