

ANC 3E Special Committee  
June 15, 2007

Attendees:

**Anne Sullivan**, ANC 3E05  
**Carolyn Sherman**, ANC 3E03  
**Sue Hemberger**, Community Member  
**Armond Spikell** and **Susan Linsky** Roadside Development, LLC  
**Kristen Barden**, Executive Office of the Mayor  
**Talia Primor**, CM Cheh's Office  
**Nancy MacWood**, ANC 3C Chairperson  
**Cheryl Browning**, Tenleytown Neighborhood Association  
**Jane Waldmann**, CSTO  
**Frances Anderson**, St. Ann's Parish Council  
**John F. Ritchotte**, St. Ann's parish  
**Ginnie Cooper**, Head Librarian, DCPL

**Amy McVey**, ANC 3E01  
**Dan Carozza**, Community Member  
**Penni St. Hilaire**, Friends of the Tenley-Friendship Library  
**Cathy Wiss**, ANC 3F Chairperson  
**Jennifer Meuwissen-Rose** Ward 3 Vision  
**Deacon Whitaker**, St. Ann's Rectory,  
**Sherry Ettleson**, Janney School  
**Archie C. Williams**, DCPL

Main points of the meeting are as follows:

- Reconstruction of the Tenley-Friendship Library is fully funded (approximately \$16M) and the new facility will have at least 20,000 sq ft. of interior space. An architect has been selected and demolition is in process. The goal is to have the branch re-open in early 2010. The Library Board of Trustees is committed to moving forward with plans to build the library with as little delay as possible. They are highly motivated to produce new branch libraries for the four communities whose branches closed in 2003. But they are also concerned about equity among those branches. Making more ambitious plans (than the 20,000 SF budgeted for) is likely to lead to substantial delays. Using the political process to explore alternatives and seek out additional sources of funding "can make a project stretch out an incredibly long time."
- Ginnie Cooper has directed libraries systems in five different states over the past 30 years and has supervised the (re-)construction of somewhere between 50 and 60 buildings. She has pioneered mixed-use and public-private partnerships for library facilities. In her experience, public-private partnership always leads to delays and they never save the library money (in part because they always lead to delays and construction costs increase over time). Even when, as in this case, everyone is eager to expedite the process, delays occur because agreements need to be reached with everyone at every stage of the process (e.g. design, construction, occupancy).
- This doesn't mean that she's opposed to public-private partnerships. It's really up to the community. Will they get something out of it they value? In this case, the potential benefits to the library would be underground parking and the possibility of putting more library services on one floor (which would decrease staffing

costs). Unlike DCPS, DCPL can build more and use private funds to augment facilities. The LEAD legislation (which said that funds generated by sale or leases of library land (or development rights) must go to a special DCPL fund has never been implemented.

- The library always has to give something up in this type of project (e.g. ability to expand, loss of natural light in part of the building). That said, in her experience, existing libraries rarely get expanded – more typically, when a neighborhood grows, a whole new branch is built. And there are always some areas of a library where natural light isn't necessary (e.g. meeting rooms where videos may be shown, backroom operations.)
- John Ritchotte of St. Ann's asked Ms. Ettleson of the School Improvement Team if the SIT had approached other developers about this project. Ms. Ettleson said that Mr. Armond Spikell had initiated the approach to SIT and that the SIT had not publicized this PPP. There has been no open competitive bidding for the right to build this PPP nor has there been any attempt to solicit other ideas for a mixed-use project.

Ms. Ginnie Cooper spoke at length about the library in response to questions posed by the ANC 3E Special Committee, beginning with how the projected size of the library had been determined. There is no standard formula such as public school specifications based on student populations. High usage doesn't necessarily dictate a need for more space; rather, the space is dictated by the size of the area served. In DC, there are actually a generous number of branches because there are several very small libraries less than a mile apart. The four library projects that are to be built as soon as possible will each have at least 20,000 square feet of interior space in an equitable manner.

The optimum situation is to have as much of the library on one floor as possible, but there are configurations of library land that prevent that from happening. Staffing costs account for approximately 65 to 70% of the budget. But there's not much difference between the staffing costs for a 20,000 SF library and a 35,000 SF library, assuming that you can have almost everything on a single floor. The rest of the budget is normally 10 to 15% on collections, and the rest goes for travel, training, and special programs.

Ms. Cooper said that for the new library, the cost of underground parking spots would be typically be about \$35,000 per space and probably even more here given the small footprint of the building (which will mean that ramps and lane consume a greater % of underground space than they would in a larger facility). Without a ppp, it will be difficult to get many more parking spots than the former library had, but Ms. Cooper said that the same amount or even few spots would be fine due to the library's proximity to Metro.

When asked what DCPL had done differently this time to ensure timely replacement of the branches, Ms. Cooper said they budgeted enough money (3x as much), will issue separate contracts for each project (rather than bundle them as they did last time), and they will not be using design-build contracts this time.

The four new branches will all be larger than the previous ones. The community members have expressed their understanding of just how important a community library is, and especially in the case of the four library projects, people have a right to be angry that they have been without a library for so long. The Board of Trustees of DCPL wants to deliver these libraries as soon as possible. The Board members are very concerned about any delays which would delay the library opening past 2010. Significant delays could mean higher construction costs due to rising costs of materials and/or labor. The high water table at the Tenley Library and the tightness of the site will add to the cost of the building.

A specific question about the possibility of an exterior gathering space was asked. Ginnie envisions a library with a prominent entrance and lots of light, although some areas of a library, such as staff workrooms and meeting rooms, do not necessarily need light. Today's libraries must serve as a meeting place for the community. Many of the details about the building will be determined through the planning and "hopes and dreams" meetings, scheduled to be this summer. Information from an initial meeting will be given to the architect to start designing the building. The architect will return to the community with a concept plan for further refinement. Altogether, there will be four community meetings.

DCPL has selected an architect for the project and is awaiting confirmation by the DC Council. All architectural firms considered had mixed use and library experience, although not all architects had mixed use with library experience.

It is important for a specialized architect to design the library and determine how it can interface with another use. DCPL will expect to get the elements of its building that it wants. A mixed use project poses some difficulties, such as noise and water penetration, and will require a number of agreements on such things as apportionment of costs and tasks like shoveling snow.

The Library Board of Trustees has said that it is up to a developer to show a preponderance of community support. This is important because building a mixed use project without community support can lead to problems and law suits.

In response to a concern about protecting the children from the residential building traffic, Ms. Cooper suggested that it's best to have a wide separation and different entrances for each use of the building.

Armond said that the project would likely need to go through the PUD process which would delay it by anywhere from 6 months to a couple years. Frances Anderson made note that the project would not benefit St. Ann's in any way so her main concern was to protect the church and school; the stained glass windows, the underground water, etc.

Amy McVey asked Armond if the PUD process could provide amenities to St. Ann's even if it is a religious institution. Armond said that they could provide amenities to St. Ann's.

Dan Carozza, who gained in-depth experience while working with SWW/GW, observed that this process seems to be one in which people are looking at this opportunity as "here is the money; what can we build for that amount?" He said it should be the other way around: "Here are our needs – (DCPS) give us the money we need."

Armond Spikell spoke up to say that speed was important because the costs could rise including steel and other supplies as well as labor especially if immigration reform is pushed through.

Anne Sullivan mentioned that a resident of CityLine and Council Member Cheh task force member stated at that task force meeting that he wanted to see more parking put into any building. He has one car parked in CityLine and has parked another on a neighborhood street.

Carolyn Sherman asked if this project was going to be "fast-tracked." Armond said that it could be and explained that fast tracked means that the project could be in phase 1 before they even start phase 2. Carolyn also asked about a feasibility study. Armond said that would come later in the process. The committee asked that a feasibility study, to include the use of educational specifications, be performed before a decision is made.

Sue Hemberger praised Ms. Cooper's record of insisting on green building practices for libraries and for high levels of finish. She asked both Ms. Cooper and Mr. Spikell to start from the premise that the library's involvement should raise standards for the whole building rather than allowing cost factors associated with the residential component to lower standards. A discussion of the city's green building law ensued and the consensus seemed to be that so many points were built into the site, that LEED "certified" would be too low a standard for this project. Cooper also indicated that LEED gave some points for things that really didn't have much environmental impact and she was inclined to take a more substantive approach.

Sherry Ettleson was asked by Mr. Ritchotte if the SIT had considered the issues of using the public alley behind St. Ann's as an entrance to the buildings if St. Ann's did not grant the project an easement. She said the SIT committee hadn't gone into that level of detail. So, no, they had not ruled out using the alley, which is heavily used by children, as an entrance way.

Mr. Ritchotte pointed out to Armond that any loading would have to have the least negative impact. Jack reminded the committee that there are many types of trucks which must be considered; garbage, fire, ambulance, moving, delivery, etc.

Mr. Ritchotte then pointed out that:

(a) about half the length of the alley was less than two cars wide so that automobiles usually waited in the wider areas for oncoming cars to pass,

(b) the eastern edge of the alley was “one car length plus two or three feet from classroom doors,” and

(c) the alley was used by Janney children and by AU students as well as by Saint Ann’s children and parents, thereby contradicting Ms. Cooper’s desired situation of having a wide separation between the projects.

The meeting concluded with the announcement of the ANC 3E Special Committee community meeting that will be held on Monday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM at St. Columba’s Church.