Call to Order
Gerding called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Virginia G. Young Room of the Columbia Public Library.

Roll Call and Determination of Quorum
A quorum of members was present.

Public Comment
There was no comment from the public in attendance.

Approval of Minutes
Gerding asked for changes or corrections to the minutes from November 10, 2011. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as written.

Preliminary December Financial Report of the CLD Debt Service Fund
There were no questions or comments about the preliminary report.

Preliminary December Financial Report of the CLD Building Fund
Gerding asked how the fund generated investment interest of nearly $12,000. Smith explained that, at the end of December 2010, the library booked an unrealized loss to move its investments up to market. To do that, Smith had to record a decrease in cash held and an increase in interest income of the same amount. The action is reversed the next year and the accounts will reflect the true cash balances. Smith said he does not yet have the market value for December 2011. Gerding asked what library investment had market risk, and Smith replied that treasury securities and other investments backed by the federal government do have market value.

Old Business
CPL South Parking Lot: Bolton reviewed the changes that would occur if the proposed reconfiguration of the parking lot is accepted. The south drive would be widened to allow vehicles to both enter and exit. The north drive would be restricted with a truck apron.

The first aisle of parking would be closed at the north end, which would result in the loss of two spaces. A “speed table” would be added between the curb at the closed north end of the first aisle and the stairs. In total, five parking spaces would be eliminated.

Bolton stated that the turning radii of large vehicles such as the Community Bookmobile and school buses had been checked using a computer modeling program. He displayed drawings showing the route those vehicles would take to travel through the lot and said he is confident that they will have no trouble entering via the south drive and maneuvering through the turns. The largest tractor-trailers will have to enter via the north drive and mount the truck apron. Bolton
stated that removable bollards could be placed at the east end of the truck apron so that it is clear to passenger vehicles that they should not turn into the north drive.

Carr asked if garbage and recycling trucks would be able to use the south drive and if there would be any concern with the weight of those vehicles. Bolton replied that the size of the vehicles should not be a problem, but weight is not taken into consideration in this modeling. He noted that the city may be able to provide alternate vehicles if the currently-used garbage trucks cannot easily access the lot after reconfiguration. In response to a question, Bolton noted that the computer modeling program is conservative and he is very confident that the vehicles they modeled would be able to make the turns in the reconfigured parking lot.

Gerding asked if the angle to enter the south drive would be the same as the current entrance, and Bolton said it would be. He also confirmed for her that patrons could exit using either drive. Barrett asked if Bolton had concerns about the amount of potential interaction between the trash trucks and pedestrians or vehicles backing out from parking spaces. Bolton said that, by entering and driving along the south side of the lot, the trucks will likely encounter fewer pedestrians than they do on their current route along the north side of the lot.

Richards expressed his concern that the proposed south entrance and closed-off first aisle will be confusing to patrons and result in traffic jams, or worse, accidents at the top of the entrance. He also noted that the retaining wall along the east edge of the lot currently restricts visibility as you are exiting the lot via the south drive. Richards wondered if the restricted visibility added to two-way traffic would result in accidents. Bolton stated that patrons should be able to tell at the top of the entrance whether or not there are any spaces available in the first aisle before they commit to turning right. However, if they do need to back up and turn around after driving up that aisle, the space at the top of the drive is large enough to permit that maneuver. He noted that part of the retaining wall may need to be removed to address the issue of drivers being able to see each other as they are entering and exiting. In response to a question, Bolton noted that the proposed changes would make the south entrance 26 feet wide. The current entrance is 30 feet wide.

Gerding asked if it was necessary to lose the two spaces at the top of the first aisle. Bolton noted that the changes make it easier for vehicles to back out and turn around, and the curbs that will be constructed create a “pedestrian refuge” – an area where patrons can be out of the way of traffic while they wait to cross. He added that he did look at a configuration in which the first aisle was unchanged, but it would not reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflict to the same degree as the current version.

Webber asked about what materials are used to construct the speed table. Bolton said they are usually a 2-inch face and 1-inch curb of concrete, and he would recommend an asphalt fill although it could also be done with concrete. Webber suggested a speed table also be installed at the crosswalk at the bottom of the ramp, and Gerding voiced her support.

Smith asked about the ease of access for emergency vehicles, particularly if bollards are installed at the east end of the truck apron. Bolton replied that the Fire Department would likely hold a set of keys to the bollards, which would be agreed upon during their review of changes to the fire lane.

Richards asked if there was the possibility of incorporating slanted parking spaces and/or one-way aisles in the plans. Bolton said that the ideas could be incorporated, but slanted parking spaces would likely mean the loss of more spaces, and one-way aisles would mean that patrons could only use one drive as an exit, rather than both drives.

Bolton raised the subject of adding a sidewalk along the south drive, but noted that such a sidewalk would likely only be used by people who park in the lot and walk to Grant Elementary.
Groshong noted that parents park along the east side of Garth in the afternoon to pick up children from Grant Elementary, and asked if those vehicles will be a problem if the main entrance and exit is relocated. She also pointed out that the crosswalk sign could be an obstacle and that more traffic will be driving over the crosswalk. Bolton stated that, from an engineer’s point of view, the crosswalk is not in a good location and that the logical spot for a crosswalk is at the corner. Carr noted that she had discussions with former Grant Elementary personnel about moving the crosswalk, and they were not fruitful. She added that, as the library is not open at that time, she has not asked that parents refrain from using the library’s south lot when dropping off children before school begins.

Jones asked if the book drops would remain in the same location after a reconfiguration. Carr replied that staff are discussing the issue and noted that the book drops must be moved during the lot resurfacing, so there may be an opportunity to place them in the north lot and let them remain there after patrons get used to using them in that location. There are numerous questions about convenience, logistics and safety that are yet to be answered.

Bolton reviewed the cost of the project and noted that the $25,000-50,000 quote does not include a monumental sign, granite work for the retaining wall, removal and re-installation of light fixtures, landscaping and, if applicable, the cost associated with meeting the City’s storm water ordinance. He informed the board that changes to the storm water ordinance may be presented in April and could cause both the lot reconfiguration and lot resurfacing project to be exempt, saving the library a great deal of cost. If the ordinance is not amended, the library could still seek exemption for these projects.

Carr stated that she and St. John had reviewed comments about parking in response to two open-ended questions on the 2011 Community Survey. The first question was “What do you like LEAST about your library?” Of 438 answers, 54 mentioned parking (specifically, the size of spaces and lack of spaces). The second question was “If the library could make one improvement, what should it be?” Of 427 responses, 47 suggested improving parking in fairly general terms. No patrons mentioned cars stacking on Garth or safety concerns. Carr also reminded the board that there have been no pedestrian-vehicle accidents in the lot’s history. St. John added that the building is only ten years old, and negative perception of changes to the parking lot may revive negative public sentiment from the time of the building’s construction. Smith added that the public may not see a correlation between benefits gained by a reconfiguration and the cost of the project. St. John added that it is inevitable that patrons will be upset during the resurfacing due to being inconvenienced, but if they are not happy with the result of a reconfiguration, the negative feeling will be carried forward.

Richards stated that he is worried about accidents with the proposed reconfiguration. He added that he would like to see the ramp’s practicality emphasized in a physical, visual way, perhaps including a sheltered area at the bottom for waiting patrons.

Jones asked if there was a way to quantitatively compare patron safety with the current configuration versus the proposed configuration, and Bolton said there was not.

Gerding stated that there are compelling arguments for going ahead or not. She asked for statements from those interested in recommending the new configuration to the full Board of Trustees.

Baka stated that she was in favor of the reconfiguration because it solves the problem of people turning in and stopping at the bottom of the stairs. Jones said that he is in favor of getting traffic away from the stairs; he expressed his support for proactively making changes to decrease the potential for accidents to occur. Webber said that he believes the lot’s main safety issues are concentrated in front of the stairs, including the possibility of rear-ending another car. He said he
believes a great number of people have safety concerns about driving through the south lot. Groshong asked if it was an option to keep the first aisle open on the north end. Bolton produced a drawing showing that option and noted that the potential conflicts in front of the stairs would not be significantly reduced in that scenario because more cars would travel through the first aisle and likely pull in front of the stairs to drop off patrons. Jones asked if the “pedestrian refuge” and speed table could be moved to the west side of the first aisle if that aisle is not closed off, and Bolton said it could be, although two more parking spaces on the west side of the stairs would have to be eliminated to provide a safe curb for pedestrians to cross to.

Sievert asked that the lot resurfacing include some of the “smaller” ideas, like new signage. Breyfogle suggested painted arrows on the new surface.

Gerding asked for statements from those who would not recommend the new configuration to the full Board of Trustees. Richards said that there is no accident history, the staff are not in favor of the reconfiguration and there is no consensus among the CLD Board, so he would not recommend the changes. Sievert stated that she could not support the loss of five parking spots.

Groshong suggested re-approaching Grant Elementary leadership to ask that they move their crosswalk to the corner of Garth and Crestmere.

ACTION: Jones moved, Baka seconded recommending the entrance modifications to the full Board of Trustees. A vote was taken by show of hands. The motion passed 4-3.

Parking Lot Resurfacing: Smith stated that the staff has received new information since the October 10, 2011 presentation of options for the parking lot resurfacing. Specifically, staff received word that the thickness of the concrete in the south parking lot is why it has failed, and probably not solely due to the unique geological conditions of the soil. The concrete was poured six inches deep, as requested, but eight inches is likely necessary to prevent similar damage in the future. Furthermore, staff have learned that the price of asphalt is rising. However, the asphalt overlay would likely take less time to complete, meaning the lot would be closed for fewer days. Therefore, staff recommend the board authorize staff to bid both asphalt overlay and total concrete replacement. This will allow staff to gather more specific information about the potential costs as well as the time difference for completing either procedure, and allow the board to make a more informed decision about the parking lot resurfacing. Consulting fees associated with this recommendation are estimated at $200. In response to a question, Smith said he did not expect the same company to bid on both asphalt resurfacing and total concrete replacement.

ACTION: Sievert moved, Breyfogle seconded requesting bids for both asphalt resurfacing and total concrete replacement for the south parking lot. The motion passed.

Smoking Policy: Barrett stated that the policy went into effect in January 2011 with very few issues. Patrons adapted quickly. She related an incident occurred last week which involved residents of Crestmere Avenue: a man was standing on the sidewalk staring at one of the houses and when police drove by to ask about his intentions, the man stated that he went to that spot to smoke so he would not be facing the school on Garth. Neighbors told staff that they have seen the same man there on more than one occasion. Carr told the board that the neighbors are concerned that the library’s smoking policy may be pushing smokers and their debris into the neighborhood, and the neighbors asked the board to consider creating a designated smoking area on the CPL property.

In response to a question from Sievert, Carr said that the request was not from the neighborhood association. Webber asked if this has been the only incident of its kind, and Carr said that it is the only one brought to the attention of library staff.
Gerding stated that the neighbors’ concerns are understandable. She asked if the Buildings and Grounds staff could occasionally check that sidewalk for debris and Carr said the staff are willing to do that. Gerding asked that staff keep the board apprised of any further developments or similar incidents.

**New Business**
There was no new business.

**Miscellaneous**
There was no miscellaneous business.

**Public Comment**
No members of the public were in attendance.

**Adjournment**
There being no further business, Gerding adjourned the meeting at 6:55 P.M.

Minutes recorded by Amanda Burke, DBRL staff.

______________________________
Jim Jones, Board Secretary