

Ottawa Public Library Board Meeting

Minutes 11

Tuesday, 1 December 2015

5:00 p.m.

Champlain Room, Ottawa City Hall, 110 Laurier Avenue West

Notes: 1. *Please note that these Minutes are to be considered DRAFT until confirmed by the Board.*

Notes: 2. *Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by the Board.*

Present: Chair: Tim Tierney
Vice-Chair: André Bergeron
Trustees: Steven Begg, Kathy Fisher, Allan Higdon,
Catherine McKenney, Scott Moffatt, Pamela Sweet,
Marianne Wilkinson

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest were filed.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes 10 - Tuesday, 10 November 2015

CONFIRMED

With unanimous consensus, the Board agreed to add Alternative Services Implementation Plan to the agenda.

CHAIR'S VERBAL UPDATE

Central Library

The external portion of the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) process is completed and garnered encouraging interest. The REOI package was downloaded by 110 different organizations, including major architectural, engineering, development, and construction companies from across North America. There were 15 responses and 14 Commercially Confidential Meetings (CCMs) held, which is an unusually large number and possibly the most for a capital project of this size. Staff are analyzing the information and will use the data to inform the recommendations regarding Stage two of the Board-approved implementation process. A Central Library Update on the Public Opinion Research Results will be brought forward at the January Board meeting, and a staff report on the next steps in the new year.

Syrian Refugees

The City is preparing to receive a number of Syrian refugees and Ottawa Public Library (OPL) staff are working with the City, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, as well as our settlement partners to assist the newcomers.

Action: Staff will continue to keep the Board posted on OPL's support in the assistance of welcoming the Syrian Refugee newcomers.

MOTION OPL 20151201/1

That the Ottawa Public Library Board receive the Chair's verbal update for information.

RECEIVED

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S VERBAL REPORT

Financial Literacy Day – Kelly Keehn Author Reading

OPL hosted an extremely well attended event on Financial Literacy Day on November 26 with guest author Kelly Keehn. Chair Tierney spoke to the audience about OPL's role in building financial literacy among Ottawans.

Another Extraordinary Year @OPL

In 2015, there were a number of accomplishments on Board driven files:

Central Library project:

- Successful public engagement sessions
- Identified as Board and Term of Council priority
- Officially a project

eBook Advocacy:

- Important file that joined together library groups on the Fair Pricing campaign and website launch
- City Council endorsement
- Leadership of Chair and support of the Board

The CEO thanked the Board for their guidance, wisdom, and unparalleled support for the library in making the system strong and vibrant. She looks forward to working with the Board in 2016, and wished the members and their families a safe, and happy holiday season. *The Board members were presented with some chocolates.*

On behalf of the Board, Chair Tierney thanked the CEO and the staff of the OPL for their dedication, and hard work.

MOTION OPL 20151201/2

That the Ottawa Public Library Board receive the CEO's report for information.

RECEIVED

REPORTS

1. ADOPTION OF OPL 2016 DRAFT BUDGET

OPLB-2015-0101

Danielle McDonald, CEO began with opening statements reminding the Board the purpose was to approve and recommend to Council, an

operating and capital budget for 2016. She discussed the recommendation on furthering the work required to develop a central library, asking that \$3.9M be approved to continue the planning requirements. The proposal was for the Board to fund \$1M, with the balance of \$2.9M coming from City Council. The CEO reminded the Board that they received the three-year capital forecast at the November meeting, and it was not up for discussion this evening.

Chair Tierney asked Monique Désormeaux, Deputy CEO to respond to two inquiries from the November board meeting.

With respect to an inquiry raised by Trustee Moffatt to the priorities listing, and where North Gower fit in, Ms Désormeaux advised that North Gower was one of eight facilities that were identified by the Board in May 2012, calling for renovations and a slight expansion. The priorities came with no funding, and were subject to move as opportunities presented themselves. Ms. Désormeaux reported that funds have been secured through the Friends of the Ottawa Public Library Association (FOPLA) to refurbish the branch in 2016, which includes new shelving, new desk, paint, and possibly carpeting.

With respect to Trustee Wilkinson's inquiry regarding meeting rooms at Beaverbrook Branch, Ms. Désormeaux stated that rates were aligned with those at the Mlacak Centre when the branch was re-opened as a larger facility to ensure the Library was not competing with the centre. She explained that when the two meeting rooms are rented out individually, the room is rented at the small meeting room rate; when the room is rented out as one large room, it is rented out at the medium room rate. The same holds true for the Nepean CentrepoinTE branch.

The Board heard from the following delegations:

Richard Van Loon, Rosemount Expansion and Development (READ) group,* noted that READ, and a group of representatives from seven community associations in the Rosemount catchment area were in attendance. He expressed concerns with the capital budgeting for the Rosemount branch. Mr. Van Loon said that until recently, relationships with the Board and staff had been good. He set out some facts about the

Rosemount branch stating that it very overcrowded and by any modern library standards, quite obsolete. Expansion as well as renewal is highly desirable. He noted that the Board had listed Rosemount as the top branch priority for the last four years but aside from an elevator replacement, nothing has happened. Meanwhile, six other branches have been renewed and/or expanded, all of which were lower than Rosemount on the priority list, and some promising opportunities had passed by. Mr. Van Loon asked that the Board reassert the priority of Rosemount expansion and development, and work in consultation with the community, to get actual costs estimates of the options for expansion as well as renewal, in time to consider for the 2017 budget. As well as complete the project in time for the 100th anniversary of Rosemount in 2018.

Chair Tierney commented that much staff effort has been put into exploring options: a leasing opportunity and submission to the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program (CIP 150). While neither were fruitful, he said that Rosemount remains a priority and looked forward to working with READ.

In response to a question from Trustee Moffatt regarding promising opportunities that had passed by Mr. Van Loon mentioned that the Chair pointed out a few, as well there were early discussions with Tamarack Developments.

Sophia Wong, Co-Chair, Connaught Public School Council*, spoke of the importance of the Rosemount branch to the Connaught Public School, the students, and the families. She was in support of the expansion and renewal, and provided a few examples of how the programming and the learning enhance the users' experience. She referenced areas for improvement such as increasing resources in other languages, and increasing or offering free programming as there is a high population of low-income families in the neighbourhood.

Megan Therrien and Jeannette Rule, Dalhousie Community Association (DCA) and Champlain Park Community Association (CPCA)*, (*Jeannette Rule was unable to attend*). The DCA and CPCA represent two of eleven Community Associations that sit on the READ Board. Ms. Therrien highlighted the importance of the Rosemount branch,

and provided her personal experiences. Historically, the community has many young families, low-income households, and new Canadians, all of which have special needs that a properly sized and equipped library can accommodate, but which Rosemount in its current form cannot. Both the DCA and the CPCA fully support the request previously put forward by READ.

Mike Pyndus*, spoke of the Central Library and various components of the project, such as the pre-definition and implementation phase. He said the full cost of the project is a significant factor, including space requirements. He wondered how staff derived the 130K square foot space as well as the 30K square foot minimum for the ground floor as it would have had an impact on the results of the business case. He expressed concerns with the functional programming, and the reduced height of the shelving from seven to five feet, as this would increase the cost and the size of the collection space by 40%. He had issues with moving forward without a commitment of funds, especially without a project charter or a project management plan. He asked that these questions be responded to via an access to information request he would be submitting.

Deirdre Foucauld and Sarah Anson-Cartwright, Bookmark the Core*, *(Sarah Anson-Cartwright did not speak)* spoke of the group's strong support of the City's decision to build a Central Library. Ms. Foucauld urged the Board and the City to include the public by engaging them in the two most critical decisions: location and design. The group looked at libraries in cities across North America run by municipal governments, and Library Boards in a design-bid-build approach. She said the City and the Board hold design competition, award the architectural and building contracts, and raise the funds to pay for the project. Every aspect of the project is under the control of the City and the Board. She was concerned that this was not the current approach taken for Ottawa's proposed Central Library. She said this matters because \$3.9M is a first funding request for the City's most significant civic project after the Light Rail Transit (LRT) during this term of Council. She expressed concerns about the most vital aspects of the project, and that the City has not consulted with the public about the location of the Central Library. The location has to draw people to visit, a vibrant and successful Central Library like those in other cities. She urged

the Board and the City to engage the public.

Alayne McGregor registered in advance to speak to the Board, she did not attend the meeting and no communications were received.

*[*Individuals / groups marked with an asterisk above either provided comments in writing or by email; all submissions are held on file with the CEO.]*

Prior to asking his questions to staff, Vice-Chair Bergeron noted the Board does see the need to work on Rosemount, and demonstrated such earlier in the year with support towards submitting an application to the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program (CIP 150), which was not successful.

In response to allocating development charges or levies in new areas where communities are already established, Ms. Désormeaux confirmed that there are opportunities for the community to obtain a special levy to raise funds, noting it would require the Councillor's support in the particular ward. In the past, community associations have also participated in raising funds, which was the case with the Constance Bay branch.

Trustee McKenney reminded staff that she would like to see more public consultation for the Central Library project as noted a few months ago.

She asked for details regarding the amount assigned in the budget estimate for analysis related to the exemplar site. Elaine Condos, Division Manager, Central Library Development project advised that there is less than \$300K allocated.

Trustee McKenney questioned why staff are doing anything with the exemplar site if it is not the preferred site. Ms. Condos replied that the work is needed to undertake planning studies that include a traffic study, servicing of the exemplar site, investigation into zoning, and official plan application, as well as the application fees. The work is required to test the viability of the site, and feed into the financial analysis that needs to be completed in order for the Board to make a decision on the next steps.

Trustee McKenney inquired what those next steps would be, why the

analysis is needed if the location is not yet known, and why a detailed traffic study is necessary. Robin Souchen, Manager, Realty Initiatives and Development, Real Estate Partnership and Development Office (REPDO) advised that the request is required as part of the process in moving forward with the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and the Request for Proposals (RFP). If 557 Wellington is not the end site, the money is not lost. The analysis will be used by REPDO in the potential disposal of the site to fund the library.

Trustee McKenney was skeptical as the traffic study and a full viability test for the exemplar site would not be needed unless it was the preferred site. Ms. McDonald, CEO explained that the site at 557 Wellington can be used as leverage to finance the project. Staff need to undertake the work to ensure that the property can be sold or used. The preferred site is not known at this time.

Trustee McKenney requested that a breakdown of the \$300K be issued to her prior to next week's Council meeting. Chair Tierney said that that would be taken as direction.

Trustee Wilkinson stated that there is money in the budget for planning at Rosemount. The community has a committee (READ) already established and asked if staff would find it feasible to work with the community group, and the ward councillor to keep this moving forward. Ms. McDonald pointed out that staff have been working with the group and in fact emailed the Feasibility Report to Mr. Van Loon in the spirit of cooperation.

Chair Tierney paused the dialogue and advised the public of the inaccurate media story, where the Rosemount study was referenced as a bootleg copy.

Ms. McDonald mentioned there are challenges with the site but there is planning money. She did not have any issues in continuing the dialogue with the community group.

Chair Tierney mentioned that there has been some misconception that the Board doesn't feel that Rosemount is important, but it is. It is difficult when the Library is land locked in a building that cannot go up nor wide, but

options will continue to be explored. Chair Tierney said that the tools of options, such as levies, have been discussed with the READ group. He understood that the group would like to expedite the process but the Library is constrained when it comes to budget. He reiterated that the Rosemount branch is a priority and something that staff will be focusing on in the future. Looking at the inside of the building is the next logical step but that is a decision that will be made at a future board meeting.

Action: Staff continue to work with the READ group and the ward councillor (Jeff Leiper) with respect to levies, and fundraising opportunities for the Rosemount branch.

In response to a question from Trustee Wilkinson regarding the proposed 2016 budget being less than the 2015 actual spent, Brenda Gorton, Account Manager, Financial Services Unit stated that the overspending in 2015 was a result of a one-time retroactive payout for the Pay Equity decision and the Library is expected to be on budget next year.

Mr. Souchen responded to questions from Trustee Wilkinson regarding the Central Library Development project and why the studies for the exemplar site, specifically the traffic study were needed at this particular time. He noted the traffic study is part of the overall Official Plan Mapping amendment zoning change. The zoning change is a larger, broader, highest invest-use, not necessary specific to the library but can be included in a library use. Trustee Wilkinson was concerned that the Board was paying for studies that are not actually for the Library and asked that staff provide more details.

As the question regarding the \$300K allocated for the exemplar site was raised by two Trustees, Chair Tierney directed staff as follows:

Direction to staff:

That staff provide the Board, in advance of the 9 December 2015 Council meeting, a breakdown of each component of planning studies regarding the \$300K allocated for the analysis for the exemplar site.

Trustee Wilkinson commended staff for the outstanding job on the budget.

Trustee Begg inquired about the impact on the materials budget as \$500K of it was being used for the \$1M contribution towards the Central Library project. Ms. Désormeaux advised that the budget requires choices when it comes to what is going to be funded. The two priorities for the Board are completing RFID implementation and moving forward on the Central Library Development project. She noted that normally, one-time funding would come from the reserve funds; however, the \$1M could not be taken from the reserve account because the Library would be operating with a deficit in 2015. That deficit flows through the reserves because the Library is not allowed to finish the year in a deficit situation. Ms. Désormeaux said that staff look to close out previous approved capital accounts with residual funding, using those funds for one-time funding. There was one dedicated specifically to the collection account. By reducing the overall materials budget of \$4.8M by \$500K, the library still has this capital account that can be spent to offset that \$500K resulting in no impact on the collection budget in 2016.

In response to questions on public consultation around the Central Library posed by Trustee Sweet, Ms. Condos advised that public engagement in 2016 will take a number of forms. The Central Library website will be refreshed and public engagement will be undertaken as part of the development of the functional program. Other engagement is not known yet as it is premature. Trustee Sweet inquired whether any of the \$3.9M was earmarked for 2017-2019. Ms. Condos stated that the \$3.9M is intended to complete the planning phase of the Central Library Development Project by the end of 2016, early 2017. There is no budget for 2017 and 2018 as it is too early in the process.

Trustee Higdon asked whether the library received the outstanding \$1.4M provincial grants for the upcoming year, as the provincial figures were behind. Ms. McDonald noted that they will be coming in shortly. Ms. Gorton advised that the provincial grant is a fixed amount that the library receives every year. The province changed the timing of the application process and the grant should be released sometime in December.

Action: Staff will keep the Board apprised once the provincial/federal grants that are approved.

In response to a question from Trustee Higdon regarding a dramatic drop in fine revenue and how the amounts set aside for anticipated revenue from fines is derived, Ms. McDonald advised that fines projection has been a problem for several years. The Library sends email notifications when materials are coming due, which has changed the behavior of customers. In addition, the Library does not collect fines from ebooks. The \$70K in the budget is to address the second year of the mitigation strategy. Ms. Désormeaux added that closing branches for the conversion to RFID has also impacted the accumulation of fines as fewer people are coming to the branch to pick up or return items. She noted that by moving to hourly increments for the rental of the meeting facilities across the branches may raise money to offset the drop in fine revenues.

Trustee Higdon joked that the Library should lighten up on the fine notification to help with revenues. Chair Tierney pointed out that others have been vocal about turning off that automated messaging system. In reference to a point made by Trustee Moffatt about looking at raising the fines, Chair Tierney said that the opportunity to discuss that in detail would be for another meeting but he directed the following:

Direction to staff:

That as part of the 2017 budget, staff review fees and fines with respect to tipping point for increased revenues.

In response to a question from Trustee Fisher regarding the debt financed “land acquisition legacy” item and whether there are conditions associated with the use of debt financing for any of the capital projects, Ms. Gorton identified that the debt financing shows up as such but debt is not issued until a project begins. There is no impact to the Library as it remains available on the budget. She said City Council is very specific about limits and rules around the amount of debt that can be issued. As the Library proceeds into the development of the Central Library, and should the City enter debt financing for the project, there would be interest charges that would accrue for which the Library would be responsible.

There being no further discussion, the report was carried as presented.

Chair Tierney thanked staff as 2015 brought the one-time pay equity and many other hurdles. He commended the Board members for working hard in the first year of their term. Many important questions were posed during the year and the length of meetings have shown that.

MOTION OPL 20151201/3

1. **That the Ottawa Public Library (OPL) Board approve the 2016 OPL Draft Operating and Capital Budget, and forward to City Council for consideration and final approval; and,**
2. **That the Board approve the draft funding request for \$3.9M to further the work required for the Central Library Development Project, and that in addition to OPL funds of \$1M for the project, the OPL request that Ottawa City Council fund the balance of \$2.9M from City reserves.**

CARRIED

With the consent of all members present and voting, pursuant to Section 21(3) of the Procedure By-Law (By Law January 1, 2015) the following item was added to agenda for consideration:

2. **ALTERNATIVE SERVICES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Trustee Begg mentioned that an Ad Hoc Working Group, of which he and Trustee Wilkinson are members, was struck to look at alternative services delivery. Meetings were conducted with OPL staff where impressive analysis had been provided and good options developed. The plan had been to bring a report to the Board in Q4 2015; however, more time is needed to complete consultation with Councillors and the library customers that may be impacted by these changes. Trustee Begg moved the following motion:

MOTION OPL 20151201/4

Moved by Trustee Steven Begg:

WHEREAS the OPL Board approved a staff recommendation to have

the Alternative Services Delivery Implementation Plan brought to the Board in Q4 2015; and,

WHEREAS the Ad-hoc Committee has met and agree that customer feedback and consultation is a necessary component to ensure the success of the implementation plan; and,

WHEREAS additional time is needed to conduct comprehensive and meaningful customer consultations,

BE IT RESOLVED that staff be directed to bring back the Alternative Services Implementation Plan by Q2 of 2016.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION OPL 20151201/5

Be It Resolved that the Ottawa Public Library Board meeting be adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary