

Ottawa Public Library Board Meeting

Minutes 17

Tuesday, 12 July 2016

5:02 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 16 - Tuesday, 14 June 2016

CONFIRMED

CHAIR'S VERBAL UPDATE

There was no update provided.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

There was no update provided.

REPORTS

1. CENTRAL LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT: SITE EVALUATION PROCESS

OPLB-2016-0171

Chair Tierney stated that site evaluation criteria process is a critical decision point to select the best possible location for the future Central Library.

He noted that if the Board was unable to approve the criteria in the time allotted, that another date and time for a continuation of the meeting was secured. He reminded the Board that they approved a new build option in June 2015, and that staying at the current site at 120 Metcalfe Street was not an option.

Chair Tierney turned the presentation to Danielle McDonald, CEO who began by introducing the team that contributed to the development of the report.

The CEO said the purpose of the meeting is to approve recommendations aimed at selecting a site and advancing the request for a new Central Library. She pointed out that the Site Selection Process is multi-stepped, unique to Ottawa, and built using expertise, public input, and best practices. Ms. McDonald and Deloitte representatives, Bing Bing Wang and Sam Pickering, provided an overview of the Central Library Development Project: Site Evaluation Process. *(Held on file with the Chief Executive Officer)*

Key highlights of the presentation:

- Provided context on the staged implementation four-step process;
- Detailed the project planning process;
- Gave a high-level overview of the site selection process and timelines;
- Explained that Deloitte developed the draft criteria using various inputs;

- Explained the two sets of criteria and associated weightings (OPL stand-alone facility and an OPL-LAC joint facility), providing examples of how public input was used in the development of the criteria;
- Detailed the need for further due diligence; and,
- Summed up the final recommendations.

The CEO mentioned that staff will come back to the Board via an in-camera meeting in August to provide results of rankings as there are both publicly- and privately-held sites, and public disclosure could compromise the competitive process.

The Board heard from the following delegations:

Ms. Emilie Taman, Bookmark the Core, Citizens for a Central Library in Downtown Ottawa expressed concerns with the weighting criteria vis-à-vis public input, and the Central Area definition being combined with “downtown.” Ms. Taman said the PACE report mentioned that the Central Library needed to be located in a densely-populated or frequented Central Area, as being ‘in the heart of the city’, ‘where people work and play’. She questioned the higher weighting referencing the Nanos Report with respect to “Easy to get to by public transit” versus “Easy to get to by walking.” She said the staff report suggests that greater weight will be given to sites that are near a new Light Rail Transit (LRT) station, and asked that greater weight be given to walkability. Ms. Taman expressed concern that the project would become a Public Private Partnership and mentioned that Bookmark the Core would be contacting local Members of Parliament to voice their concerns. Ms. Taman concluded by saying the project is a critical piece of infrastructure that should not be influenced by development appeal.

Bruce Morgan* expressed interest in a robust and inclusive process that leads to a new Central Library that meets the needs of its constituency. He stated that for the most part, the site selection criteria is subjective, placing faith in the Site Evaluation Committee to apply those criteria to candidate sites. He observed that the screening criteria had 60% of the weight placed on accessibility and a location in the Central Area, and 40% to site physical attributes. Mr. Morgan was concerned with the point allocation of ‘Accessible by walking and cycling’ compared to ‘Accessible by public transit.’ He

indicated this was at odds with the research conducted by Nanos in December 2015. He suggested that the weighting for accessibility between walking and transit be equal, if not greater for walkers. Mr. Morgan touched on the detailed assessment criteria, saying that the primary user interests (accessibility and location) are only captured in the screening factors and then carried forward if a site passes the screening. As such, the proposed weighting places too much emphasis on city planning, building, and contextual suitability at the expense of greater consideration of accessibility and location.

Yves Potvin* spoke to location as being one of the most important criteria in a Central Library, after the size and quality of that library's resources. He questioned the Board's definition of Central Area, and proposed that it be redefined to include the northern part of Centretown, bounded by Bronson Avenue, Somerset Street West, Elgin Street, and Gloucester Street. He provided personal examples of ideal sites, acknowledging the best sites may not be for the rest of the city, but for those likely to access the facility on foot.

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

Questions from the Board were then put to staff.

In response to a question from Trustee McKenney regarding the weighting allocated for 'S-5 – Accessibility by public transit' versus 'S-6 – Accessibility by walking and by cycling,' Mr. Pickering advised that accessibility encompasses more than just walking and the considerations behind weighting had several inputs into the process: public engagement, city policies, city-wide resources, local branch, etc. He said the multi-million dollar LRT project is the City's biggest priority and according to Board direction, the Central Library had to be in close proximity to it. Mr. Pickering noted that Bookmark the Core referenced the PACE and Nanos reports where the emphasis is on all forms of access, looking at transit and LRT combined to provide accessibility. He said walking was also encompassed in 'S-7 – Proximity to the cultural and administrative centre of the City.'

Dr. David Gordon, Director, School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen's University [a member of the Site Evaluation Committee] added that best

practices may be considered, looking at users of tomorrow versus today. He noted that the city has a transit service where citizens are underserved. He pointed out that the citizens of Ottawa may not recognize the impact of good transit; that is, having a high-quality transit service brings more people into a catchment area than walking or cycling would. He mentioned that a high-quality LRT system would be a game changer. Dr. Gordon wasn't surprised by the Nanos report regarding transit facts, citing the significant increase in library use in Montreal at the Bibliothèque et archives nationales du Québec (BanQ), by co-locating the library with a transit station with high LRT usage in a location that was considered to be peripheral of the downtown, and yet attracts people worldwide. He indicated that the three million visitors a year at BanQ was far higher than anything imagined. Dr. Gordon said OPL's timing couldn't be better, noting Calgary and Vancouver came to the conclusion that people use LRT as a horizontal elevator.

Trustee McKenney cautioned that with the increase in transit fares, many people will not take the train for three stops. She asked staff to explain the rationale of the point allocation for S-5 in comparison to S-6, in particular to the sites east of Bronson. Mr. Robin Souchen, Manager, Realty Initiatives and Development, Real Estate Partnership and Development Office (REPDO) indicated that public transit scale is weighted by distance. Zones are established to reflect proximity.

Trustee McKenney indicated agreement with the proposed weighting, however, found it difficult to not find a site on the map that isn't walkable or cyclable. She asked if a site on top of an LRT station would get higher rating than that of a site a block away. Mr. Souchen said those further would score slightly lower.

Trustee Wilkinson had questions regarding 'S-5, S-6, and S7, on the nuance of the criteria, how they will be used, the use of judgement, and whether transit is segregated out of walking and cycling. Ms. Elaine Condos, Division Manager, Central Library Development Project said that transit is not segregated; S-7 includes transit, walking, and cycling.

Trustee Wilkinson had concerns with LRT ridership and how the four LRT stations would differ from one another. Mr. Souchen indicated that a walkability test will be done with the detailed mapping of candidate sites relative to the LRT stations. Trustee Wilkinson asked how that will be

determined or measured for walking. Dr. Gordon pointed out that city geographic information system (GIS) provides actual walking distances as well as how many people work and live in the area.

Trustee Wilkinson said the weighting for those criteria is a contentious decision, and inquired whether S-5 and S-6 criteria could be analyzed at a 20/20 split. Mr. Peter Woods, the Fairness Commissioner, commented that there were no issues doing that analysis. Mr. Souchen added that a mathematical sensitivity analysis for information purposes could be done.

Ms. McDonald asked if this direction would impact the process timelines. Ms. Wang advised that as part of the evaluation process, if the weighting is changed during the sensitivity analysis, they will look at it on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Pickering added that 20/20 split proposal is not a critical part for the timelines; however, if the ranking changes, each would have to be looked at.

Direction to staff:

That the Site Evaluation Committee undertake a sensitivity analysis for information purposes on Screening Assessment Criteria S-5 – Accessibility by public transit (25 points), and S-6 – Accessibility by walking and by cycling (15 points), using adjusted weightings of 20 points for each criterion for this purpose, for both an OPL stand-alone facility, and an OPL-LAC joint facility.

Vice-Chair Bergeron asked to confirm that the Board is to approve the 25/15 proposal and that the 20/20 split direction would only be for information. Chair Tierney confirmed.

Trustee Sweet asked why the current boundary is important (i.e. going to Gloucester and not further south) and the importance of LRT in this decision. Mr. John Smit, Manager, Policy Development and Urban Design, Planning and Growth Management Department pointed out that the Central Area is the boundary that the Board approved. He noted that a Secondary Plan is in development, which will re-look at the Central Area boundary, with the intention to broaden it. This will occur as part of the next Official Plan exercise. As for the LRT importance, he indicated that with mixed-use centres, and more residential areas in surrounding communities, people will be investing in the city because of transit. Mr. Smit added that Lebreton Flats was always seen as

part of downtown, which is on the horizon and will allow the city to refocus streets. Downtown Moves is working on downtown being more pedestrian friendly with less congestion, and as planning evolves it will recapture downtown streets to enhance life in the city, keeping downtown engaged. He said he can see Little Italy and Chinatown being part of downtown.

In response to Trustee Sweet's question on the analysis of current and future populations, and time span of the projections, Mr. Smit said they have numbers to support the work. He mentioned that with the federal government leaving the core, private sector development will occur and transform downtown. Dr. Gordon pointed out that the timeframe should depend on how long you think the new Central Library should last.

Trustee Begg asked how the percentage in scoring for each criteria was going to work; specifically, will the weighting be scaled back depending on first rank, second rank, etc. Ms. Condos explained that the percentages regarding sufficient site area will accommodate the functional building program and will be converted from percentages into points. Mr. Pickering added that they are developing an evaluation framework to ensure consistency.

Further to a question from Trustee Begg regarding denying a site if it had encumbrances, Ms. Condos stated that a certain judgement would be used in the evaluation, and remediation can be considered for a site if it is the best value for money. Mr. Souchen added that a range of factors are required for demolishing a building. Trustee Begg asked how cyclability would be factored into S-6 criterion, Ms. Condos said that details will be developed by Deloitte for safe cycling, for dedicated cycling paths, for multi-use paths, and that National Capital Commission properties protecting cycling will score higher.

Vice-Chair Bergeron said it is recommended that three sites be on the short-list, however, if there was an additional fourth site, would the Evaluation Committee consider it in the mix. Ms. Condos responded in the affirmative, saying that there will be guidelines to move forward but also will need flexibility, hence to check in with the Board in August.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Bergeron regarding comments from the Fairness Commissioner on the composition of the Evaluation Committee, Mr. Woods expressed the utmost confidence in the group, indicating he was

impressed by the committee's experience and breadth of knowledge.

As the scoring will be an important element in the evaluation framework, Trustee Fisher asked the team to provide some views as to what will be measured in the scoring considerations to determine the economic impact. Mr. Pickering advised that some will be binary, objective, and subjective. He said that overall guidelines will be provided for the subjective scoring and prescriptive scoring would rely on members' judgement. Mr. Pickering advised that everyone will have a say but a consensus will be taken.

In response to a question from Trustee Higdon on whether options will be presented to the Board at the August meeting, Ms. Condos said that staff will present site rankings with up to six possible sites, three for an OPL stand-alone facility and three for an OPL-LAC joint facility.

Trustee McKenney asked how the criterion 'D5-Contextual Suitability' in the Detailed Assessment Criteria Summary will be compared, asking if it will include how many residents and employees are in the area today versus 25 years from now. Mr. Smit mentioned that they will look at existing and future numbers, and what the character and image of the area may look like into the future. He said there will be a lens for each, which will have a degree of value. He noted that it will be discussed during the Evaluation Criteria Framework. Ms. Condos added that demographic data will also be provided to the Evaluation Committee.

In response to a question posed by Trustee McKenney as to what 'D6 – Proximity to existing or planned government institutional facilities that are complementary in terms of function and use' will look like and what the catalyst economic driver outcome for the library will be, Mr. Smit pointed out that the site should allow for significant City-building to be realized. Looking at the history of central libraries, they can bring positive changes in parts of the city where this would not happen if the library wasn't there.

In response to a comment from Trustee McKenney that the economic driver is not LRT because the library would enhance any area it may be in, Mr. Smit said the driver is looking to attract other investment opportunities. Ms. Condos added that this has been evident in other cities, citing the regeneration of an area or development (e.g. Vancouver, Halifax, Salt Lake City). She noted that

developers may want to build residences, retailers like being where people are, and central libraries are seen as desirable neighbours.

Chair Tierney closed the questions to staff by recognizing the Board for reaching this milestone, with commitment and dedication in ensuring the best possible process is undertaken to bring a new Central Library to the city. He thanked OPL staff, the employees of the partners at the City, as well as the consultants and committee members who worked on this step of the process.

Chair Tierney said that the City is making a significant investment in LRT and recognized the Mayor for his support.

Trustee Sweet then asked to move an amendment to the recommendation.

MOTION OPL 20160712/1

Moved by Trustee Sweet:

That the Ottawa Public Library Board amend recommendation 3 to read August 16, 2016.

CARRIED

There being no further discussion, the report recommendations were put before the Board and were CARRIED, as amended.

MOTION OPL 20160712/2

That the Ottawa Public Library Board:

- 1. Approve site evaluation criteria including associated weightings for the Central Library Development Project, as further described in this report; and,**
- 2. Authorize staff to commence the site evaluation process; and,**
- 3. Direct staff to report back to the Board on the results of Stage 1 of the Site Evaluation Process at a Board meeting to be held on 16 August 2016.**

CARRIED, as amended

Chair Tierney mentioned that staff committed to releasing the sites publicly once the criteria was approved. He said that in the interest of transparency, he asked to Board to approve a direction to the CEO to release the list of candidate sites by the end of day Wednesday, July 13, 2016.

Directions to staff:

That staff release publicly by end of day Wednesday, 13 July 2016, the Candidate Sites and map that will be evaluated in the search for the best possible location for the new flagship Central Library.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION OPL 20160712/3

Be It Resolved that the Ottawa Public Library Board meeting be adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary