TO:       HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM:     CITY MANAGER       DEPARTMENT:   LIBRARY
DATE:     OCTOBER 23, 2006     CMR: 400-06

SUBJECT:  REQUEST FOR COUNCIL DIRECTION ON FINAL LIBRARY SERVICE
MODEL ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (LSMAR) REPORT TO BE ISSUED
ON DECEMBER 4, 2006

Staff recommends that the City Council approve the proposed report structure for the Library
Advisory Commission’s (LAC) final LSMAR report and provide direction to both staff and the
LAC regarding the expectations for the report. Staff also recommends that completion of two of
the earlier directives from the City Council to the LAC be rescheduled for the reasons outlined in
the Discussion section below. These directives are: 1) to determine methods to reduce operating
costs and 2) to outline what would need to happen at the libraries if no funding for the
recommendations can be approved.

BACKGROUND

In December 2004, the City Council directed the Library Advisory Commission to “recommend
a strategy for creating a full-service library at the existing or another site; a strategy to include
maintaining neighborhood facilities and distributed services; to maintain collection services; and
to … recommend a redefinition of branch services.” Since that time, the LAC and staff have
worked to develop this strategy, now called the “Library Service Model Analysis and
Recommendations (LSMAR).”

The LAC presented a draft of the LSMAR report and recommendations to the Council on May

The Council conceptually approved these key concepts in the draft report:

- Maintain all current library locations;
- Expand and/or improve access to services and collections and seek technological and
  other efficiencies; and
• Upgrade Mitchell Park library services from branch library resource levels without downgrading the Main Library.

The Council stated that existing General Fund revenues shall not grow (other than inflation) to cover any library improvements, but rather, the additional required funding for non-capital and operating costs should come from a parcel tax or another non-General Fund source.

Given this principle, the Council directed the LAC and staff to:
• Determine methods to reduce operating costs;
• Determine how big Mitchell Park Library would need to be;
• Determine facilities growth requirements (if any) at other libraries;
• Be explicit about service levels at Main assuming that the Main Library will continue to serve adults, teens and children;
• Maintain 4th and 5th grade services at Children’s Library;
• Prepare preliminary cost models/projections/estimates for capital and staffing needs;
• Develop scaled versions of the recommendations with costs;
• Identify strategy and funding for increasing collections;
• Provide more analysis of strategies related to City/School partnerships; and
• Outline what would need to happen at the libraries if no funding for the recommendations can be approved.

Since the May meeting, staff and the LAC have worked to create a framework for addressing these directions. The LAC has held public meetings every two weeks since July to address specific focus areas of the LSMAR. The LAC has also formed an Ad Hoc Committee to address Mitchell Park site planning issues. This committee is part of the Space Study Project Management Team working with Group 4 Architecture to develop site and space recommendations for Mitchell Park. Group 4 will also evaluate costs for adding group study and program rooms to the Main Library and the cost for moving Technical Services and Library Administration to the Mitchell Park Library. The working schedules for the LSMAR and the Space Study are included with this report as Attachment A.

DISCUSSION

The LAC is about halfway through its discussions of the LSMAR topics and intends to bring a final report of recommendations to the City Council on December 4, 2006. To ensure that the report meets the original intent and goals of the Council, staff and the Commission request Council review and feedback on a proposed outline of the LSMAR report. Additionally, staff recommends that discussion of two Council directives be rescheduled to a future date to allow for a more comprehensive analysis of those specific issues.

Draft LSMAR Report Outline
The key elements of the proposed final report include the following:
1) Background/Identification of Current and Future Needs – This section will provide background information about the City’s library system and an assessment of the need for improvements.
2) Summary of LAC Recommendations for Investment – This section will provide the core content of the report. It will address the following Council directives stemming from the May 15 meeting:
   a) Recommend how big Mitchell Park Library would need to be
   b) Recommend facilities growth requirements (if any) at other libraries
   c) Provide preliminary cost models/projections/estimates for capital and staffing needs
   d) Provide scaled versions of recommendations with costs

The section will provide two tables that outline recommended investments, one for Facilities and one for Programs/Services. Attachment B provides a sample section of the Programs and Services table that would address some recommendations for enhancing collections. The Facilities table may appear in a slightly different format from Attachment B but will provide similar information. The LAC has not made final recommendations on the programs identified in the table. They are included for illustrative purposes only.

Each table (Facilities and Programs/Services) will identify enhancements available with existing funds, the recommended level of investment, additional investment opportunities and the justification statement for the recommended level of investment. The Programs/Services table will address content areas discussed by the LAC such as collections, technology and staffing. These content areas are outlined on the enclosed working schedule for the LSMAR.

3) Addressing other Council Directives – This section of the report will respond specifically to several Council directives not appropriately addressed by the “scaled options” format. As such, staff and the LAC will develop a discussion section about each of these topics with specific recommendations identified. These directives are:
   a) Maintain 4th and 5th grade services at Children’s Library
   b) Provide more analysis of strategies related to City/School partnerships
   c) Be explicit about service levels at Main assuming that the Main Library will continue to serve adults, teens and children

4) Conclusion – The final section of the report will begin to identify some alternatives for achieving the recommendations for investment presented in the report. This will be a starting point for future discussions with the City Council on options for funding enhancements to the City’s library system.

5) Appendices – The report will also include several appendices with additional background information. Staff is still developing the complete list of these appendices. Some of these appendices may include:
   a) Collections assessment and other comparable library data
   b) Mitchell Park Site Study/facility assessments
   c) City/School partnership analysis
   d) Technology analysis
Directives to Address After Completion of LSMAR

Staff recommends that the City Council delay discussion of two directives originally identified at the May 15 meeting until Spring 2007.

1) Directive: Determine Methods to Reduce Operating Costs – The LSMAR report will recommend some items that can increase efficiency. However, staff recommends that a broader discussion of operating efficiencies be delayed until completion of the City Auditor’s report on Library operations, due in Spring 2007. The audit will provide an additional perspective on operational efficiencies to consider.

2) Directive: “No Funding” Alternative – Staff recommends that discussion of this directive be delayed until after completion of the final LSMAR report and that the City Council engage more directly in the discussion. This is a question of resource allocation, which is more appropriately the purview of the City Council. After completion of the final LSMAR report, staff, the City Council and the LAC will need to have further discussions about funding the recommended improvements and/or options to consider if no additional funding is available.

RESOURCE IMPACT

There are no resource impacts associated with these recommendations. The final LSMAR report will address resource impacts associated with the recommendations in that report.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This is not a project requiring environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any LSMAR recommendations implemented will undergo environmental review, if and to the extent required.
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