

# CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

## Policy Session Worksheet

**Presentation Date:** 12/01/21    **Approx. Start Time:** 10:00    **Approx. Length:** 30 minutes

**Presentation Title:** Oak Lodge Library/Concord Community Center Project

**Department:** Business & Community Services and North Clackamas Parks District

**Presenters:** Sarah Eckman,BCS, Mike Bork, NCPRD and Cindy Becker, County Admin

**Other Invitees:** Jason Varga, Project Manager and Mitzi Olson, Library Manager

### WHAT ACTION ARE YOU REQUESTING FROM THE BOARD?

We are requesting approval from the Board to delay this project in order to further deliberate with community stakeholders and the NCPRD advisory board regarding options for the library, community center, and park.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This project was a joint effort among the Oak Lodge Library, NCPRD, and the County to develop a community center that incorporates a modern library to better serve the area and revitalize the Concord resources.

This Policy Session is the culmination of previous communications and meetings regarding this project. At an Executive Session in August, 2021, the BCC agreed to delay both the Gladstone and Oak Lodge projects in order to obtain current cost estimates from the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) firm that was being engaged for the Project.

While the CMGC was working on the estimates, staff became aware of a significant decrease in NCPRD funding from the original estimates that were provided to community stakeholders and Commissioners. Available funding is now less than half of the original estimates. Staff worked with the architects and CMGC to identify viable options that would preserve the original design within available funds. While a smaller scale design for the community center would be possible, there is still a shortfall in funding. Staff conducted meetings with the Concord Property and Library Planning Task Force (Task Force) and NCPRD Advisory Committee (NCPRD DAC) to discuss options. Both groups strongly urged the County to slow down the process until they've had a chance to digest the issues and gather more information to make informed recommendations. (Note: A recap of these meetings is included in the attachment.)

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (current year and ongoing):

Is this item in your current budget?  YES  NO See Below

What is the cost? Depends upon the option ultimately selected

What is the funding source? County backed Revenue Bonds, Library Funds, NCPRD Funds

The chart below compares budget projections including the CMGC estimate (with and without Value Engineering (VE))

Facility	Original	July Estimate	CMGC \$	CMGC w/ VE
NCPRD	\$23.8 million	\$29.7 million	\$28.8 million	\$13.7 million*
Library	\$13.6 million	\$15.7 million	\$17.0 million	\$16.1 million
Total Project	\$37.4 million	\$45.4 million	\$45.8 million	\$39.8 million

\*This dollar amount reflects a significant reduced capacity of the Community Center vs. just value engineering. (Further discussion can be found in the attachment.)

Funding available for this project is as follows:

<u>Library</u>	<u>Available Funding</u>
Library District Reserve for Oak Lodge	\$2.9M
Oak Lodge Capital Reserve	\$1.0 M
Oak Lodge Beginning Fund Balance	\$.75M
State ARPA Funds	\$.75M
General Fund Portion of Revenue Bond	\$7.3M*
Library Budget Portion of Revenue Bond	<u>\$2.1M**</u>
Total	<u>\$14.8M</u>

\* \$527,484 yearly payment

\*\* \$151,884/yearly payment

\*Bond rate calculated for 20 years @3%

#### NCPRD Community Center and Park

	<u>Original Funding</u>	<u>Available Funding</u>
General Fund Reserve	\$1.8M	\$0.0M
Property Sale Proceeds	\$5-9M	\$4.5M
SDC's	\$2.4M	\$2.4M
Grants	\$2.0M	\$0.5M
Library Proceeds	\$0.3M	\$0.3M
NCPRD Portion of Rev. Bond	<u>\$9.5M</u>	<u>\$0.0M</u>
Total	\$21-23M	\$7.7M

#### **STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT:**

- How does this item align with your Department's Strategic Business Plan goals?  
This aligns with the BCS strategic result of preserving, improving, and enhancing the quality and capacity of managed properties and facilities. The construction of the new libraries supports the Oak Lodge and Gladstone Library program so the public can access publically funded diverse materials and services to achieve their individual goals.
- How does this item align with the County's Performance Clackamas goals?  
This project aligns with the Vibrant Economy Goal: It provides economic development, public spaces, and community enrichment services to residents, businesses, visitors, and partners so they can thrive and prosper in healthy and vibrant communities.

**LEGAL/POLICY REQUIREMENTS:**

There is an IGA between County and City of Gladstone in which the County agreed to construct and manage two libraries: Gladstone and Oak Lodge.

**PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION:**

A number of public outreach strategies were initiated to reach the widest audience. Public input ranged from in-person interviews with teens, residents and staff, to an on-line open house. Project information and events were advertised via multiple methods, with a dedicated project website to share information, surveys and updates.

A dedicated Task Force was created which included NCPRD at-large members, Clackamas County Library Board of Trustees, Friends of the Oak Lodge Public Library, Gladstone Library Board, and Neighbor. The Task Force met numerous times with design consultants and County staff to create a Master Plan, review options/changes and provide input throughout the process.

County staff - and Commissioner Savas - met with the Task Force on 11/16/21 to provide an update on the library project specifically related to the availability of funds. The NCPRD DAC met with NCPRD staff on 11/17/21 to provide a similar update.

**OPTIONS**

1. Proceed with the original Master Plan option projected to cost \$45.8 million
2. Proceed with the reduced Community Center option projected to cost \$29.8 million
3. Delay the project and work with library and community center stakeholders to identify options that align community priorities, design and funding.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Option 3: Delay the project and work with library and community center stakeholders to identify options that align community priorities, design and funding.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Powerpoint Presentation

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Division Director/Head Approval \_\_\_\_\_

Department Director/Head Approval \_\_\_\_\_

County Administrator Approval \_\_\_\_\_

For information on this issue or copies of attachments, please contact Jason Vargas @ 503-351-4012



## Concord Property and Library Planning Task Force Feedback

County staff and Commissioner Savas met with the Planning Task Force on 11/16/21 to provide an update on the library project. Members had the following comments and concerns:

### **Deep Frustration**

- Some Members expressed significant frustration and anger about where the project is and how it got to this state: *“It feels like the rug is being pulled out from what was a very good 3-year project.”*
- Some don’t believe the Board understands nor appreciates the history of the project, the extensive years of public engagement, and the amount of time and effort invested by Task Force Members who brought thoughtful and considered guidance to the project. Task Force members commented that they weighed various possibilities during the process and were assured there was adequate funding by NCPRD and County staff.
- This project has been many years in the making and now members feel deceived and misled.
- Several feel there’s been a lack of transparency and accountability which has led to lack of trust.

### **Funding**

- Some Members mentioned the need to exhaust all other funding sources, i.e., grants, County funds, state/federal fund designations. There were several questions about NCPRD funding, how it changed, and how much was available for the project. Members want to understand more about the finances Overall, Members want to understand more about the finances associated with this project after being denied requested funding specifics and being told NCPRD had sufficient funding to build the plan as designed.
- It was mentioned that operational costs of the library need to be included in conversations about building size and costs and restricted Library District Funds

### **Confusion about the Models**

- Information about the various alternative models presented at the meeting was confusing – both the attached and free standing models– in terms of cost and square footage. This increased the frustration levels.
- Members also expressed concern about the degree of seismic upgrades, particularly in the Community Center, if a phased model is used.

- There was a lot of information to digest at once in a very short period of time which made it difficult to consume. This was the first Members heard of these proposals.

### **Stand-Alone vs. Attached Library Model**

- Attached model:
  - Members initially selected the attached model because it was said to offer long-term operational cost savings with sharing of some key public use spaces and related management; greater energy efficiency with a single jointly-designed building; more user friendly than separate buildings; and more space left available for the park.
  - Some questioned the scaled down Community Center approach for what it did/did not include, including value engineering items that were briefly discussed.
- Stand-Alone model: *“The library really is the priority here.”*
  - Some Members seemed supportive of a stand-alone library option and want to do what’s right for the community
  - Several members stated they just want to see a quality library built.
  - Some questioned whether the site was the best location and wondered if the library were built at Concord, would it be operating next to an abandoned building? *“I don’t want to a new library sitting next to a vacant school.”*
  - There was apprehension about whether the Community Center would get renovated:
  - Concerns were expressed about the impact of a stand-alone library on the park space.

### **Messaging**

- Members want to know how this funding shortfall and Task Force planning process will be messaged to the larger community.

### **Slow Down the Process “Do it right rather than do it right now”.**

- Although the Task Force had significant deliberations for the design approved in the Master Plan, with this new information, Members want more time to deliberate options, gather information, and seek the best option for the library, community center and park in Oak Lodge.
- They understand that this will delay the project but don’t want to be rushed into making any decisions for the Dec. 1 policy session.
- Some Members want the task force to convene and discuss the proposed paths forward after they have had time to process the information shared with them.