

AGENDA

Old Library Committee

Friday, April 3, 2015 - 9:00 AM

Legislature Chambers, Governor Daniel D. Tompkins Building, Ithaca, NY

I. Call to Order

II. Changes to the Agenda

III. Minutes Approval

- a. November 07, 2014

III. Discussion

- a. Report or Discussion Item (ID # 5510) - Summary of Proposals Received in Response to the Request for Proposals
- b. Report or Discussion Item (ID # 5511) - Review and Approval of Process for Conducting Review of Proposals
- c. Schedule of Committee Meetings

V. Adjournment

Old Library Committee
 Regular Meeting Minutes (same as Notes) – Draft 11-20-14
Friday, November 7, 2014 3:00 PM
 Scott Heyman Conference Room

Attendance

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Michael Lane	Chair	Present	
Dooley Kiefer	Member	Present	
Leslyn McBean-Clairborne	Member	Late	3:10 PM
Kathy Luz Herrera	Member	Present	
Michael Sigler	Member	Present	
Carol Chock	Legislator	Present	
Ed Marx	Planning Commissioner	Present	
Joe Mareane	County Administrator	Present	
Jonathan Wood	Tompkins County Attorney	Present	
Jay Franklin	Director of Assessment	Present	
Peter Stein	Legislator	Present	
Marcia Lynch	Public Info. Officer, County Administration	Present	
Lisa Monroe	County Office for the Aging	Present	
Karen Fuller	Minute Taker/Legislature Office	Present	

Guests: Robert Stundtner, DPI Consultants; Tom Hanna, Nancy Medsker, Tom Seaney, Anna Kelles, Dewitt Park Civic Association; Graham Gillespie, Holt Architects; Harriet London, Joel Abrams, Diane Dawson, Lifelong; John Graves, City of Ithaca; Keri Blakinger, Ithaca Times

Call to Order

Mr. Lane, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Public Comment

Anna Kelles, DeWitt Park Civic Association member, reported there are between 400 to 500 signatures on the online Dewitt Park Civic Association petition. She clarified that of the 194 lots identified by the City of Ithaca available they are not slated for development, and some would not be able to support development. In her conversations with Meg Wilson at the City of Ithaca Planning Department she was told there are also underutilized lots that have been identified. She stressed the importance of encouraging the developers to consider other areas of the City if not selected and noted the cost of preparing responses.

Tom Hanna, DeWitt Park Civic Association member, said he is hopeful the Legislature will accept public comments on the Request for Proposals. He spoke of his work experiences in responding to Request for Proposals and appreciates the detail that would provide a positive outcome. He also hopes the Legislature narrows the number of developers to ensure the project is not dropped due to competitive levels. Mr. Hanna said he appreciates the work the County is doing.

Mrs. McBean-Clairborne arrived at this time.

Robert Stundtner, representing DPI, recommended the County not make any considerations in the Request for Proposals that would be redundant with what the City of Ithaca would require from developers. He said not all lots available to be developed in the City would provide the same capability as the Old Library Site. He believes the County should consider the value of the property,

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Nov 7, 2014 3:00 PM (Minutes Approval)

Minutes
Old Library Committee
Friday, November 7, 2014

what revenues would be generated from the property, and that the responders should know how each element would be evaluated. By knowing the scoring of the evaluation process it would show a fair process.

Chair's Report

Mr. Lane explained that the Committee's work at this meeting is to complete necessary work that will bring the information to the full Legislature for discussion and comments. He does not anticipate the Committee would require another meeting in the near future. Mr. Lane said he understands Mr. Stundtner's comments that the County's primary purpose should be the funds it would receive for the property, however, if the County wanted only funds it would not be going through the process it chose and would simply sell the property. He believes the reason for this process is to try to come up with a project that is going to provide the most value to the County for the funds received.

Minutes Approval

9/30/2014 Minutes

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Leslyn McBean-Clairborne, Member
SECONDER:	Dooley Kiefer, Member
AYES:	Lane, Kiefer, McBean-Clairborne, Luz Herrera, Sigler

Reports

Draft Request for Proposals (RFP) - Old Library Site (ID # 5217)

Mr. Lane thanked Mr. Marx for the work he has done in preparing the Draft Request for Proposals and suggested the Committee review each section.

Ms. Herrera said she does not believe the document requires any major changes, however, believes that the full document should be reviewed as part of the public record for transparency.

The Committee then reviewed each section of the document and offered suggested amendments to language and items that should be included. Areas clarified, modified, and/or added to the document included:

- The importance of maintaining the timeline to ensure all information is received in a timely fashion to allow the sale and occupancy to take place as needed.
- Clarification of when and how a resolution indicating the property is no longer needed for public use and when it would be put on a tax roll was provided. The key factor is it is not taxable at the time the resolution is adopted but the point it no longer has a public use.
- Consideration was given regarding the addition of Architecture 2030 standards, however, although it was believed important to have an understanding of how the standards are developed from a database of similar buildings, consensus was not reached to include the standards in the Request for Proposals.
- Developers will be asked to submit both a public and confidential document; the confidential

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Nov 7, 2014 3:00 PM (Minutes Approval)

Minutes
Old Library Committee
Friday, November 7, 2014

document would contain requested information on potential partnerships and other areas that are not subject to public scrutiny at the time.

- The Committee expressed a strong interest to include language regarding a living wage. Mr. Marx said he has had conversations with Mr. Wood and Mr. Mareane about this topic and it was thought that due to the nature of General Contractors having multiple bids on projects of this size it would not be feasible to make it a requirement. The standard Request for Proposals contains language expressing the County’s commitment to a living wage. Mr. Mareane said the County does have a value statement regarding wages that could be included.
- Mr. Mareane suggested that following conversations with Mr. Wood, Mr. Marx, and Mr. Franklin that language regarding possible tax credits and the term of the credits be included in the document.
- It was decided to include language that there is an expectation to complete the project as presented.

* * * * *

Resolution

Resolution: Authorizing Release of Request for Proposal – Tompkins County Old Library Property (ID # 5219)

Mr. Lane asked the members of the Committee their preferences on which developers to invite to respond to a Request for Proposals. Following a brief discussion the Committee agreed to include all four remaining developers.

The Committee discussed the resolution with Ms. Kiefer offering clarifying amendments that were considered friendly. A brief discussion about procedure followed and it was determined that a presentation of the four proposals would be made at the November 18th Legislature meeting followed by action on the resolution at the December 2nd Legislature meeting. Mr. Lane said unless the comments from developers are significant the Committee would not meet again until the proposals are received for review.

Mr. Lane expressed his appreciation to the public for their attendance and input at the Committee meetings. He said although it has taken a long time it should result in a better project.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Michael Sigler, Member
SECONDER:	Dooley Kiefer, Member
AYES:	Lane, Kiefer, McBean-Clairborne, Luz Herrera, Sigler

WHEREAS, Tompkins County owns property commonly known as the “Old Library” located at 310-314 North Cayuga Street, Real Property Tax Parcel 61.-1-4, in the City of Ithaca, and

WHEREAS, the property consists of approximately 0.88 acres with a 38,630 square foot building that was originally built to serve as the Tompkins County Public Library, and

WHEREAS, since the Library was moved to its current location on Green Street in 2000, the building has primarily been used for records storage and as the site of the Community Justice Center, and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive review of County space and program needs has led to plans for the

Minutes
Old Library Committee
Friday, November 7, 2014

relocation of these functions which is expected to be completed in 2015, and

WHEREAS, studies of County space needs have considered reuse of this site but found no economically feasible use for County purposes at this time, and

WHEREAS, the property is strategically located in the City of Ithaca and has the potential to contribute to the community and to the tax base if redeveloped, and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 2013-199, this Legislature authorized the issuance of a Request for Expression of Interest (RFEI) to seek potential developers who would purchase or lease the property for the purpose of redevelopment, and

WHEREAS, in response to the RFEI, the County received six responses, all of which proposed using the site solely, or primarily, for housing, and

WHEREAS, the Old Library Committee (the “Committee”) has met eight times to consider the proposals, including one meeting devoted to accepting public input, and

WHEREAS, over the course of the review period, two developers withdrew their proposals, and

WHEREAS, while differing in design, the mix of proposed uses, the type and market niche of the residential elements of the project, the Committee finds that DPI Consultants, LLC of Rochester, NY; Franklin Properties of Syracuse, NY (in collaboration with MCK Builders Associates, Stream Collaborative, Taitem Engineering, Dr. Marne O’Shea, MD); the Rochester Cornerstone Group of Rochester, NY (in collaboration with Cayuga Housing Development Corporation); and Travis Hyde Properties of Ithaca, NY (in collaboration with HOLT Architects) warrant an invitation to respond to a Request for Proposals issued by the County in order to secure specific and detailed proposals and commitments from the developers, and

WHEREAS, the Committee has developed and approved a Request for Proposal that will require the presentation of additional project details and commitments that will inform the Legislature’s ultimate selection of a developer for the Old Library site, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, on recommendation of the Old Library Committee, That the accompanying Request for Proposals be issued to DPI Consultants, LLC of Rochester, NY; Franklin Properties of Syracuse, NY (in collaboration with MCK Builders Associates, Stream Collaborative, Taitem Engineering, Dr. Marne O’Shea, MD); the Rochester Cornerstone Group of Rochester, NY (in collaboration with Cayuga Housing Development Corporation); and Travis Hyde Properties of Ithaca, NY (in collaboration with HOLT Architects).

SEQR ACTION: TYPE II-20

Adjournment

On motion the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Nov 7, 2014 3:00 PM (Minutes Approval)



Old Library Committee
Governor Daniel D. Tompkins Building
Ithaca, NY 14850

4.a

Meeting: 04/03/15 09:00 AM
Department: Planning Department
Category: Buildings and Facilities

REPORT OR DISCUSSION ITEM NO.
(ID # 5510)

Summary of Proposals Received in Response to the Request for Proposals



Old Library Committee
Governor Daniel D. Tompkins Building
Ithaca, NY 14850

4.b

Meeting: 04/03/15 09:00 AM
Department: Planning Department
Category: Buildings and Facilities

REPORT OR DISCUSSION ITEM NO.
(ID # 5511)

Review and Approval of Process for Conducting Review of Proposals

Proposal for Old Library RFP response review process

1. Staff score criteria identified in RFP including narrative explanation for each score (Rank on a scale of 0 to 5 where 0 = did not address and 5 = addressed exceptionally well) – April
 - A. energy efficiency and carbon footprint, including impacts of proposed demolition/deconstruction and/or remediation, of the project including any attempt to meet Architecture 2030 standards (e.g., 0 – meets current energy code, 5 - meets LEED Platinum or 2030 district standard)
 - B. quality of the overall program and conceptual design, including its compatibility with the surrounding historic neighborhood and how it addresses traffic, vehicular and pedestrian circulation and parking (e.g., 0 – meets zoning code, 5 - setbacks and massing sensitive to adjoining property and street, design includes elements to address historic district, incorporates traffic and pedestrian features that will serve building occupants and minimize neighborhood impact)
 - C. responsiveness to community needs including housing and other uses, such as a community organization (e.g., 0 – does not specifically address a community need, 5 – provides housing addressing an unserved market segment, including a diverse population, includes mixed uses, provides a community amenity and houses a community organization)
 - D. positive economic/tax base impact (e.g., 0 – no net positive impact as requested subsidies outweigh benefits, 5 – large net positive impact including impact to tax base and downtown economy)
 - E. capability of the developer or development team to undertake, finance, and manage the project (e.g., 0 – development team experience doesn't match project scope and financing plan is questionable, 5 – excellent development team with extensive comparable experience developing successful projects and financing plan is sound with little or no uncertainty)
 - F. demonstrated market feasibility of the proposed program (e.g., 0 – no evidence that market analysis has been conducted or that market for proposed uses is supported by demand, 5 - market well documented by community-wide and developer studies and costs are in line with market)
 - G. price/lease payments offered for the property (e.g., 0 – NPV does not meet county's listed price without any rationale, 5 – NPV greatly exceeds county's listed price)
 - H. plan for managing neighborhood impacts including noise and air quality during demolition/deconstruction/remediation and construction. (e.g., 0 – no substantive plan presented, 5 – plan presented that minimizes neighborhood impacts to the maximum extent possible both during construction and after project is occupied)
2. Committee reviews staff scoring and either confirms or revises. Post for public review. - April
3. Optional interviews; public comment period/hearing. – May
4. Committee considers proposals, staff scoring, and public comments and recommends a decision to the Legislature. – May/June
5. Legislature considers committee recommendation and makes a final decision. – June/July