



MINUTES

Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC)

Wednesday, September 13, 2017
6:00pm Meeting Room, Downtown Branch
224 Church Street in Santa Cruz

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Steve Blair, Linda Craighead, Martha Dexter, Rena Dubin, Martín J. Gomez, Elise Granata, Tera Martin, and Teresa Thomae

ABSENT: Yolanda Henry and Nikolara Jansons until 6:02pm

STAFF: Director of Libraries Susan Nemitz and Administrative Assistant Ivan Sumano-Vargas

2. ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

None

3. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Under 7. General Business add item E. Rebuilding Concepts

4. APPROVE MINUTES OF AUGUST 9, 2017 MEETING

RESULT:	APPROVED MINUTES OF AUGUST 9, 2017 MEETING
MOVER:	Martha Dexter
SECONDER:	Rena Dubin
AYES:	Blair, Craighead, Gomez, Granata, Jansons, Martin, and Thomae
ABSENT:	Yolanda Henry

5. REPORT BY THE LIBRARY DIRECTOR

Susan Nemitz deferred her report to the Communications Subcommittee.

Rena - over 2000 surveys have been completed by the community. Pop ups were held Downtown and printed copies were available at the Downtown Library. As well as an online version when patrons would visit the Library's website. Believed that there was a good cross section of random people, such as teenagers and even families that were surveyed. The survey will close on September 15th and the full results will be presented at the September 28th DLAC meeting.

Martin - in addition to the 2000 surveys several were received in Spanish. Yolanda conducted one focus group and is scheduled to do another focus group on Friday with the Boys & Girls Club.

6. MEMBER REPORTS

None



7. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Draft Program – Penny Hummel (Noll & Tam)

Overview of the assumptions they began with for the project: city population will remain stable, physical collection of the library will remain stable, and staffing will remain at current levels.

Goals with the program is to maximize public use of the library and increase capacity of “community spaces”.

Provided details on applying industry service standards by presenting the current available seats and space, comparing them to current best practices, and suggesting what the future building should provide.

Design considerations: intuitive wayfinding, user-friendly, environmentally friendly, lots of natural light, warm and comfortable, natural ventilation, art throughout, technologically rich, flexible, safe, streamlined workflow, and wow factor.

B. Building Assessment of Current Building – Eric Skiba (Noll & Tam)

Operational failures: doesn't have a proper space dedicated to teens, back of house to public ratio is poor, the backup generator, concerns of asbestos in the floor tiles and other areas, poor delivery space, restrooms don't meet ADA, inadequate meeting spaces, indoor lighting is inadequate, book drops are poorly placed and are not secured, too few quiet study areas and no group study space, elevator is dated and breaks down a lot, the original ventilation system has poor performance, electrical plug availability, power, and wiring throughout the building is inadequate, staff work space is inefficient and poorly configured, shelving in many areas is too tall for the designed space, staff has poor sight line, and service desk is large and inflexible.

Seismic analysis/report from 2014 and generally speaking the building came out fairly well structurally. Site evaluations were conducted to find areas that could use improvement.

Eric reviewed California building code that would affect the remodeling/renovating of the current site and building.

C. Shared Space Option on Cedar Street – Martin Bernal (City of Santa Cruz)

This option came out as a convergence of various circumstances and opportunities that coincided with various city goals. A Feasibility study was conducted solely to demonstrate whether it was feasible and it was not intended to develop the final configuration of whatever project would end up there. Essentially to answer if this particular site accommodated a shared use facility.

The Downtown vision is to have mixed used development. Long term goal is to not have multiple surface parking lots. Many of the current surface parking lots are slated for future development.

A preliminary site for the Farmer's Market as a long term permanent location has been identified. The site identified is the parking lot on Cathcart and Front Street. This site can also be used for other special events and when not in use it will still be a regular parking lot.

Possibilities for mixed use project could include housing, office or commercial, and of course the library services. If all surface parking lots are eliminated and the parking structure is developed there will be a net loss of parking spaces in the downtown area.



The current concept is to have the library on the first floor and the above floors to be the parking garage. The second floor has additional room that could be used for either more library use, housing, or office/commercial use. Another benefit to moving the library is that it would save money on temporary relocation during renovation if the library were to stay in its current location.

D. Site Criteria Draft and Discussion – Noll & Tam

Accessibility so the site can be easily reached by public transit, walking, or biking. Location is visible, part of the density of downtown and it's well connected to some of the corridors.

E. Rebuilding Concepts

Multiple design options were shared for rebuilding the library in its current location. The concepts showed that the current site has some pretty good possibilities. However, it could be the most expensive choice which will be determined at a meeting next month.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Lewis – One of the reasons this building is in the shape it's in is because of deferred maintenance. In a way the City owes the library for that deferred maintenance and there is some obligation to take that money that was saved over those years to apply to the new facilities. That will shorten the gap a bit. Think in terms of the library's mission statement, goals, and objectives. There is nothing in a parking garage that meets those terms and it offers no advantage to what you want to accomplish. It only provides limitations. Think about having the library on the ground floor of a parking garage and how it blocks off part of the building, so no light coming in on one side of the building. Nothing can be installed on top of the library either. Parking is in a process of changing. We are beginning to think a lot differently about transportation.

Jean Brockelbank – Martin Bernal mentioned the December 6, 2016 City Council meeting, but didn't mention the fourth item from that meeting. The fourth item was to provide an independent study of rebuilding or remodeling this library. The RFQ and the addendum required a minimum of three public meetings for this process. We do not have public meetings in this process. The contract with Noll & Tam mentioned community meetings. Somehow these public meetings fell through the cracks. We have public comments at these committee meetings but that's different from public meetings. Instead of having public meetings you've had the surveys and the pop up, but we have not yet had these public meetings and I'm bothered by that and I'm hoping that the committee will discuss that after you review and study the first RFQ, the addendum to the RFQ, and the contract with Noll & Tam. If things changed ok, but where is the transparency.

Colonel Terry Maxwell – Voted in support of Measure S for the \$75 million for the library bonds because I thought I could have confidence that it was legitimately needed and that it would be spent competently, honestly, and legitimately. I no longer have confidence that's the case. Susan Nemitz does not have adequate cost control or competence in contracting. She needs an inspector general to really go through with



discipline. You have changed my mind and I see that yes, the garage combination could be a new modern facility.

Gabriel Jameson – Looking at Martin Bernal’s plan, the high ceilings does sound very nice and yes natural light could come in through those windows, but blocking off the entire back with ramps and having a narrow alleyway between the university center and all those other buildings does not seem like a very good option for the library. There seems to be almost no outside space. That’s just sidewalk and street and parking, but there is no area to be outside and enjoy the sun while at the library. It’s very important to get this library right. I feel that rebuilding on the current lot is a more beneficial proposal and I express my support for that over the mixed building project.

Judi Grunstra – So many unknowns about the combined space. The timeframe, would they be building, are there parts of the projects while the library is still already installed. The City will have no problem finding other tenants using the space. The Watsonville library has a courtroom on top and there was a serious leak that came down through the ceiling and it damaged the carpeting and a lot of books. It was an expensive process to sterilize the books, so that’s something maybe you haven’t thought of stuff above the library with a bunch of people living on top. The Outreach plan has troubled me about this process. The RFQ did call for three public meetings, dialogue with the public. 2000 surveys is a good effort but I don’t know how accurate. Maybe somebody sent in 500 surveys. We don’t know what will go if they knock down the building on the current site. If the City really wants to consolidate things, they own a bunch of buildings around downtown, the Park & Recs office, and some other place, and a little house. Maybe they should think about consolidating those offices and building housing where they own those buildings. It’s unfortunate to be so concerned with this garage because that’s not really your thing that has to do with our library.

Bob Morgan – Every year the American Institute of Architects partners with the American Library Association to design awards to libraries for superior design and looking at the past 5 years of those awards there has not been one award given to a library attached to a parking garage. Wow factor for me is not attached to a parking garage that stands 70 feet above street level. I urge you to look at the submissions and award winners that the AIA recognizes every year for some inspiration. I’m very troubled and uncomfortable with the feeling that the concept of consolidating parking lots is driving the decision about the library. I can think of a lot better things to drive a vision than consolidating parking. Particularly when we have 10,000 free parking spaces about a quarter of a mile towards the ocean. So I urge to really consider this space, this location, and honor the master plan that was done in 2012.

Fred Geiger – It troubles me to hear people saying things before the numbers are even in. I don’t think anybody from the City or any other groups should be advocating for anything until we have some numbers. An assumption that all the parking lots are going to be used for something else, so therefore we’ll have a reduction in parking, that’s a gaping assumption, so when is that going to happen. Our climate action plan says that we should discourage automobile use, so \$75,000 per parking space doesn’t sound like discouraging automobile use at all. If we can’t do this right, if we can’t take our time, and if there can’t be a public process we are going to end up with a lot of wasted money, a



big citizen uprising and regardless of how smarter people know what's better before they even have their figures it's going to be a disaster.

Pauline Seales – Like the idea of the alternatives that can be done on the current site. The other way is complicated, time consuming, time wasting, money wasting, etc. So just from the interests of the library staying here there is a lot to recommend it. The under the garage thing is aesthetically unappealing to me and to most everybody else and as has been mentioned garages is certainly not the way to solve this climate crisis. The Farmer's Market, a place for 100 years, it's all going to be underwater in a 100 years.

Susan – When we were asked to vote for Measure S we assumed it would improve the library. Maybe give the staff raises, maybe add more time to the library openings, etc. If you had been a little more forthcoming and said this money is not only for the library but it's also to build a parking structure, a café, etc. I know it would not have passed. There is so much more efficient use of space in this library I could even redesign it and I don't know anything.

Debbie Bulger – When we voted for Measure S it said it was for the library and if it had said a parking garage goes with it I would have voted against it. We should take a cue from what they did with the old Sentinel building. I think if the committee chooses to go with the parking garage option the project will be delayed enormously. There is a huge number of people in this community that will fight it and what you heard at the Farmer's Market is accurate. If we want to see a library be built it needs to be at this site, this is a wonderful site and it's the center of town.

Joe Jordan – Was pleasantly surprised by many things heard tonight. Can work with the net loss of parking if what Martin Bernal said is true. If you are going to build this thing you better put a lot of solar on the roof.

Rick Longinotti – Co-Chair of the Campaign for Sensible Transportation. According to consulting agencies, you don't build new parking structures without first offering a reward system for people who commute to not arrive in a single occupant auto. I would advise you tonight that if you are thinking about that side of the Farmer's Market, it will take years because there will be significant opposition.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Final Adjournment of the Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC) at 8:34pm to the next Regular Meeting to be held on Thursday, September 28th at 6:00pm at the Downtown Branch Meeting Room located at 224 Church Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Respectfully submitted,
Ivan Sumano-Vargas, Clerk of the Committee