



# MINUTES

## Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC)

Wednesday, November 8, 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, Elise Granata, Yolanda Henry, Nikolara Dunbar-Jansons, Tera Martin, Teresa Thomae

**ABSENT:** Martín J. Gomez until 6:04pm

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

### 2. ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Press Release on City Hall to YOU

### 3. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO AGENDA

General business item C will still be discussed but the Community Meeting is no longer planned for November 12<sup>th</sup>.

### 4. APPROVE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2017 MEETING

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>RESULT:</b>   | <b>APPROVED MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2017 MEETING</b>          |
| <b>MOVER:</b>    | Rena Dubin   |
| <b>SECONDER:</b> | Martha Dexter  |
| <b>AYES:</b>     | Blair, Craighead, Dunbar-Jansons, Granata, Henry, and Martin |
| <b>ABSTAIN:</b>  | Teresa Thomae  |
| <b>ABSENT:</b>   | Martín J. Gomez  |

### 5. REPORT BY THE LIBRARY DIRECTOR

None

### 6. MEMBER REPORTS

Rena Dubin – Reported on a Teen Focus Group of 21 homeschooled teenagers she held on November 8<sup>th</sup>. The Focus Group was to gather opinions and discuss the new Downtown branch with teenagers.

### 7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jean Brocklebank – Mentioned the March 2013 SCPL Facilities Master Plan and what in 2013 it was believed to be able to be accomplished with around \$10 million. Pointed out the language from Measure S and that it states to modernize, upgrade, and repair. Questioned the committee on whether they had read the staff report from the December 2016 City Council meeting where they discussed putting a new library into a parking garage.



Michael Lewis – Suggested to make a list of all improvements this building requires from highest necessity to lowest and to go down the list and stop when the budget limit has been reached.

Judi Grunstra – Stated that there is still valuable insights from the Facilities Master Plan. Also added her own Pros and Cons to the list started by the committee.

Reed Searle – Suggested to listen to the architect about all they have done with other libraries because he believes the committee had not factored everything they had said. Wants to only do the bare work necessary and then put off what is really wanted to make a first class library.

Colonel Maxwell – Stated that he monitored patrons at the Downtown branch in the last several weeks and didn't see full patrons even on a Saturday, but he does see the homeless come in often to sleep, charge phones, and use the bathroom. Claims that because of Google people don't need reference librarians as much. Infuriated at the waste and incompetence of this County's waste of the taxpayer's money. Doesn't believe the library truly needed the \$75 million from Measure S.

Todd Hager – Asked the committee if a focus group has been done on the property taxpayer's who are actually funding the Measure S bond. Wants the committee to focus on the exact wording on Measure S. It doesn't say to spend all that money so he thinks things should be left flexible. Wants more focus on who is paying for it and not to build something and then be stuck to it.

Samuel Wilson – Stated that if this had happened 30 years ago one couldn't have predicted what is needed now. So why can the committee claim to know what is needed 30 years from now.

## **8. GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **A. Review of the Field Trip on November 7, 2017 with the Santa Cruz City Council**

Susan Nemtiz requested to hear the experience of visiting Los Gatos for the second time from the committee members. Of the members that attended the tour, they were all very appreciative of having a second look at the Los Gatos library. They were able to look at the library differently now after having discussed the Downtown branch for the past couple months. They were impressed with the technology, warm and inviting welcoming space, sorting room, flexibility of areas, and modernization.

City Councilors Sandy Brown and Chris Krohn were present at this meeting and provided their own insight. They were impressed how the Los Gatos library was completed with \$22 million, the lighting, the children's area, no homeless, and were shocked that it's actually smaller than the Downtown branch.



**B. Review and Further Discussion of the Pros and Cons of each Renovation/Build/Relocate Option from the Last Meeting**

The finalized Pros and Cons with Public Comments included (bolded bullet points are from the committee and italicized are from the public):

| <b>Option A – Partial Renovation of Existing Library - \$24,620,958</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Pros</b>  | <b>Cons</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Retains location</b></li> <li>• <b>Lower cost</b></li> <li>• <b>Integrity of Civic Area</b></li> <li>• <b>Work would start sooner</b></li> <li>• <i>No need to demolish building</i></li> <li>• <i>Flexible space</i></li> <li>• <i>Technology opportunities</i></li> <li>• <i>Welcoming entrance possibilities</i></li> <li>• <i>Genealogy space opportunities</i></li> <li>• <i>Parking lot next door</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>\$2 million over budget</b></li> <li>• <b>No soft costs</b></li> <li>• <b>36,000 sq. ft. (losing 8,000 sq. ft.)</b></li> <li>• <b>Relocate</b></li> <li>• <b>Band-Aid (Not 30 years)</b></li> <li>• <b>Increased maintenance costs</b></li> <li>• <b>Can't do defensive architecture</b></li> <li>• <b>No new programs</b></li> <li>• <b>Can't grow appeal</b></li> <li>• <b>Disruption services; staff</b></li> <li>• <b>More costly to operate</b></li> <li>• <b>There will still be expected costs. Not fiscally responsible.</b></li> </ul> |

| <b>Option B – Shared Space with Parking Garage - \$26,674,381</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Pros</b>   | <b>Cons</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Would not need to relocate to temporary space</b></li> <li>• <b>Meets all program goals</b></li> <li>• <b>Largest return for dollar</b></li> <li>• <b>Moves library to new site</b></li> <li>• <b>Shared construction cost</b></li> <li>• <b>Opens up design opportunity and collaboration</b></li> <li>• <b>Moves closer to metro</b></li> <li>• <b>More secure environment</b></li> <li>• <b>Defensive architecture</b></li> <li>• <b>More beautiful building</b></li> <li>• <b>Attract more walk-ins</b></li> <li>• <b>General visibility</b></li> <li>• <b>Attract curiosity</b></li> <li>• <b>Parking</b></li> <li>• <b>Opens up 224 Church Street</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates a new asset for city</b></li> <li>• <b>Location is already a parking lot</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Over budget \$3.5 million</b></li> <li>• <b>Concerned group that does not want garage</b></li> <li>• <b>Moves library to new site</b></li> <li>• <b>Sharing control with other parties</b></li> <li>• <b>Losing historical continuity</b></li> <li>• <b>Later start date</b></li> <li>• <b>Cost escalation</b></li> <li>• <i>Demise of antique fair</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of sunlight</i></li> <li>• <i>Visits will increase but not necessarily library use</i></li> <li>• <i>Proximity to metro not important</i></li> <li>• <b>Inconsistent with climate action plan</b></li> <li>• <b>Visibility more difficult?</b></li> </ul> |



| <b>Option C – Full Renovation of Existing Library - \$37,785,761</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Pros</b>  | <b>Cons</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retains location</li> <li>• Integrity of Civic Area</li> <li>• Lower cost than some options</li> <li>• Allows full program and structural goals – Allows full use of available sq. footage</li> <li>• Destination; architectural statement</li> <li>• Beautiful building</li> <li>• Work could start sooner</li> <li>• Few construction unknowns</li> <li>• Should last 30 years</li> <li>• Attracts a more diverse population</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$15 million over budget</li> <li>• Relocate</li> <li>• Disruption of service</li> <li>• Disruption of staff</li> <li>• Retains footprint</li> <li>• Lack of control of exterior space (Defensive architecture)</li> <li>• Windows; columns stay the same; architectural design limitations</li> <li>• More costly to operate</li> </ul> |

  

| <b>Option D – New Construction of Existing Library - \$49,313,846</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Pros</b>   | <b>Cons</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deluxe model</li> <li>• Dream (Full fantasy)</li> <li>• Opportunity to address all needs of survey respondents</li> <li>• Outdoor space</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost (\$26 Million deficit)</li> <li>• Relocate (Temporary)</li> <li>• More costly to operate</li> </ul> |

**C. Discussion of the Framework for the Community Meeting planned for November 12, 2017 at the Downtown Branch Library**

The Community Meeting planned for Sunday, November 12<sup>th</sup> was officially canceled. The new date for the Community Meeting is now Sunday, December 3<sup>rd</sup> from 1pm to 3pm. The purpose of this Community Meeting is to get some community engagement for the 4 construction options. There will be a third party to facilitate the meeting and it will be held at the Downtown branch meeting room.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Final Adjournment of the Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC) at 8:00pm to the next Regular Meeting to be held on Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup> 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