

CONCERNS ABOUT OPTIONS

ALL OPTIONS:

1. The costs aren't real. There is a biased assessment of the costs. Mistrust of the figures and estimates. Check the figures. The numbers are too high. (this view was expressed in the documentation of every discussion recorded)
2. The process hasn't been open or inclusive.
3. Estimates are biased towards Option B.
4. The city complex, including the Library, sits on a flood plain. We should spend as little on the Library as we can and plan to move the entire thing to a non-flood plain area.
5. The amenities listed in the survey are not related to Libraries. They might be appropriate for a place that has cheap, adequate land—it is not necessary for a library to provide them.
6. Proximity to bus stop not part of the survey. Bias toward parking.
7. I do not feel that the options were fully explored and revealed to the interested clientele ahead of time. Can we back up?
8. Negative descriptions
9. No good option. Disappointed in all four options. All bad choices. Back to drawing board.
10. Why can't various program options be included in the different construction options?
11. Library should be stand alone.
12. Stay within budget, as people voted for Measure S.
13. Want to figure out how to make the library attractive for future generations.
14. Need to have a vision of what we want. If we don't have enough \$, then we as a community will look to raise \$ to make the investment worthwhile.
15. [I am] Most concerned with safety and space to do library work
16. Don't want everything we do to be about communities (sic) centers.
17. Do any of these options take into account the future flood issues we're facing due to climate change?
18. How would the shortfall be made up in each option?
19. Need to look at operating costs.
20. \$23 million – well spent in innovation—current/future needs
21. Technology needs to be emphasized in any of the options
22. What can we do without going over the budget? Work with what's realistic. Amortize costs over decades.
23. Security + safety concerns
24. Creative
25. We don't need it bigger—more homeless will hang out.
26. Smaller space is okay if design decisions are well made

OPTION A (Partial Renovation of Existing Library):

1. Option A doesn't address items such as roof leaks
2. This option may not be the most practical approach
3. Keep the Library in the space it is in. Use the money to the best use at Downtown current location. There is parking and they can deal with the homeless that are there.
4. Perhaps expand the Library into the parking lot next door if we need more space.

5. Goal should be to keep the costs as limited as possible while increasing tech (upgrade) and making the facility ADA compliant.
6. Not much fundraising would be needed for the renovation option.
7. Move genealogy to another location. Use for computers.
8. Reorganize efficiently.
9. Find a way to solve security. It can be done.
10. Stay within the budget
11. Priorities such as ADA needs, HVAC, wiring, etc., some reconfiguration of interior spaces
12. What is in the 8000 sq ft that wouldn't be included? Maybe it could be used without renovations. Why is it off limits in this option?
13. Start date limits amount of time to fundraise.
14. Like the idea of renovating existing structure. More interested in utilizing current building.
15. Can't live with Option A.
16. Option A can be done right now + that's nice.
17. No public opposition.
18. Start with new roof. DLAC list of negatives not positives.
19. 30 years of deferred maintenance/lapses in construction for 12 years
20. Option calls for 2 designer of 2 elevators, bathrooms, upgraded re ADA, provides quiet space.
21. When would the items left out of Option A be addressed?
22. No office space for Option A.
23. Heating system needs to be replaced.

OPTION B (New Mixed-Use Construction):

1. Measure S had no discussion of a parking structure. It is a "bait and switch" that does not engender trust.
2. If we are going to consider parking in a Downtown area then the parking should be underneath the Library. Since the building is happening in the flood plain, the parking should be underneath the library and no more than 2 stories on the garage.
3. There are concerns about the heritage trees at the Logos lot.
4. Use of the current building is an important part of the conversation.
5. Where will the additional millions for the new library at the parking garage come from? (From the sale of the old building?)
6. A partnership with the parking structure is financially questionable. How can you plan on putting the library in a project that hasn't been approved yet?
7. Faustian bargain
8. Has the income from office space been included in the cost calculations? Who would get the revenue?
9. Would this be more favorable with a structure as high as new buildings on the Mall? (5-6 stories)
10. Security could be an issue in the parking garage option, too.
11. With garage – vibrations, noise, pollution. Not a good place for a library.
12. Why would the building be lower than current buildings on Pacific? Higher building could allow more rentals and more income. This is a possible trade off. Intention of height is no higher than existing buildings on Pacific, not necessarily lower.

13. Farmers Market move may not be desired by community. This can stall the project.
14. Longer start date involves increased construction costs.
15. If solid assessment reveals another site is desirable, then could move "Cedar/Lincoln" site, and can be a library, civic plaza, gardens. Drop idea of garage. New construction, but not parking. Could be a landmark structure, civic gathering place. Would fit Santa Cruz.
16. Including housing options, other options in new multiuse site, is all vague. Poor planning.
17. Like the idea of a new building on the new site but not parking garage.
18. Moving Farmers Market will change community who visit it.
19. Don't build structure that might not be need (sic)
20. Cost burden of 37 million for garage impact of costs of garage parking fees will go up (sic)
21. 20 years from now, we may need parking. Lease on Option B may be attractive. May need more parking.
22. 400-500 parking spaces. Greenhouse gases. Congestion.
23. Pollution in library
24. 2nd option can be positive. Might cost more right now.
25. Doesn't want to be on top of a parking structure when I go to the library
26. Social problems are created from mixed use—mixed use not a library space, library should its own building if possible

OPTION C: Full Renovation of Existing Library

1. Also like Option C but know that we need to raise a lot of ideas.
2. Cost prohibitive
3. Option C more sensible

OPTION D: New Construction on Existing Library Lot

1. Cost prohibitive
2. Full new building if possible but no parking garage
3. Completely new building on current site would be ideal

FUNDRAISING

1. Ask the 1% to donate
2. Put another bond issue out
3. If the Santa Rosa fire can raise funds there shouldn't be a problem raising money for the Library.
4. Given the current political climate there won't be tax money available.
5. The dope growers will come to the rescue as they are being taxed to the hilt. Who gets the tax money from the growers? Could it be the Library?
6. Go to foundations and ask for money. Ask the rich tech agencies over the hill to contribute.
7. Who cares?
8. Bond
9. Tap the rich
10. Cabrillo might help. English teachers assign library materials.
11. Tech Center as separate from [current building] here. May be able to get \$ from tech with separate building

12. More can be done with assets of library that get discarded. Maybe we could sell older books. A smarter way to sell books that may be heading to discarded. (sic) May be other options for books? Recycling? Artists using books for projects might purchase books.
13. Tech presence. Specific attention paid to Silicon Valley millionaires. May donate \$\$
14. Naming rights to meeting rooms.
15. Pay attention to people saving \$ from tax reform bill. They can put \$ into library.
16. Would like to see the library help the Friends w/book sales.
17. Private donations; foundations
18. No federal funding
19. How does UCSC get its funds? Do it the way they do it. Partnership with UCSC? Cabrillo? CSUMB?
20. Cut corners – alternative options- when construction begins