

Notes from DLAC community meeting 12/3/2017 - Group Reports

Summary of Construction Options

Option A: Partial Renovation of Existing Library

Option B: New Mixed-Use Construction

Option C: Full Renovation of Existing Library

Option D: New Construction on Existing Library Lot

The following comments were transcribed from discussion group notes recorded during the community meeting and represent the work of 8 scribes and the individual comments of several people in the room. A total of 92 people were present for at least part of the session from 1-3pm.

Some of the scribes' documentation were more detailed than others. The words used here are as written by the participants and the scribes. Some scribes/groups opted to list individual comments rather than group conclusions.

Following the group reports are sections reflected in the meeting documentation around Concerns About Options/Fundraising, Unanswered Questions/Comments.

Each group was asked to discuss these topics:

- a) Construction Options: Concerns and considerations for each
- b) Fundraising Advice

Construction Options: Concerns and Considerations for Each

Table agreed to take a straw poll of which of the 4 options each person liked (7 citizens at the table, 1 DLAC committee member, 1 scribe). The 7 citizens voted for as many of the options as they liked:

Option A: 4

Option B: 0

Option C: 3

Option D: 2

All our table favored Option A.

Group of 4 people: Option A: Maybe partial is enough. Option B: Parking. Don't need more parking. Have remote parking since parking not wanted. Option B - Out. Option C: No Option D: No

My interest is in keeping it in this [current] location. Not liking parking structure idea. Sentimental.

If city is going to build parking structure anyway, maybe include the library. But we may not need more parking. may be building a white elephant.

Table of 8 people: Last 2 options - 2 expensive. Some want to throw out. Do best for the community. Will possibly have to readdress. Need to look @ all options. May need another ballot measure. Use current building - prime criteria. 5 of 8 prefer Option A. Group prefers Option A or B.

Table's Top 5 (sic) Concerns:

1. \$
2. Association with parking lot
3. Questions of "process"
4. Loss of old building
5. Inform taxpayers, citizens, library patrons, honest, open
6. Tech \$

Option A list does not incorporate positives of former meeting

Table favors Option A. Has parking issues + questions + concerns. Feelings of wanting to know more. Multi-use concerns.

Table of 7 People: Hypocritical of City to support multi-use parking public garage on [sic] City that prides itself on green; additional cost of storage while remodeling; social, educ. doesn't work as a multi-use; Employee says only Option D will work because shortchanging the public; employee works in jacket and fingerless gloves in winter; not sufficient homework in presenting these options

What can we do with \$23 million wasn't prioritized according to our needs (consultants' task)

Table concerned about numbers. Several would rather have a new building, too expensive to renovate, but would like to see a smaller well-designed space. Group wants to discuss all the uses for a mixed use building. Housing, gardens, plazas more supported than parking. One person would support Option B if it could be affordable housing. Option C was the least cost effective, no one [in group] was attached to the facade or the way space is laid out. 2 people liked a completely new building on present site.

