

Dear friends of the downtown library ~

The library/garage project will **not** be on the August 28 City Council meeting agenda. As far as we know, it is put off until a September council meetings (either the 11th or the 25th). We'll let you know as soon as we know.

Things seem to be in a constant state of flux.

An estimated \$33 - \$37 million parking garage is now looking like an estimated \$41 million. The Library Joint Powers Authority is attempting to arrange another 25% of Measure S funds be disbursed to the countywide entities, including the City of Santa Cruz. This means more money for a renovated library as well as for a new library in a garage.

We'll end this Update with the following letter (below), sent to the Mayor on August 9th. We've had no reply as of today. Still, we think our suggestions have merit. We'll see.

Meanwhile, keep spreading the word about our web site. Thanks!

Jean

<https://dontburythelibrary.weebly.com/>

---

Dear Mayor Terrazas ~

As the date draws near when the Council will revisit the library/garage project and vote on whether to proceed with the proposed project on Lot 4, we propose the following three suggestions for your consideration:

**1). A motion, vote and direction by Council to consider the library separately from the parking structure**

- Although the library-parking garage was presented to Council in December 2016 as a combined project, Council did direct the City Manager to provide an "independent study of the cost savings of renovation versus a new" library. This implies that the *Council was amenable to separating the two projects* and is under no obligation to approve or deny the project in its entirety.
- If the parking garage as a project should suffer long delays, the library will suffer the same delays if it is inextricably hitched to the parking structure. This could jeopardize the option of a timely renovation and revitalization of the downtown library, sought by so many City and County residents.
- At one of the DLAC meetings, City Manager Bernal stated that the garage was *not dependent* on the library-as-tenant in order to go ahead with the garage. Other tenants could no doubt be found if so desirable. Also, if the city anticipates needing more office space, city departments could occupy space in the garage (thus consolidating rental costs they are currently paying in buildings scattered around downtown). This is something that has not entered the discussion (at least during the public process).

**2). A motion by Council to obtain a real independent study of a \$23 million renovation and**

## revitalization

- At the July 19 Study Session, the DLAC presentation was short on substance, their slides of other modern libraries more like window dressing. The Council neither received **information** about what Measure S funds could accomplish in a renovation nor discussed it. In fact, renovation and revitalization possibilities were not presented whatsoever at the Study Session, even though members of the public have consistently called for such.
- The same happened at Monday's Open House, the "community outreach" mentioned at the Study Session. The obvious goal of the event, with its tours, was to make the public see the library building as beyond redemption. Each time the public asked "how can this be fixed or upgraded" we received blank stares and no answers. The Open House was an exercise of subterfuge to convince the public that the existing library is a hopeless mess, needs to be abandoned and a new one built on Lot 4.
- The poster boards of the Group 4 conceptual renderings, showing a new library in a "mixed-use" structure, were used to make people think this is what the project will look like. We stood quietly and listened to that deliberate intent to convey a false impression to a woman who was obviously new to the issue. Then we spoke and said that is not true, there are no architectural drawings of the project, no floor plans, not even a decision of whether or how the project will go forward.
- A considerable amount of money and time must have been spent producing the presentation materials for the Open House. It seems only fair to request preliminary floor plans or conceptual drawings of what a renovation that fits within the budget could accomplish. The threats of cuts in services and programs that appear in recent handouts make one believe the library will be in worse shape by investing \$23 million in a renovated and revitalized library. The additional funds apparently being made available through an amendment by the JPA means more funds can also be applied to a creative renovation!
- Monday's Open House continued to deny other options for the library. The Open House neither replaces nor precludes the *need for "an independent evaluation of cost savings of renovation versus new build,"* especially if renovation and revitalization can meet the library priorities identified as being important to the community.

### 3). A motion by Council to separate the Farmers Market project from the garage and library projects.

- Since the Farmers Market project cannot be funded by either Measure S or City Parking Deficiency funds, this project should also be separated, so as not to be either delayed or unduly influence delay in a revitalized or newly built library downtown. The City Manager and Farmers Market Manager have apparently been working together successfully on a proposed Front Street location, estimated by the City Manager initially at \$6 million.
- With all of the work between the City and the manager of the Farmers Market, monthly Antique Faire, also held on Lot 4, has received cursory consideration, despite the fact that it brings a lot of people downtown and provides employment for many dealers, a large number of whom are on a fixed income.

So far the City has focused solely on the proposed project, with blinders on, not seeing the

possibilities of alternatives that are conservative and progressive. For example, an alternative to rebuild the two-story parking garage on Church Street, adding another two stories to it, could be considered. This might meet parking needs goals in a less costly alternative than the newly estimated 41 million for the Lot 4 project.

David, we are hopeful that you will seriously consider our suggestions of separating these projects, so that no one project hampers or derails the other.

Sincerely,

Jean Brocklebank (communications)

Judi Grunstra (librarian)

Michael Lewis (webmaster)

on behalf of 114 City and County residents

[Don't Bury The Library](#)