



## **AGENDA**

### **Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC)**

Wednesday, December 13, 2017

6:00pm Meeting Room, Downtown Branch  
224 Church Street in Santa Cruz

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

Committee Members Steve Blair, Linda Craighead, Martha Dexter, Rena Dubin, Martín J. Gomez, Elise Granata, Yolanda Henry, Nikolara Dunbar-Jansons, Tera Martin, and Teresa Thomae

#### **2. ADDITIONAL MATERIALS**

#### **3. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO AGENDA**

#### **4. APPROVE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 8, 2017 MEETING (P2-5)**

#### **5. REPORT BY THE LIBRARY DIRECTOR**

#### **6. MEMBER REPORTS**

#### **7. GENERAL BUSINESS**

- A. Public Meeting Debrief**
- B. Summary of Construction Options (P6-10)**
- C. Remaining Questions**
- D. Recommendation**
- E. Caveats**
- F. Draft Report Proposal (P11)**
- G. January Meeting to Finalize Report**

#### **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

## 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>

Option C – Full Renovation of Existing Library - \$37,785,761	
Pros	Cons
<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>

  

Option D – New Construction of Existing Library - \$49,313,846	
Pros	Cons
<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

# Summary of Construction Options

Downtown Santa Cruz Library

Report from the Downtown Library Advisory Committee (DLAC)

## Introduction

This draft document summarizes each of the four construction options for the downtown Santa Cruz library discussed during the DLAC meetings. None of the options comes in under the \$23,000,000 slated for the downtown library by Measure S; each option requires additional fundraising, partnership with private sector, reduced scope, or something similar to bridge the shortfall.

The programming goals and service needs for the downtown library were determined by DLAC members, library staff, community members who attended the DLAC meetings, and various public surveys. The design goals for the library were determined by the services and desired physical features of the library. Each of the cost estimates in this document is a combination of construction expenses and service needs.

The architectural firm of Noll & Tam, with specialized expertise in remodeling, renovating, and new construction of public libraries costed the options, based on their knowledge of library construction and also on the design features prioritized by DLAC after the survey.

The *Measuring Measure S* website at [https://www.santacruzpl.org/measure\\_s/](https://www.santacruzpl.org/measure_s/) provides background on the library project. Additional documents including the detailed cost estimates from Noll & Tam are available on this website at [https://www.santacruzpl.org/measure\\_s/branch/7/documents/](https://www.santacruzpl.org/measure_s/branch/7/documents/).

## Option A: Partial Renovation of Existing Library

Option A is a proposed partial renovation of the existing downtown library building that is capped as close as possible to the \$23,000,000 funding provided by Measure S for the downtown library.

### Cost and Timing

- Estimated budget: \$24,620,958 - **Over budget by \$1,620,958**
  - Lowest initial construction cost with greatest future operating expenses)
- Does not include cost of a temporary library – Library would be closed during construction
- Shortest time period of 124 weeks with construction beginning April 2019

### Design and Services

- Addresses accessibility and seismic code compliance and remodels 36,000 s.f.
- Does not resolve many infrastructure problems
  - Remediation of roof problems not included in this estimate
  - Upgrades existing ventilation system but does not replace it with modern HVAC or provide air conditioning
  - Works around structural issues rather than designs for the future (For example, power needs addressed with wiring in floor-to-ceiling columns, rather than in-floor wiring)
  - More costly to operate due to workarounds of structural limitations rather than replacement of systems
  - Does not replace or increase size of existing windows (single-pane glass)
- Retains current location
  - Maintains integrity of Civic Complex (City Hall / Civic Center / Library area)
  - Reuses the current building
  - Provides adjacent parking (existing surface lot)
  - Accessible to public transit
- Does not provide the recommended 44,000 s.f.
  - 8,000 s.f. of existing library not part of the remodel and unavailable for public use
  - 20% smaller than the other options
- Smaller size prevents the library from meeting program goals including teen space, meeting rooms, study/tutoring spaces, and expanded computing without trade offs

### Security

- Does not fully address desire for increased security (consequence of preserving existing architectural footprint)
  - Building exterior essentially untouched
  - Main entrance not redesigned to decrease loitering or improve traffic flow
  - Hidden spaces and obscured sightlines caused by stairwell and power drops in columns are not mitigated
- Sightlines could be improved by position and size of stacks and location of help desk

## Option B: New Mixed-Use Construction

Option B is a new mixed-use construction project on the site of the existing Cedar Street surface lot behind the Logos building. This multi-story structure would be lower than the buildings on Pacific Avenue and would house both the library, a parking garage, and possibly affordable housing or office space. The needs of both the Farmer's Market and the Antique Faire are addressed in this option.

### Cost and Timing

- Estimated budget: \$26,674,381 - **Over budget by \$3,674,381**
  - This option provides the greatest number of desired program and design features for the amount of library funds invested
  - Exterior construction costs come from Parking Authority budget; library dollars spent on services and interior design
  - Requires a relationship with the Parking Authority; does not give library full control of design
- The project would take 188 weeks with construction beginning March 2020
- There are no additional costs for temporary relocation and little disruption of services

### Design and Services

- Solves infrastructure problems associated with the current building
- Does not retain current location of library
  - Breaks up the existing Civic Complex (City Hall / Civic Center / Library area)
  - Provides an additional asset for the city
  - Provides adjacent parking (new garage on existing surface lot)
  - Proximity to public transit
- Provides the recommended 44,000 s.f. and meets all library program goals including teen space, meeting rooms, study/tutoring spaces, and expanded computing
- Provides expanded design opportunities
  - Shared construction costs allow possibility of double-pane windows and additional natural light
  - Design constrained by a multi-use space (library and parking garage)
- Does not require increasing the number of existing parking spaces
  - Does not require expanding the number of parking lots; the proposed Cedar St. site is an existing surface parking lot
  - Will result in the loss of (non-heritage) trees currently located in the existing surface lot
- Relocates the Farmer's Market and Antique Faire to nearby downtown areas

### Security

- Fully addresses desire for increased security by allowing for purposeful architectural improvements that minimize loitering and improve traffic flow while eliminating hidden spaces and obscured sightlines caused by stairwell and columns in the existing library.



## Option C: Full Renovation of Existing Library

Option C renovates the existing downtown library building as much as possible while preserving the architectural footprint. It allows for reuse of the existing building and redesign of the interior by demolition of non-load bearing walls; construction and renovation are limited to prevent affecting the structural integrity and triggering seismic code retrofit.

### Cost and Timing

- Estimated budget: \$37,785,761 - **Over budget by \$14,785,761**
- The project would take 188 weeks with construction beginning March 2020
- Budget includes costs incurred by temporary relocation of collection and equipment; some patron interruption

### Design and Services

- Solves infrastructure problems associated with the current building
- Retains current location
  - Maintains integrity of Civic Complex (City Hall / Civic Center / Library area)
  - Reuses the current building
  - Provides adjacent parking (existing surface lot)
  - Accessible to public transit
- Provides the recommended 44,000 s.f. and meets all library program goals including teen space, meeting rooms, study/tutoring spaces, and expanded computing
- Provides expanded design opportunities
  - Limited by footprint of the existing building due to seismic code regulations
  - Allows possibility of double-pane windows and skylights
  - Window size, columns, and exterior must be retained due to seismic concerns

### Security

- Partially addresses desire for increased security (limited by preserving existing architectural footprint)
  - Enables some external security improvements
  - Although building footprint is preserved, entrance can be reoriented to discourage loitering
- Enables some internal security improvements
  - Sightlines improved by position and size of stacks and location of help desk
  - Hidden spaces and obscured sightlines caused by stairwell and power drops in columns are not mitigated

## Option D: New Construction on Existing Library Lot

Option D reuses the existing lot of the downtown library, but not the building itself. It attempts to maintain the integrity of the existing Civic Complex (City Hall / Civic Center / Library area) while meeting all the desired program goals and design features.

### Cost and Timing

- Estimated budget: \$49,313,846 - Over budget by \$26,313,846
- The project would take 188 weeks with construction beginning March 2020
- Budget includes costs incurred by temporary relocation of collection and equipment; some patron interruptions

### Design and Services

- Solves infrastructure problems associated with the current building
- Retains current location
  - Maintains integrity of Civic Complex (City Hall / Civic Center / Library area)
  - Provides adjacent parking (existing surface lot)
  - Accessible to public transit
- Provides the recommended 44,000 s.f. and meets all library program goals including teen space, meeting rooms, study/tutoring spaces, and expanded computing
- Provides the only option that allows for outdoor reading space, outdoor event/meeting space, and outdoor activity space (such as messy children's programming)
- Closure for remodel results in interruption of services
- Provides expanded design opportunities
  - Not limited by footprint of the existing building
  - Allows possibility of double-pane windows and skylights
- Incurs temporary relocation costs and disruption of services
  - The branch would need to be closed for the duration of the renovation and the collection moved
  - Some Downtown Branch resources would still be available for checkout at other branches

### Security

- Fully addresses desire for increased security by allowing for purposeful architectural improvements that minimize loitering and improve traffic flow while eliminating hidden spaces and obscured sightlines caused by stairwell and columns in the existing library.



## Draft Report Proposal

### 1. Memo to City Council

- Overall Process – Tera
- Community Survey – Rena
- Summary of Program – Steve
- Options Analysis – Steve
- Recommendation – Rena
- FAQ – Tera

### 2. Report by Noll & Tam

- Design Considerations
- Library Program
- Options