



- MEETING MINUTES -

**Subject: Stakeholder Resources Group Meeting #2
Dixon Public Library Design Concept Phase 1**

Date: July 27, 2010

Place: Gretchen Higgins Elementary School, 1525 Pembroke Way, Dixon

Attendees:

Consultants, Staff, Commissioners, Trustees:

Wayne Gehrke / Group 4 Architecture
Kari Svanstrom / Group 4 Architecture
David Schnee / Group 4 Architecture
Laura Lafler / LSA Associates, Inc.
Gladys Cornell / AIM Consulting
Donna Lucchio / AIM Consulting

Gregg Atkins / Dixon Public Library

Herb Cross / Library Trustee
Jim Ernst / Library Trustee
Susan Ostergard / Library Commissioner
Shane Taber / Library Commissioner
Olivia Stringer / Library Commissioner

Stakeholder Resources Group:

Helen Ritchey / 4-H Club
Cookie Powell / Dixon Family Services
Sandra Alatorre / Dixon Family Services
Jack Caldwell, Dixon Chamber of Commerce
Ada Barros / Dixon Mother's Club
Nancy Schrott / Dixon Women's Improvement Club
Leslie Earl / Dixon Women's Improvement Club
Don Mort / Friends of the Library
Tess Paxton / Girl Scouts
Marda Henry / Historical Society
Marylou Batchelor / Soroptimist Int'l. of Dixon
Maggie Kittyle / Soroptimist Int'l. of Dixon
Ethel Calvello / Dixon Community/Senior Center
Ginger Emerson / Old Town Neighbors
Nyssa Gilreath / Dixon Public Library Teen Advisory Board
David Werrin / Dixon Carnegie Library Preservation Society
Krista Molina / Kiwanis Club

MINUTES

The second Stakeholder Resources Group (SRG) meeting for the Dixon Public Library project was held Thursday, July 27, 2010, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Gretchen Higgins Elementary School, 1525 Pembroke Way, Dixon. The stakeholders present for the meeting and the group they represent are listed above, as well as the consultants, staff, and commissioners who were in attendance. The meeting was open to the public, and the names of those in attendance are provided on the meeting sign-in sheet (see attached). The meeting was facilitated by AIM Consulting and recorded as follows.

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Gladys Cornell of AIM Consulting. 53 people were in attendance, including 17 SRG members. Ms. Cornell welcomed all attendees, asked the consultants, staff and stakeholders to introduce themselves, and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Homework Review

At the first SRG meeting, the stakeholder group was given a homework assignment to visit a recently built library and document what they liked/disliked about the facility. Gladys Cornell asked each stakeholder present to share where they went and what they learned.

Site Analysis Review

Wayne Gehrke of Group 4 reviewed a list of site characteristics that has been developed through the programming process and stakeholder input for the library project. These include:

- **Historic**: Does the option celebrate and honor the historic Carnegie Library?
- **Civic Presence**: Does the option strengthen the downtown street presence?
- **Relationship with Park**: How well does the option provide a focus for the park, create a functional relationship of parking with the park, and provide opportunities for outdoor connections for library programs?
- **Parking**: Does the option provide visibility from parking to the library entry and community room entry, and is the parking convenient?
- **Functionality**: Does the option allow portions of the library to be used independently, does it allow staff and book drop to be near entries, and is there a good flow between different collections and groups?
- **Meets Building Program**: How well does the site and building option meet the needed square footage (25,000 - 28,000 SF)?
- **Cost**: Does the option provide cost saving opportunities?
- **Sustainability**: Does the option allow for good natural daylight exposure or other sustainable design features?
- **Flexibility**: Does the site option allow for flexibility in the library's layout for future changes as needs change over time?
- **Compatibility**: Is the option compatible with adjacent uses?

Mr. Gehrke asked all stakeholders to consider these characteristics upon their review of the site options being presented, and asked if there were any questions/comments.

A summary of comments and questions included the following:

- Parking is limited and has peak times on the street.
- Parking for meetings is what concerns the neighborhood residents. This needs to be considered.
- Local events occupy street parking all the time, and haven't been a problem.
- If parking is on the street, please provide trees.

Mr. Gehrke continued with a presentation of height options for the proposed library. He noted that all options shown include the Carnegie library. Illustrations presented included a cross-section view and a modeled view of two height options: (1) Carnegie remains at its historic height of approximately 4'-6" above grade; and (2) Lower the Carnegie approximately 2'-6" to a recommended height of 1'-6" to 2'-0" above grade.

Question: How would the Carnegie be used?

Answer: This is still under development, but initial considerations include archives, historical collections, and large meeting spaces.

Kari Svanstrom of Group 4 further discussed three points:

- Building height and single-story design.
- Location of the Carnegie on the site (facing N. First Street or East B Street).
- Overall shape of the library (the building footprint).

A summary of comments and questions included the following:

- The basement is not used much, and it has structural issues.
- The basement could be a children's area or meeting rooms.
- It seems more costly to fill-in the basement and lower the building, than add an elevator.
- People are already not used to entering through the Carnegie.
- Create a new public/main entry.

Group 4 noted that the Carnegie basement is not currently ADA compliant or publicly accessible, and is also deteriorating. It would require significant work structurally. The cost of these alternatives will be compiled and compared as the process moves forward.

Question: Will the team hire a historic architect as the project moves forward?

Answer: Group 4 has a lot of historical experience, including Carnegie buildings. Possibly at the next phase of the project, when appropriate, a historic specialist could be brought in.

Site Options Presentation and Discussion

Dave Schnee of Group 4 stated that their approach included preserving the entire facade, including the interior of the Carnegie building. How to best do this will be further explored and developed as the design process moves forward. Their goal is to explore how to best preserve and showcase the historic building.

Kari Svanstrom continued with the presentation of site options for the project. Utilizing large presentation boards on easels, she presented two options for the location of the Carnegie and proposed footprint of the new library building.

Option A: The Carnegie remains in its current location and the new building wraps around it.

Option B: The Carnegie is relocated to N. First Street creating an anchor as you enter downtown.

Both schemes will require a new foundation for the historic building.

Question: How would B1 include the Carnegie Building?

Answer: The front exterior would be preserved, and the other sides would be incorporated into the interior of the new construction. Illustrations of this will be further developed for future meetings if this is the direction we are given to proceed.

Question: Relative to the CEQA preliminary study, from the perspective of the community, how does this satisfy that requirement?

Answer: Further analysis including the Carnegie Library's historical significance will be conducted as part of the CEQA requirements.

A summary of comments included the following:

- Option B2 is preferred. The location near the park would enhance its presence.
- It's hard to have an opinion when you don't know what the new design will look like. If it is jarringly different, it might be difficult to accept. It should blend and integrate with the new construction.
- Restoration doesn't move a building.

Group 4 noted that the facade of the Carnegie will be the same no matter where it is located. It will be equally respected. The overall goal is a great library.

Question: Can you describe the roof elevation?

Answer: We don't know yet. That is why we are here today, to get feedback and review options. There is a way to take proportions and elements, and treat them respectfully. This dialogue gets the process started. The Carnegie does have a high roof line. It is important to scale it appropriately to the surrounding neighborhood.

Group 4 asked the SRG to indicate which option they preferred by a show of hands. Five preferred the scheme to keep the Carnegie in its present location, and eight preferred the scheme that moves it to face N. First Street.

Question: If the Carnegie is used as an entrance, would a ramp be difficult to accommodate?

Answer: This will need to be studied and further developed.

Question: How do the proposed options provide compatibility with the neighborhood? (The CEQA preliminary study paragraph was cited).

Answer: This has been heard by the architect.

Question: Is there access to the park between Second Street and the park?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Wouldn't the entrance in the middle be difficult for the staff to manage as well as navigate through the building?

Answer: Staff would be centrally located in the center of the arms, and the details of this will be further developed as the process moves forward. This layout is a fairly common strategy and will allow for good visibility by staff of the building.

A summary of comments included the following:

- Option B2 brings history back to First Street and Dixon. It creates better flow and allows for a clean slate. A1 is a compromise.
- Option B1 has better exposure to the park. I like the one-way drive through parking.
- N. Second Street is narrow. This could be a problem for parking access.
- The library should have more entrances to not have to walk too far.
- I appreciate the difficulty of the team's challenge, but not knowing what is inside makes the selection of an option difficult.
- I like the short-term, one-way parking provided in Option B2.
- The library is dwarfed by the park (B2, A2). Lowering the square footage of the library should be considered.

- Option A2 would work best for the community, but the staff would have to be on roller skates to manage the space.
- We should not short change ourselves regarding the size of the library. Don't build a facility that is too small before it is paid for. It is here for the future of Dixon and generations.
- Dixon has not increased significantly in size in the past 10 years.
- It may not be growing today, but the library is being used more, especially in these economic times. It cannot shrink down and serve the community.
- It seems archaic to design a single-story building. Create a multi-story building that can offer spaces that allow for revenue generating activities. Let it pay for itself.
- Preserving history is important.
- More technology will reduce the volume of books, which can reduce the size of the library.
- A library located downtown is very special and appreciated. However, if we need something that serves us so far into the future maybe downtown isn't the right location. There is limited parking, and compromises need to be made.

Group 4 noted that the recommended square footage range was based upon the programming process and demographics of the service area. The service levels (square feet of library space per person) are comparable with the other libraries in the County operated by Solano County Library system. Also, a multi-story building is more expensive to build and operate. If the SRG would like to consider this, they need to make it known.

It was also noted that the library serves 196 square miles within the County. It serves a much larger population than just Dixon, which was used for the planning basis. It was clarified that everyone within the jurisdiction is within the taxation and voting district for library services.

Environmental Review

Laura Lafler of LSA Associates was introduced. She presented an overview of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the project, and stated that a preliminary study has been prepared and submitted that defines the project and an evaluation of what is currently known about the project. The preliminary study is on file and available to anyone who would like to obtain a copy of it.

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared for the project. The official notice to initiate the process was posted 10 days ago. Based upon CEQA guidelines, the public comment period for the project extends from July 21, 2010 to August 23, 2010. During this timeframe, if anyone feels there are topics not identified as areas of concern or addressed in the preliminary

study, they can raise that concern tonight, submit their concern on a comment card, or submit a letter to Gregg Atkins, District Librarian.

Ms. Lafler provided an overview of the issues and topics that are typically included in an EIR and again noted that comments could be made tonight or submitted through August 23, 2010. If submitted in writing they should be submitted to the District Librarian as the Library is the Lead Agency for the project.

Comment: Parking needs to be addressed. Also, Highway 113 does have dangerous intersections.

Question: Is LSA neutral in their assessment?

Answer: Yes, LSA is retained by the Library District and has no affiliation with the architectural firm.

Question: Were biological resources considered when the house on the adjacent property was destroyed? Were there environmental considerations taken?

Answer: The demolition of this property was not part of the preliminary study. It was removed before the study was initiated.

Question: Will future demolition be part of the EIR?

Answer: Yes, future demolition and an evaluation of the existing trees will be part of the EIR.

Question: If LSA is a neutral party, why do public comments go to the Library District, and not LSA?

Answer: The Library is the Lead Agency. It is a standard practice of the EIR process for comments to be submitted to the Lead Agency.

Question: Will the EIR use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings? the address section 5.02.1 regarding historic resources, rehabilitation, change, etc.

Answer: Yes, we will reference these standards in preparing the EIR.

Question: Shouldn't this be looked at before design is considered - EIR first, followed by design?

Answer: The environmental consultant will continue to evaluate the project relative to environmental impacts as the design and detail evolves. Generally, the EIR evaluates the impacts of a design.

Public Comment: The objective of the process is for the lead agency to have a preferred project. The EIR evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and recommends mitigation measures to reduce these potential impacts. The Library Board will consider this evaluation of the proposed project, certify the EIR as adequately addressing the potential impacts, and include the proposed mitigation measures in their approval of the proposed project.

Ms. Lafler noted that the document must be certified before the project is approved or disapproved.

Question: The preliminary study states that preservation of large trees, where feasible, will occur. Who determines this?

Answer: No one knows at this time what trees will be impacted. Some will be incorporated into the project. It has been determined that the large oak will stay, as well as the park trees. Others will be looked at, and evaluated if feasible.

Question: Has LSA completed other EIR's in Dixon?

Answer: I don't think we have, however, we have many offices, and something may have been completed from another office that I am not aware of.

Question: Is another location being considered?

Answer: No, the southwest quadrant is a dead project.

Question: Can comments be submitted as a petition or group comment, or must it be by individual? What happens next?

Answer: A form letter or petition is acceptable. If you are concerned about an environmental topic not adequately addressed in the initial report, then the public needs to let us know. A draft report will be prepared over the next few months. One month will be allowed for public comment once the draft report is released. Responses will be documented and incorporated into the report. Final report will be submitted for review and approval.

Question: Do future projects enter into the EIR?

Answer: Cumulative impacts to this project need to be looked at relative to new or proposed projects that are in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Next Steps and Adjournment

Gladys Cornell reminded all attendees to complete a Comment Card with additional questions/comments and/or take one with them for future input.

Ms. Cornell announced the upcoming NLBC meeting on July 29, and the next SRG Meeting on September 21.

Ms. Cornell closed the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Comment Card Summary

A summary of Comment Cards collected include the following:

- I think that options A2 or B2 with the Carnegie on First Street would be the best because the old building will add to the historic “Main Street” of Dixon, where it has always been wasted on B Street. I agree with what Jack Caldwell said about it allowing for almost a “clean slate” for all of the new building.
- Can the next meeting be held someplace else? City Hall? Tremont School? I hate to complain, but the squeaking noise drove me crazy!! Is it the AC?
- I really like this new project and working with the community as a case manager here in Dixon I am very concerned because most of my clients are afraid that the library will be built but not used for man useful programs other than book. The community really needs programs for adults children and seniors, e.g. ISL classes, computer classes, music classes, etc. Also, another subject that I am concerned about would be staff. Would there be enough staff in that huge building?
- I think the discussion this evening (7/27/10) has focused too much on the historical aspect of the library building and people are forgetting that first and foremost, this building is a library. It needs to be serving our entire community, including adults, teens, children and families, not just those who are history buffs. I haven’t noticed it in the library, but it would be great if library staff solicited input from folks who actually use the library on a regular basis. It seems to me that the SRG has several representatives who do not use the library on a regular basis.
- Books (hard bound and paperback), not e-type are not going away. Nothing will replace sitting and reading a picture book with a child on your lap or relaxing anywhere with a wonderful paper novel. Frustrating to hear some SRG members forgetting purpose to get library built and more concerned with how/where with Carnegie building. Main importance is LIBRARY! They are missing BIG picture!
- CEQA comments should go directly to CSA not through Gregg Atkins – potential for conflict of interest. Parking lot on Jackson is not suitable for inclusion in number of spaces available – families won’t cross N. First Street with children in rain (example). Also, several spaces are reserved for “patients” and are filled during weekdays.

Technology 'survey' notes: summary

Library should make itself a 'local Google': a small data center with a small collection of stacks. It should be a community center with lecture and exhibit space as well as space for groups to meet. Include Wii stations, information kiosks and musical performances.

Ask Apple, Google, Microsoft, Oracle, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for grants to make our library a local data center: this is akin to what Carnegie did for the so-called 'dead-tree library'.

Design the building for maximum flexibility and easy access to cabling so that whatever comes after fiber-optic can be readily installed. Walls should be movable or removable and furniture should be readily reconfigured.

Library should be hub of self-improvement with a learning environment. Emphasize convenience, quality and customization. Current libraries are centralized with limited access. Libraries need flexible scheduling and open access to become an 'information ATM'.

Need a 'Loud Room' for public discourse and group projects. Need a multimedia space for activities such as shooting videos and recording music, host video game tournaments. Create an 'information column' where people can share digital and other news stories.

This should be a 24/7 electronic library = e-village. Social networking as well as learning environment is central to new library. This will take the place of school libraries (!)

Digital books are currently about 50% the price of hard copies. When this becomes 10% hard copies will mostly disappear. The increased convenience, portability and ease will drive users to have e-readers for e-books. Amazon currently sells more e-books than hardbacks.

Davis Public Library has a pilot program for downloadable media: a/v, videos, music and e-books can be 'checked out' to e-readers and in 3 weeks time will disappear ('poof') from the e-reader. This is the likely future for all libraries.

Beware funding a building with no funds for maintenance, upgrades and salaries. This is known as the 'Edifice Complex' and is to be avoided!

Find out why non-users don't have library cards.